Re-Envisioning the Roles, Tasks, and Contributions of Language Teachers in the Multilingual Era of Language Education Research and Practice

MAGDALENA KUBANYIOVA
University of Birmingham
School of Education
Edgbaston
Birmingham B15 2TT
United Kingdom
Email: m.kubanyiova@bham.ac.uk

GRAHAM CROOKES
University of Hawai'i
Department of Second Language Studies
1890 East-West Road
Honolulu, HI 96822
Email: crookes@hawaii.edu

This article lays out the proposition that the rapid changes in 21st-century society, in which multilingualism is the norm, have presented new challenges, questions, and resources with regard to the roles, tasks, and contributions of language teachers. In line with recent research developments and in keeping with tradition, we believe it helpful to think of language teachers' broader identity role as that of moral agent. We examine implications that such a re-envisioning has for the knowledge base of language teachers and for the purposes and practices of language teacher education and professional development. Drawing on research in language teacher education, language teacher cognition, second language acquisition, and applied linguistics more broadly, we highlight the need to go beyond traditional notions of teachers' knowledge of language, language learning, and language learners. We also subject to critical scrutiny the notions of effective pedagogies and reflective practice as the desired outcomes of language teacher preparation and development. Instead, we introduce critical alternatives that offer creative possibilities for educating teachers able and willing to serve student populations with diverse language learning needs across interlinguistic, sociopolitical, and historical contexts of language teaching.

Keywords: language teachers; language teacher education; teacher development; teacher identity; critical pedagogy; advocacy; moral values; moral vision

TO CELEBRATE THE CENTENARY OF THE founding of *The Modern Language Journal* we have been asked to review and address the role and position of 'the language teacher,' as part of this special issue. We do so as *MLJ* readers and authors, potentially in dialogue with the rest of the *MLJ* community. In giving us our charge, the Editorial Board put forward some broad questions concerning 'the teacher,' which challenge us (all) to think carefully, historically, broadly, perhaps

globally, and certainly critically, about this crucial concept. The major function of the present article is not to attempt to answer these questions authoritatively, but to provide food for reflective thought in this centenary year. Here are some of the questions initially posed: (a) What do we understand about the fundamental contribution of the teacher in language classrooms, schools, and beyond? (b) What do language teachers really need to know? (c) Why do language teachers do what they do? (d) How do language teachers develop? (e) How can language teachers adapt, innovate, and survive in the face of political, economic, and other realities that they must face? (f) How can we relate approaches to language teacher education to wider societal and cultural

values, language ideology, power, and material development in society?

These are, of course, very broad questions, and any answers that can fit within the compass of a journal article are bound to be partial. In addressing them, we note that on the occasion of the millennium, an *MLJ* retrospection on the previous century was undertaken (Magnan, 2000), so we shall not attempt to reproduce its debates here. Instead, we have opted for a bigger-picture treatment in which we aim to present key points around the following three themes: First, we build on one fundamental position identified for this special issue, which highlights the multilingual and multicultural nature of societies and learners as the norm. We concede that this postmodern condition has presented new challenges and questions with regard to the roles, tasks, and contributions of language teachers and we will spell out what we see as their core. In so doing, we will advocate for a need to turn more firmly to tradition in education in general and language teaching in particular.

Guided by this overarching framework, the second theme concerns the set of questions regarding the knowledge base of language teachers. In line with developments in language teacher education, language teacher cognition, second language acquisition, and applied linguistics more broadly, we suggest going beyond traditional notions of teachers' knowledge of language (typically operationalized in many a teacher education program around the world and in public discourses in terms of structural and competence-based proficiency measures), of language learning (largely guided by prevalent monolingual norms inherent in cognitivist approaches to SLA), and of language learners (traditionally seen through the monolithic lens of individual differences research on 'good language learners').

Finally, the third set of issues prompts a critical look at language teacher education and professional development purposes and practices. Specifically, we subject to scrutiny the often unexamined notions of 'effective' pedagogies and reflective practice as the desired outcomes of language teacher preparation and development. By considering the moral ends of language teacher education, we introduce alternative heuristics, which open up new possibilities for preparing teachers able and willing to serve diverse student populations with diverse language learning needs across interlinguistic, sociopolitical, and historical contexts of language teaching, while at the same time guarding against the 'psychologization' of education (cf. Zembylas, 2013); the idea that teachers and schools should provide solutions to what are predominantly structural problems.

NEW CHALLENGES, PERENNIAL ISSUES

Initial Reflections on the Fundamental Contribution of the Teacher in Language Classrooms, Schools, and Beyond

As Lantolf (2000, summarizing Byrnes, 2000) makes clear, the *MLJ*'s probable readership, or at least its contributors, shifted over the first half of its existence, with secondary school teachers who were once a significant portion of contributors since World War II becoming a minimal author group. Despite this shift,[1] we assume that the journal, its editors, authors, and readers think of 'the language teacher' as a professional, in command of a fairly extensive body of knowledge of the field of language teaching, high levels of expertise in the target language and culture, and committed to supporting students in their study of this area. Accordingly, the potential fundamental contribution of the language teacher is substantial.

Even an instrumental understanding of the 'fundamental contribution' is necessarily substantial: Understanding 'fundamental' as conceptually basic, the language teacher still is probably expected to shoulder major responsibilities to select material, arrange it, organize curriculum generally, motivate students, manage classrooms, liaise with parents (except in postsecondary education), work as a team member but take individual responsibility for success and failure, engage in assessment activities for students and evaluate a course or curriculum as a whole (or share in such duties), and in some cases raise funds for small or large co-curricular activities.

Understanding 'fundamental' in terms of what is conceptually most important for language teachers to do and to be seen as doing—the oft-contested area of the aims of teachers (cf. Wringe, 1988)—we could say that, at one level, language teachers mediate the Other to the culturally singular. A fundamental contribution then is simply that of maintaining or manifesting an identity that is not entirely mainstream (at least in, for example, the United States). In democratic countries, this should be in concert with a general responsibility to develop "moral and democratic citizens," just as *MLJ* readers were enjoined to do, through language teaching during the 1940s (Horwitz, 2000, p. 528). Beyond this responsibility, language teachers are now seen as implementing

(or resisting) language policies (e.g., Varghese, 2008) and having an activist role in the maintenance of cultures and languages under threat.

However, if "the view of language in society takes multilingual societies as the norm," as the charge for this special issue indicates, the fundamental contribution—and the notion itself—of the language teacher has inevitably changed. For much of the 20th century, the 'modern language' teacher (in the United States[2]) had the primary role of introducing an unknown 'other' language and culture to the purportedly monolingual mainstream high school or university student. Now, the contribution of the 'additional language' teacher across language learning contexts (e.g., foreign, second, bilingual, heritage, complementary, immersion, etc.) is to promote, maintain, and strengthen the multicultural nature of his or her society, enable students to navigate the complex language learning demands in their multilingual lifeworlds, and in some cases act as an advocate for minority cultures within a dominant culture and country.

A caveat must be entered concerning the unitary term 'the teacher'—it cannot withstand even our basic taken-for-granted understandings of diversity in the early 21st century. One naturally asks, "which teacher, where, in what kind of school?" Professionally employed language teachers are themselves diverse: rich or at least middle class though sometimes poor, also white, black, male, female, experienced and inexperienced, well resourced or working under conditions of poverty or military occupation, and so on. Also contrary to the initial 'professional' conception just articulated, it should not be forgotten that some language teachers work in positions so tightly controlled, in terms of curriculum content and job specifications, as to offer almost no opportunity for professional discretion; some may not have a sense of professional identity or any sense of vocation, as they simply utilize their native or near-native competence in a job that pays the bills while they wait for something else; some are taking up one of the few options available to an intelligent young woman in a patriarchal society. In general, most of the literature of our field, not to mention the *MLJ* archive, fondly addresses a well-resourced first world (or North American) audience, when the realities (even in the United States) are very different (for a rare counterexample in the *MLJ* and the United States, see Burnett, 2011).

