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This adaptive methodological inquiry explored the affordances and constraints of one TESOL teacher education program in Libya as a conflict zone. Data was collected through seven documents and 33 questionnaires. Questionnaires were gathered from the investigated program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates, who were in-service teachers. Interviews were not conducted because all participants who agreed to be interviewed withdrew as a result of prolonged electrical blackouts in Libya during the data collection period. The findings revealed that even though the participants were positively satisfied with their program’s basic components, they showed dissatisfaction toward a number of issues. Participants’ perceived affordances of their program included offering teacher preparation and training courses, offering language development courses, and offering school-based teaching practices. The program’s constraints, as perceived by the participants, were the following: the program did not meet the Libyan ministry’s ELT objectives; the program only had one curriculum that prepared student-teachers for three educational levels; the program had unachieved curricular objectives; the program had curricular deficiencies; the program relied too heavily on one form of assessment; the program offered short teaching practice periods, the program had graduation project challenges; the program lacked quality assurance; and the program did not offer professional development opportunities. Findings also revealed that the participants
regarded critical language teacher education as an effective approach for program reform due to the current political and social chaos that is mounting in Libya. The current status of the program shows that it does not prepare student-teachers to teach English in a conflict zone. Thus, participants recommended implementing peace, social justice, and environmental education into the curriculum to help raise student-teachers’ awareness and to work towards positive change in the Libyan educational and social culture.
DEDICATION

(1)
اللهَمِّ لَكَ الحَمَدُ حَمَداً كَثِيراً حَتَّى تُرَضَى!
All praise is due to Allah! I thank you, my God, until you are satisfied!

(2)
To my dear mom
Who believed in the power of education,
Who always told us:
A woman with a degree is a strong and powerful woman!

(3)
To my dear dad and my dear husband
Who believed in me!
And supported me throughout my life changing experiences!

(4)
To someone who considers me “a threat”
I am a peace loving woman!
My hijab and my English language are powerful facets of my identity!

(5)
To all Libyan women who have survived Libya’s crisis,
To every marginalized and/or oppressed woman,
To women over 46,
Always believe in yourself
Nothing wrong with being ambitious
And having dreams!
Follow your dreams!
Get your dream degree!
Remember: “It is never too late to become what you might have been!*”
You can do it!

* George Eliot
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

(الحمد لله) Alhamdu Li Allah = Thanks, God

I started my Acknowledgements by thanking Allah; I want to show my gratitude to the almighty Allah, my God. Throughout my whole life, especially during my Ph.D., my faith was my strength, and it pushed me forward, even during the spread of Islamophobic rhetoric. Each time I faced the computer screen, I said prayers. These prayers were a powerful force – a force that kept me going, especially when I felt drained and felt like giving up.

I would not be where I am now without the support, help, and encouragement of many people, which is why I am writing the following paragraphs. In this Acknowledgement, I would like to express how grateful I am to a number of people, even though I feel that all my words are not enough to say thank you.

I would like to thank my dear hubby, Elhashmi Eltkbali, for standing by me, even when he lost the chance to pursue his studies in engineering and turned down a position in the company where he used to work, just to give me the chance to be where I am now. He was the shoulder on which I cried when I felt as if I couldn’t go on. He kept saying that I would graduate each time I told him that I preferred to die before I saw myself as a failure. He was there for me when I lost hope and took me through the rough times. He supported me emotionally and academically, even though he had his own challenges.

My dissertation would have not been completed without the help and support of my amazing Dissertation Chair and committee members. I would like to gratefully and sincerely thank my wonderful advisor, Dr. Gloria Park. I still appreciate the fact that she supported me during the dissertation proposal stage, even though I had never worked
with her before. Dr. Park was not just an academic advisor who had helped me throughout my dissertation journey. She was a very sympathetic and considerate person. I will always cherish her and what I learned from her as a successful mama teacher-scholar.

I also gratefully thank my committee members, Dr. Curt Porter, Dr. Usree Bhattachrya, and Dr. Sharon Deckert. Thanks, Dr. Porter, for all the insightful comments, the positive and encouraging feedback. Thank you, Dr. Bhattachrya, for all the insight you gave me. Thank you, Dr. Deckert, for your support and for agreeing to step in as a committee member at the end of this project. I also sincerely thank you for mentoring me and for providing me with positive feedback and advice; I very much appreciate you and your time.

A special thanks goes to my dear friend and colleague, Fatma Dreid. Our Viber chats and talks filled me with lots of energy and hope. I often called her feeling like there was a huge bag of worry and fear on my shoulders. That bag disappeared just after I talked to her. Fatma also was a great form of support during my data collection period. I always thanked Allah that she is my close friend because if she wasn’t there, I would not have survived the data collection challenges. Thanks also goes to my friend and colleague, Radia Alwerimmy. Her supportive Facebook messages and comments have always raised my self-esteem. I am grateful for what she did to send me the program’s approval letter on time, which made me so proud to have her in my life. I won’t forget to thank my former boss, the former head of my English department, Dr. Shaban Dabbas. He helped in many ways. He supported me throughout data collection for my MA, and he did his best to help me with data collection for my dissertation as well. As my list of the
names I would like to thank is so long that cannot be covered in three pages, thanks to all my friends and colleagues in Libya, at IUP, and at MUM for their help throughout the dissertation process. May God bless you all!

Another special thanks goes to all my participants, the investigated program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates. They did their best to provide valuable and reliable data, even when they were living in a conflict zone and suffering from continuous blackouts and unreliable Internet service. Thank you to one of the student-teachers, whom I call the Super Star Salma, for helping me in many ways.

I am also sincerely thankful to Marissa McKinley and Melissa Carrion for reading my dissertation and for doing their best to meet my dissertation deadlines. I deeply appreciate every comment they wrote because their feedback helped me to improve my ideas and helped in clarifying what might have seemed weird and/or unclear to my readers.

Last but not least, I am deeply thankful to my parents, my mother-in-law, my sisters, my sisters-in-law, my brothers and their families, and my brothers-in-law and their families for their unconditional love and support and for their prayers. Special thanks to my sons: Taha, Yasin, and Mokhtar, for helping me whenever I was electronically challenged and frustrated and didn’t know what to do. Another special thanks to my sweetheart, my only daughter, Kawtar, for the hugs and kisses that lifted me up whenever I was down. I finish with a prayer for my dear grandma, mema Zahra Alghanudi (زهرة الغنودي), and my uncle, the Libyan artist, Mohammed Elsharif (محمد الشريف), who passed away while I was here. May their souls rest in peace!
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROLOUE</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Experience as a Student-Teacher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My First-Year Teaching Challenges</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an ESOL Educator</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Challenges as a Curriculum Developer</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being In and Out of the Conflict Zone</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being an Empowered Graduate Student</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Observations About Teacher/Learner-Centered-Instruction</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Belief in the Postmethod Perspective</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| One | **INTRODUCTION** | 20 |
| Broadening Personal Views About English: From EFL to EIL | 21 |
| Statement of Problem | 26 |
| Purpose of the Study | 33 |
| Research Design | 34 |
| Significance of the Study | 38 |
| Sociocultural and Sociopolitical Landscape of Libya | 40 |
| Organization of the Dissertation | 59 |

| Two | **A REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON TESOL TEACHER EDUCATION** | 61 |
| Which English to Teach: Standard English or World Englishes? | 63 |
| The Changing Face of TESOL Teacher Education | 67 |
| TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum | 76 |
| Critical Language Teacher Education Approaches | 101 |
| Chapter Summary | 109 |

<p>| Three | <strong>METHODOLOGY</strong> | 112 |
| Research Design | 112 |
| The Research Context | 116 |
| The Participants | 120 |
| Data Collection | 126 |
| Researcher’s Insider and Outsider Positionality | 132 |
| Data Analysis | 135 |
| Methodological Disruptions and Challenges | 138 |
| Trustworthiness of the Study | 143 |
| Ethical Considerations | 145 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limitations of Methods</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDY FINDINGS ON OYA UNIVERSITY’S TESOL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Description of the Programmatic Components</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ Perceptions on TESOL Teacher Education Programs</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ Perceptions on the Program’s Affordances and Constraints</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ Perceptions on Critical Language Teacher Education</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants’ Insights for Program Reform</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of Interpretive Analysis Findings</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Libyan TESOL Teacher Education Program’s Affordances and Constraints</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using TESOL Teacher Education Programs as Tools for Empowerment in a Conflict Zone</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reforming a TESOL Teacher Education Program in a Conflict Zone</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications of the Study</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Research Directions</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPILOGUE</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being In and Out of the Conflict Zone</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing Research in a Conflict Zone</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Experience in Completing the GCCCU Faculty Portfolio Program</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Experience at TESOL 2016</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Country That Empowered Me Discriminates Me!</td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Insights</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Remarks</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFERENCES</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDICES ........................................................................................................................................339

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Institutional Review Board (IRB)</td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Dean’s Approval Letter</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Recruitment/Invitation E-mail</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Informed Consent Form</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Teacher-Educators’ Questionnaire Protocol</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Student-Teachers’ Questionnaire Protocol</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Graduates’ Questionnaire Protocol</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Teacher-Educators’ Interview Protocol</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Student-Teachers’ Interview Protocol</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Graduates’ Interview Protocol</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>University Requirements</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Faculty Requirements</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>English Department’s Compulsory Requirements</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>English Department’s Elective Requirements</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>English Language Teacher Education Curriculum (1st Year)</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>English Language Teacher Education Curriculum (2nd Year)</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>English Language Teacher Education Curriculum (3rd Year)</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>English Language Teacher Education Curriculum (4th Year)</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Academic Supervisor’s Teaching Practice Assessment Form</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Educational Supervisor’s Teaching Practice Assessment Form</td>
<td>367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>School Principal’s Teaching Practice Assessment Form</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comparison of Affordances As Defined by Gibson and Norman (McGrenere &amp; Ho, 2000, p. 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Green Flag Call (Arabic Version Translated into English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher Knowledge Base (Based on Golombek, 1998; Grossman, 1990; Reinders, 2009a; Reinders, 2009b; Shulman, 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ways of Exploring Teaching (Richards &amp; Farrell, 2011, p. 159)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Overview of the Teacher-Educators’ Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Overview of the Student-Teachers’ Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Courses Student-Teachers’ Took</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Overview of the Graduates’ Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Questionnaire Sections and Their Relation to the Research Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Compulsory/Elective Courses Representing the Program’s Knowledge Base (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Compulsory/Elective Courses Representing the Program’s Knowledge Base (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Elective Course Focus and Credits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## LIST OF FIGURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Location of Libya in the continent of Africa and the Libyan flag</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Libyan educational system</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The history of ELT in Libya</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A framework for planning a curriculum</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The three phases of curriculum progression</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The percentage of coursework compared to the exit requirements</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Program’s courses</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Courses that show the program’s responsibilities</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number of grammar and basic skills courses</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Repetition of some courses</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mentoring, induction, and professional development relationship</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The main aim of this study was to explore the affordances and constraints\(^1\) of Oya University’s\(^2\) TESOL\(^3\) Teacher Education Program as viewed by the program’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates. In this prologue, I discuss some narrative snapshots to help in contextualizing the study. Following Park’s (2012) use of narrative snapshots to describe certain academic and professional events, I use my narrative snapshots to describe specific academic and professional experiences, illustrating the reality in Libya. The snapshots explain various events in my academic and professional life that exemplify how I was prepared as a pre-service ESOL\(^4\) teacher, what I encountered as a first-year in-service ESOL teacher, what I observed as an ESOL teacher educator, what I went through as a curriculum developer, what I went through as a Libyan educator living in and out of a war-torn country, how I was empowered as a Ph.D. graduate student, my observations about teacher-centered and student-centered instruction, and my belief in the significance of having a postmethod perspective on English language teaching (ELT) in Libya. These snapshots enable me to clarify my views and position, and they help to contextualize my study.

My interest in TESOL teacher education programs arose from my personal experience. I was a graduate of the ESOL program at the Faculty of Education at one of the largest Libyan public universities. My disappointment with the program’s focus mostly on theoretical courses in linguistics and literature is what encouraged me to explore the workings of TESOL teacher education programs. One of the factors that

---

1 In depth discussion of affordances and constraints is in Chapter 1.  
2 Oya University is a pseudonym.  
3 TESOL, Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.  
4 ESOL, English to Speakers of Other Languages.
contributed to our TESOL teacher education program’s failure in preparing us, as Libyan ESOL teachers at that time, was the eradication of the teaching of English during the period 1986 – 1993 from all levels of schools in Libya (Assed, 2012; Clark, 2013; Elhensheri, 2004; Mohsen, 2014). For political reasons, English was regarded as the enemy’s language, as well as a form of “obnoxious colonialism” (Assed, 2012). In the following sections, I include a number of snapshots of my narrative about my experiences as an ESOL teacher and educator to set the scene of this study.

**My Experiences as a Student-Teacher**

I was in my second year, the academic year 1985 – 1986, when Muammar Qaddafi’s government policies aimed to “eliminate foreign influence” (Clark, 2013) by forcing the English language eradication as a response to the US and UK attacks on his colony, known as Bab Alazizia. Consequently, all the English department members, faculty and students, found themselves with no future. Students gathered in the hallways and outside the Faculty of Education’s building, questioned this decision, and searched for ideas to change it. At that point, most of the students asked for a meeting with Qaddafi. I had no idea who called for and scheduled the meeting with Qaddafi and how, but since I had similar worries regarding my future, I decided to attend this meeting when my friends asked me to join them.

I still remember how the students in the department gathered outside the former building of the Faculty of Education and went to meet Qaddafi to ‘beg’ him to keep our department so that we could finish our studies. When we entered Bab Alazizia and passed all the security machines, we were put in a room, and we waited for a while until Qaddafi came. All the students were angry, except one of his lovers, who hugged him and chanted
what his followers used to say in his presence. We were surprised by her because, at that moment, no one was in favor of Qaddafi or his new language policy. Many students talked, and he sat on his chair just listening. All I recall is that Qaddafi promised to think of the problem and find a solution.

After that meeting, we were forced to study a summer semester in any department of our choice, so I chose to study in the Geography Department. During that semester, I heard that Qaddafi’s orders were to allow the existing students to complete their studies and close acceptance of new students’ applications for an unknown period of time. To my knowledge, no one heard why Qaddafi changed his mind. I guess it was his strategy to keep the situation under his control. I was taking summer courses when a friend told me that an official permission came to the department, so we were then allowed to continue our study at the English Department. Hearing the good news, I left the Geography Department and completed my English language study.

Before the exclusion of English from the Libyan curriculum in 1986, a practicum was required by the fourth year students of the English Department. Since English was no longer taught at middle and secondary schools, a practicum at schools was excluded from the department’s program. As a result, my cohort and the other cohorts were required to ‘teach’ their peers, which, in reality, consisted of observing peer classroom practices, as opposed to actually teaching. This experience affected me as a student-teacher and deprived my peers and me from being prepared to confront classroom challenges. Besides, it made me wonder whether our existing program had some flaws that might have inhibited student-teachers’ preparedness to real classroom challenges. Accordingly, this study explored the student-teachers’ and the program’s in-service graduates’ views
about how they were prepared to become teachers, as well as their views about peer
teaching and school-based teaching. The inclusion of the program’s student-teachers and
graduates, who are in-service teachers, gave them voice and opportunity to participate in
the anticipated program reform.

My First-Year Teaching Challenges

When I graduated in August 1988, I learned that English was taught in the
scientific sector\(^5\) of the secondary schools in Libya. As soon as I graduated from the
Faculty of Education, I applied and submitted my documents to the Libyan Ministry of
Education. Then, I was accepted by the ministry and was granted a position to teach in
one of the secondary schools in my hometown, Tajoura. I began teaching in January
1989.

The experience of being a teacher for the first time was not easy. I still remember
how I was surprised by the many requirements and was not able to overcome some of the
challenges easily. Tasks, such as lesson planning and assessment, were not easy since I
was striving to become a successful ESOL teacher. Although I had a good command over
the English language, I had some flaws and weaknesses, especially since I was teaching
English for Specific Purposes. The first challenge was in making myself aware of
complicated scientific words and their pronunciation before entering the class and
helping students understand them. This struggle made me reach for more experienced
teachers, while pushing me to rely on the ready-made teachers’ handbook.

---

\(^5\) Libyan high schools were divided into two sectors: the Scientific sector (ilmi ﻋﻠﻣﻲ) and
the Arts sector (adabi أديبي). In the former, students take courses related to mathematics
and science, whereas in the latter, students study history, geography, literature,
philosophy, psychology, and social sciences. The courses that are common between the
two sectors were languages (Arabic, English & French) and religion (Quran Studies).
Another source of struggle was a result of teacher evaluation through regular inspections. Regular teacher evaluation inspections aimed not only to evaluate ESOL teachers, but also to check teachers’ progress with the curriculum and the ministry’s plans. This inspection was done by supervisors assigned by the Libyan Ministry of Education. Those supervisors preferred to make unexpected visits and sought to surprise teachers. Although they were supposed to provide support to novice teachers, their ways of ‘invading’ the class made the relationship between the supervisors and the teachers seem authoritarian. As a result, teachers considered the supervisors as the ‘bossy’ authorities who came looking for mistakes. Even though I did not encounter problems with my supervisors because their feedback showed their satisfaction with my performance, I always found myself experiencing the same feelings my other peer teachers felt each time we knew that an inspector visited one of our peers unexpectedly.

That struggle, along with those feelings of frustration and that the program failed to prepare me for real classroom experience in my first year of teaching, always made me question the quality and efficiency of the program’s curriculum. Issues related to basics, such as every day evaluation and regular testing, were solved through peer discussions and personal understandings and trials. My struggle led me to seek out ways to socialize with other experienced teachers, which helped me gain more confidence and grow as an ESOL teacher. Subsequently, I was concerned with my struggle and questioned what I learned in the university and how the learned knowledge was applicable in the classroom.

Thus, this study gave the investigated TESOL teacher education program’s graduates the opportunity to reflect on how they were prepared and provide suggestions on how to improve the existing program. In addition, their reflections on their first-year
teaching challenges provided insights on what to include in the program reform that would help future graduates cope with their first-year teaching challenges.