What does it mean to think about schools, when some have air conditioning and others have neither floor nor windows (Hayes, 2010b; Tin, 2014)?

What does it mean to claim for the 'professional' teacher a degree of knowledge when so much that passes for knowledge in the field is both continually contested and regularly becomes apparently obsolete, especially as a result of technological changes? What does it mean to think about the contributions of the language teacher to societies when so many are in conflict or in a state of war (Bekerman & Zembylas, 2010; Hayes, 2010a, Nasser & Wong, 2013)? And, finally, what does it mean to be a language teacher in the age of globalization in places where young people do not have direct access to transglobal networks and mobility or move out of necessity rather than choice (Hawkins, 2014)? We attempt to engage with some of these issues in the face of changing realities of language teaching by focusing on what we, along with others, see as the core of the language teacher's role: that of a moral agent.

Re-Envisioning the Role of Language Teacher as a Moral Agent

Theorizing over the past 30 years on language teachers and teaching through cognitive (Borg, 2003), sociocultural (Johnson, 2006), and broader social (Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015) and critical turns (Crookes, 2009, 2013; Hawkins & Norton, 2009) has led to rethinking of the language teacher's identity from a "passive technician" to a "reflective practitioner" through to a "transformative intellectual" (Kumaravadivelu, 2003, pp. 8–13; 2012), which amplifies the moral orientation to conceiving the roles and identities of language teachers. Although such an outlook is certainly not new in education (cf. Fenstermacher, 1990), within our own area the turn toward value-oriented, moral, and ethical dimensions is, according to Morgan & Clarke (2011), "perhaps the most significant development in language teacher identity research" (p. 825).

Past debates in our field suggest that the question of values, moral visions, ideologies, and ethical judgment is inherent in virtually every aspect of language teaching and language teacher education, whether such debates have been informed by a critical theoretical stance (e.g., Crookes, 2009, 2010a, 2010b, 2013; Gray, 2013; Hafernik, Messerschmitt, & Vandrick, 2002; Hawkins, 2011; Johnston, 2003; Wong & Canagarajah, 2009) or whether they spring from empirical inquiry into the teachers' internal resources which shape and are shaped by their language teaching activity in the classrooms and schools (Golombek, 1998; Kubanyiova, 2009, 2012, 2015; Mori, 2011; Scarino, 2005). A political or moral stance may

be required in relation to the kinds of language practices that are promoted, tolerated, or discouraged in classrooms, schools, and beyond (Faltis, 2015; Razfar, 2012; Varghese, 2008) or to the conduct of interpersonal interactions between people in the classrooms (Burnett, 2011; Richards, 2006; Ushioda, 2011). The value orientation to the teacher's role also involves a critical examination of instructional practices that may feed student motivations for the study of languages that are tied to mere profit or power (Smith & Carvill, 2000) rather than common good, social justice, or intercultural understanding, and of the uses of testing as tools for accelerating political agendas rather than students' L2 development (Shohamy, 2005). Language teachers are constantly called upon to negotiate pedagogical choices that seek to develop students' additional languages (L2s) for a variety of educational, social, heritage, identity, and instrumental purposes in a range of contexts, such as foreign or world language education (Magnan, Murphy, & Sahakyan, 2014; Tin, 2014; Zhu Hua & Li Wei, 2014), immersion education (Cammarata & Tedick, 2012; Swain, 2000), CLIL (Dafouz & Hibler, 2013), multilingual environments of mainstream schooling (Creese, 2005; Varghese, 2008) or heritage/complementary education (Creese, Blackledge, & Takhi, 2014) while striving to maintain their L1s for those same purposes and often despite prevalent language ideologies and policies. In these and many other areas across the theoretical and curricular spectra of language teaching research and practice, the role of the language teacher emerges as one filled with questions of what languages and language teachers are for, what purposes language education and language teacher education should serve in societies in which multilingualism and multiculturalism are the norm, and what implications such broader values and purposes have for the teacher's here-and-now encounter with his or her students; questions that go well beyond the narrow pedagogical concerns of language instruction in the classroom, but which exert powerful influence on them.

Certainly, our own choice of the term 'moral' in envisioning the core role for language teachers is not without its problems and requires further justification. As the previous brief overview has shown, the terms moral, ethical, political, critical, or even a social justice perspective (cf. Hawkins, 2011) all offer creative possibilities for facilitating a fresh look at the tasks, challenges, and resources of language teachers in the multilingual era. Needless to say each also carries a set of distinctive and sometimes incompatible theoreti-cal, philosophical, historical, and practical meanings (for an overview, see Crookes, 2009). Our choice is motivated by our effort to build on tradition in general research on teachers and teaching (e.g., Fenstermacher, 1990; Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Hansen, 2001; Hargreaves, 1995; Sockett, 2008), which tends to deploy the term moral to foreground the dynamism between the teacher's (and the school's and society's) commitment to universalizing values, such as social justice, and his or her 'here-and-now' pedagogical and at the same time deeply personal investment in the moments of educational action. By choosing the term moral, then, we wish to emphasize the need to encompass at once an outward- (political, structural, societal) and inward-oriented (teacher's own emerging investment in the teacher–student encounter) dimension of the language teacher's contributions, roles, and tasks.

We acknowledge that this position raises additional questions. Are language teachers willing and able to become the moral agents? Are they free to act on their values and convictions? Will their desire to fulfil the role of moral agent meet support from others, especially those in positions of authority and power? Although particular lines of analysis (and tradition) may suggest this overarching responsibility of the language teacher, the practical circumstances of many language teachers around the world do not lend themselves to such an identity or role (cf. Fatima, 2013). This, perhaps, highlights the role of language teacher education in supporting but also advocating more widely for such a role, as discussed later in this article.

Our view of the matter, although intended to be forward looking, also draws on 'tradition.' First, the idea that as a teacher one is part of a tradition that preexists us and may continue after we are gone, prevents our own limited capacity to act from appearing both vanishingly small and pointless. Yes, quite possibly our contribution will be small, but we have a responsibility to those who came before us, and there will be others that follow. Second, for a major way of understanding knowledge and professional practices (Gadamer, 1960/1975; T. May, 2001), it is in fact impossible to know and act outside a tradition; without recognizing this or the traditions we are part of, we will have a limited ability to understand ourselves as language teaching professionals and contribute accordingly. As we engage with the key questions posed to us, we suggest that, although the contexts for language teaching may have changed dramatically (or we are now more aware of their diversity and wish to act and theorize accordingly),

it could be valuable to locate ourselves, as language educators, within specific traditions of our discipline.[3] Here we draw from philosopher of education Hansen (2001, p. 115), who depicts educational traditions as having the power to "deepen and intensify a teacher's connections with and commitment to the present." In his view,

> tradition in teaching symbolizes a dialogue across human generations. In that dialogue, the encounter with the past questions and curbs "presentist" impulses, among them the tendency to regard the fashionable views of today as infallibly wiser and more urgent than any alternatives that might come to mind (if they come to mind at all). The alternatives I have in view are not ideologies or educational formulae from days of yore (. . .). [T]he practice of teaching (. . .) does not constitute a hardened, unchangeable endeavor to which teachers must bend themselves unquestioningly. Rather, it is a living practice. It evolves as a result of the initiative and imagination of teachers, part of whose task is to respond (but not to "react") to external pressures and social demands. (Hansen, 2001, p. 9)

This outlook on teaching should help teachers to situate themselves in practice but also take a critical distance from it. It provides teachers with a shared intellectual and moral ground that allows them to talk and learn from one another despite differences in their institutional contexts, the age and proficiency levels of their students, and the languages or indeed subjects that they teach.