**Being an ESOL Educator**

After earning a degree in TESOL from Newcastle University in 2006 and moving from secondary teaching to university teaching, the experience of being a teacher-educator and seeing some of my students’ frustrations during practicum raised more concerns. These concerns were related to my transition from being a high school teacher to a teacher-educator and about the TESOL teacher education program itself. My concerns as a teacher-educator were about being able to help student-teachers to become effective teachers and about being able to provide them with the knowledge I gained from the TESOL program. The program related concerns were about the effectiveness of the TESOL teacher education program in preparing Libyan students to become successful language teachers. Since the program aimed to prepare students to be English language teachers, I intended to provide support to them in my classes by giving them the chance to teach their peers. Having taught the “Strategies 1” course, which was designed around the idea of peer teaching practice, my experience allowed me to see that my students needed more support to strengthen their confidence in their teaching abilities. This awareness raised some questions: can this course, “Strategies 1”, provide student-teachers with the help and support they need? How can the TESOL teacher education program prepare or envision all issues related to them? And most importantly, is it possible to envision a program that takes into account all student-teachers’ matters and prepares them for real classroom teaching?
My experiences and observations while teaching “Strategies 1” and observing student-teachers during practicum made me see the difference between peer practice teaching and teaching one’s own class. I still remember how one of my students panicked when she was practicing teaching at the middle school. She was scared when she was corrected by a student who lived in the UK for a while and his English sounded native-like. She could not finish the lesson, walked out of the class, and started crying. I tried to calm her down, saying that it is okay to have such advanced students in class and that she could benefit by asking the student to read the new words first or any way that would benefit her or the class. At that moment, I knew that our program, no matter how much we tried to design it to meet our future teachers’ needs, failed to prepare many of them to overcome the simplest challenges. Again, the question of whether it is possible for any TESOL teacher education program to prepare student-teachers for real classroom issues that will raise their confidence and teaching efficiency was questionable.

Therefore, this study intended to investigate the program’s curriculum by analyzing its content. Besides, the inclusion of the program’s teacher-educators, especially those who did not participate in the program design, as well as student-teachers and graduates, provided valuable insights for the program reform.

**My Challenges as a Curriculum Developer**

The experience of being a member on three committees that aimed to develop TESOL teacher education programs in Libya showed me how these programs were designed. The main aim of these three committees was to redesign TESOL teacher education programs to improve student teachers’ language proficiency and teaching skills. The first committee was formed when I was the head of the English Department at
the Faculty of Education. This was after the faculty was transformed from being a Teacher Preparation College to the Faculty of Education. The purpose was to design a curriculum that embraced the general objectives of teacher education and specific content knowledge preparation related to the English Department. The second and third committees were formed with the aim of having one TESOL teacher education curriculum first in the three faculties of education at the investigated public university and then in all English departments around Libya. There were complaints from student-teachers and their parents when they noticed that student-teachers lost credits when they transferred from a certain Faculty of Education to another across Libya. Thus, the main aim of those meetings and having one TESOL teacher education curriculum around Libya was to benefit the students so they did not lose their credits.

When I was elected as the Chair of the first committee, I was inexperienced and terrified. I was terrified because my MA study did not prepare me to design/develop a TESOL teacher education program. Deep inside, I was not only thinking of how to prepare a TESOL teacher education program, but I was also thinking of all the criticism I would face. I still remember how I struggled to prepare the preliminary proposal for what was called the department’s “Vision, Mission, and Goals,” while struggling to find another committee member who was a Ph.D. holder and was willing to contribute to the project, since contributions were on a voluntary basis. My other concerns were related to how to design a program that would diminish all the frustration and worries I had been
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6 I was required to prepare it in Arabic, and the words were as follows: vision (alru’ya الزاوية), mission (risalat alkism رسالة القسم), and department goals (ahdaf alkism أهداف القسم). After it was prepared in Arabic, I find out that I was required to prepare an English version, which was a terrifying challenge to me, especially when I thought of those criticizing peers.
through when I was a student-teacher in a similar program and what the current and future students of the department would face.

Since I was studying English in the period when English was banned to be taught in schools or used in public by Qaddafi’s government, I lost the opportunity to teach in real classrooms. I was just thinking of how to help our students to be prepared for real classroom practices and to teach them how to overcome problems that might arise while teaching. With only the information I got from a course I took during my MA study, I prepared the description of the program’s vision, mission, and goals, and I assigned all committee members with the responsibility of preparing content for certain courses. My other concerns were related to how proficient I was in writing program’s vision, mission, and goals in English and gathering the curriculum components in one document. I felt that my experienced colleagues, as well as others who did not live similar experiences, would judge and criticize my work. Sadly, the Libyan culture is based on criticism. From my experience as a Libyan and a member of the Libyan academic community, I believe that many of the Libyan academic community members mostly criticize other’s language proficiency and academic work and efforts more than praising them or providing support. Thus, deep inside, I knew that someone would be critiquing my work more than working toward improving it as a preliminary work.

The second committee was prepared to unite the three TESOL teacher education programs’ curricula. The university’s aim was to have one curriculum that was offered by the three faculties of education. The challenge was to accept the criticism of those who have not been in my shoes and to be prepared for accepting others’ ideas. Then, there was a call to unite all the English departments’ curricula around Libya to be one TESOL
teacher education program. All of the heads of the English departments around Libya gathered and met at the Faculty of Education Tripoli. For hours, program proposals\(^7\) were presented and discussed. Finally, a committee was formed to prepare a final draft that included what had been discussed, and I was chosen to be a member of this final committee. As we were discussing the proposals and trying to gain a consensus, it was clear to me that our personal experiences shaped our program designs, curricula, and practices. For me, it was surprising that most of the committee members were experienced teacher-educators and Ph.D. holders but relied on the previously prepared programs and did not accept ideas of adding courses that they thought to be challenging. For instance, they were not accepting new courses, such as Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL), easily. I had to defend each of my suggestions and struggled to prove my point because they considered me ‘less experienced’ as I was an MA holder while they were Ph.D. holders.

Now that I am a doctoral candidate at Indiana University of Pennsylvania (IUP), and after taking various courses that have helped shape my understanding of my role as an ESOL teacher-educator, I totally agree with Freeman (1989) when he stated the following:

Language teacher education has become increasingly fragmented and unfocused. Based on a kaleidoscope of elements from many disciplines, efforts to educate individuals as language teachers often lack a coherent, commonly accepted foundation. In its place, teacher educators and teacher education programs

\(^7\) Each English department presented their proposed program’s project to be discussed. They then attempted to find similarities and differences, and they worked to decide what to include in the final draft of the project.
substitute their own individual rationales, based on pedagogical assumptions or research, or function in a vacuum, assuming - yet never articulating - the bases from which they work. (p. 27)

Although Freeman wrote these words during the eighties, I felt that he was describing exactly the final committees’ views of TESOL teacher education, as well as the program in my context of Libya. This excerpt resonated with me because it reminded me of the moments when the committee was debating the significance of some of the courses over others. I believe that most of the final committee members were making their decisions by relying on their personal justifications and experiences without taking into consideration what is being taught in the Libyan public schools or research results.

For instance, there was a debate on whether to include creative writing or not in the curriculum, and those who thought that it was not needed by the Libyan ESOL teachers voted to not include such a course, even though the secondary school students were required to write narratives and short stories in the “new”

It was considered “new” at that time. curriculum. There was an assumption that any student-teacher who took literature courses could teach creative writing. Another point was related to the number of hours/credits that were needed for each course that was decided to be included in the curriculum, such as how many hours/credits Libyan student-teachers should take in linguistics and literature. Literature majors favored the inclusion of as many courses as they thought were required, whereas linguistics majors thought that student-teachers needed more linguistics courses. I assume that our curriculum could be described as ‘ill-prepared’ since it was a result of our individual rationales and assumptions; after all, many of us on the committee were not
prepared as teacher-educators, and many of us had limited, or may not have even had any, experience in developing a coherent and focused TESOL teacher education program. More specifically, I assume that our curriculum could be described as ‘ill-prepared’ because it does not prepare our student-teachers to teach English in a conflict zone.\(^9\)

Previously, all my ideas about teacher education were a result of how I was taught. Given my readings throughout my doctoral education, my idea about TESOL teacher education has changed. I later realized that developing an appropriate TESOL teacher education program, which improves teacher knowledge and bridges the gap between theory and practice, is not an easy process. However, by taking into account the results of research, reforming a coherent and focused TESOL teacher education program can be achieved. As a result, the key concern of my study was to find out ways of reforming TESOL teacher education in Libya through existing research findings and through what is reported by my study’s participants.

**Being In and Out of the Conflict Zone**

When the uprise against Qaddafi began in February, 2011, I had been in Denver, Colorado, for about three months. I was physically away from the conflict zone. However, my mind and heart were in Libya. Even though I was away, the situation in Libya was deeply distressing. The news of rape and killings left me depressed. I lived the terror of hearing similar news about my family or losing someone because of the war. I also feared finding myself a refugee. I was emotionally drained. Being one of the victims of the regime’s oppressive actions, I was praying all the time to get rid of Qaddafi and his
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\(^9\) A conflict zone is an area that is considered as a warzone or an armed violent environment in which battles and clashes involve military forces, militias, and armed insurgents that put people’s lives into danger (Nelson & Appleby, 2015).
regime. Although we were experiencing difficult financial problems, the terror of losing family, and the fear of finding ourselves refugees, my family and I supported the revolution and hoped for a new Libya.

When Qaddafi was killed, I was happy, like any Libyan who was against Qaddafi, thinking that everything would be better after we got rid of him, his ideology, and his regime. I thought that we would be able to unite as one nation and work to improve our country. In 2014, however, like many Libyans, my “dreams of 2011” were “shattered” (Stephen, 2016, para. 4). Since then, Libya has become “torn by civil war and Isis [has] expand[ed] quickly into the chaos” (Stephen, 2016, para. 2).

From the beginning of the Libyan crisis, Libyans suffered from long hours of power outages and economic problems. Fights between militias and fights against DAESH\(^\text{10}\) have caused large numbers of deaths. The political crisis and the fights between parties on authority and presidency have not only caused political divisions, but it has also led to the spread of discrimination and racism, especially to minorities, Qaddafi’s followers, and those who disagree with the dominant ideology. Many Libyans are homeless, displaced, and suffering. Thus, the whole situation caused trauma and injustice. In December, 2016, a video was shared on social media that showed an undressed woman being tortured and gang-raped by militiamen while she was crying and asking for mercy, which caused more distress in the Libyan communities in Tripoli (The New Arab, 2016). Outrage protests and rights groups’ demonstrations took place in the capital calling for actions “against the brutal crime and rampant abuses by some of the

\(^{10}\) DAESH is an Arabic acronym for ISIS: Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.
country’s militias” (The New Arab, 2016, para. 2). As the situation in Libyan cities was getting worse, my belief that Libya needed an educational revolution became stronger.

Even though I was safe, the trauma of war and the fear of losing my family and my country affected me deeply, so much that I sometimes had difficulty focusing on my own work and faced long periods of writer’s block. Deep inside, I had a belief that I need to do something to contribute to improving the situation in my country.

Being an Empowered Graduate Student

Reading about teacher, social justice, and peace education has shaped and formed my ideas about teacher preparation programs, in general, and in Libya, in particular. When I was introduced to the concept of educating for peace in Blitz and Hurlbert’s (1998) *Letters for the living* and in O’Reilley’s (1993) *The peaceable classroom*, Libya was going through a vital cultural and political change. Questions of how teachers could help and how TESOL teacher education programs could contribute to bringing peace to Libyans stared at me and kept me sleepless for many long nights. Then, I read Burns and Richards’ (2009) edited collection *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*. This collection provided me with a broad knowledge of the contemporary issues discussed in Language Teacher Education. It consisted of research, practice, debates, trends, and developments in the field; the topics in the book triggered my enthusiasm to continue to seek out what constitutes effective TESOL teacher education programs in Libya.

Effective teacher, social justice, and peace education programs were of significance to me due to my personal reactions to what was going on in my beloved country. War against Qaddafi has put teachers and students alike into very dangerous
situations. To date, Libyans are still facing after war consequences, militias’ battles, everyday struggles, kidnappings, rapes, brutal killings, social injustices, and a rise in DAESH’s terror. Deep inside, I began thinking how I could contribute to make a significant change, a change that would provide the new Libyan generations with a better future, a future that is oppression and violence free. What is more is that the sounds of shootings or explosions I heard whenever I called my families in Libya during and after the war against Qaddafi, the news of the killings and assassinations of the innocent, the news of rapes, and the terrorist attacks on the US embassy and other delegates made me question the role of our schools and universities in this new Qaddafī free era: What can teachers do for their students to promote change for a better future? How can the Faculty of Education prepare effective teachers to incorporate positive change?

Nelson Mandela once said that “education is the most powerful weapon we can use to change the world” (Nelson Mandela Foundation, 2015). I believe that change in Libya starts with changing Libyan education, especially teacher education. This is because “effective teachers make a fundamental difference in the lives of our nation’s students” (NCTQ, 2010, para. 1). As stated by the US Secretary of Education, “university-based teacher preparation programs need revolutionary change – not evolutionary tinkering” (Duncan, 2009, para. 3). Although this statement was related to America’s teacher education, I borrow this statement because it describes the need for change in Libyan education, given the current sociocultural and sociopolitical climate.

After the war against Qaddafī was over in 2011, and many Libyan students studying abroad were granted permission from their sponsors to visit their families in Libya, in the summer of 2012, I celebrated those special feelings of getting rid of a
dictator and enjoying being between my two families. My visit to my country was not only to see my family and celebrate their safety, but my visit also included meeting my colleagues and the head of the English Department at the Faculty of Education at Oya University\textsuperscript{11}. When the Study and Exams Coordinator at that time told me that the program was planning for a program reform, I wanted to discuss my idea of conducting my doctoral dissertation at the department. The head of the department at that time gave his approval and assured me that everything would be done to assist me with my study.

Starting with the idea of what makes an effective TESOL teacher education program, I listed other questions that led to forming the study’s research questions, such as “how is the field of [TESOL] teacher education defined, and what does it encompass? On what theories, research, and practice is [TESOL] teacher education built? What knowledge base is required for pre-service and in-service teachers? What beliefs and principles do teachers hold, and how do these influence their practice? What is the relationship between the content of a teacher education program and the practices of its graduates?” (Doley, 2013, slide 2). These questions sparked my interest for my study and helped in forming my research questions.

**My Observations About Teacher/Learner-Centered-Instruction**

Even though I was unable to work at IUP as a teaching associate because I had to move to Dayton, Ohio, I consider myself fortunate that I got the chance to teach as a part-time faculty member at another prestigious US university, i.e., Miami University Middletown (MUM). I taught a number of language and university courses at MUM’s English Language Center (ELC) for three semesters, which helped me gain more

\textsuperscript{11} All names of participants and institutions are pseudonyms.
experience and professional development. Teaching at a context different from the Libyan context made me come face-to-face with the educational differences I was reading about as a graduate student, one of which, and perhaps the most influential, was realizing how classes are managed and how subjects are taught in teacher-centered contexts versus learner-centered contexts. At the time, I also realized how these two pedagogies either created learners who adopt a surface approach to their learning or learners that adopt a deep approach to their learning (Beattie, Collins, & McInnes, 1997).

I come from a context where teachers are still the main source of knowledge and spoon-feed their learners. In the Libyan class, students are required to listen to the teacher, receive information, and then show their success of learning on their final exams. Thus, this kind of pedagogy does not encourage students’ critical thinking and creativity. Consequently, most students adopt the surface approach in their learning because they

(1) try simply to memorize parts of the content of teaching materials and accept the ideas and information given without question, (2) concentrate on memorizing facts without distinguishing any underlying principles or patterns and (3) are influenced by assessment requirements. (Beattie, Collins, & McInnes, 1997, p. 3)

Teaching in a context where the teacher’s role is not just spoon-feeding and testing, which creates opportunities for active learning through discussions, questions, reflections, group work/projects, different tasks, and self-instructional materials, made me believe that there should be an educational shift in Libyan university teaching. I believe that this shift is vital, and Libyan educators need to change their perspectives on how knowledge can be transformed to learners and the roles of ESOL teachers and
learners. This is by evaluating the existing learner-centered approaches that are appropriate for the Libyan context.

   Learner-centered pedagogy encourages learners to adopt deep approaches to learning, which encourages them to

   (1) seek to understand the issues and interact critically with the contents of particular teaching materials, (2) relate ideas to previous knowledge and experience and (3) examine the logic of the arguments and relate the evidence presented to the conclusions. (Beattie, Collins, & McInnes, 1997, p. 3)

This shift is specifically needed in the Libyan pre-service teacher education programs since it could enhance student-teachers’ active learning strategies, as well as their teaching skills. Accordingly, this study aimed at providing insights on curriculum reform through participants’ perceptions on critical language teacher education approaches and appropriating them to the Libyan context.

**My Belief in the Postmethod Perspective**

During Qaddafi’s era (1969 – 2011), English language education was considered as a form of colonization. However, I believe that ELT can be a mean of decolonization. In his article titled “A postmethod perspective on English language teaching”, Kumaravadivelu (2003b) discussed postmethod as being ‘a postcolonial construct’. The postmethod’s parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility will help Libyan educators to become “context-sensitive” and can be used to help “construct a pedagogy that is sensitive to their local needs, wants, and situations” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, p. 545). This supports my belief that TESOL teacher education can help in making a difference in Libyan students’ lives. In fact, their “lived experiences, motivated by their
own sociocultural and historical backgrounds, should help them appropriate the English language and use it on their own terms according to their own values and visions” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, p. 544). By giving our future teachers the chance to understand the three parameters of postmethod, they will be able to evaluate the existing methods and decide what is appropriate for their context and will further be able to construct a contextualized pedagogy. Besides, incorporating critical pedagogy will help train future teachers to become critical thinkers, readers, and writers.

This study can be one of the contributions to a change for a better world in Libya. I am not claiming that I can change the world and make it better, but I am hoping that my study provides evidence of existing program’s affordances and constraints and provides suggestions that will help develop the department’s curriculum to be more effective in preparing student-teachers to become successful teachers who are willing to take on the challenges that our country currently faces. I am hoping that the study provides insights that would help in preparing a program that prepares student-teachers to teach English in a conflict zone.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The Prologue was needed to state my insider positionality. In the current chapter, I argue the need for a study focusing on one of the TESOL teacher education programs in Libya. First, I briefly discuss the paradigm shift in ELT that led to the evolution of English as an International Language (EIL) that broadened my previous views as an EFL teacher/educator. Then, I provide an overview about the purpose and significance of the study and the research design.

In the following sections, I describe the situation of ELT and TESOL teacher education in Libya as it is described in a number of studies. I begin with a brief description of the location of Libya, the Libyan ethnic groups and their spoken languages, and a very brief review of the history of Libya, with a focus on general education during the mentioned periods to set the scene for the following sections, as well as to help the reader locate and recognize Libya geographically and understand the educational context. In the following section, I provide an overview about education in Libya, in which there is an explanation of how Qaddafi’s ideology was implemented in the Libyan curriculum, as well as how it was taught and practiced in the Libyan public schools and universities. The aim of this brief review is to describe the impact of Qaddafi’s ideology on Libyan students and culture, which leads to the significance of implementing approaches, such as critical language teacher education, that empower student-teachers’ critical thinking and problem-solving strategies. Finally, since the main concern of the study is focused on English as a Foreign Language. The term EFL is outdated as a result of the gleaning understandings about World Englishes and EIL. In this study, EFL is only going to be used when it is mentioned in the reviewed studies or by this study’s participants.
TESOL teacher education, I first focus on clarifying the position of the English language in the Libyan curriculum and how it is taught, and then I provide a brief overview about TESOL teacher education in Libya. I conclude this chapter with the organization of the dissertation.