THE KNOWLEDGE BASE OF LANGUAGE TEACHERS IN THE MULTILINGUAL ERA

The older mainstream answer to the question of 'what language teachers really need to know' would have been couched in terms of formal knowledge of language structure and function, the target culture (seen as monolithic), basic pedagogical techniques, and the like. This picture is confirmed by Schulz's (2000) review of *MLJ* articles over the past century, though even as late as the 1940s "the methods course still was not a general requirement for all students preparing to teach FLs." (p. 502) On the other hand, curriculum design was not a large part of language teachers' knowledge, nor was test development. However, consider the recent three-volume series *What English Language Teachers Need to Know* (Murray & Christison, 2011a, 2011b, 2014), a reasonable and mainstream indicator, as its title suggests, of a current answer to the question. The authors helpfully divide this material into three domains: (a) the contexts of language teachers' work along with the target language and how it is learned, and the role of teachers as professionals, (b) planning, instructing, and assessing teaching, and (c) curriculum design.

Academics might be tempted (perhaps wrongly) to conceptualize language teachers' knowledge as somewhat equivalent to that housed in the academic fields pertinent to language teaching, that is, a broad version of applied linguistics along with, for example, what Shulman (1987) has established as pedagogical content knowledge. By the 1980s there had been repeated attention to the question among professional and government groups (at least in the United States, and as reported in the *MLJ*), mainly answered in terms of professional preparation courses.[4] Schulz's (2000) summary comments concerning changes, made as she looked back on a century of such questioning, are instructive, yet, in the end, disturbing. First, she notes that language teaching is certainly "no longer seen exclusively as an art" and that "we currently believe that there are principles, processes, skills, behaviors, techniques, strategies, beliefs, and attitudes that impact on teaching and learning and that can be empirically studied and 'taught'" (p. 517). Although methods courses have become accepted, their content is no longer exclusively informed by the study of 'methods,' but increasingly draws from the interdisciplinary connections with the domains of second language acquisition, psychology, linguistics, anthropology, and education. This much is commonplace. Yet, she continues:

> What struck me most, however, while going through thousands of pages of the *MLJ*, was that our progress (i.e., any documented, measurable impact on quality, quantity, or both) in the area of teacher development has been disappointingly small. We are still discussing many of the same issues that were discussed more than 80 years ago, and we still have not found solutions to many of the problems that plague the development of FL teachers. FL teacher preparation is still long on rhetoric, opinions, and traditional dogma, and short on empirical research that attempts to verify or test those opinions or traditional practices. Most perturbing, we still have not found ways to develop and to guarantee an adequate linguistic proficiency in all of our teachers. (. . .) We still have not found ways to ensure that all of our prospective teachers have an opportunity to spend some time in a target language country, despite 'the utter futility of book knowledge alone as a preparation for the teaching of a foreign language' (p. 411) already noted by Nunemaker in 1927 (. . .). Requirements for teacher preparation and teacher certification still reflect a chaotic variety among states, and certification is still no guarantee of adequate teacher competence in many states. School districts still

employ teachers who have only minimal qualifica-
tions (a minor or less) to teach FLs. (p. 517)

We agree with Schulz. Across a lengthy period of
time, observers of the state, needs, and knowledge
of language teachers are, unfortunately, making
the same points over and over again, presum-
ably because conditions are indeed not improv-
ing. Perhaps one difference in the early 21st cen-
tury is that technological archiving of professional
discourse should actually make it easier to notice
this (the *MLJ*'s complete electronic archive of is-
sues being a good example here). Perhaps, then,
other perspectives and forms of knowledge need
to be emphasized, that may address matters from
a slightly different angle.

Beyond Teachers' Knowledge, Beliefs, and Attitudes

Although many of Schulz's (2000) observa-
tions are just as relevant today, some of the as-
sumptions guiding discussion of what language
teachers need to know have changed dramat-
ically in the context of globalization, and ad-
ditional dimensions of teachers' knowledge are
now seen as crucial. For example, in addition
to teachers' knowledge, beliefs, and attitudes—
sometimes subsumed under the umbrella of lan-
guage teacher cognition (Borg, 2006)—teachers
need to 'know' metaknowledge: conceptual ma-
terial at a higher level than mere facts. Teach-
ers need have knowledge that enables them to
make sense of their moral and political lives
as language teachers. Thus language teachers
need a philosophy of teaching (cf. Crookes,
2015) and need to know how schools really
work, so as to be able to understand (and,
where necessary, critique) their own institution
and their role within it. They also need to
know how societies operate in regard to the
learning and teaching of languages, particularly
societies in which language learning is associated
with students advancing to social roles and di-
verse forms of employment through selective ed-
ucation systems. With this knowledge, they are
better placed to take actions, however small, to
improve the rationality and justice of their prac-
tice as language teachers.

Language teachers also need knowledge that
might be called teacher-level or teacher-specific
administrative knowledge. Even though by being
referred to as 'the teacher' and not 'the principal'
we are assuming that they do not administer their
schools, they nevertheless need to understand the
administrative structures of their institution and
the networks of power and control that penetrate

into it. In countries where there is a sufficient de-
gree of civil society (a regrettably small propor-
tion of the total), language teachers should know
how to work with other teachers and how to build
networks, preferably knowing of the existence of
teacher unions, and if necessary lawyers, to de-
fend their interests and protect them when and if
they are under attack (cf. Marshall & Oliva, 2006).
Primarily, however, what the multilingual condi-
tion has meant in terms of teachers' knowledge
is the need to move beyond the traditional (and
largely monolingually conceived) notions of lan-
guage, language learning, and language learners,
which are briefly discussed next.

Beyond the Knowledge of Language, Language Learning, and Language Learners

We follow Lantolf (2000) in noting the role
of major world events and periods in impacting
the *MLJ* and its world, both at the turn of the
millennium and now at the *MLJ*'s centenary. De-
spite problems with the term 'globalization,' it still
serves to indicate our view that the present state of
the world is different from what it was before. Any
language teacher whose career was established be-
fore, say, 1995, has seen such striking changes that
we feel compelled to sound this note once again.
As Kramsch (2014) has written:

> Through its mobility of people and capital, its global
> technologies and its global information networks,
> globalization has changed the conditions under
> which FLs are taught, learned, and used. It has desta-
> bilized the codes, norms, and conventions that FL
> educators relied upon to help learners be success-
> ful users of the language once they had left their
> classrooms. These changes call for a more reflec-
> tive, interpretive, historically grounded, and politi-
> cally engaged pedagogy than was called for by the
> communicative language teaching of the eighties. (p.
> 302)

This quote indicates the general impact of
globalization which has meant that 'our' (or
the *MLJ*'s) core understanding of language has
shifted focus, to one which is much more em-
bodied and by no means confined to words.
Halliday's (1978) definition of language as a
social semiotic is longstanding, but changes in
the means and mechanisms of language-based
communication have increased its saliency. In
particular, computer-mediated communication
and the rise of virtual reality has called the body
into question but called it back into the theory
and practice of language learning, teaching,
use, and research, with gesture (e.g., Belhiah,
2013) and other aspects of language, and

conceptions of literacy that go beyond the spoken word both more obviously part of what we should teach and what technology allows us to research (e.g., McCafferty & Stam, 2008). Teachers' knowledge of language is tied to their embodied lived experiences and multilingual repertoires (Coffey, 2015) and integrates a broader intercultural perspective, which Liddicoat & Scarino (2013, p. 6) defined as "the self-awareness of the language teacher as a participant in linguistic and cultural diversity; it is therefore not simply a way of teaching, but a way of understanding lived experiences of language and culture as the framing for teaching."