**Broadening Personal Views About English: From EFL to EIL**

English is considered a foreign language in the Libyan context, even though this term is outdated because of the widely spread understandings about World Englishes and EIL. EFL is traditionally defined as the teaching and learning of the English language in contexts where English is only being used in the classroom, while access outside the classroom is not available to both students and teachers (Brown, 2001). Kachru (1986) differentiated between three circles of English that he specified as being “distinct types of speech fellowships of English, phases of the spread of the language, and particular characteristics of the uses of the languages and of its acquisition and linguistic innovations” (p. 122). In this framework, Kachru categorizes a model of three circles of English according to how English is used in various countries around the world: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. These circles can be explained as follows: (1) the Inner Circle category includes countries where English is the native language, such as the UK and the USA; (2) the Outer Circle category includes countries that accepted English as a national language, which mainly refers to countries that were British colonies, such as India and Ghana; and (3) the Expanding Circle includes “the regions where the performance varieties of the language are used essentially in EFL contexts” (Kachru, 1985, pp. 366 – 367).

Even though this model might seem simple since transnational migrants are not
considered, it can be seen as a way of understanding certain countries’ functions concerning how these countries perceive the English language. Thus, according to Kachru’s framework, Libya is an Expanding Circle, which is why Libyan scholars consider English as a foreign language in the Libyan context.

One of the weaknesses of Kachru’s framework is about the use and role of English in the Expanding Circle (Kirkpatrick, 2007). Kirkpatrick (2007) explicates that “it underestimates the roles” English “plays in Expanding Circle countries” (Kirkpatrick, 2007, p. 29). As technological advances are increasingly affecting countries around the world, the roles and uses of the English language are changing. English now is used as a medium of communication, not only with native speakers, but also with non-native speakers. English is also used as a medium in education since many universities offer courses that are taught in English, and English is taught in schools among the other courses in the Expanding Circle countries, such as Libya.

Thus, I think that we can no longer consider English as a foreign language in Libya. One reason is the availability of the language in the Libyan context through various types of social media. Another reason is the daily interactions with native and non-native speakers of English from around the world, such as delegates, educators, workers, businessmen, or those there for other purposes in Libya. Besides, the fact that English is being taught in Libyan public and private schools from primary schools shows that English is no longer a foreign language in Libya. Also, the move to the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in the textbooks that were designed by British curriculum developers and published by Garnet Education drives to assumptions that members of the Libyan Ministry of Education were considering Libya’s
place in the world and the position of the English language as a global language.

Before my understanding of Kumaravadivelu’s (2003b) postmethod and World Englishes, English has always been the foreign language I learned to use and to teach. As an English language speaker and teacher, like many Libyans, I always assumed that English language learners and teachers should choose either British or American English as the target language. I also considered myself as “the other”, who always wanted to be native-like and compared my language proficiency to native speakers of English as being “less than the ‘native’” speaker’s proficiency (Kirkpatrick, 2007, p. 7).

Reading Alsagoff, McKay, Hu, and Renandya’s (2012) Principles and practices for teaching English as an international language, some of Kachru’s articles (1986, 1996), Kirkpatrick’s (2007) World Englishes: Implications for international communication and English language teaching, and other “World Englishes” journal articles (Brown, 1993, 1995; Lovtseivch, 2005), these texts changed my previous views about my English language and my students’ as well. I began to feel ownership of my English language and started to consider it as one of the other possibilities or varieties that were proposed (Widdowson, 1994).

My new belief of ownership of the English language encouraged me to re-evaluate my beliefs about native speaker-based language competence. I also started to believe that the English language should be considered and taught as an International English language in Libya. As teacher-educators, we need to help our student-teachers understand the postmethod parameters that are particularity, practicality, and possibility with the aim of teaching them to evaluate what they are studying, be “context sensitive”, and adopt or create what is suitable for their contexts (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, p. 545).
Previously, my aim as an English language user was to be native-like in my fluency. Similarly, as a teacher, I encouraged my students to reach the native-like fluency following either the British or American English. However, I discovered that the native speaker standards were criticized and “found to be utopian, unrealistic, and constraining” (Alptekin, 2002, p. 57). Now, having read Brown (2012), I know that some of the Libyan students might have aimed to reach native-like proficiency and learned to accept the fact that not all students are willing or aiming for native-like English. Libyan students, who are not aiming for native-like proficiency, or not able to reach the native-like proficiency, are the students who need the EIL framework (Alptekin, 2002). As teacher-educators, I believe that it is our responsibility to help students understand that their “nativised” variety is not “worse [or] less than the ‘native’ variety spoken by someone else” (Kirkpatrick, 2007, p. 7).

Accordingly, the question that might be raised here is this: why EIL and not EFL? English is becoming the most widely used language for not only communication, but also for education and economic exchanges. Scholars are now more interested in debates about considering EIL or English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), which affect many EFL contexts. Libyan students are using English more than ever to communicate with other non-native English speakers more than with native speakers. Even in education, the number of Libyan students who go abroad to study in Outer Circle countries, such as India, Malaysia, and South Africa, is similar to the number of students who choose to study in Inner Circle countries. For this reason, as teacher-educators, I believe that it is our responsibility to discuss with student-teachers the dichotomy of native/non-native speakers of English language teachers and the concept of World Englishes. Our roles also
include helping them understand the meaning of non-native speakers’ ownership of their own variety of English and acknowledge that they already own theirs.

In addition, the idea that having one variety of English is better than the other varieties of English is no longer acceptable. The widely spread English language has resulted in having “multicultural identities” (Kachru, 1985, p. 357), which means having “many Englishes” (Kirkpatrick’s, 2007, p. 28). Since nearly all the English Language departments around Libya consist of English language scholars from around the world, Libyan students are being introduced to a variety of Englishes. As a result, I believe that EIL and World Englishes should be taught to our students. More importantly, EFL classification has limitations that can be summarized as (1) the misunderstandings of the term ‘native language’ and (2) the difficulty of “accurately” classifying EFL countries because English is widely “spread” around the world (Kirkpatrick’s, 2007, p. 28).

For all the previously mentioned reasons, I privilege EIL over EFL. Hence, in this study, EFL will be used when it is mentioned in the reviewed studies or by the participants of this study. Additionally, in this study, I use the phrase TESOL teacher education instead of second language teacher education since the latter phrase cannot be used in the Libyan context. As affirmed by one of my participants, TESOL “appears to be a reasonable choice [that] neutralizes the argument for or against the foreign/second dichotomy” (Q8\textsuperscript{13}, 2015, p. 1), and therefore, it seems to be more relevant to the Libyan context.

\textsuperscript{13} Q is the abbreviation for Questionnaire.
Statement of Problem

TESOL teacher education’s significance and familiarity are a result of the growing calls for proficient language teachers around the world (Burns & Richards, 2009). This demand calls for efficient teacher preparation and professional development approaches. Consequently, many researchers and language educators have focused on issues and views related to TESOL teacher education (such as Burns & Richards, 2009; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Richards & Nunan, 1990).

Richards and Nunan’s (1990) Second language teacher education is the main, significant publication that included both theoretical approaches and empirical data in the early 1990s. The collection included articles that made a difference in the field of TESOL teacher education, such as Bartlett’s (1990) article on reflective teaching and Lange’s (1990) article on the notion of teacher development. The book’s major contribution in this difference is that it presented the shift from teacher training to teacher education. It not only presented ideas about teaching itself, but it also discussed ideas related to classroom observation and supervision, teachers’ decision making nature, and teachers’ critical self-evaluation. A few years later, Freeman and Richards’ (1996) collection of reports titled Teacher learning in language teaching focused on how language teachers learn to teach second or foreign languages. Then, TESOL Quarterly had a special themed issue on teacher education, guest edited by Freeman and Johnson (1998), and they provided a framework for reconceptualizing TESOL teacher education. The issue focused on knowledge base and included contributions on “professional development research, descriptions of best practices, and commentaries on current issues in language teacher education” (McKay, 1998, p. 393). Later, other journals included more work that
concentrated on language teacher education. In 2000, Johnson’s *Teacher education* provided in-depth descriptions of teacher education practices from varied settings.

As the interest of language teacher education grew and the number of the publications increased, conferences and meetings that focused on language teacher education were also established. The First International Conference on Language Teacher Education (1stICLTE) was held in May 1999 and was at the University of Minnesota’s Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition. This meeting brought scholars, researchers, and educators who are interested in language teacher education and teacher development from around the world from varied national and international contexts. The conference’s main themes focused on: (1) the knowledge base of language teacher education, (2) social, cultural, and political contexts of language teacher education, (3) language teacher education policy, and (4) processes of language teacher education (1stICLTE, 1999). The conference covered all language learning levels and varied areas of language teaching that include ESL/EFL, foreign languages, bilingual education, and immersion education (1stICLTE, 1999).

Interest in language teacher education and, specifically, TESOL teacher education, has increased. Most of the available literature covers many areas, such as the knowledge base of language teaching and processes of TESOL teacher education. Most recently, in his review, Wright (2010) focused on “the context to which the new agenda has influenced second language teacher education practices in recent years” (p. 259). Although Wright (2010) acknowledged successful practitioner research culture in
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TESOL teacher education, he claimed that further research is needed, especially in “less well-documented contexts” (p. 289).

One of these “less well-documented contexts” is Libya. TESOL teacher education research in the Libyan context is nearly nonexistent. Research on TESOL teacher education programs in Libya is scarce. My review of the literature shows that most of the existing research studies focused on teaching methods, language learning, classroom interaction, and technology enhanced instruction; therefore, this empirical research addresses a gap in the Libyan context and contributes to the existing literature of the TESOL teacher education research discipline.

To my knowledge, the only studies that investigated TESOL teacher education in Tripoli, Libya, that I was able to find were a master’s thesis and a doctoral dissertation that were by Hawana (1981) and Elhensheri (2004). The two studies were conducted at the same Department of English as the Faculty of Education at Alfateh University, which is a public university in Tripoli, Libya.

Hawana (1981) investigated the EFL teacher education program of the former Faculty of Education that I mentioned in the Prologue. He reported that the program was “not achieving any of its objectives” and that the program prepared Libyan students to become primary, preparatory, and high school ESOL teachers with the same curriculum, which he regarded as a limitation (Hawana, 1981, p. 28). Hawana (1981) then recommended having different programs for each educational level that meet the Libyan student-teachers’ needs as primary, preparatory, or high school EFL teachers (p. 28).

What distinguishes Elhensheri’s (2004) study from Hawana’s (1981) study is the fact that she conducted it in the same program after the end of the English language
eradication period, which was around 1986 – 1993, and the establishment of the new curriculum for public schools that focuses on communicative methods of teaching. Even though her study was conducted after more than two decades, Elhensheri (2004) reported that the program did not meet its objectives and that there was a gap between theory and practice. She stated that there was a difference between the university’s policy and the public school prospective; a discrepancy between the syllabus and the examination requirements; a contradiction between the teaching approaches advocated by the students and those followed by classroom teachers; and an inconsistency between the emphases of the EFL teacher education program and the focus of the public school’s course books and syllabus (Elhensheri, 2004, p. 308). More details about Hawana’s (1981) and Elhensheri’s studies is discussed in the following literature review chapter.

As can be seen, the previous studies reported that the TESOL teacher education program in Libya neither addressed student-teachers’ needs and in-service teachers’ needs, nor the public schools’ curricular requirements. It is necessary to state that this study is not a confirmatory or replication study. The focus of the study is to investigate a Libyan TESOL teacher education program and its affordances and constraints from the viewpoints and experiences of the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates in order to connect theory and practice, especially in preparing Libyan student-teachers to teach English at Libyan public schools in Libya as a conflict zone.

In her suggestions for further research, Elhensheri (2004) encouraged investigating TESOL teacher education programs using a methodology that differs from hers and specified a case study approach. Due to the nature of the research questions, this study is designed as a qualitative case study, with the aim of having a complete
description and evaluation of the program through the program’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates who are in-service teachers.

Even though this study is not evaluating the program, the results can provide insights for future program evaluation. Program evaluation is a necessary process, especially in the availability of all curriculum components that will be evaluated (Brown, 2012). This study might help in “the appraisal of the quality of all the curriculum components that are in place and for the ongoing maintenance of the curriculum” (Brown, 2012, p. 161).

Given the fact that the English Department’s previous curriculum development attempts did not take into account neither student-teachers’ nor graduates’ views about how they were prepared to become teachers and their actual needs in a real classroom environment, the study intends to investigate their views and understandings of the TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints that would help in providing valuable insights for program reform.

Therefore, this qualitative study lays the ground for restructuring the curriculum of TESOL teacher education programs in Libya as a conflict zone, especially in this one particular university where the study is conducted.

**Research Questions**

The two main research questions are as follows:

- How do the teacher-educators, the student-teachers, and the graduates of the English Department at the Faculty of Education at Oya University perceive and understand the affordances and constraints of their existing TESOL teacher education curriculum?
How do the English department’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceive and understand critical language teacher education as an approach for program/curriculum reform?

A deep understanding of the program’s affordances and constraints is necessary for an effective program reform. Since the basic notions in this study are the terms “affordances” and “constraints”, the following section is devoted to establishing the meanings of the two concepts and their usages. The terms “affordances” and “constraints” carry several meanings, depending on different fields. In this study, I only focus on the meanings that are relevant to the purpose of using them.

The concept of affordances. The term “affordance” was coined by the American psychologist James Gibson when he proposed the theory of affordance. He claimed that he made up the noun affordance and used the term to describe the relationship between an environment and an object with the possibility of action (Gibson, 1977). Later, many researchers borrowed the term, and its meaning was extended to include perceived affordances (Anderson, 2014).

One of the researchers who borrowed the term is Donald Norman (1988), who introduced the concept of affordance in The psychology of everyday things. To Norman (1988), the term “refers to the perceived and actual properties of the thing, primarily those fundamental properties that determine just how the thing could possibly be used” (p. 9). Accordingly, affordances are the actual and perceived properties of things.

As shown in Table 1, McGrenere and Ho (2000) compared Gibson’s definition of affordances and how it is defined by Norman. They specified that the main difference between the two definitions is that while in Gibson’s definition “affordance is the action
possibility itself”, in Norman’s definition, affordance is used for “both the action possibility and the way that that action possibility is conveyed or made visible to the actor” (p. 180).

Table 1

Comparison of Affordances As Defined by Gibson and Norman (McGrenere & Ho, 2000, p. 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gibson’s Affordances</th>
<th>Norman’s Affordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Action possibilities in the environment in relation to the action capabilities of an actor.</td>
<td>• Perceived properties that may not actually exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent of the actor's experience, knowledge, culture, or ability to perceive.</td>
<td>• Suggestions or clues as to how to use the properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existence is binary - an affordance exists or it does not exist.</td>
<td>• Can be dependent on the experience, knowledge, or culture of the actor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can make an action difficult or easy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meaning of affordance is evolving and becoming more complex than Gibson’s meaning of affordance (Turner, 2005; Haines, 2015). The main aspect of affordance that is connected to this study is that “it is situated in the relationship between user and artefact” (Haines, 2015, p. 165). In this study, I focused on the affordances of one of the Libyan TESOL teacher education programs as perceived by the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates. Affordances help in understanding their perceptions on the program and their preparedness to teach as interactionists’ views with the purpose of action that leads to program reform.

**The concept of constraints.** Exploring an environment’s affordances is incomplete without understanding its constraints (Greeno 1994). Constraints are the identified limitations that inhibit goal achievement with the aim of improvement (Greeno
They are the participants’ perceived obstacles and limitations with the aim for action (Murphy & Coffin, 2003; Fu, Chu, & Kang, 2013). Li (2012) explained that constraints are “conditions like norms, efforts and relations” that “limit greater possibilities” of a system, whether educational or not (p. 788). In this study, the investigated program’s constraints are understood as they are perceived by its teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates with the aim for an effective program reform.

Li (2012) asserted the necessity of a profound understanding of a system’s affordances and constraints. To create “the optimal environment [that is] necessary for learning to take place” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, p. 48), it is necessary to understand the participants’ relationship with their program and their perceptions of its affordances and constraints. For the purpose of this study, affordance is defined as the potential program characteristics that teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceive as their program’s strengths for effective student-teacher preparation. Constraint, on the other hand, is defined as the possible conditions that teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceive as their program’s identified obstacles with the aim for action. Following Gibson’s (1979) stance in that “we must perceive in order to move” (p. 223), the terms affordances and constraints were used to help in recognizing and understanding teacher-educators’, student-teachers’, and graduates’ perceptions of their programs and provide their insights for effective program reform.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to investigate one of the Libyan English Departments’ TESOL teacher education programs in Libya as a conflict zone to outline its affordances and constraints as perceived by the faculty, student-teachers, and in-
service teachers who have graduated from the department. In addition, this study intends to explore the views of the programs’ teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates about critical language teacher education as a program reform due to sociocultural and sociopolitical changes in the Libyan context. This is to provide insights into a restructuring plan to redesign the program’s curriculum and refocus its mission to meet the needs of students of English and the public and private schools’ needs in Libya as a conflict zone.

**Research Design**

The site of the study is the English Department at the Faculty of Education at a public university, Oya University, in one of Libya’s major cities. The focus of the study is the department’s TESOL teacher education program.

Due to the sociocultural and sociopolitical situations in Libya that influenced the progress of the study as planned, the English Department’s TESOL teacher education program is explored using an adaptive methodological inquiry. The study was designed as a qualitative case study. However, the study can no longer be considered as a case study because of the challenges I encountered while collecting data, especially that I was not able to conduct interviews. More details are discussed in the methodology chapter.

Qualitative research is chosen because it helps in “understanding the complex interrelationships among all that exists” (Stake, 1995, p. 37), which means understanding the TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints through its teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates, as well as through analyzing the content of the program. The study is critical because it is set in a public domain that “allows it to
become the starting point for the critique and transformation of the conditions” in the program (Simon & Dippo, 1986, p. 197).

The participants of the study are selected purposefully. They are all from the English Department’s TESOL teacher education program; the participants are 15 teacher-educators, 10 student-teachers who are practicing teaching in schools or on campus, and 10 in-service teachers who have graduated from the English Department. Pseudonyms are used to protect their identities. The following are three lists of criteria for selecting the participants. The first set of criteria is for choosing the teacher-educators:

Given the fact that the English Departments’ teacher-educators are from various cultures and nationalities, which include Libyans, Iraqis, Indians, and Filipinos, all teacher-educators are invited to participate. There are no age or gender restrictions.

- Since the number of teacher-educators in the department is limited, I include all of the teacher-educators in the study to ensure the inclusion of the voices of those who did not participate in the previous attempts of the program’s curriculum design and development.
- All teacher-educators are full-time professors holding a master’s degree and a doctorate degree.
- All faculty participants have been teaching in the department for more than one semester.

The second set of criteria is for choosing the student-teachers:

- All student-teachers are full-time students.
They are in their final years of study: third or fourth-year students.\footnote{15}

Student-teachers include those who have already taken or are taking the Strategies 1 and Strategies 2 courses.

Student-teacher participants have to be student teaching or have taught either on campus or at Libyan public schools.

The final set of criteria is for choosing the graduates:

- All graduates have to be graduates of the TESOL teacher education program.
- All graduates are full-time teachers at Libyan public or private schools.
- Graduate participants’ teaching experience ranges from one year to eight years of teaching.

Data collection sources for this study include written artifacts and questionnaires. Documents include the Faculty of Education’s guidebook, English Department’s curriculum, lists of the departmental requirements, teaching practice and graduation project assessment forms, a list of student-teachers’ graduation project titles, and one of the departmental meetings’ minutes. Questionnaires are questionnaires of the program’s faculty, student-teachers, and its graduates. Semi-structured interviews with the program’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates are not conducted as planned because all who agreed to be interviewed withdrew because of the continuous blackouts and low Internet connections at the time of data collection.

Since each data collection tool depended upon the results of the previous one, the data collection procedure was an on-going process and occurred in three phases.

\footnote{15}{In the third year, student-teachers take Strategies 1 and Strategies 2 courses, where they do microteaching, whereas in the fourth year, they practice teaching at schools.}
Phase 1: In this phase, documents that included Faculty of Education’s guidebook (is not to be included in the Appendix since it includes real names of some of the participants), the English Department’s curriculum (Appendices K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, and R), meeting minutes that are related to curriculum changes (are not to be included in the Appendix since it includes real names of the participants), the teaching practice assessment forms (Appendices S, T, and U), and the graduation project assessment form were collected. Unfortunately, I was not able to locate any document of the ministry’s aims and objectives of ELT. All departmental documents were collected between October 2014 and May 2015.

Phase 2: In this phase, the questionnaires were distributed to the department’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates (Appendices E, F, and G) to gather participants’ views about the affordances and constraints of their existing program, to recruit participants that met the criteria, and to form preliminary questions for the interviews. Questionnaires were distributed and gathered between March 2015 and December 2015, taking into account the unstable situation that caused long blackouts and low Internet connections in Libya.

Phase 3: In this phase, interviews were supposed to be conducted with the department’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates (Appendices H, I, and J) electronically through Skype/Viber. Unfortunately, all participants who agreed to be interviewed withdrew due to long periods of blackouts and really low Internet services in Libya at the time of data collection.

Since data collection and analysis are not a linear process (Merriam, 1998), data was analyzed during and after the process of data collection. Each data went through line-
by-line reading and memoing and was coded first by hand and then by using NVivo. Categories were created through axial and selective coding, which helped in identifying themes that describe the case while relating it to the relevant literature.

**Significance of the Study**

Teacher education is important because of the need to prepare qualified and competent teachers. Demand for highly qualified and proficient ESOL teachers defines the need for effective teacher education programs to prepare ESOL teachers around the world. This endeavor is even more crucial in a context disrupted by wars and political scars, such as Libya. Thus, the first significance of the study lies in the fact that it addresses the concept of TESOL teacher education in the Libyan context as a conflict zone and the role of TESOL teacher education in preparing transformative teachers to teach in conflict zones. It also contributes to the existing dialogue by presenting results that can enrich the body of knowledge in the field of TESOL teacher education and can open discussions on social justice and peace education.

Second, this study is conducted in the Libyan context after Qaddafi was defeated. The Ministry of Education decided to make major changes in the Libyan curriculum to drop all the courses and subjects that aimed to teach Qaddafi’s thought and the *Green book*. I am hopeful that the results of the study provide suggestions for restructuring the program as needed. If the English Department’s TESOL teacher education program is developed and improved according to what recent research on TESOL teacher education around the world calls for, given the contextual sensitivities due to the postmethod’s parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b), it not only can contribute to the quality of teaching and learning in the Libyan context, but it
can also open the field for more related studies. Additionally, the study provides evidence for Libyan education policy makers that can direct them to improve the professional standards for TESOL programs and the accreditation of Libyan preparatory and secondary school teachers.

Additionally, the existing program went through various attempts of curriculum improvement without having done any kind of research or without having revised their curriculum based on research evidence. When I requested a copy of the program’s curriculum, I was given three different copies that were given by the head of the department, exams coordinator, and quality assurance coordinator, which had differences in credit numbers and whether the courses were compulsory or electives. For that reason, an important contribution of this study is that it directs the attention of the head of the department, exams coordinator, and quality assurance coordinator to the significance of having one version of the program. Hopefully, it will help to revise the program curriculum and have a final version of the reformed program, which not only can help the program teacher-educators, but also can help the student-teachers and any future researchers. Furthermore, the findings of this study could provide Libyan educators and administrative leaders of teacher preparation programs with foundational knowledge that could help them develop strategic plans for TESOL teacher education improvement in Libya as a conflict zone. This study encourages the program developers to evaluate the program’s effectiveness in preparing future ESOL teachers to teach in conflict zones.

Finally, the results of this study can contribute to the existing body of research that examines TESOL teacher education. Much of the teacher education literature focuses on teacher education programs, in general, but little has been said about the preparation
of teachers to work with ESOL learners in contexts where English is regarded as an international language. This study might raise questions that lead future research on other TESOL teacher education programs in the Libyan context, as well as other contexts, especially less-documented contexts. One under-researched topic is the development of the curriculum of TESOL teacher education that prepares student-teachers for teaching in a conflict/post-conflict zone. This study lays the ground for future researchers to investigate how TESOL teacher education programs prepare their student-teachers to teach English in war-torn and post-conflict contexts.

As the site of the study is a TESOL teacher education program in Libya, in the following sections, I briefly discuss the sociocultural and sociopolitical landscape of Libya as the context of the study.

**Sociocultural and Sociopolitical Landscape of Libya**

There is a need to familiarize the reader with the study’s context, which is why this section discusses the sociocultural and political landscape of Libya. Before war against Qaddafi, many of the people I met outside of Libya did not know where Libya was in this world. Some people, who heard about Qaddafi, associated Libya with him as if it was his own property. Whenever I chatted with people, they would always ask me the regular question, “Where are you from?” Then, their first response would be, “Oh, Qaddafi”, after revealing that I am from Libya. There were times when I was not comfortable with such responses. At that time, fear of the violence that might happen never gave me the chance or the courage to say that Libya is not Qaddafi.

I still remember when I was in Denver, Colorado, talking with one of my Chinese peers during an orientation week of a language course. My Chinese peer asked me where
I was from, and as I told her that I was from Libya, I felt the usual discomfort, thinking that she would say “Oh, Qaddafi!” To my surprise, her response was that she never heard of it and asked me to show her my country’s location on the world map that was on one of the classroom’s walls. With gratification, I headed to the map and started talking about my beloved country, Libya.

Libya is situated in the north of Africa and is considered one of the largest countries in the world. As can be seen in Figure 1, six African countries border Libya: Tunisia and Algeria are to the west, Niger and Chad are to the south, Sudan is to the southeast, and Egypt is to the east. The Mediterranean Sea is the north border of the country.

![Figure 1. Location of Libya in the continent of Africa](http://www.bbc.com/news/world-africa-13754897)

Libyan people are divided into four ethnic groups: Arabs, Amazigh, Tuareg, and Tabu. These ethnic groups’ spoken languages are Libyan Arabic varieties, Tamazight, Amazigh, and Tuareg. The majority of the population speaks Libyan Arabic.

---

Tamahaq (also known as Tamashaq or Tamagaq), and Tabu (Abdulaziz, 2014). However, during Qaddafi’s era, Standard Arabic was the only official language in Libya. After 2011, the minority ethnic groups called for inclusion of their languages in the new Libyan constitution. These minorities think that their languages were marginalized and have to be recognized by being included in the constitution as one of their rights after ending Qaddafi’s dictatorship era. This inclusion can be considered as a postcolonial movement that calls for postmethod teacher education.

Most people in Libya are Muslims. Even though Islam is the dominant religion, there are a few Christians who have their own churches where they practice their religion and worship God. These Christians are either the wives of some Libyans, delegates, or workers from around the world. People from other nationalities, who work in Libya, came from around the world. They are part of the educational system, economic and industrial sectors, and even part of the fields of medical science and nursing, along with other fields.

Libya went through various types of colonization that affected the Libyan educational system. For decades, Libya was colonized by the Romans, the Ottoman Empire (1521 – 1911), the Italian occupation (1911 – 1943), and the Franco-British administration (1943 – 1951). During these periods, the educational focus was mainly on Quran citation rules, memorizing the Quran, and memorizing the Prophet Mohammed’s sayings. However, some changes occurred during the French and British administrations period, in which more schools were established around Libya, and the first Teacher-Training Institute was established in 1948 (Marrah, 1975). After independence (1951 –
1969), the Kingdom of Libya’s constitution was formed, in which education was regarded as one of the basic rights of the Libyan people (Marrah, 1975).

Education in Libya went through various challenges and changes that this brief review will not cover since my review’s main focus will be on education during Qaddafi’s era, which is described in the following section.

**Education in Libya**

Education in Libya is free for everyone, from primary education to university level. Student enrollment and participation rates are considered “extremely high” (Alhmali, 2007, p. 1). As shown in Figure 2, which illustrates the Libyan educational system, the first nine years of the Libyan educational system are compulsory and regarded as “the cornerstone” of the Libyan Basic Education (UNESCO, 2006/07, p. 9). Basic Education is divided into two educational levels: six years of primary education and three years of preparatory education. During the six primary school years, students take “a number of educational and cultural subjects” that they “have to learn during the academic year” (UNESCO, 2006/07, p. 9), which is scheduled to be taken throughout the week; among these subjects is the English language.

The following three years are the preparatory/middle school years in which students take several educational and cultural subjects, among which is the English language. After finishing the three preparatory school years, students take the final national test and obtain the Basic Education Certificate. After successful completion of the basic education cycle, students enroll in secondary schools of their choice.
Since education policies in Libya were not stable and went through various changes during Qaddafi’s era, secondary education went through several changes as well. Before 1982, the Libyan secondary education system included general secondary education, teacher training education, commercial education, and vocational education. In March 1982, the Ministry of Education adopted a new educational system that included general secondary education, technical secondary education, vocational secondary education, and teacher training education. It was decided that technical education would be in four years and included 22 specializations, divided into the following categories: basic sciences, engineering, biological sciences, agricultural sciences, social sciences, and arts. Admission to a number of specialized secondary schools was seized in 1992 “due to the difficulties linked to the implementation of this structure” (UNESCO, 2006/07, p. 11). In 1996 - 1997, this system was reintroduced by the ministry with a limited number of specializations: basic sciences, economic sciences, biological sciences, arts and media, social sciences, and engineering sciences. Study durations were for four years. In 2006,
the system was reorganized to include only six specializations, which are basic sciences, engineering, biological sciences, social sciences, languages, and economics. This time, the duration of study was changed to three years.

After the February 17th revolution, in 2013, specialized secondary education was cancelled, and it was replaced by a general secondary education system in which students could choose between two sectors: Arts or Science. In the Arts sector, students could take educational courses related to social sciences, languages, history, and geography, whereas in the science sector, students could take a number of courses related to mathematics, chemistry, geology, biology, and physics. The compulsory courses that are now taken by students of both sectors are the Quranic studies, the Arabic language, and the English language.

Students who do not prefer secondary education choose to study at the vocational/technical training centers, where they are trained to specialize in various jobs, including becoming nurses, technicians, builders, painters, plumbers, mechanics, or electricians. English is required to be studied at these schools.

After successfully completing the secondary school and being awarded with the Secondary Education Certificate, Libyan students choose between university education, technical colleges, and higher technical/vocational institutions. According to a report titled Higher education in Libya, there were “twelve public universities and five private universities in the academic year 2011-2012” (EACEA, 2012, p. 4).

The duration of the study differs from one faculty to another. This ranges from four years to five or six years. There are three degrees offered: the Bachelor degree, the master’s degree, and the Ph.D. degree. Most of the departments offer both a master’s and
a Ph.D. program. The English Department, however, offers only a master’s degree program. English majors usually go to study abroad to countries where English is a native language, such as the UK and USA, in order to earn the Ph.D. degree.

In Tripoli, there is only one public university, and it includes programs that provide specialization in various subjects, including computer science, education (three campuses located in different areas), engineering, languages, medical science, sciences, and social sciences. Students who do not enter the university might choose to study at one of the higher institutions that provide diverse subjects and specializations within three to four years of study. English is taught at all programs.

Having described the Libyan education system briefly, which aimed to not only familiarize the reader with this context, but also to situate the English language in the Libyan system, the next section is devoted to explaining the implementation of Qaddafi’s ideology in the Libyan educational system.

**Qaddafi’s Ideology in the Libyan Curriculum**

In 1977, Qaddafi announced what he called the Third Universal Theory, which he discussed in detail in three parts of the *Green book*. He believed that his book brought hope to people, and he chose the color green to help deliver his message. In his book, Qaddafi claimed to find solutions to the problem of democracy, the economic problem, and the social basis. From 1977, the country’s name changed to the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. Jamahiriya is Qaddafi’s solution to the problem of democracy, in which he claims that the authority is for or by the people. The word ‘Jamahiriya’ is “a word coined by Qaddafi and often left un-translated. It roughly means ‘state of the masses’ or ‘peopled’” (O’Carroll, 2011, para. 8).
Since 1977, the Libyan curriculum included what was called Muammar’s thought or the leader’s ideology\textsuperscript{17}. From kindergarten to university level, children and students were required to chant, study, and memorize Qaddafi’s ideas. In kindergarten and all preschool levels, children learned his ideas through songs. Children were forced to call him “baba”, which meant “dad”. They were raised in these schools to believe that Qaddafi was their dad, and they should listen and believe in everything he said. Also, most of the songs and the chants the children would sing praised Qaddafi as being their dad and forever champion. I remember how my husband and I used to tell our sons not to sing those songs at home and not to believe in those things. First, I saw doubt, and then as my sons grew, they gradually understood. My husband and I used to tell our sons not to tell anyone about what we said, fearing that we could get caught as Qaddafi haters.

From primary to secondary levels, students were forced to take courses aimed at enforcing Qaddafi’s ideology\textsuperscript{18}. Students studied textbooks that were mainly designed to teach his thought as well as read the three parts of the Green book. In these textbooks, students read about how people should rule and how Qaddafi’s solutions were the best. They were also taught about colonization, considering US and other countries as enemies. Also, Qaddafi changed some of the history books to suit his ideas, so what was taught in history always looked at colonization and how Libyans should fight against colonialism from Qaddafi’s perspective.

At the university level, students took four courses that were called various names, which started with Political Culture and Political Awareness and ended with Jamahiriya

\textsuperscript{17} Muammar’s thought in Arabic is known as (fikr mammer ﻓﻜر ﻣﻌمر), and the leader’s ideology in Arabic is known as (fikr elkayid ﻓﻜر القايد).

\textsuperscript{18} A course called The Jamahirian Society, in which students study Qaddafi’s thought (elmujtama eljamahiri المجتمع الجماهيري).
Ideology. The main aim of these courses was to teach the *Green book* with more detailed focus, and the courses sought to raise students’ consciousness towards what the regime called “the enemy” and colonialism. Students would study from two textbooks that discussed some of the history that showed examples of colonialism. They would then read about how the *Green book* and Qaddafi’s ideology saved and will save Libya.

Qaddafi was always praised and was taught to be seen as the icon, the father, the leader, the champion, the hero, the intellectual, the philosopher, and even like a prophet. His followers were strong believers of him. People who saw him as ridiculous, a murderer, and a liar always told their children not to believe in him and his ideology. For instance, my husband and I always told our children that Qaddafi’s ideology courses are just courses forced by the Ministry of Education and not to believe in them. What helped my sons is our travel to various places around the world and our stay in the UK.

With all of these courses, there were other dominant forms of education that enforced Qaddafi’s ideology, which were: a) the daily pledge, what was known as the “Green Flag Call” and “the pledge”, and b) a week in April that was known as the “Open Week”.

**The Green Flag Call and the pledge.** Those are the words that were said by the students every morning before entering the school building for classes. The school day would begin with students standing in lines in front of the flagpole, first repeating the Green Flag Call before the anthem, and then stating the pledge after the anthem. In the pledge, students would swear to God to believe, follow, and protect Qaddafi, his theory, and the country, and to kill anyone against it. Table 2 shows a translation of the Green Flag Call.
Table 2

The Green Flag Call (Arabic Version Translated into English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Original)</th>
<th>(Translated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>إن الألوان الزرقاء والصفراء والحمراء والسوداء لا تبعث بالإنسان روح الأمل بل أنها تمثل الخراب والدمار واليأس. أما اللون الأخضر فهو لون الأمل لون الحياة و حتى الجنة يرمز لها باللون الأخضر. و هذه هي رايتنا الخضراء راية الاعزة والكرامة ترتفع خفافة عالية على أرض الحرية أرض أول جماهيرية الأرض البطولية والأقدام التي رويت بدما الشهداء الإبرار. وحتى تبقى هذه الراعية خفافة عالية قفوا لتحيتها.</td>
<td>The colors blue, yellow, red, and black do not fill us with hope, but they resemble destruction, devastation, and hopelessness. The green color, however, is the color of hope, color of life; even the paradise is symbolized by the green color. And this is our green flag, the flag of pride and dignity, Flying high upon the land of freedom, the land of the first Jamahiriya. The land of heroism and braveness that was watered with the blood of faithful martyrs, and to keep this flag flying high, stand to greet it with the words of the anthem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Open Week. The Open Week was once held between the first and second week of the month of April. The 7th of April is the day in which the regime executed many university students, university professors, school teachers, other civilian professionals, and military officers who were suspected of opposing the regime in front of university students, professors, and staff during the years of 1980 - 1985. Since 1986, the regime forced schools and universities to celebrate this day and watch the execution of opponents of the regime. During this week, classes were put on hold, and students attended lectures about the Green book and participated in activities, such as sports, arts, and other cultural activities. However, the main theme of every activity was embracing Qaddafi’s thoughts.

Now, after years of getting rid of this ideology, many still think that Qaddafi’s ideology still affects several Libyans because of the ongoing clashes and fights between gangs and militias, along with the spread of weapons among youth, which have resulted in many deaths of innocent people. There is a need to revolutionize education in Libya to
become transformative to help Libyans, especially student-teachers. I believe that there is a need to break barriers and challenge current stereotypes and help build an educational system that empowers social justice and peace.