Despite these complex, multifaceted, and socially embedded understandings of language discussed in contemporary applied linguistics research, language teacher candidates in many contexts around the world have been largely exposed to narrow and static notions, which depict language as object, with its well defined and fixed morphological, syntactical, phonological, and pragmatic features, and leave unaddressed the pedagogical implications of the socially grounded understandings of language as "social institution, as verbal practice, as reflexive practice" (Trappes–Lomax, 2002, p. 1). Although, echoing the words of Schulz (2000) presented earlier, the interpretative, embodied, personal, and culturally embedded notions of language still pertain more to rhetoric informed by applied linguistics research than the actual practices of language teacher preparation (cf. Lantolf, 2009; Tedick, 2009), there are already signs of promising efforts to bring the new understandings of what it means 'to mean' across languages and cultures to bear on the preparation of language teachers and subject this process to empirical inquiry (Byrnes, 2012; Coffey, 2015; Gebhard et al., 2013; Scarino, 2014, Svalberg, 2015).

Another key concept associated with language that globalization calls us to focus on is the nation-state. Under globalization, this has been thoroughly called into question (see e.g., Vertovec, 2009). Now perceived as less or even nonhomogeneous, multicultural, and also often quite unable to protect its citizens (or defend its language teachers), the sociopolitical realities make language teaching—for what national or global purposes, with what populations?—a question more urgently in need of being answered. Some language teachers teach for the maintenance of nations in diasporic forms beyond the nation-state; many language teachers take advantage of the nonhomogeneity of their nations to benefit their students; and language teaching in coun-

tries such as the United States (particularly of so-called critical languages) is strongly supported by 'security interests' that have heightened, as secure borders and the security of citizens have been less able to be maintained by agents of the state.

Related to the notion of language as social practice of meaning-making are the changing perceptions of what it means to learn it. Firth and Wagner's (1997) challenge to the then dominant cognitivist tradition in SLA research has since fuelled a range of 'alternative' (Atkinson, 2011) epistemological approaches to L2 learning. These have shifted away from the view of language learning as an incremental and linear adding to an L2 linguistic code and of the language learner as "deficient communicator" (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 285). Instead, the focus in much SLA research is now on language learning as a "dynamic process of ever-expanding meaning-making" (Byrnes, 2012, p. 21), in which participants invest their multilingual repertoires and social identities (S. May, 2014; Norton, 2000; Ortega, 2013). Learning an additional language therefore "positions that person differently in relation to the world in which they live" (Liddicoat & Scarino, 2013, p. 6), and the identity of 'language learner' is seen as only one of multiple positionings in the meaning-making process. The conception of 'the learner' is continually shifting, as new emphases come to the forefront. Learners are no longer solely monocultural individuals seeking a liberal education through exposure to the best of another culture, but also interculturally minded citizens ready "to enter—through imagination and empathy—into an active and open-ended engagement with difference" (Lloyd, 2012, p. 492), or heritage students, struggling to improve their situation through maintaining their first language, or retaining a space for the indigenous language inside an otherwise oppressive and alien curriculum. All of this has significant implications for what language teachers need to know about language, language learning, and language learners, eloquently summarized by Creese et al., (2014):

> Our study shows that proficiency is not fixed, but rather depends on local knowledge about student lives and community histories. Linguistic prowess and skill is much more than the use of an unchanging linguistic standard in a target language linked to a country of origin. Rather, an ability to draw on a range of linguistic resources which index a similarly complex range of social and historical experiences is an important proficiency for the language teacher in the language classroom. Migration

histories, local Birmingham knowledge, and shared aspirations around education and employment all play into the teacher–student relationship and are indexed through the use of the most minute of linguistic signs. We argue that teacher professional development must work with a comprehensive view of the language teacher that attends to the social context, power relations, and ideologies in play and not to static notions of native-like proficiency. (p. 948)

LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PURPOSES AND PRACTICES

Language teacher development is a subject that has appeared repeatedly in the pages of the *MLJ*, usually with a sense that language teachers are not well prepared; admittedly, we still know little about how they develop. True, language teacher development has become better grounded and theorized, particularly in Vygotskyan sociocultural theory (e.g., Johnson, 2009) and theoretical debates on what should constitute the knowledge base of language teacher education are well known (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Tarone & Allwright, 2005; Yates & Muchinsky, 2003). Empirically, however, the field has yet to generate substantial data-based evidence of how language teachers make sense of their professional lives at different stages of their career (to the extent that they do) and how (or whether) they become moral agents within their sociocultural, historical, and political contexts, especially with regard to the new demands discussed in this article. While conditions for development as well as trajectories or stages of development have been a major theme in education research (cf. Huberman, Grounauer, & Marti, 1993), given its importance, one might wish for more and broader work in this area for language teachers.

Much of the available empirical research in the language teacher development domain has been done on the very early stages of development, not least because that is what researchers have easiest access to (e.g., Barnes, 2006; Farrell, 2003, 2006, 2012; Golombek, 2015; Johnson, 2015; Johnson & Golombek, 2011), with some work illustrating the development of experienced language teachers (e.g., Kubanyiova, 2012; Moodie & Feryok, 2015; Tsui, 2003). The converging evidence from this body of work points to the centrality of language teachers' identity development in this process. For example, using longitudinal data of two novice language teachers, Kanno and Stuart (2011) have argued convincingly that rather than the acquisition of teacher knowledge, it is the development of a teacher identity that constitutes the central project of learning to teach. Similarly, Kubanyiova's (2012) inquiry into EFL teachers' engagement with a specific educational innovation has underscored the crucial role of teachers' identity-relevant vision rather than knowledge as influential in their development. The study has also shown that when the moral concerns are missing from the teachers' visions of themselves, there is little chance of meaningful development that would have significant consequences for language students' classroom experiences. More generally, there is growing consensus that developing teachers' "ethical knowing" (Scarino, 2005, p. 33), which includes reflection on the philosophies, values, and moral purposes that guide their practices, constitutes a critical task of preservice and in-service language teacher education.

In general teacher education, the classic work by Huberman et al. (1993), depicting teachers' professional trajectories through the life span, based on an enormous data set (5-hour-long interviews with a sample of 160 Swiss secondary teachers), provides an account of phases of teachers' development through a career, looking in detail at such matters as change in degree of 'pedagogical mastery,' teachers' motivation level and satisfaction with their work, their levels of 'activism' or engagement with the job itself at different times in their career, and entry and exit phases and dispositions. While the researchers found patterns, they also observed that "human development is largely *teleological*; that is, human actors observe, study and plan the sequences they follow and, in doing so, are able to orientate and even to determine the course of events in each succeeding phase" (p. 18). Rejecting somewhat deterministic sociological and "psychodynamic" analyses of development, they concluded that "the development of human characteristics is . . . more the result of a co-creation: of a voluntary or adaptive change by individuals interacting in a distinct social environment" (p. 18).

With this in the background as the gold standard, one may in contrast note that there is valuable but much less extensive work in our field, including, for example, Pennington (1996) and Johnston (1997) on TESOL teachers' careers (concerning Hong Kong and Poland, respectively).[5] The most obvious difference between the studies in our field and the findings by Huberman et al. is Johnston's finding of the evanescent or nonexistent nature of the language teachers' career. In brief, his EFL teachers in Poland did *not* have careers. They did not move

through positions of increasing demand or responsibility; they did not have secure positions at all; and they did not receive increasing rewards, professional or monetary.[6]

In thinking about language teacher development, one can take an individual focus, one can think about teacher–teacher relationships, and one can think about the work context. In terms of theories of development, one could again have an individual focus, a sociocultural Vygotskyan one (Johnson, 2006, 2009) or a social learning theory (e.g., Wenger, 1998). Our field (not to mention education) has been spelling out the conditions needed for effective teacher development for decades, yet in some countries and sectors at least it seems that not only has no progress been made, but the movement overall has been backward (if one espouses a morally informed, professionally oriented conception of the teacher). So while we can continue to refer to the psychological processes and institutional conditions for 'language teacher development,' from this point of view there could be a resistant response to the question (replying, "*Do* they develop?"), and we should be able to take a broader structural (social, institutional) view on the issue.