**English Language in the Libyan Curriculum**

Even with the widely spread understandings of World Englishes and English as an international language, the English language is still considered as a foreign language in Libya. The first time English was included as one of the subjects in the Libyan curriculum was during the Franco-British administration in 1943 (Elhensheri, 2004, p. 19). Figure 3 provides a brief summary of the history of English language teaching and learning in Libya and the changes that happened since it was first included in the Libyan curriculum.

![Figure 3. The history of ELT in Libya.](image)

During 1950s, the main focus at that time was on grammar, vocabulary, and “reading books employing the same vocabulary” (Elhensheri, 2004, p. 41). Throughout the sixties and seventies, according to Elhensheri (2004), English was taught using the traditional grammar-based approach, with a specific focus on grammar and vocabulary,
and reading using books that convey English language knowledge “in the context of Arabic culture and environment” that were prepared by M. Gusbi (p. 41). A similar series used during the 1980s was prepared by M. Gusbi and R. John. All the series were titled *English for Libya* (Elhensheri, 2004).

In the beginning of 1980, English language teachers emphasized grammar and reading comprehension. The extensive use of the Arabic language, oral drills, correct grammar and pronunciation, vocabulary memorization, and reading aloud (Orafi & Borg, 2009) were the characteristics of English language teaching during that period.

However, English was banned to be taught or used due to Qaddafi’s regime’s new language policies from 1986 to 1993, which were a result of the “political tensions between Libya and the West” (Orafi & Borg, 2009, p. 246). Subsequently, the status of English language teaching noticeably worsened for almost a decade (Orafi & Borg, 2009), which affected many Libyan students and university graduates. Thus, since 1996 until this year, there is obvious evidence of the “negative consequences” that is shown in the decline of the standards of English language teaching and English language teacher education, specifically in relation to the university graduates’ “limited grasp of English” (Orafi & Borg, 2009, p. 246).

**The starting level of ELT.** Before the eradication of the English language from public schools, English language teaching once started in the Preparatory/Middle School. After English was reintroduced into the Libyan curriculum, teaching English began the last two years of Primary School in 2007, i.e., grades five and six.

**ELT instruction and textbooks.** Before English was eradicated from the Libyan curriculum, the textbook *English for Libya* was prepared by a Libyan English language
educator. I guess the Libyan ministry commissioned him because of the few number of professional Libyan English language teaching and learning scholars during that time.

After English had been reintroduced, the ministry rejected a new textbook series that was prepared by a group of Libyan English language educators and replaced it with the textbooks that were prepared and designed by British curriculum developers, including Alan and Fiona Tankard, D’Arcy Adrian-Vallance, Mike Macfarlane, Jenny Quintana, and others. Neither English language educators, nor teachers and school administrators, know why the Ministry of Education chose those authors to prepare the textbooks. I guess it was a result of the dominant assumption that ‘native speakers know better’. Garnet Education published the new textbooks. It is unknown why this publisher was chosen. As stated on its web site, Garnet Education\(^1\) is an independent publisher that specializes in English for Academic Purposes, which is why I suppose it was chosen.

The new curriculum was introduced in 2000, which was challenging to many Libyan in-service teachers. It signified a substantial shift “in teaching methodology and materials and in the assumptions about language, teaching and learning these were based on” (Orafi & Borg, 2009, p. 244). Although the new textbook series employed a communicative approach in teaching English, Libyan teachers were still relying on Grammar Translation and Audio-lingual methods of teaching English since they were forced to teach with this new approach without being trained to teach it (Elhensheri, 2004).

At the university level, textbooks are chosen by the head of the English Department and faculty. The most chosen textbooks are from Oxford University Press,

\(^1\) [http://www.garneteducation.com/](http://www.garneteducation.com/)
Cambridge University Press, McMillan, and Pearson Longman, which are made available by Libyan representatives and some Libyan private bookshops.

**ELT in the Libyan classroom.** After the return of the English language to the Libyan curriculum, new approaches and textbooks were introduced to Libyan English language teachers without any prior training (Elhensheri, 2004), which resulted in teachers’ “limited uptake” of the “core curriculum principles” (Orafi, 2008, p. 227). Teachers’ instruction differed from the communicative curriculum intentions (Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009). Complex relationships among the curriculum reform, teachers' practices, teachers' beliefs, and a range of contextual factors were behind teachers’ limited uptake of the curriculum (Orafi, 2008). Orafi (2008) stated that Libyan teachers’ beliefs about English language teaching and learning “were not in line with the principles endorsed by the curriculum” (p. 228). This was because their beliefs about language teaching and learning were affected by their prior experiences. Another point was that teachers’ beliefs about their students’ linguistic abilities and language proficiencies affected their decisions in regard to curriculum implementation. For instance, teachers omitted a number of the activities, such as the writing activities, when they thought that these activities were higher than their students’ linguistic abilities.

**Classroom interaction.** Classroom interaction is “tightly controlled by teachers” (Aldabbus, 2010, p. 73), even though the communicative curriculum was planned to be learner-centered. The teacher’s role is that of an information giver, whereas a student’s role is that of a passive information receiver and imitator. Teachers control the classroom and mostly focus on correcting students’ errors. As a result, the dominant practices are teacher-led repetition and question-and-answer exchanges. Teachers neglected peer and
group work that are proposed in the activities of the new textbooks (Aldabbus, 2010; Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009).

The medium of interaction is the Arabic language, which is used both by the teachers and the learners (Aldabbus, 2010; Elhensheri, 2004; Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009). Teachers justified their use of the Arabic language as facilitating students’ understanding and saving class time (Aldabbus, 2010).

In addition, learners were seen as knowledge receivers; learners were not given the chance to provide peer feedback. In fact, teachers were the only language models, and the primary feedback that teachers provided was criticism and physical punishment; error correction characterized all teachers’ total feedback (Aldabbus, 2010; Elhensheri, 2004; Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009).

**Misunderstandings and concerns.** Even though the Libyan teachers were positive about implementing the communicative approach to teach English in the Libyan context, there were areas in which they had some misunderstandings and concerns, which included the following:

- Empowering students and disempowering teachers: they thought it would result in “losing or affecting their authority or control over classrooms” (Shihiba, 2011, p. 275).

- Teachers’ thoughts about the approach as not being appropriate to the Libyan context.

- The image of disordered classrooms that lack discipline: “This misconception could be also attributed to these teachers’ misunderstanding of the notion of students’ ‘freedom to learn’” (Shihiba, 2011, p. 277).
• Lack of some teachers’ understanding of the approach made it difficult for them to provide any definitions or explanations for the communicative approach.

• Being unclear about how to assess students in the communicative approach (Shihiba, 2011).

These misunderstandings and concerns were the consequences of implementing the communicative approach in the Libyan English language classroom without attempting to provide professional development opportunities for the Libyan in-service teachers (Orafi & Brog, 2009; Shihiba, 2011). If in-service teachers were given professional development opportunities prior to the implementation of the new curriculum, teachers might have been able to include the intended objective to the curricular reforms in their actual teaching practices (Aldabbus, 2010; Elhensheri, 2004; Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg 2009; Shihiba, 2011).

**ELT evaluation.** The main aim of teaching English in all of the levels is to help students learn how to use the language in daily communication. However, in secondary schools, English is additionally taught as English for specific purposes, with the aim of preparing students for their university major. ELT instruction is test-driven instruction. A student’s proficiency is evaluated throughout the academic year, as well as throughout final exams given at the end of the year. Students take three pen-and-paper tests, two midterm tests, and one final test. The tests mostly concentrate on students’ reading comprehension and grammar (Aldabbus, 2010; Elhensheri, 2004; Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009; Shihiba, 2011).
Technology in the ELT classroom. Although Libyan English language teachers depicted positive attitudes towards integrating technology in their classrooms, they encountered problems related to time constraints and lack of administrative support (Emhamed & Krishnan, 2011).

CDs are the most used type of technology, due to their availability and their extensive use in the syllabus. Other types of technology, such as computers and overhead projectors, were not used, due to their unavailability and teachers’ claims of not being trained to use them (Emhamed & Krishnan, 2011). The problems that were reported by teachers were “related to lack of support from the school administration and time constraints to short duration of lesson time” (Emhamed & Krishnan, 2011, p. 191).

Challenges of ELT in the Libyan classroom. Libyan English language teachers face some challenges that can be summarized as follows:

- Time constraints: The time assigned for each lesson is usually seen to be shorter than what is planned for the lesson in the textbook. Another point is that the syllabus needs more time than the time apportioned by the ministry (Aldabbus, 2010; Elhensheri, 2004; Emhamed & Krishnan, 2011; Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009; Shihiba, 2011).

- Classroom size and levels of students: Each class has students with various levels of language proficiency and includes large numbers of students (Aldabbus, 2010; Elhensheri, 2004; Emhamed & Krishnan, 2011; Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009; Shihiba, 2011).

- Inadequate teaching materials: Schools lack language labs and other teaching aids that facilitate language learning and teaching (Aldabbus, 2010;
Elhensheri, 2004; Emhamed & Krishnan, 2011; Orafi, 2008; Orafi & Borg, 2009; Shihiba, 2011).

In brief, it seems that Libyan English language in-service teachers are underprepared to teach a curriculum that adopts the communicative approach, which raises a question about how they were prepared to become English language teachers, as well as how a TESOL teacher education program needs to be constructed in contexts, other than the English speaking countries. Thus, one of the aims of my proposed study is to explore how the existing TESOL teacher education program is preparing student-teachers to be able to teach using the communicative approach in a context that lacks many resources and how student-teachers should deal with the challenges of adopting a new curriculum, as reported by the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates.

**TESOL Teacher Education in Libya**

As mentioned earlier, the first teacher preparation institute was established in 1948 during the Franco-British administration (Marrah, 1975). Unfortunately, I was not able to locate information about how Libyan students were prepared to become teachers at that time.

The first Faculty of Education was established in 1965 in a major university in the capital of Libya (Elhensheri, 2004) as a result of the pressing need for qualified Libyan teachers to teach at Libyan public schools and to ensure access to efficient educational programs that address the Libyan learners’ needs. Another reason for establishing the Faculty of Education was to “decrease” the country’s “dependence on foreign expertise” (Hawana, 1981, p. 4).
The Faculty of Education included a number of departments, among which was the English Department. This department’s syllabus was the basis for all existing English language teacher education programs around Libya, which was designed to prepare student-teachers by asking them to take educational courses in Arabic, along with English courses. As one of the basic requirements for graduation, the program required student-teachers to practice teaching in schools. During the 1990s, the Faculty of Education was cancelled and was replaced by teacher training institutes. When I tried to trace the reasons for closing this faculty, there were no documents that specified the reasons. From personal communication with many of my colleagues, it was reported that there was an assumption that the faculty was not needed since the other programs were teaching most of the courses, especially at the Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Science.

In 2004, a decree\textsuperscript{20} with a decision to reorganize the Libyan universities was officially distributed and called for, including the Teacher Training Colleges within the university system. In the same year, another decree\textsuperscript{21} was issued that cancelled the teacher training institutes and called for redesigning their programs as faculties of teacher training. In 2009, an additional decree\textsuperscript{22} was circulated to all Libyan universities and called for renaming the Teacher Training colleges to become the Faculty of Education. More information about the study’s site is in Chapter 3, which is one of the faculties of education that was redesigned from being a Teacher Training college to the Faculty of Education.

\textsuperscript{20} Decree number 118.
\textsuperscript{21} Decree number 200.
\textsuperscript{22} Decree number 55.
Organization of the Dissertation

The dissertation is organized into five chapters with a Prologue and an Epilogue. As previously seen, the Prologue served as an overview to how the idea of investigating TESOL teacher education in the Libyan context began. This chapter, Chapter One, provided an introduction to the study that included the purpose of the study, organization of the study, and the significance of the study. It also provided a concise description of the context of the study.

Chapter Two provides a review of the relevant literature that looks at TESOL teacher education. It is divided into four parts. It begins with a discussion of teaching Standard English and World Englishes. It then involves a discussion of the changing face of TESOL teacher education. It also briefly covers the main changes and trends in English language teacher education. The following part deals with the TESOL teacher education curriculum, which covers curriculum planning, curriculum goals and objectives, curriculum models and approaches, teaching practice, and curriculum evaluation. Following that is a review of some of the studies that explored TESOL teacher education programs. The final part provides a brief overview about critical language teacher education. It seems necessary to highlight that the review includes some references that are more than 20 years old because they are considered as seminal work, or because they are discussed in most of the articles and books of scholars of TESOL teacher education.

Chapter Three discusses an adaptive methodological inquiry as the methodology of this study. It includes a description of the site of the study and the participants. The chapter then introduces the data collection sources that were employed to collect data, as
well as data analysis procedures. The chapter also includes a discussion of the researchers’ insider and outsider positionality as well as a discussion of the methodological disruptions and challenges. The chapter concludes with a brief consideration of ethical issues and the study’s trustworthiness.

Chapter Four discusses the findings from the investigated program’s documents and questionnaire analysis in relevance to the research questions. The chapter is divided into five parts that discuss the investigated program’s programmatic components, the participants’ perceptions on TESOL teacher education programs, their perceptions on the program’s affordances and constraints, their perceptions on critical language teacher education; and their insights and suggestions for curriculum reform.

Chapter Five consists of a discussion of the results in relevance to the reviewed literature and addresses the pedagogical implications, recommendations, and suggestions for further research. The Epilogue is the final chapter in which I reflect on the study and my experiences as a graduate student and an adjunct.
CHAPTER TWO

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE ON TESOL TEACHER EDUCATION

The main purpose of this study was to explore how the faculty members, student-teachers, and the graduate in-service teachers of the English Department at the Faculty of Education at Oya University in Libya perceive and understand the affordances and constraints of their TESOL teacher education curriculum. Further, the study aimed to examine their perceptions of critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform. Therefore, in this chapter, I review the relevant literature in relation to TESOL teacher education that provides a framework for this study. Some of the reviewed references are more than 20 years old because they are considered seminal work or because they are discussed in most of the articles and books of scholars of TESOL teacher education.

In the ELT field, attention to TESOL teacher education began by the end of the 20th century. In the 1980s, researchers and educators, such as Shulman (1986) and others, explored teachers’ knowledge base and how this affected the quality of their teaching. Over the past 25 years, TESOL teacher education has gone through substantial changes (Wright, 2010).

The review of literature showed that teacher education was mentioned in various terms, which included training, preparation, and development. It was found that the concept of teacher education evolved from the teacher-training concept (Klapper, 2001). Many researchers and educators, such as Burns and Richards (2009), Richards and Nunan (1990), Shulman (1987), and others, distinguished between the two concepts by stating that teacher training focuses on skills training, whereas teacher education is concerned
with more than involving teachers in simple skills training. Thus, teacher education involves teachers in professional knowledge and competency development. The current literature also shows that while teaching is regarded as mastering certain familiar skills, teacher education is holistic because teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning are formed through the different components of teacher education programs.

The other term that exists in the literature is teacher development. Teacher development is seen as the process of “continual intellectual, experiential and attitudinal growth of teachers” (Lange, 1990, p. 250). This concept refers to in-service teachers’ professional development, and, therefore, is not going to be covered in detail in this literature review since this study’s main concern focuses on how student-teachers and graduates perceive and understand their preparation in the teacher education program.

Most of the literature that discusses TESOL teacher education is introduced as second language teacher education. Richards (1990) was the first to coin the term “second language teacher education” (Wright, 2010, p. 259). After that, second language teacher education became “an umbrella term” for language teacher education in TESOL (Wright, 2010, p. 260). Even though the term “second language” continues to be “controversial” in contexts where English is still regarded and taught as a foreign language, or as an international language, Wright (2010) stated that this term “has been consolidated” after the publication of Burns’ and Richards’ The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education in 2009 (p. 260).

Richards (1990) specifies that TESOL teacher education’s intention should be to “provide opportunities for the novice to acquire the skills and competencies of effective teachers and to discover the working rules that effective teachers use” (p. 15). Richard’s
definition points out the significant main points that raise questions on how student-teachers gain knowledge and effective skills for teaching. The answers to these questions are at the core of any TESOL teacher education program. Richards’ definition also challenges the existing understandings of TESOL teacher education in the Libyan context. This study helps us, the Libyan teacher-educators, solidify our understanding of the roles of TESOL teacher education programs in preparing Libyan student-teachers to teach in the 21st century.

In this chapter, I review the field of TESOL teacher education. I begin with a brief review of research on which English to teach. Then, I review the three areas in the field of TESOL teacher education that are relevant to my research questions: (1) the main changes and trends in English language teacher education, (2) TESOL teacher education curriculum, (3) and critical language teacher education. This review, while not exhaustive in nature, aims to understand TESOL teacher education. In my review, I summarize and analyze what has been studied, connect the literature to my research questions, and I lead a discussion about the significance of this study to the field of TESOL teacher education. I conclude this chapter with a summary.

**Which English to Teach: Standard English or World Englishes?**

Since I believe that there is a need to consider EIL over EFL in the Libyan context, which was discussed in Chapter One, it seems necessary to briefly discuss how ELT classroom practices have changed researchers’ and educators’ perspectives in terms of which English to teach. As mentioned in Chapter One, Kachru’s three circles model categorized English according to how English is used in various countries around the world: the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle, and the Expanding Circle. Regardless of the
weaknesses in Kachru’s three circles model, Kachru’s model has raised researchers’ and educators’ attention to “the existence and validity of dynamic varieties of English” (Bruthiaux, 2010, p. 365). This awareness and the fact that English has become a global language has changed the common perspective that Standard English is the real language that should be taught in the ELT classroom.

There is no “agreed-upon definition” of the term Standard English because of the difficulty of defining the term and classifying specific features for being or not being standard (Farrell & Martin, 2009, p. 4). McArthur (2003) identified three characteristics of Standard English, which includes (1) being easy to be recognized in print, (2) being used by presenters, and (3) being related to speakers’ social class and education (p. 442). Standard English can be considered as the widely accepted form of English that is taught in ESL/EFL classes. British English and American English are the widely used forms of Standard English that are taught in ESL/EFL classes. They are considered the target language and are mostly taught in the countries that are in Expanding Circle. Standard English is also known as Received Pronunciation (RP).

World Englishes might have different interpretations among scholars (Jenkins, 2006). For some it is the “umbrella label” that covers all varieties of English (Bolton, 2004, p. 367). For others, World Englishes refers to the Outer Circle Englishes, which includes the localized varieties of English that have developed in regions that were colonized by the United Kingdom (Jenkins, 2006). Kachru (1985) explains that World Englishes signifies “the types of spread, the patterns of acquisition, and the functional domains in which English is used across cultures and languages” (p. 12).
**Teaching Standard English and/or World Englishes**

Perspectives on whether to teach Standard English and/or World Englishes are considered conflicting. Having Standard English as the ultimate goal for English language learners might have negative results on how learners perceive the great diversity of English varieties. Teaching World Englishes, however, is considered as a form of language teaching that leads to raising learners’ awareness of and respect for the English varieties. Kachru (1992) suggested giving learners the chance to explore different forms of English that include standard and non-standard varieties to raise their awareness of the “functional validity” of all varieties (p. 361).

Choosing which English to teach is not an easy task. What influences decisions about which English to teach is that those varieties might be mutually unintelligible (Farrell & Martin, 2009; Smith, 1992). For instance, to speakers of English who do not live in Singapore, Singlish is considered unintelligible. Thus, teaching Singlish to Singaporean English learners “may limit [their] ability to communicate with speakers of English outside Singapore” (Farrell & Martin, 2009, p. 4). However, English learners’ familiarity with other English varieties facilitates communication. More specifically, their knowledge of English varieties facilitates understanding of others and being understood by others (Smith & Nelson, 1985; Smith 1992).

Farrell & Martin (2009) believe that English language teachers and teacher-educators “can inform their practices about the different varieties of English that exist” by considering what they called “a balanced approach to teaching English” (p. 4). This is done by considering the teaching context, valuing their learners’ English, and preparing their learners for intercultural communication (El-Sayed, 1991; Farrell & Martin, 2009;
The basic element of a balanced approach is being “culturally sensitive to the diversity of contexts in which English is taught and used” (McKay, 2002, p. 128). Choosing the variety of English that is the focus of a program depends on the teaching context, teacher-educators’ teaching abilities and styles, and the learners’ educational and cultural needs (McKay, 2002). Factors that affect teacher-educators’ decisions to focus on a specific variety of English include their “own education, attitudes towards models, the model’s prestige or usefulness, [and the] availability of materials or tests” (Petzold, 2002, p. 424). Another significant factor in choosing the appropriate English variety is helping learners understand the value of their own English. Even when they notice some differences between their own English and the target language, teacher-educators need to help them value their own English (Farrell & Martin, 2009). Finally, English has become the “global language” that is used not only for communication, but also for business, science, politics, and education (Crystal, 2012, p. 1). As a result, English language teachers and learners should be prepared to communicate with speakers of other varieties by exposure to those varieties (Matsuda, 2003), which are available online, on radio and TV, and in newspapers and magazines (Cook, 1999). A question is raised: how can a program in a country torn by war and conflict be balanced? A more detailed discussion is in Chapter 6.

Accordingly, one of the aims of this study is to explore which English is taught in the Libyan TESOL teacher education program in the Faculty of Education at Oya University. The study’s concern is to explore the program’s teacher-educators’, student-teachers’, and graduates’ perceptions on teaching Standard English and World Englishes.
The Changing Face of TESOL Teacher Education

The study’s main concern is the affordances and constraints of a TESOL teacher education curriculum in Libya, as observed and reported by the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates who are in-service teachers. Accordingly, this section is devoted to discussing the main changes and trends in TESOL teacher education for the purpose of understanding the study’s program.

ELT was regarded as “a matter of simply translating theories of second language acquisition (SLA) into effective instructional practices” in TESOL teacher education programs (Johnson, 2009, p. 21). Today, ELT is seen “as a dialogic process of coconstructing knowledge that is situated in and emerges out of participation in particular sociocultural practices and contexts” (Johnson, 2009, p. 21). In other words, teachers make their decisions about the way they teach their students, taking into account the complexity of their social, cultural, and historical contexts in which they create and use appropriate forms of knowledge. The question that emerges here is whether TESOL teacher education program developers in the Libyan context view it this way since they are one of the programs that face what Johnson (2009) termed as the “social, institutional, and political constraints that work against the creation of development opportunities” for English language teachers (p. 21).

As mentioned earlier, TESOL teacher education went through various changes. During the 1980s, TESOL teacher education focused on teaching and teaching methods and techniques. By the end of the 1990s, however, TESOL teacher education became concerned with “LEARNING TO TEACH” (Wright, 2010, p. 266, emphasis from source). Drawing on the constructivist view, Freeman and Johnson (1998) called for a
reconceptualized knowledge base. The reconceptualized knowledge base influenced TESOL teacher education and created a new agenda at the start of the 21st century. This influence had “clear consequences” on curriculum goals, learning experiences, and evaluation (Wright, 2010, p. 267). In addition, moving away from behavioral views changed TESOL teacher education pedagogy. Therefore, one of the study’s aims is to understand how these changes and trends are viewed in the Libyan TESOL teacher education program, as well as attempting to understand how these changes are conceptualized.

**Reconceptualizing Knowledge Base**

Graves (2009) stated that knowledge base of TESOL teacher education is “often confused with” the knowledge base of language teaching (p. 116). She differentiated between the two by explaining that knowledge base of TESOL teacher education consists of the aspects of the TESOL teacher education and that knowledge base of language teaching is “part of” TESOL teacher education (Graves, 2009, p. 116). Since the study’s main focus is the TESOL teacher education knowledge base, and since the study’s main focus is to illustrate how teacher knowledge is part of TESOL teacher education, Table 3 summarizes the main categories of the teacher knowledge base, along with summarizing definitions and subcategories.

The knowledge base of TESOL teacher education “informs” three general areas: 1) what teachers need to know, which includes knowledge base of language teaching, 2) how English language teachers should teach, and 3) how English language teachers learn to teach (Johnson, 2009, p. 21). Thus, knowledge base in teacher education specifies and determines the content of TESOL teacher education programs, the pedagogies that are
taught in TESOL teacher education programs, and the institutional forms of delivery through which both content and pedagogies are learned.

Table 3

Teacher Knowledge Base (Based on Golombek, 1998; Grossman, 1990; Reinders, 2009a; Reinders, 2009b; Shulman, 1987)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Subcategory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject matter knowledge</td>
<td>Understanding the content and structure of the subject.</td>
<td>Language proficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linguistic knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Second language acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General pedagogical knowledge</td>
<td>Understanding the necessary principles, methods, and strategies for effective teaching and learning.</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical content knowledge</td>
<td>Understanding how to make subject comprehensible to others.</td>
<td>Teacher language awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of context</td>
<td>Understanding what influences instruction by understanding the sociocultural and institutional impacts.</td>
<td>Knowledge of learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge of educational goals and purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological pedagogical content knowledge</td>
<td>Having technological expertise.</td>
<td>Curriculum knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher self-knowledge</td>
<td>Understanding and accepting self.</td>
<td>Institutional context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitudes and expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Day and Conklin (1992), the TESOL teacher education knowledge base requires four types of knowledge: content knowledge, pedagogic knowledge, pedagogic content knowledge, and support knowledge. The main domains of the TESOL teacher education knowledge base are explained as follows:

**Content knowledge.** It is the knowledge of subject matter, which is the English language in the ESL/EFL/EIL contexts. This type of knowledge is represented through courses, such as syntax, semantics, phonology, and pragmatics.
Pedagogic knowledge. It is the knowledge of general teaching strategies, beliefs, and practices. This is related to how teachers teach, such as classroom management and making decisions.

Pedagogic content knowledge. It is the way in which content is represented to students to facilitate their understanding. To be more specific, it is related to how the English language is taught, in general, as well as how English language skills and grammar, for instance, are taught. It is also related to how students understand the subject matter, the types of difficulties they confront, the interfering misconceptions, and the ways of overcoming classroom management difficulties. This would be represented as teaching English language skills, teaching English grammar, English language materials evaluation and development, English language testing, English language program, English language methods, and curriculum evaluation and development.

Support knowledge. It is related to the different disciplines that inform English language teaching and learning approaches. This is represented in psycholinguistics, linguistics, second language acquisition, sociolinguistics, and research methods.

In addition, TESOL education programs need to prepare students for the 21st century’s technological challenges (Reinders, 2009a), which can be considered as one of the significant domains of the TESOL teacher education knowledge base.

Technological pedagogical content knowledge. Technological pedagogical content knowledge is considered significant because of the advances of technology use in language education in this era. Today, a challenge of many teachers is “helping learners develop the skills to deal successfully with the increased control and independence that technology demands” (Reinders, 2009a, p. 236). For this reason, TESOL teacher
education programs need to implement technology where it can be taught as a separate course, or TESOL teacher education programs need to integrate technology into a course or all courses of the program. Another point that needs to be taken into account is whether the student-teachers are going to be learning to use technology formally or informally. A formal approach is training student-teachers to use technology in a course, whereas in an informal approach, student-teachers learn to use it “out of enthusiasm for the medium and with help from colleagues” (Reinders, 2009b, p. 19). Finally, technology education can be generic or specific. In the generic approach, student-teachers are introduced to basic skills that help them use technology in their teaching, whereas with the specific approach, student-teachers are taught how to use certain commercial programs. For that reason, teacher-educators are “in the delicate position of explicitly linking the benefits of the innovation to classroom practice” (Reinders, 2009a, p. 230).

Freeman and Johnson (1998) necessitated TESOL teacher education knowledge base reconceptualization. They indicated that TESOL teacher education programs' content was "largely drawn from" other disciplines, especially theoretical linguistics and SLA (Johnson, 2009, p. 21). Johnson (2009) called for building a TESOL teacher education knowledge base that focuses on the ELT activity itself by concentrating on "who does it, where it is done, and how it is done" (p. 21).

Given that this study’s main concern is on the TESOL teacher education program in the Faculty of Education at Oya University, one of the main goals is to understand the focus of the program, the TESOL teacher education knowledge base, and how this knowledge is conceptualized.
Recognizing the Legitimacy of Practitioner Knowledge

Johnson (2009) indicates that practitioner knowledge should be considered as “legitimate” knowledge since it is formed “by and from practitioners as they participate in the social practices associated with English language teaching and learning” (p. 22). To be more specific, practitioner knowledge is “the kinds of knowledge practitioners generate through active participation and reflection on their own practice” (Heibert, Gallimore, & Stigler, 2002, p. 4). Thus, it is “linked with practice” since it is generated through teachers’ response to everyday classroom issues that form practice.

One of the ways used to “legitimize” practitioner knowledge is reflective teaching that is through reflective journals. Through reflection, teachers’ experiences become tools of change in teachers’ classroom practices. Johnson (2006; 2009) believes that practitioner knowledge can enhance knowledge base of teacher education. Johnson’s (2006; 2009) reasons were that (1) practitioner knowledge is caused by and comes out of teachers’ practice and experiences; (2) it emphasizes the interconnectedness of teachers’ thoughts about their work; (3) it is totally linked with teaching practice problems; and (4) it is associated with the context where teachers face the problems.

new models and choose what was appropriate to their contexts through their journal entries. In addition, Farrell (2007) used Case-Based Teaching to prepare student-teachers for a real classroom experience through reflecting on problematic experiences. Furthermore, Farrell (2008) used critical incidents with student-teachers during their practicum, which helped them become aware of the complexity and uncertainty of teaching. Student-teachers mostly wrote descriptions of negative incidents they faced, and they then exchanged their interpretations, which helped them become more aware of the teaching process. Finally, Farrell (2009a) used concept mapping, which helped students to understand the development of their beliefs and concepts through reflections.

Making sense of disciplinary knowledge is another form of practitioner knowledge. Johnson (2009) advocated for two approaches, which she considered as being “absent” within the TESOL teacher education traditional knowledge base. These approaches are (1) documenting practitioner knowledge through dialogue between TESOL Quarterly readers and authors and (2) classroom-based research. Johnson (2009) explained that:

dialogues highlight the complex ways in which teachers actively link theoretical knowledge to their own experiential knowledge as they reframe the way they describe and interpret their lived experiences. The new understandings that emerge enable teachers to reorganize their experiential knowledge, and this reorganization creates a new lens through which they interpret their understandings of themselves and their classroom practices. (p. 23)

In addition, classroom-based research that investigates teachers’ ways of understanding and adopting the disciplinary knowledge can help them understand how teachers make
sense of the disciplinary knowledge, as well as helping teachers reform their conceptions of language.


**Broadening the Definition of Language and SLA**

Firth and Wagner (1997; as cited in Johnson, 2009) called into question the traditional assumptions about language and SLA and necessitated broadening language and SLA definitions. Consequently, there were calls for questioning the content of the curriculum and the traditional L2/FL instruction methodologies. Johnson (2009) specified them as “structural and statistic” explanations of language and pedagogical practices that are built according to the mental processes assumptions (p. 24). The following acts were focused on the “unification of language and culture”, as well as focused on conceptualizing language as a social practice (Johnson, 2009, p. 24).

In L2/FL contexts, the English language not only is the medium of instruction, but it is also the object of teaching and learning. L2/FL instruction includes discussing utterance positions, cultural schema, and others’ understandings, evaluations, and assumptions since L2/FL pedagogy’s goal is focused on building the capability of function.
Changing TESOL Teacher Education Pedagogy

Research showed that views of TESOL teacher education and teacher learning shifted away from the behavioral views to “transmissive pedagogy” (Wright, 2010, p. 272). These changes led educators and researchers to investigate the effects of participative and process-led pedagogy, the reflective approach, and the narrative inquiry approach. Wright (2010) specified the developing pedagogy’s characteristics as (1) stressing student-teachers’ “LEARNING to teach” and becoming “THINKING” teachers; (2) integrating “REFLECTIVE” activities through journals and diaries; (3) obligating student-teachers’ “INQUIRY” that helps them understand their own beliefs, their contexts, and professional practices; and the “appropriation of pedagogies” through experience (p. 273, emphasis is from source).

Even though there is a shift from behavioral views to experiential and constructivist and social constructivist views, Wright (2010) claims “there is evidence to suggest that, in many contexts, change in [TESOL] teacher education pedagogy has been either very slow or negligible” (p. 281). In fact, Wright (2010) reveals that despite efforts for reform, initial teacher education has not embraced a new pedagogy. This study, therefore, aims to investigate the program’s pedagogy as experienced and perceived by the constituents of Oya University’s TESOL Teacher Education Program.

Changing the Nature of What Constitutes Professional Development

The common belief about professional development is that it is prepared “by others for or to teachers” (Johnson, 2009, p. 25). Even though professional development structures, such as professional workshops and educational seminars, have provided, and will continue to provide, teachers with credential professional development, a number of
professional development structures have emerged. Now, teachers are engaged in self-directed, collaborative, inquiry-based learning that is related to their classroom.

Teacher research leads to teachers’ professional development and extends their professional knowledge, which improves students’ learning (Robinson, 2012). Raising questions that explore teachers’ practices and their classrooms’ issues usually results in teachers’ learning and enhances their practitioner knowledge (Alvarez & Corn, 2008; Autrey et al., 2005; Soares, 2008; Robinson, 2012; Rogers et al., 2005).

In brief, understanding the trends and changes that guided the reconceptualization of TESOL teacher education is required since the study’s main concern is exploring one of the Libyan TESOL teacher education programs. In the following section, I discuss the TESOL teacher education curriculum, with the purpose of understanding the main components of a curriculum and how it can be developed and evaluated, which could provide insights for understanding Oya University’s research site for this study.

**TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum**

Since the main concern of this study was on the Libyan TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints, and since the study’s aim was to provide insights for curriculum reformation, this section of the literature review provides an overview about the TESOL teacher education curriculum and the relevant research studies.

Before explaining what constitutes the curriculum of a TESOL teacher education program, there is a need to discuss what the term ‘curriculum’ means. Since the term ‘curriculum’ has been interpreted in various ways that this brief review will not cover
because it is beyond the scope of this study, I will only discuss the definitions that provide a basis for this proposed study.

Eisner’s (1994) broad definition of curriculum shows that it is “a series of planned events that are intended to have educational consequences for one or more students” (p. 31). In this broad view, Eisner attempts to cover various activities that include not only curriculum planning stages, but also covers the educational goals of the program and instruction. Another definition that can be regarded as more specific is Rodgers’ (1989), which explains that a curriculum is “all those activities in which children engage under the auspices of the school” (p. 26). Rodgers (1989) further explains that this includes “not only what pupils learn, but how they learn it, how teachers help them learn, using what supporting materials, styles and methods of assessment, and in what kind of facilities” (p. 26).

It is worth mentioning here that literature shows that there is a difference between the terms “curriculum” and “syllabi”. Rodgers (1989) distinguished between curriculum and syllabi by specifying that a syllabus is the content of a certain course within a whole program, whereas curriculum is a larger concept that answers the ‘who, what, and how’ questions mentioned earlier.

Eisner’s (1994) and Rodgers’s (1989) definitions indicate any program’s specific educational processes and goals. As my study is concerned with TESOL teacher education programs, the aim here is to define a TESOL teacher education curriculum. Graves (2009) described a TESOL teacher education curriculum as “an interdependent, situated set of educational processes and tools whose aim is teacher learning” (p. 115). In more detail, Graves (2009) states that the educational programs’ plans focus on “who will
be taught, what will be taught, how it will be taught, and how what is learned will be evaluated” (p. 115), which agrees with Rodgers’ (1986) earlier mentioned definition. Thus, the aspects of any TESOL teacher education curriculum are: understanding student-teachers, defining student-teachers’ goals and learning outcomes, knowing what to teach student-teachers and how to teach them, and evaluating the effectiveness of the teacher education process (Graves, 2009, p. 116).

As seen in Figure 4, any TESOL teacher education curriculum is a combination of 1) curriculum aims and purposes; 2) learning experiences that affect decisions on teacher education pedagogy, the roles of teacher-educators, and the roles of the content of the program on students-teachers; and 3) the procedures of curriculum evaluation (Breen & Candlin, 1980; Wright, 2010), which is influenced by the contexts according to the contexts’ culture, beliefs, and values.

![Figure 4. TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum (Breen & Candlin, 1980, p. 2).](image)

Adapting Breen and Candlin’s seminal model, Wright (2010) “reformulated” three sets of questions as “a productive means of” analyzing a TESOL teacher education
program (p. 262). These questions included questions that define a program’s purposes and goals, a program’s formal learning experiences, and a program’s evaluation procedures. Answers to the first set of questions, Wright (2010) specified, will identify the content of any TESOL teacher education program and will assert the program’s standards and its minimum entry standards. These questions are as follows: “What sort of teacher should emerge from [the program]? What learning and developmental demands shall we make on learning teachers? What previous knowledge, values, attitudes and beliefs do learning teachers bring to [the program]?” (Wright, 2010, p. 263).

Answers to the second set of questions Wright (2010) specified to define the formal learning experiences in any TESOL teacher education program shape the pedagogies of the program and “may also consciously ‘build in’ opportunities for INFORMAL learning” (p. 263). These questions are as follows: “How can we help student teachers learn to teach? What is the role of the teacher educator? What part does content play in the learning experience? What IS content on [a TESOL teacher education program]?” (Wright, 2010, p. 263).

Answers to the third set of questions define the process of evaluation of any TESOL teacher education program and help in fulfilling the “gate keeping function” (Wright, 2010, p. 263). The responses to these questions will provide a way to evaluate whether the program met its own objectives and how its graduates influenced their educational contexts (Wright, 2010). These questions are as follows: “How do we know we have succeeded in meeting our curriculum goals? Have the learning teachers succeeded in attaining the required standard for entry into the teaching profession?” (Wright, 2010, p. 263).
Using Wright’s (2010) questions helped in exploring the study’s TESOL teacher education program and helped in determining the program’s purposes and goals, the adopted approaches and models, the formal learning experiences, and the evaluation procedures.