With this in mind, the research in education as well as language teaching has clearly important insights to contribute to the reflection on how language teacher education and language teacher development could go about preparing and supporting language teachers for their role as moral agents in the multilingual classroom, school, and society, while at the same time raising awareness of the broader context of macro structures which could make the impact of teacher education potentially limited. We briefly reflect on three related issues, including the need to (a) rethink the meaning of 'effective' practice, (b) broaden the scope and purposes of reflective practice in language teacher education, and (c) enable teachers to develop an advocacy stance.

Rethinking 'Effective' Practice

Effectiveness has often been the fallback value for much, if not most teaching. We are implicitly enjoined by administrators, parents, and government policy makers to be maximally efficient in developing 'the language' among our students. Despite Kumaravadivelu (2003) and others, methods and techniques are still advocated as answers to the question "What is the best way to teach an L2?" (the context being taken for granted as a classroom of 20 or more students), where best is again implicitly or explicitly taken to mean most efficient—quickest in getting the average student to increase the maximum on any recognized test of language proficiency, whether conceptualized as structural or communicative. In philosophy of education terms, this is, of course, an 'essentialist' position.

Some other rationales (and traditions) for education, such as the desire of perennialist liberal education (Carbone, 1996; Van Doren, 1943) to bring out the best in a human being, or the progressive position, to prepare a student to be a productive and engaged member of a democracy, stand faint chance of being heard in the underresourced, oversurveilled classrooms of most developed countries (as they struggle with the neoliberal politico-economic environment of the early 21st century). Yet meanwhile (perhaps blindly, or as a result of ivory tower insulation), a substantial part of academic discussion of language education remains interested in advocating for any less instrumental conceptions of language teaching. In offering a discussion of some areas in which the term efficiency does not govern, we want to point out that we are not offering a progress narrative. These are reiterations and instantiations of positions available for as long as mass education has manifested itself in language teaching; but being marginal, they are always less visible than the mainstream.

Critical pedagogy has become a standard guest at many a language conference and probably creeps into at least some advanced university language classes and informs some heritage language programs. For World Languages, we have the steady output of senior scholars such as Osborn (2006), Reagan (2009), Kubota (2010), and many others; particularly for heritage and bilingual education, we can rely on both long established and more recent lines of work (cf. García, 2008; Kramsch & von Hoene, 1993; Leeman & Roman–Mendoza, 2011) manifested by numerous and diverse scholars. (We are confining ourselves to language teaching here, though of course these ideas apply to L2 use, language policy, and so on.) In general, it is important for language teacher educators "to better understand both the local and social realities of secondary language classrooms so that teacher education programs may more broadly serve their prospective teachers' needs and the communities in which they will live and teach" (Burnett, 2011, p. 4). The implications of this line of critique for language teacher education have also become apparent (Hawkins, 2011).

Broadening the Scope and Purposes of Reflective Practice

Paralleling the work on critical pedagogy is ongoing inquiry into teaching that highlights the key role of the 'inner landscapes' of teachers' lives (cf. Kubanyiova, 2015) in shaping the quality and meaning of their classroom practices and interactions with students (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2009; Kelchtermans, 2009; Korthagen, Attema–Noordewier, & Zwart, 2014; Zembylas & McGlynn, 2012), particularly prominent amongst which appears to be *teacher vision* (Borrero, 2011; Gillette & Schultz, 2008; Hammerness, 2006; Kennedy, 2006; Kubanyiova, 2012). In other words, how or indeed whether teachers enact particular pedagogies and practices and what consequences these have for students' learning experience appears to depend on the kinds of visions that teachers bring into these practices. In addition to cultivating teachers' critical pedagogies, therefore, it seems crucial to begin to think of the core task of language teacher education in terms of facilitating the development of the kinds of moral visions that will enable language teachers to adapt, innovate, and survive in the face of political, economic, and other realities they must face in order to enhance language learning experiences for diverse language learners, users, and persons in their classrooms. This leads to our call for broadening the current scope and purpose of *reflective practice*. Drawing on the work of Hargreaves (1995), Kelchtermans (2009) has made the following statement in this respect:

> Few educationalists will deny the importance of reflection in teaching and teacher development. Since the early 1980s—especially with the publication of Schön's seminal book on the reflective practitioner (1983)—the term has never left the hit-parade of trendy educational concepts. I am using the term 'reflection' here in a very broad sense to refer to both the skill and the attitude of making one's own actions, feelings, experiences the object of one's thinking. Yet, there is a need for caution. Very often we see that reflective skills and practices are being used in a predominantly instrumental and technical way. Teaching as enacted scholarship demands a concept of reflection that is both deep and broad enough to encompass its moral, political and emotional dimensions. (p. 267)

The technicist view of language teaching that decades of conventional research have supported remains dominant, in the sense that values are rarely engaged within language teacher education. If they are, they are also at risk of being displaced by another equally strong ethos to be found in some parts of language teaching (particularly private language school language teaching), which might be called instrumental in the sense that for a substantial section of our field, language teaching is a transaction between client and trainer, governed by an hourly charge.

We would like to think that the overall view of the field (at least from the *MLJ* perspective) is more sympathetic to a morally informed viewpoint. This stance was always there in the tradition of bilingual education, which acts on the moral ground of the rightness of preserving cultures. But the handful of titles with the word 'moral' in them within, say, the *MLJ* archive, is indicative of its attenuated presence. Nevertheless, in the work of Johnston, not to mention Vandrick, and even Crookes, along with the morally grounded critique of applied linguistics and language teaching drawn upon by advocates of critical applied linguistics (e.g., Pennycook, 2001), we can find some resources for the development of a moral vision by language teachers (Dörnyei & Kubanyiova, 2014; Kubanyiova, 2014). We are also starting to see empirical work submitted to peer-reviewed journals that follows on literature reviews (e.g., Crookes, 2013) that will document the teaching philosophies of language teachers.

We do not wish to suggest that the pragmatic pedagogical concerns (in relation to, for example, error correction, treatment of L1, assessment, or syllabus design) have no place in reflective practice and should give way to what may be perceived as somewhat abstract notions of moral values and visions; quite the contrary. What we hope to have shown throughout this article is that these pragmatic concerns and actions are indeed fundamental to what language teachers do on the ground, but that hardly any of them can be divorced from their "primary," "predominant," and "pervasive" moral dimension (Sockett, 2008, p. 59). As Sockett claims and we tend to agree, "there is no aspect of the engagement to which the moral is irrelevant" (p. 59).

Thus, language teacher education researchers will not only need to continue in their empirical inquiry into how language teachers become self-aware (cf. Farrell, 2013), but also how such self-awareness can be harnessed to enable student teachers to forge their moral visions and readiness for action. Until the field has produced relevant data-based evidence (cf. Mann & Walsh, 2013) of how such identities, commitments, and actions can be fostered through reflective practice, its contribution and value for preparing language teachers willing and able to support students' complex language learning needs in their

multilingual lifeworlds must remain subject to on-going and critical scrutiny.

Toward Advocacy

Throughout this discussion, we have endeavored to link approaches to language teacher education to wider societal and cultural values, language ideology, power, and material development in society, which is why we have advocated for critical language teacher education and teacher development. In this final note, pertinent to language teachers' *advocacy positions*, we wish to focus on *surveillance* (Taylor, 2012), a theme which, though initially articulated for the social sciences by Foucault more than anyone else, as far back as 1968, now seems to be a highly prominent aspect of globalization, and certain languages, and language users in particular; as well it potentially affects language teachers' practices in classrooms and society.