Figure 5 shows Graves’s (2009) framework for planning a TESOL teacher education curriculum, which consists of understanding teacher-learners through needs analysis; making decisions about the curriculum goals, and objectives; knowing what to teach them and how to teach them by deciding which approaches and models to adopt; and evaluating the effectiveness of the teacher-education process.

**Figure 5.** A framework for planning a curriculum (Graves, 2009).

Graves states that these aspects form the TESOL teacher education knowledge base. As my study was concerned with Oya University’s TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints, it was necessary to review literature related to
what constitutes a TESOL teacher education curriculum, the critiques of the program, and
how it is evaluated. In the following section, I discuss the key aspects of a curriculum.

Aspects of the TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum

In the following section, I discuss the key aspects of a curriculum that includes curriculum goals and objectives, curriculum approaches and models, and teaching practice.

Curriculum goals and objectives. The “ending perspective” describes the results of the educational experience that indicates what teachers should know and be able to do, which are known as the program’s goals (Brown, 1995, p. 75). Goals represent the general statements that are concerned with the “desirable and attainable purposes and aims based on perceived language and situation needs” (Brown, 1995, p. 75). Objectives, on the other hand, offer the “building blocks from which curriculum can be created, modeled, and revised” (Brown, 1995, p. 75). They are the “precise statements [that are] about what content and skills the students must master in order to obtain a particular goal” (Brown, 1995, p. 75). Thus, goals specify the desired learning outcomes, whereas the objectives show the procedure that leads to those learning outcomes.

Deciding the curriculum goals and objectives is affected by what Eisner (1994) termed as “educational ideologies” (p. 47). These educational ideologies are the theories and philosophies that were dominant for a while and affected our educational decisions regarding curriculum goals, objectives, and content selection. Richards (2001) specified five educational philosophies: academic rationalism, social and economical efficiency, learner-centeredness, social reconstructionism, and cultural pluralism. Taking into account the context of the program, the curriculum planners work on the selected
educational philosophy and curriculum theory, along with the identified goals to develop the whole program.

TESOL teacher education programs should have a balance between theory and practice, and should offer authentic teaching experiences, provide support to teachers, establish chances for collaboration, and plan practices for teacher empowerment among the curriculum goals and objectives.

**Balancing between theory and practice.** A number of studies specify that there is a tendency among teacher education programs to present theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge separately (Goodlad, 1990; Freiberg & Waxman, 1990; Grimmest & MacKinnon, 1992). Practical knowledge is usually presented without connection to theory. However, introducing theories to student-teachers without making connections to classroom practices will hinder those students from internalizing them and applying them to their teaching. Thus, it is of significance to help student-teachers bridge the gap between theory and practice by giving them the chance to understand theories and their implications through modeling (Day, 1999).

**Authentic teaching experiences.** The best way to learn to teach is by being involved in teaching practices (Guyton & McIntyre, 1999). Therefore, TESOL teacher education programs should provide student-teachers with chances to teach in real classrooms where they can face real classroom problems.

**Providing support.** Fisher (2001) asserted the necessity of constant training for both pre-service teachers and in-service teachers. This is because teaching is a complex process that might lead teachers to becoming drained physically and emotionally. One of the suggestions for providing support is to provide mentoring programs (Blair-Larsen,
1998), which can help “close the gap between pre-service training and the actualities of teaching” (Eisenman & Holly, 1998, p. 80).

**Collaboration.** Collaboration between TESOL teacher education programs, schools, educators, teachers, policy makers, and their communities is of significance (Johnson, 2000) since it not only benefits teachers but also creates effective teaching opportunities. To be able to teach effectively, teachers need to have opportunities for reflection, research, and collaboration in order to help minimize the complexities related to teaching experience (Clarke, 1994).

**Teacher empowerment.** Harrington (1994) stresses the significance of empowering student-teachers with tools for continual growth. A number of researchers asserted the significance of preparing pre-service teachers to be active researchers by showing them how to experiment with various methodologies and interpret their results (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Student-teachers can be prepared and motivated to become contributing research professionals through TESOL teacher education programs’ newsletters and mini conferences (Murphy, 2000). Moreover, teacher-educators can be models for their students by applying “self-reflections” (Golombek, 1998, p. 462), giving instructional suggestions, and presenting classroom research results.

In brief, effective TESOL teacher education programs should have a balance between theory and practice, and they should offer authentic teaching experiences, provide support to teachers, establish chances for collaboration, and create opportunities for teacher empowerment.

**Curriculum approaches and models.** The aim of a TESOL teacher education program is to “bridge the gap” between what student-teachers already know and the
programs’ goals (Graves, 2009, p.116). Two components encompass TESOL teacher education programs, which is what teachers will be taught and how teachers will be taught. The former is “directly linked” to the programs’ goals, whereas the latter is related to the instructional practices through which the content is learned by the student-teachers (Graves, 2009, p. 116). Thus, a program’s chosen way of delivering knowledge to its learners is described through its chosen models or approaches.

Aeichner (1983; as cited in Elhensheri, 2004) categorizes teacher education models into four models, which include the behaviorist model, the personalistic model, the traditional craft, and the inquiry model. While in the behaviorist model, imitation is the mastery of scientifically validated skills, the focus of the personalistic model is on the whole personal growth and self-assertion. The traditional craft’s focus, however, is on inherited craft knowledge mastery through master-teacher apprenticeship. Finally, the inquiry model is skills-oriented, which focuses on empowering student-teachers through analysis of original pedagogic problems in order to provide solutions that are appropriate for a certain context.

Woodward (1991) proposed a loop input model in which student-teachers learn how to teach through educators’ teaching. The process of the teaching is embedded within the class content, which allows student-teachers to understand the roles of teachers and students, as well as the teaching experience. Woodward (1991) explains that student-teachers benefit from this model since it enables them to become familiar with teaching techniques without leaving their institution through educators modeling their teaching methods. Accordingly, student-teachers enter “into a length apprenticeship with an experienced teacher” (Woodward, 1991, p. 43).
Wallace (1991) classifies teacher education models into three models: the craft model, the applied science model, and the reflective model. Followers of a craft model believe that the expertise of the teaching exists in training, whereas followers of the applied science model believe that the value of expertise is in content knowledge. Followers of the reflective model believe in the power of constant self-reflection, which leads to professional self-development (Barduhn & Johnson, 2009). Wallace (1991) considers the applied science model as the “traditional and probably still the most relevant model underlying most training or education programs” (p. 8). This model is also referred to as the “rationalist learn-the-theory-and-then-apply-it model” (Ur, 1992, p. 56).

Day (1999, 2014) discussed four models: the apprentice-expert model, the rationalist model, the case-studies model, and the integrative model. With some similarities to the craft model, as proposed by Wallace (1991), the apprentice-expert model is a linear process in which student-teachers are taught by an expert without questioning the expert. In this model, knowledge is attained through observation, instruction, and practice (Day, 1999, 2014). Teacher-educators, trainers, and experienced school-teachers can be considered as models that student-teachers can follow. The rationalist model is also mentioned as the "rationalist learn-the-theory-and-then-apply-it model" (Ur, 1992, p. 56) and is also known as the applied science model (Wallace, 1991). In this model, teaching is rationalized as being “a science” that “can be examined rationally and objectively” (Day, 1999, p. 41). Novice teachers can benefit from this model through understanding theories and methods of teaching. With some similarity to the inquiry model, in the case-studies model, student-teachers discuss and analyze actual
case histories in the classroom. Using videos, this model can provide student-teachers with opportunities to analyze and discuss authentic classroom situations.

Day (1999, 2014) indicated that the consequence of reliance on any one of the previously mentioned three models alone is failing to manage the knowledge base. Day (1999, 2014) believes that the integrative model can incorporate the strengths of all three models and expose student-teachers to all types of knowledge through various experiences and activities. Day (1999, 2014) considers reflective practice as the main component of the integrative model. The purpose of reflection is in “helping teachers to think about what happened, why it happened, and what else they could have done to reach their goals” (Cruickshank & Applegate, 1981, p. 553).

As can be seen from the discussion of the models as proposed by Aeichner (1983), Woodward (1991), Day (1999, 2014), and Wallace (1991), there are some similarities among the models, even though they are presented with different aims. The chosen training methods establishes how student-teachers learn to teach. Since choosing a single model is considered inappropriate (Day, 1999, 2014), program designers are encouraged to integrate a combination of various models.

**Teaching practice.** The aim of this study is to investigate the affordances and constraints of the TESOL teacher education within the Faculty of Education at Oya University. One of the components of the curriculum of the investigated program is that of teaching practice, which is considered as “a core learning experience” (Wright, 2010, p. 282). For the purpose of understanding the study’s program, this section provides a brief discussion on teaching practice. The review of the literature showed that the terms
teaching practice, practice teaching, and practicum are used as synonyms with the same aim. In this study, I will use the term ‘teaching practice’.

Many TESOL teacher education programs consider teaching practice as one of the significant components of teacher preparation, with the aim of connecting between the program’s academic courses and the schools’ real classroom (Farrell, 2007; Richards & Farrell, 2011). Since real classroom teaching situations cannot be introduced during coursework, the main objective is helping student-teachers to relate and apply the knowledge and experiences they gained from coursework in real classroom situations with real students (Richards & Farrell, 2011). By having the chance to interact in a real classroom environment, learners, fellow teachers, administrators, and student-teachers can enrich their understandings and learn to teach “in school and classroom contexts” (Wright, 2010, p. 282).

TESOL teacher education programs introduce student-teachers to two kinds of teaching practice: microteaching and class teaching. Microteaching is usually done on campus with peer student-teachers. Student-teachers become involved in “planning and teaching a short lesson or part of a lesson to a group of fellow student-teachers”; microteaching invites feedback from the educator and peers (Richards & Farrell, 2011, p. 4). Wright (2010) stated that microteaching could be considered as “unfashionable” because of “its behaviourist roots” if its procedure is not adjusted to “accommodate the new knowledge base on teacher learning” by linking students’ experiences through critical reflections and dialogues (p. 282). Critical reflections provide great opportunities for student-teachers to learn to teach by evaluating their own experiences, whereas
dialogues give them the opportunity to discuss their experiences with their peers and supervisor (Richards & Farrell, 2011).

The second kind of teaching is teaching a class at a school, which aims to give student-teachers the opportunity to observe teachers, teach a part of a lesson, and then teach a whole lesson “for an extended period of time” (Richards & Farrell, 2011, p. 4). Even though student-teachers go through challenging experiences within this period of teaching practice, it is considered a valuable opportunity for professional development. During teaching practice, student-teachers are observed by their peer student-teachers, supervisor or teacher educator, and by a cooperating teacher.

Even though teaching practice is regarded as the key moment for student-teachers “to acquire the practical skills and knowledge needed to function as an effective language teacher” (Richards & Crookes, 1988, p. 9), there are a number of challenges that might affect the effectiveness of teaching practice and student-teachers’ learning opportunities. These challenges can be summarized in the quality of supervision (Farrell, 2007) and making teaching practice a real learning opportunity for professional growth (Richards, 1998). For instance, brief, uncoordinated supervision and limited support and guidance can lead to questioning the quality of teaching practice supervision (Richards & Crookes, 1988, p. 9). Student-teachers’ lack of knowledge of their learners and context might lead to a failure in their professional growth. For that reason, Farrell (2007, 2008a) emphasized the significance of involving student-teachers in an awareness-raising process that would empower them to understand the complexity of teaching.

Richards and Farrell (2011) suggested a number of ways student-teachers can monitor their own teaching and analyze how they learn to teach. This can be achieved by
recording the lessons (audio/video), using written accounts, writing teaching journals, collecting case reports, creating teaching portfolios, writing descriptions of critical incidents, conducting small-scale action research, and attending student-teacher support group meetings. Table 4 briefly introduces the ways student-teachers can explore their teaching.

Table 4

Ways of Exploring Teaching (Richards & Farrell, 2011, p. 159)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What to use?</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio- or video-record a lesson</td>
<td>Record of lesson to examine different aspects of teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written accounts of lessons</td>
<td>Written accounts of lessons using checklists and narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching journal</td>
<td>Written, ongoing account of teaching experiences in notebook or electronic form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case reports</td>
<td>Account of a teaching incident or experience collected over a period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching portfolio</td>
<td>Collection of documents over time to provide a record of teaching, a source of information for reflection and review, and/or a picture of the kind of teacher you are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical incidents</td>
<td>Written accounts of any unplanned event that occurs during class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Small-scale teacher-conducted classroom research that seeks to clarify and resolve practical teaching issues and problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-teacher support groups</td>
<td>Group of fellow student-teachers who meet regularly to share their teaching experiences, goals, problems, and/or concerns. This group can also collaborate on projects of interest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through these collection methods, student-teachers can assess their teaching experience, which can help them uncover some features of their teaching, which they might not know by just relying on feedback from others. Additionally, these various ways of exploring student-teachers’ teaching practices can provide great opportunities for discussion, as well as for reflection on what has been learned.
Teaching practice, whether microteaching or class teaching, is an opportunity for student-teachers to experience professional growth. This study’s intention is to investigate the TESOL teacher education program’s components. It also intends to explore how teaching practice is applied and how student-teachers understand how they are supported.

**Curriculum Evaluation**

Curriculum evaluation is the stage in which ways of evaluating a program’s effectiveness is decided. Evaluation is of significance since it assesses whether a program’s goals and objectives are achieved; evaluation also helps to assess students’ accomplishments and curriculum implementations (Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001). According to Gaies (1991), evaluation attempts to gather “concrete evidence about the impact and functioning” of any program. Likewise, Patton (1997) defined evaluation as “the systematic collection of information about the activities, characteristics, and outcomes of programs” that are intended to be used “to make judgments about the program, improve program effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about future programming” (p. 23). Although evaluation is usually done at the end of any program, Brown (1995) believes that it is “a never-ending needs analysis” that can be done as a continuing process (p. 233). Evaluation is usually done by external or internal professional researchers, administrators, or even faculty members of the evaluated program (McCormick & James, 1989).

Richards (2001) defined the purposes behind three forms of evaluation: formative, illuminative, and summative. Formative evaluation’s intention is concerned with constant program development and improvement; a formative evaluation aims to find out what
went well and to consider various problems. Richards (2001) provided a number of questions for formative evaluation that help to identify what to improve (p. 288).

Illuminative evaluation, however, explores how a program’s aspects work for “a deeper understanding [of] the processes of teaching and learning that occur in the program, without necessarily seeking to change” (Richards, 2001, pp. 289-290). Richards (2001) provided questions that can be used to collect information for a deeper understanding. Finally, summative evaluation, which Richards regarded as the most familiar type of evaluation among teacher and program administrators, strives for making decisions about the worthiness of the curricular aspects. The focus is on defining a program’s effectiveness and its acceptability (Richards, 2001). There are varied measures that are used to identify a program’s effectiveness, which include mastery of objectives, performance on tests, measures of acceptability, retention rate or reenrollment rate, and efficiency of the course.

Stufflebeam (2001) placed 21 models of evaluation into four categories, which includes pseudo-evaluations, questions / methods oriented, improvement / accountability, and social agenda / advocacy. Stufflebeam (2001) placed case study evaluations under the questions / methods oriented model and provided a comprehensive description that would benefit this study.

Gaies (1991) indicated that usually, a combination of models are used for evaluation with varied sources of methods that might include tests, surveys, performance measures, and individual students’ feedback using both qualitative and quantitative information. Richards (2001) discussed the procedures that can be used to make decisions about how to conduct an evaluation, which can be used to choose methods for evaluation.
Richards also provided some examples of program evaluation that could help first time program evaluators.

This study is concerned with a Libyan TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints, as observed and identified by the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates. Accordingly, it was necessary to review literature related to what constitutes a TESOL teacher education curriculum, how it is planned, and how it is evaluated. As can be seen in the review, using Wright’s (2010) questions helps to explain the Libyan TESOL teacher education program’s purposes and goals, the formal learning experiences, and the evaluation procedures. Including the program’s faculty, student-teachers and graduates will help determine whether the program’s goals and objects were met. In the following section, I review a number of studies with the aim of identifying some of the TESOL teacher education program’s reported affordances and constraints.

**Research on TESOL Teacher Education Programs**

The previous parts of this literature review provided information about what constitutes knowledge base and a TESOL teacher education program’s components. In this section of the chapter, I review studies that investigated TESOL teacher education programs. Research that critically analyzed “context-specific” TESOL teacher education curriculum practices is considered to be “little” (Nguyen, 2013, p. 37). TESOL teacher education has “a strong conceptual base”, however, research that explores knowledge base development practices is limited (Nguyen, 2013, p. 38). Researchers, such as Alsagoff & Low (2007), Faez (2011), and Fradd & Lee, (1998), investigated the factors that affect TESOL teacher education knowledge base development and found that
influential contextual factors had the most impact. The diversity of the programs and their sociocultural contexts shape TESOL teacher education programs’ contents and practices (Nguyen, 2013).

Research on TESOL teacher education programs around the world revealed that those programs have their own affordances and constraints. Even though those programs’ affordances and constraints cannot be generalized because of the cultural and educational differences from country to another, knowing the reported constraints might explain the challenges of developing effective TESOL teacher education programs. The most reported constraints of TESOL teacher education programs can be summarized as not being adequate in preparing effective English language teachers and not having explicitly developed subject matter knowledge (Chen, 2014; Faez & Valeo, 2012; Giannakaki, Hobson, & Malderez, 2011; Karimvand, Hessamy, & Hemmati, 2014; Nguyen, 2013; Zhu, 2013). Additionally other reported constraints include having a gap between theory and practice, having little focus on contextual knowledge, having lack of pedagogical reasoning and decision making, having short periods of teaching practice, lacking the quality of assessment, and lacking the quality of instructors among other curricular limitations (Chen, 2014; Faez & Valeo, 2012; Giannakaki, Hobson, & Malderez, 2011; Karimvand, Hessamy, & Hemmati, 2014; Nguyen, 2013; Zhu, 2013). Another constraint that is related to TESOL teacher education programs in conflict zones is that some programs fail to prepare their student-teachers for real classroom challenges, which is a result of being in war-torn or post-conflict zone (Nelson & Appleby, 2015).

In the following sections, I review research on TESOL teacher education programs in the Arab world and in Libya due to the similarities between those contexts
with the aim of understanding TESOL teacher education programs’ affordances and constraints.