Schulz (2000), reflecting on almost 100 years of *MLJ* literature on teacher development, refers to working conditions as still poor:

> Teachers (not just those teaching FLs) are still over worked, under valued, and underpaid, and their status as a profession will remain questionable without common professional standards and procedures for policing themselves and enforcing the standards. No one can claim that a teacher's work has become easier at the beginning of the 21st century than it was a century ago. In spite of technological advances and the much-hyped knowledge revolution, the classroom teacher—regardless of instructional level—still has to deal in oversized classes with individual learners who differ in language learning aptitude, motivation, interest, ambition, learning styles, parental support, and educational, social and economic needs, and with learners who are distracted by myriad conflicting interests, temptations, and demands among which they have to prioritize their time and energies. More than ever before, FL teachers need opportunities, time, financial support, and encouragement to keep up with the changes in their field, the changes in SLA and pedagogical theories and practices, the changes in technology, and the changes in the society that sends its children to educate for an unpredictable future. (. . .) American society at large needs to insist on working conditions and reward and support systems for teachers that will attract talented individuals from all subcultures of American society and encourage highly qualified and competent teachers to remain in our schools. As long as teachers need to find part-time or summer employment to provide the basic material comforts for themselves and their families, as long as they have to face up to five different preparations a day in classes of 25 students and more, as long as they are faced with in-structional settings where, at best, they can function as custodians, we will neither attract nor retain a sufficient number of highly qualified and highly motivated teachers. (pp. 517–518)

Similarly, Clarke (1994), some decades ago, specifically referring to *reflective practice* for TESOL teachers, commented:

> If teachers are to be considered reflective practitioners, they need to be given the responsibility and the discretion to do their jobs. Of primary importance is the need for the time to reflect; collaborate; observe other teachers; develop personal theories, curriculum, materials, and so forth. In addition, teachers need smaller classes, more hospitable classrooms, and the resources to experiment with and change their approach to teaching. In short, the day-to-day business of teaching must become more conducive to thoughtful work. (p. 23)

Nothing has changed to make these recommendations, which were correct at the time, any less correct now. But since then, the working conditions of language teachers in many countries have deteriorated in the face of accountability and surveillance regimes, and in some cases broad declines in state funding of postsecondary and adult education. This leads us to the even greater need for language teachers themselves to organize, build support from communities, and advocate for their own programs.[7]

Opinion and support for this position in the field has increased. Crookes and Talmy (2004) was an early review of this (using in addition to *advocacy* the term *program advancement*) for an ELL program, which documented a case in which language teachers and language program directors were quite unprepared to engage in advocacy, and did so poorly even in the face of budget cuts and despite a sympathetic press.[8] Very recently, it is encouraging to see an entire collection of chapters in Bigelow and Ennser–Kananen (2015) devoted to the topic, though the increased attention we find in the research literature could reflect the greater pressure under which many language program administrators and teachers feel they are working. What we do not have, and might benefit from, would be accounts of how language program advocacy and associated language policy developments take place (or consistently fail to occur) in less democratic societies. (Why, for example, are Korean teachers of English still apparently unable to affect the English testing regime that continues to stymie efforts to teach for communication?) Key points that are made by Faltis (2015) and others include the need for teachers to develop institutional alliances,

develop connections with parents, network with the community, train in leadership skills (which apply to all, not merely to those designated as 'leaders'), and engage in fundraising. All these are essential skills in an age of neoliberal globalization, as the state reduces its support for education; and they are of course skills and concepts which rarely appear in language teacher education programs.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In summary, it is obvious that as humans' ability to know more about the world as a whole has certainly increased at the beginning of the 21st century, it has also increased our ability to see the range and diversity of the worlds of language teaching and perceive them with a sense of duration and time depth. Unfortunately these advances have heightened our (the authors') frustration that the role(s) of language teachers remain, despite exceptions, insufficiently supported by contexts of work and societal expectations. This perspective led us to try to see things a little differently in regard to what language teachers might need to know and how they might need to be supported through teacher education. We have advocated for a perspective that follows from that more critical vantage point that the more accessible (more international, more multilingual) archive of modern language teaching provides; and this is a perspective that naturally encourages a moral vision and a critical, indeed sceptical viewpoint. We do of course mean this in a constructive way. And we conclude with a quote that refers us to the perennial hope of the profession, our teacher students, and perhaps will also remind readers, particularly those who have responsibilities in this area, of our need for reflexive self-examination and development as well: "If we are serious about fostering an environment that encourages our teacher candidates to take action and teach for change in the roles as teachers, we must not only facilitate environments that encourage such practice, but also model what we envision in our own daily practice as teacher educators" (Gillette & Schultz, 2008, p. 236).

NOTES

[1] Though we should not homogenize the past, a persistent early worry expressed by *MLJ* authors was that language teachers did not have good command of the language; and during the heyday of the audiolingual method, there was also worry that the work of language teachers had been "trivialized" (Horwitz, 2000, p. 530). There was also early commitment in the journal (identified by Byrnes, 2000) to the idea that teachers were born and not made (and thus not amenable to teacher training, and presumably not in need of extensive amounts of professional knowledge).

[2] After the eradication of, for example, German bilingual schools as a by-product of the chauvinist atmosphere of World War I.

[3] Of which we favor the liberal (perennial) and critical.

[4] For example, writing in the *MLJ*, Bernhardt and Hammadou (1987) analyzed the state of research in FL teacher education in light of issues raised in *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of the Holmes Group* (1986). Looking at the previous decade's (1977–1987) publications in the area of second (L2) or FL education, the authors hoped that their analysis would shed light on the following questions: "What should foreign language teachers know? What should they do? How should foreign language teachers be prepared?" (p. 290).

[5] More recently, see Apelgren (2014) and Al–Ahdal (2014), empirical studies of language teachers' developmental trajectory building on Huberman's work. Note Shelley, Murphy, and White (2012), which combines an interest in teacher narratives of change with consideration of language teacher cognition.

[6] Compare Al–Ahdal's plausible comment that "In Yemen and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, [English teachers'] upward mobility is purely on seniority; merit alone gets back-seat" (2014, p. 30).

[7] For example, http://teflequityadvocates.com/the-blog/; https://scelt.wordpress.com/ ("The official blog of the Slovak Chamber of English Teachers")

[8] When originally submitted, the article was rejected out of hand by a major sister journal to this one, on grounds of irrelevance.

REFERENCES

Al–Ahdal, A. A. M. H. (2014). High school English teachers' professional life cycle: A study in an EFL context. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *4*, 30–38.

Apelgren, B.–M. (2014). Personal ways into and forward in language teaching. *International Journal of Language Academy*, *2*, 144–164.

Atkinson, D. (Ed.). (2011). *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition.* New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Barnes, A. (2006). Confidence levels and concerns of beginning teachers of modern foreign languages. *Language Learning Journal*, *34*, 37–46.

Bekerman, Z., & Zembylas, M. (2010). Fearful symmetry: Palestinian and Jewish teachers confront contested narratives in integrated bilingual education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *26*, 507–515.

Belhiah, H. (2013). Using the hand to choreograph instruction: On the functional role of gesture in definition talk. *Modern Language Journal*, *97*, 417–434.

Bernhardt, E., & Hammadou, J. (1987). A decade of research in foreign language teacher education. *Modern Language Journal*, *71*, 289–299.

Bigelow, M., & Ennser–Kananen, J. (Eds.). (2015). *The Routledge handbook of educational linguistics*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*, 81–109.

Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education: Research and practice*. London: Continuum.

Borrero, N. (2011). Entering teaching for and with love: Visions of pre-service urban teachers. *Journal of Urban Learning, Teaching, and Research*, *7*, 18–26.

Bullough, R. V. J., & Pinnegar, S. (2009). The happiness of teaching (as eudaimonia): Disciplinary knowledge and the threat of performativity. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *15*, 241–256.

Burnett, J. (2011). Two case studies of secondary language teaching: A critical look at the intersection of management and the local and social realities that shape our classrooms. *Modern Language Journal*, *95*, 4–26.

Byrnes, H. (2000). Shaping the discourse of a practice: The role of linguistics and psychology in language teaching and learning. *Modern Langugage Journal*, *84*, 472–494.

Byrnes, H. (2012). Of frameworks and the goals of collegiate foreign language education: Critical reflections. *Applied Linguistics Review*, *3*, 1–24.

Carbone, P. F. (1996). A book review of *Liberal Education*. *Educational Studies*, *27*, 217–227.

Cammarata, L., & Tedick, D. J. (2012). Balancing content and language in instruction: The experience of immersion teachers. *Modern Language Journal*, *96*, 251–269.

Clarke, M. A. (1994). The dysfunctions of the theory/practice discourse. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*, 9–26.

Coffey, S. (2015). Reframing teachers' language knowledge through metaphor analysis of language portraits. *Modern Language Journal*, *99*, 500–514.

Creese, A. (2005). *Teacher collaboration and talk in multilingual classrooms*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Creese, A., Blackledge, A., & Takhi, J. K. (2014). The ideal 'native speaker' teacher: Negotiating authenticity and legitimacy in the language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, *98*, 937–951.

Crookes, G. (2009). *Values, philosophies, and beliefs in TESOL: Making a statement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crookes, G. (2010a). Language teachers' philosophies of teaching: Bases for development and possible lines of investigation. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, *4*, 1126–1136.

Crookes, G. (2010b). The practicality and relevance of second language critical pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, *43*, 333–348.

Crookes, G. (2013). *Critical ELT in action: Foundations, promises, praxis*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Crookes, G. (2015). Redrawing the boundaries on theory, research, and practice concerning language teachers' philosophies and language teacher cognition: Toward a critical perspective. *Modern Language Journal*, *99*, 485–499.

Crookes, G., & Talmy, S. (2004). Second/foreign language program preservation and advancement: Literatures and lessons for teachers and teacher education. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *1*, 219–236.

Dafouz, E., & Hibler, A. (2013). 'Zip your lips' or 'Keep quiet': Main teachers' and language assistants' classroom discourse in CLIL settings. *Modern Language Journal*, *97*, 655–669.

Dörnyei, Z., & Kubanyiova, M. (2014). *Motivating learners, motivating teachers: Building vision in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faltis, C. (2015). Language advocacy in teacher education and schooling. In M. Bigelow & J. Ennser–Kananen (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of educational linguistics* (pp. 65–78). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Farrell, T. S. (2003). Learning to teach English language during the first year: Personal influences and challenges. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *19*, 95–111.

Farrell, T. S. (2006). The first year of language teaching: Imposing order. *System*, *34*, 211–221.

Farrell, T. S. (2012). Novice–service language teacher development: Bridging the gap between preservice and in-service education and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*, 435–449.

Farrell, T. S. (2013). Teacher self-awareness through journal writing. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, *14*, 465–471.

Fatima, Z. (2013). *Vision, values and philosophies of English language teachers working in a state school of Karachi*. (Unpublished MA thesis). University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK.

Fenstermacher, G. (1990). Some moral considerations on teaching as a profession. In J. Goodlad, R. Soder, & K. Sirotnik (Eds.), *The moral dimensions of teaching* (pp. 130–151). San Francisco: Jossey–Bass.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal*, *81*, 285–300.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*, 397–417.

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). (1992). *Teacher development and educational change*. London: Falmer Press.

Gadamer, H.–G. (1960/1975). *Truth and method*. New York: Seabury.

García, O. (2008). Multilingual language awareness and teacher education. In J. Cenoz & N. H.

Hornberger (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education* (2nd ed., pp. 385–400). New York: Springer.

Gebhard, M., Chen, I.–A., Graham, H., & Gunawan, W. (2013). Teaching to mean, writing to mean: SFL, L2 literacy, and teacher education. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 22,* 107–124.

Gillette, M. D., & Schultz, B. D. (2008). Do you see what I see? Teacher capacity as vision for education in a democracy. In M. Cochran–Smith, S. Feiman–Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 231–237). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Golombek, P. R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly, 32,* 447–464.

Golombek, P. R. (2015). Redrawing the boundaries of language teacher cognition: Language teacher educators' emotion, cognition, and activity. *Modern Language Journal, 99,* 470–484.

Gray, J. (Ed.). (2013). *Critical perspectives on language teaching materials.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hafernik, J. J., Messerschmitt, D. S., & Vandrick, S. (2002). *Ethical issues for ESL faculty: Social justice in practice.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning.* London: Edward Arnold.

Hammerness, K. (2006). *Seeing through teachers' eyes: Professional ideals and classroom practices.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hansen, D. T. (2001). *Exploring the moral heart of teaching: Toward a teacher's creed.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Hargreaves, A. (1995). Development and desire: A postmodern perspective. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), *Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices* (pp. 9–34). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hawkins, M. R. (Ed.). (2011). *Social justice language teacher education.* Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hawkins, M. R. (2014). Ontologies of place, creative meaning making and critical cosmopolitan education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 44,* 90–112.

Hawkins, M., & Norton, B. (2009). Critical language teacher education. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 30–39). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hayes, D. (2010a). Duty and service: Life and career of a Tamil teacher of English in Sri Lanka. *TESOL Quarterly, 44,* 58–83.

Hayes, D. (2010b). 'Education is all about opportunities, isn't it?': A biographical perspective on learning and teaching English in Sri Lanka. *Harvard Educational Review, 80,* 517–540.

Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group.* East Lansing, MI:

Holmes Group. Accessed 14 September 2015 at http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED270454

Horwitz, E. (2000). Teachers and students, students and teachers: An ever-evolving partnership. *Modern Language Journal, 84,* 523–535.

Huberman, M., Grounauer, M.–M., & Marti, J. (1993). *The lives of teachers.* London: Cassell.

Johnson, K. E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 40,* 235–257.

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective.* New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Johnson, K. E. (2015). Reclaiming the relevance of L2 teacher education. *Modern Language Journal, 99,* 515–528.

Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (Eds.). (2011). *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development.* New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Johnston, B. (1997). Do EFL teachers have careers? *TESOL Quarterly, 31,* 681–712.

Johnston, B. (2003). *Values in English language teaching.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). The development of L2 teacher identity: Longitudinal case studies. *Modern Language Journal, 95,* 236–252.

Kelchtermans, G. (2009). Who I am in how I teach is the message: Self-understanding, vulnerability and reflection. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 15,* 257–272.

Kennedy, M. M. (2006). Knowledge and vision in teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57,* 205–211.

Korthagen, F. A., Attema–Noordewier, S., & Zwart, R. C. (2014). Teacher–student contact: Exploring a basic but complicated concept. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 40,* 22–32.

Kramsch, C. (2014). Teaching foreign languages in an era of globalization: Introduction. *Modern Language Journal, 98,* 296–311.

Kramsch, C., & von Hoene, L. (1993). The dialogic emergence of difference: Feminist explorations in foreign language learning and teaching. In D. C. Stanton & A. J. Stewart (Eds.), *Feminisms in the academy* (pp. 330–358). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Kubanyiova, M. (2009). Possible selves in language teacher development. In Z. Dörnyei & E. Ushioda (Eds.), *Motivation, language identity and the L2 self* (pp. 314–332). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Kubanyiova, M. (2012). *Teacher development in action: Understanding language teachers' conceptual change.* Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kubanyiova, M. (2014). Motivating language teachers: Inspiring vision. In D. Lasagabaster, A. Doiz, & J. M. Sierra (Eds.), *Motivation and foreign language learning: From theory to practice* (pp. 71–89). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kubanyiova, M. (2015). The role of teachers' future self guides in creating L2 development

opportunities in teacher-led classroom discourse: Reclaiming the relevance of language teacher cognition. *Modern Language Journal, 99*, 565–584.

Kubanyiova, M., & Feryok, A. (2015). Language teacher cognition in applied linguistics research: Revisiting the territory, redrawing the boundaries, reclaiming the relevance. *Modern Language Journal, 99*, 435–449.

Kubota, R. (2010). Critical multicultural education and second/foreign language teaching. In S. May & C. E. Sleeter (Eds.), *Critical multiculturalism* (pp. 99–112). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2012). *Language teacher education for a global society*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). A century of language teaching research: Looking back and looking ahead. *Modern Language Journal, 84*, 467–471.

Lantolf, J. P. (2009). Knowledge of language in foreign language teacher education. *Modern Language Journal, 93*, 270–274.

Leeman, J., & Roman–Mendoza, E. (2011). Critical pedagogy beyond the classroom walls: Community service-learning and Spanish heritage language education. *Heritage Language Journal, 8*, 1–22.

Liddicoat, A. J., & Scarino, A. (2013). *Intercultural language teaching and learning*. Malden, MA: Wiley–Blackwell.

Lloyd, G. (2012). Imagining difference: Cosmopolitanism in Montesquieu's *Persian Letters. Constellations, 19*, 480–493.

Magnan, S. S. (Ed.). (2000). A century of language teaching and research [Special issue]. *Modern Language Journal, 84*.

Magnan, S. S., Murphy, D., & Sahakyan, N. (2014). Goals of collegiate learners and the Standards for Foreign Language Learning. *Modern Language Journal, 98* (Supplement 2014).

Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2013). RP or 'RIP': A critical perspective on reflective practice. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4*, 291–315.

Marshall, C., & Oliva, M. (2006). *Leadership for social justice: Making revolutions in education*. New York: Pearson.

May, S. (Ed.). (2014). *The multilingual turn: Implications for SLA, TESOL, and bilingual education*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

May, T. (2001). *Our practices, our selves*. University Park, PA: Pensylvania State University Press.

McCafferty, S. G., & Stam, G. (Eds.). (2008). *Gesture: Second language acquisition and classroom research*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Moodie, I., & Feryok, A. (2015). Beyond cognition to commitment: English language teaching in South Korean primary schools. *Modern Language Journal, 99*, 450–469.

Morgan, B., & Clarke, M. (2011). Identity in second language teaching and learning. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 817–836). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Mori, R. (2011). Teacher cognition in corrective feedback in Japan. *System, 39*, 451–467.

Murray, D. E., & Christison, M. (2011a). *What English language teachers need to know. Volume I: Understanding learning*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Murray, D. E., & Christison, M. (2011b). *What English language teachers need to know. Volume II: Facilitating learning*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Murray, D. E., & Christison, M. (2014). *What English language teachers need to know. Volume III: Designing curriculum*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Nasser, I., & Wong, S. (2013). Examining social political contexts in teacher preparation in Palestine. *Teaching Education, 24*, 427–446.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Education.

Ortega, L. (2013). SLA for the 21st century: Disciplinary progress, transdisciplinary relevance, and the bi/multilingual turn. *Language Learning, 63*, 1–24.

Osborn, T. (2006). *Teaching world languages for social justice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pennington, M. C. (1996). When input becomes intake: Tracing the sources of teachers' attitude change. In D. Freeman & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 320–348). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Razfar, A. (2012). Narrating beliefs: A language ideologies approach to teacher beliefs. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 43*, 61–81.

Reagan, T. (2009). *Language matters: Reflections on educational linguistics*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Richards, K. (2006). 'Being the teacher': Identity and classroom conversation. *Applied Linguistics, 27*, 51–77.

Scarino, A. (2005). Introspection and retrospection as windows on teacher knowledge, values, and ethical dispositions. In D. J. Tedick (Ed.), *Second language teacher education: International perspectives* (pp. 33–52). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Scarino, A. (2014). Learning as reciprocal, interpretive meaning-making: A view from collaborative research into the professional learning of teachers of languages. *Modern Language Journal, 98*, 386–401.

Schulz, R. A. (2000). Foreign language teacher development: MLJ Perspectives—1916–1999. *Modern Language Journal, 84*, 495–522.

Shelley, M., Murphy, L., & White, C. J. (2012). Language teacher development in a narrative frame: The transition from classroom to distance and blended settings. *System, 41*, 560–574.

Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57,* 1–23.

Shohamy, E. (2005). The power of tests over teachers: The power of teachers over tests. In D. J. Tedick (Ed.), *Second language teacher education: International perspectives* (pp. 101–111). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Smith, D. I., & Carvill, B. (2000). *The gift of the stranger: Faith, hospitality and foreign language learning.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Sockett, H. (2008). The moral and epistemic purposes of teacher education. In M. Cochran–Smith, S. Feiman–Nemser, & D. J. McIntyre, *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd. ed., pp. 45–65). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Svalberg, A. M.–L. (2015). Understanding the complex processes in developing student teachers' knowledge about grammar. *Modern Language Journal, 99,* 529–545.

Swain, M. (2000). French immersion research in Canada: Recent contributions to SLA and applied linguistics. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 20,* 199–212.

Tarone, E., & Allwright, D. (2005). Second language teacher learning and student second language learning: Shaping the knowledge base. In D. J. Tedick (Ed.), *Second language teacher education: International perspectives* (pp. 5–24). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Taylor, E. (2012). The rise of the surveillance school. In D. Lyon, K. Bell, & K. D. Haggerty (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of surveillance studies* (pp. 225–232). New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Tedick, D. J. (2009). K–12 language teacher preparation: Problems and possibilities. *Modern Language Journal, 93,* 263–267.

Tin, T. B. (2014). A look into the local pedagogy of an English language classroom in Nepal. *Language Teaching Research, 18,* 397–417.

Trappes–Lomax, H. (2002). Language in language teacher education: A discourse perspective. In H. Trappes–Lomax & G. Ferguson (Eds.), *Language in language teacher education* (pp. 1–21). Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of second language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ushioda, E. (2011). Motivating learners to speak as themselves. In G. Murray, X. Gao, & M. Lamb (Eds.), *Identity, motivation and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 14–33). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Van Doren, C. (1943). *Liberal education.* New York: Henry Holt.

Varghese, M. M. (2008). Using cultural models to unravel how bilingual teachers enact language policies. *Language and Education, 22,* 289–306.

Vertovec, S. (2009). *Transnationalism.* London: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wringe, C. (1988). *Understanding educational aims.* London: Unwin Hyman.

Wong, M. S., & Canagarajah, A. S. (Eds.). (2009). *Christian and critical English language educators in dialogue: Pedagogical and ethical dilemmas.* New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis.

Yates, R., & Muchinsky, D. (2003). On reconceptualizing teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 37,* 135–147.

Zembylas, M. (2013, October). *What do we know about pedagogy and social justice in schools?* Paper presented at the Pedagogies for Justice Conference, University of South Australia, Adelaide.

Zembylas, M., & McGlynn, C. (2012). Discomforting pedagogies: Emotional tensions, ethical dilemmas and transformative possibilities. *British Educational Research Journal, 38,* 41–59.

Zhu Hua, & Li Wei, (2014). Geopolitics and the changing hierarchies of the Chinese language: Implications for policy and practice of Chinese language teaching in Britain. *Modern Language Journal, 98,* 326–339.