**Research on TESOL teacher education programs in the Arab world.** My search to find published studies that investigated TESOL teacher education programs in the Arab world revealed that the Arab countries can be considered among the less-documented contexts. There are a number of dissertations that explored TESOL teacher education programs in the Arab world; however, published articles can be regarded as really scarce. This might be due to the fact that most of the published work is produced locally and is not available online. I chose the following studies as illustrative cases that help in understanding the most reported constraints and limitations of TESOL teacher education programs. Studies from the Arab context were considered more than other contexts due to some of the similarities between the Libyan context and many countries in relation to the Arab context in the educational structure, ministry of education’s mandates on curriculum, and how English is taught in those contexts. My aim here is not to generalize, but to consider what has been done in the Arab contexts. The three studies that were of relevance to my study were conducted in Yemen, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan.

Raskhan’s (1995) study investigated and evaluated the College of Education’s English teacher preparation program at Sana’a University, with the aim of finding the program’s strengths and weaknesses for program improvement. The participants of the study were in-service teachers who were the program’s graduates; these graduates were teaching the English language at Yemeni public schools. Data was collected through questionnaires, which included questions about admissions, curriculum, teaching skills, evaluation, student teaching, and even program requirements. Raskhan (1995) revealed
that 172 of the participants completed questionnaires, which were distributed in person and statistically analyzed. Results showed that the graduates had positive views about the program and suggested a number of points, which included adding writing and grammar courses, paying more attention to practice, rather than theory, adding classroom management courses, and adding contemporary teaching material courses. Raskhan’s (1995) participants also suggested having educators who are native speakers of English, with the assumption that they would help them improve their spoken language. Even though this study was conducted in Yemen, the results are of significance to my study because of how the English language is being taught and introduced in the curriculum. In his study, Raskhan (1995) relied only on one source of data collection, which was only gathered from the program’s graduates. In my study, I gathered data from various sources and different participants, which not only included the program’s graduates, but also included the program’s faculty and student-teachers. This provided me with views of different participants.

Alshuaifan (2009) examined the Saudi EFL faculty members’ and EFL public school teachers’ perceptions towards a Saudi teacher preparation program. She explored their views on the program’s goals, the curriculum’s content, and the public school’s curriculum content. The participants were 13 female EFL faculty members within the College of Education at the University of Ha’il and 83 female EFL public school teachers. Data was collected through surveys, which was analyzed through measures of “mean, standard deviation, and frequency” and “a two-tailed t-test and nonparametric test” (Alshuaifan, 2009, p. 72). Alshuaifan (2009) reported that there was a difference in the EFL faculty members’ and public school teachers’ perceptions regarding the teacher
preparation program. She described EFL faculty members’ satisfaction as “border line dislike” (Alshuaifan, 2009, p. 157). Public school teachers, however, were “dissatisfied” with the program, which she described as “not surprising” (p. 157). In addition, there was a difference in the participants’ perceptions about what courses should be offered by the program, such as including Introduction to Linguistics and EFL Syllabus Design to the curriculum. The results of Alshuaifan’s study are of significance since they resonate with the results derived from the Libyan context.

Bani Abdelrahman (2003) conducted a study at Yarmouk University in Jordan, which examined the efficiency of a TESOL teacher preparation program and the role of a practicum in preparing English language teachers, with the aim of “providing the decision makers with objective information about students’ abilities in teaching English” (p. 29). The participants were 114 students. Data was collected through questionnaires, which included “likert-type items and some open essay questions” (Bani Abdelrahman, 2003, p. 86). Bani Abdelrahman (2003) investigated “the design of the program, the educational courses, the English language courses, the faculty members of the program, the students of the program, the practicum teaching courses, and the practicum supervision” (p. 159). The results revealed students’ dissatisfaction with both the program and the practicum. Students’ suggestions for program improvement included the need for additional practicum teaching visits; students suggested that these visits should occur more than one semester and should begin at earlier times (Bani Abdelrahman, 2003). Suggestions also included teaching all the educational courses in English and using technology enhanced instruction. The participants highlighted the significance of using various teaching methods and recommended adding more courses for language
proficiency development, along with making suggestions about what could help them become more competent language users and qualified English language teachers.

**Research on TESOL teacher education programs in Libya.** Published research on TESOL teacher education in the Libyan context is scarce. To be more specific, research that explores knowledge base is nonexistent, to my knowledge. There were no published articles or studies by Libyan researchers or by other researchers in the Libyan context about TESOL teacher education programs in Libya. I was able to find only one thesis and one dissertation that discussed TESOL teacher education programs in the capital city of Libya; these are: Hawana’s study (1981) and Elhensheri’s study (2004). I was told about a recent study that was conducted about our program. However, I was not able to get a copy of the thesis because the author was not willing to share her work.

As can be noticed from the dates of the two studies, Hawana’s (1981) study was conducted before the cancellation of the teaching and learning of English in Libya, whereas Elhensheri’s (2004) study was conducted after the return of English language teaching and learning in the Libyan context. Hawana’s (1981) study, *The practices of teaching English at the University of Al-Fateh, Libya*, is a master’s thesis that explored and discussed the situation of the English Department’s teaching-learning process at that time, identified its weaknesses, and suggested procedures and ways to improve the situation. Unfortunately, there is no detailed information about the design of the study. For instance, Hawana (1981) stated that he conducted “personal interviews” without specifying how these interviews were conducted, and he chose to call them “personal” (p. 6). Data was collected from teacher-educators, student-teachers, and what he called the “College of Education bulletin”, which is the handbook of the faculty (Hawana, 1981).
Hawana (1981) observed that the program’s main weakness was that it was not “meeting its objectives in many ways” (p. 24). According to Hawana (1981), the program’s graduates were “unable to express themselves in the English language to work in the government” (p. 24). Hawana (1981) further explained that students’ low proficiency was a result of obstacles, such as the “unstructured academic environment in Libya, the unannounced obligatory student meetings, and the unexpected national “close-outs” for unannounced national events” (p. 25). His recommendations included urging teacher-educators to create opportunities for students to make up what was lost during these situations. Hawana did not detail how these suggestions can be practical. However, from my personal experience, it is difficult to do so when the students’ schedules are so full that they cannot meet all at one time.

Furthermore, Hawana encouraged teacher-educators to not only rely on Grammar Translation Methods and Direct Methods in their teaching. He also recommended not to assess students’ proficiencies by only relying on midterm and final tests. In fact, what he recommended were various types of other everyday tests, such as oral tests and other reading and grammar tests. Finally, he encouraged teacher-educators to use various teaching materials, even if they were not available.

Elhensheri’s (2004) study, *An investigation into academic, professional and pedagogic aspects of the training programme for teachers of English as a Foreign Language at AlFateh University - Libya*, is a doctoral dissertation that investigated the way an EFL teacher education program at AlFateh University (currently known as University of Tripoli) in Libya reflected the recent trends in EFL teacher education and how it contributed to language teaching and learning.
Following the interpretive-constructivist framework, Elhensheri (2004) investigated the academic, professional, and pedagogical aspects of the program. She explored the role of school experience as well. Her data was collected through three sets of questionnaires and semi-structured and open-ended interviews. Her participants were EFL student-teachers, classroom teachers, university tutors, and head teachers. She analyzed data that was derived from questionnaires statistically and used content analysis to analyze data that was derived from interviews. The findings showed that there was a pessimistic view towards the program. Findings also showed that there were varied constraints that negatively affected the program’s efficiency. Mostly, the program failed to prepare student-teachers for the challenges of the communicative classroom that was designed for EFL classrooms in Libyan public schools.

Elhensheri (2004) reported a difference between the university’s policy and the public school prospective; a discrepancy between the syllabus and the examination requirements; a conflict between the teaching approaches, advocated by the students and those followed by classroom teachers; and a discrepancy between the emphases of the EFL teacher education program and the focus of the public school’s syllabus. In addition, both student-teachers and teacher-educators reported time as one of the constraints. They were dissatisfied by the short amount time of the teaching practice and the timing of the teaching practice. In brief, her results show that the EFL teacher education program in Libya failed to address student-teachers’ and in-service teachers’ needs, as well as the public schools’ curricular requirements.

In her suggestions for further research, Elhensheri (2004) suggested using case study as a methodology for in-depth understanding of the TESOL teacher education
programs in Libya. Therefore, I employed case study as a methodology and used multiple
data sources to be able to collect detailed data and in order to gain an in-depth
understanding of the context of the study.

As mentioned earlier, a study was conducted by Alzaidy (unknown), and it observed EFL educators’ implementation of the curriculum within the English
department, which is the focus of this study. I was told that Alzaidy gave a presentation in the English Department, which made me contact her, asking for a copy of her study. Alzaidy first agreed to send me a copy of her study, but she then decided not to send it with a belief that sending it would harm her more than benefit her, thinking that I would plagiarize her work. Unfortunately, Libyan academia is still operating within the
traditional way, and so, there is no database or online services that allow Libyan investigators who are studying abroad to explore what has been done in the area of their research, which causes many scholars to fear that their work will be plagiarized.

**Summary.** It seems that there is a consensus among studies’ results in reporting student-teachers’ and in-service teachers’ dissatisfaction with their programs, even though data was collected differently in each study. This dissatisfaction is not surprising, since many educators and researchers have criticized teacher preparation programs for not adequately preparing their student-teachers for real classroom challenges. What needs more attention, though, is how TESOL teacher education programs prepare student-teachers to teach in conflict and/or post-conflict zones. Taking into account what has been discussed, I investigated the TESOL teacher education program within the Faculty of Education at Oya University to identify its affordances and constraints and to provide insights for an effective program reform.
Since the third research question explores the perceptions of the investigated program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates on critical language teacher education, the following sections are devoted to understanding the approach.

**Critical Language Teacher Education Approaches**

Issues, such as immigration and (dis)citizenship, marginalization, injustice, poverty, oppression, colonialism, violence, wars, and globalization have led theorists, researchers, and educators to new approaches to teacher education and teaching. The theorists, researchers, and educators were facing the existing challenges and were finding what was considered as the “‘best practices’ for teaching” (Hawkins, 2011, p. 1). I do not think that there are such things as “best practices”; however, I believe in finding the approaches that lie within the parameters of *particularity, practicality, and possibility* to be adopted in the Libyan context. The necessity of finding the approaches that can help in eliminating and/or alleviating issues, such as marginalization, injustice, oppression, and violence, resulted in the foundation of three approaches to education: critical language teacher education, social justice language teacher education, and peace education.

Due to Libya’s social and political changes and the spread of violence and injustice among the Libyan generations since Qaddafi was overthrown, I reviewed the literature related to critical language teacher education for insights that might provide help for a better TESOL teacher education in Libya. This is with the aim of helping not only improve the student-teachers’ language proficiency, communicative skills, and teaching efficiency, but also with the aim of empowering those future teachers to become better citizens in their society and to be able to empower their learners and create a
healthy change as future teachers. Thus, in this part of the chapter, I briefly discuss critical language teacher education.

The word “critical” has been used in reference to “how dominant ideologies in society drive the construction of understandings and meanings in ways that privilege certain groups of people, while marginalizing others” (Hawkins & Norton, 2009, p. 31; Reis, 2011). The roots of critical language teacher education are from critical theory and critical pedagogy.

Critical pedagogy is one of the 21st century’s revolutionary pedagogies. It was presented as an approach to defy the existing social and educational issues by pedagogues, such as Freire (1970), Apple (1982), Giroux (1983), McLaren (1989), Shor (1992), and others. As an educator of marginalized Brazilian peasants, Freire (1970) noticed that education served the dominant social groups and perpetuated political, social, and economic inequality between the dominant and marginalized groups. Freire’s (1970) *Pedagogy of the oppressed* explained the “terms, assumptions, and basic methods” (George, 2001, p. 93) that even, nowadays, delineate critical pedagogy.

Freire (1970) and others believed that education should not oppress students but aim to help them transform and become social activists that are willing to change their societies. Therefore, critical pedagogy is an “educational movement, guided by passion and principle, to help students develop consciousness of freedom, recognize authoritarian tendencies, and connect knowledge to power and the ability to take constructive action” (Giroux, 2010, p. 15). To be more specific, critical pedagogy is “a way of ‘doing’ learning and teaching” (Canagarajah, 2005, p. 932), which means applying critical
critical pedagogy’s goals in the classroom for student empowerment to be able to make a change in one’s life and society.

The three concepts that lay the foundation of the implementation of critical pedagogy in the classroom are power relations in the classroom, dialogic practice, and the problem-posing approach. Freire (1973) criticized the existing models of education and called it “Banking Education” because of the dichotomy of the role of the teacher and the student (p. 92). Banking Education made the teacher the depositor, the one who transmits knowledge, and the students the empty depositories, who receive knowledge. Banking Education fostered the culture of silence and hindered the development of critical consciousness, which resulted in students becoming further oppressed.

Therefore, the teachers’ and the students’ roles changed in the classroom to eliminate the dangers of the previously described hierarchy by involving the students in making the decision of planning their learning process. The teachers’ role is no longer that of the authority; this change helped give the students a new position in the classroom. Students now have the authority to plan their learning processes and question power; this change gives them the ability to make important decisions about themselves, their education, and their society. Eventually, the students’ and teachers’ hierarchal relationships change from teacher-centered instruction to student-centered.

Freire (1970) proposed dialogic practice as an alternative. He believes that dialogue is necessary because it helps humans feel the significance of their existence. Dialogue will lead students to the application of democracy in the classroom. Freire’s goals were not just concerned with the transformation of undemocratic education to a democratic one, but they were also concerned with what was being taught in the
classroom. He encouraged teaching students to become critical thinkers, while encouraging them to discuss social issues that plague their surroundings, ultimately pushing them to engage in what he termed as the “problem-posing” process (Freire, 1973, p. 92; 1978). In this process, students’ critical consciousness pushes them to think critically about problems and issues related to their real world and ways of conveying change. The main role of the teacher is to help students perceive the existing reality, to understand their positions, and to think critically. Teachers’ responsibilities include helping students analyze existing social, political, and personal situations, as well as helping students recognize how to take actions and transform their lives and their society.

Qaddafi overlooked education, aiming instead to keep his citizens ignorant in order to stay in power and oppress his people as long as he could. Qaddafi forced Libyan students to read his book and memorize parts of it with the aim of brainwashing. So, how can we make a change? The answer to this question lies in changing education’s aims. According to Freire (1973), Apple (1982), and Giroux (1983), education’s major aim should be transforming students into critical individuals who become dedicated to conveying change in their societies. This transformation will start “a new era [that] will sweep away a culture of indoctrination and corruption fostered in schools and universities” (Fordham, 2011, para. 3) by Qaddafi. Since Libyan students knew that they were oppressed and fought for their freedom, they “must be among the developers of this pedagogy” (Friere, 1970, p. 54).

Thus, this study aims to investigate whether the investigated Libyan TESOL teacher education program adopted critical pedagogy to empower the Libyan student-teachers as a response to the social and political changes that happened and are still
happening in the Libyan context. It also aims to investigate how student-teachers are being prepared to become critical educators/citizens who are engaged in a dialogical learning process.

**Critical Pedagogy in the ESL/EFL Classroom**

In the last decade, interest in critical pedagogy has had a remarkable increase in the field of TESOL. However, the main argument that was raised about implementing critical pedagogy in the ESL classroom was that the main goal was to develop the students’ second language proficiency. Therefore, opponents, such as Santos (2001), thought that implementing critical pedagogy in the ESL classroom was impractical and doubtful. Santos (2001) argued that only students with advanced language proficiency can challenge their academic opinions and approaches. Since many ESL classes have students who are low proficient language users, Santos emphasized the impracticality of posing any of the critical pedagogy concepts in the ESL classroom because the main goal for the ESL teachers, as well as for the students, was focused on their language proficiency improvement.

Benesch (2001) and Kubota (1999) responded to the opponents by implementing critical pedagogy in the ESL classroom and clarified that implementing critical practices does not necessarily mean opposing the teaching of academic conventions. Rather, it encourages ESL teachers to ignore the dominant academic discourse. Benesch (2001) argued that ESL teachers’ critical practices would enable their students to critically examine their life and to understand their roles as active members of their community.

How could we transform the Libyan ELT classroom? While not specifically for Libyan educational contexts, Akbari (2008) proposed four ways of transforming classes
to implement critical pedagogy. First, Akbari (2008) stated that the transformation of any class into “critical settings” should be built on “teaching the students’ culture” (p. 278). Since the culture of the target language is being dealt with in the class, change should start by fostering students’ local culture to think about issues that are relevant to their culture from a critical viewpoint and to encourage them to aim for transformation (Akbari, 2008).

Second, Akbari (2008) proposed that teachers should not neglect students’ first language and use it as “an asset that can facilitate communication” in the second language, which does not mean using the first language “as the language of instruction” (p. 279). The third way to transform classes is to include concerns related to the students’ real-lives. ‘Local’ is the departure point in critical pedagogy, which means including “the actual life experiences and needs of learners” (Akbari, 2008, p. 180). To be more specific, transforming classes to critical practice does not separate the students’ communicative needs from their social and political needs. Thus, while they are learning the language, they deal with their real-life issues. This will give them the power and the courage to deal with situations outside of their classroom. Finally Akbari (2008) raises awareness about marginalized groups. He suggests making students become aware of issues that marginalized groups encounter. He encourages teachers to deal with topics that are normally not covered by most of the course books, such as topics about people with psychological and physical abnormalities. This can reduce inequality and raise students’ respect and understanding for others.

A question is raised about how Libyan educators can help their student-teachers become more critical, as well as how critical pedagogy can be implemented into the
Libyan English language classroom. More specifically, another question is raised about how critical pedagogy could be implemented in the TESOL teacher education curriculum and how teacher educators within the English Department could perceive critical pedagogy. Hence, this proposed study intends to explore whether critical pedagogy is considered in the Libyan ELT classroom and in the investigated program. The following section discusses areas of critical teacher education practices.

**Critical Language Teacher Education Practices**

Hawkins and Norton (2009) recognized the difficulty of finding “accounts of critical language teacher education practices” (p. 33). They organized the existing practices into three categories, which included encouraging critical awareness, encouraging critical self-reflection, and encouraging critical pedagogical relations, which are now briefly discussed.

**Critical awareness.** The aim of critical language teacher education programs is raising student-teachers’ awareness about the construction and functions of power relations in their society and how educational inequity is affected by social, historical, and political practices. Examples of praxis include identifying circumstances of social injustice in order to help student-teachers realize how they can help produce effective educational change (Goldstein, 2004; Hawkins & Norton, 2009), detect critical situations with the aim of social transformation (Pennycook, 2004; Hawkins & Norton, 2009), and raise students’ critical awareness (Hawkins, 2004; Hawkins & Norton, 2009).

**Critical self-reflection.** The aim of critical self-reflection is addressing inequities through reflection about student-teachers’ own identities and positioning in their societies (Hawkins & Norton, 2009). Self-reflection provides an opportunity for student-teachers
to analyze their relationships as individuals with their social world, aiming for opportunities for social change. Examples of praxis include creating an emerging awareness about how student-teachers’ self-perception is shaped by their societal discourses, which affects their ability to act in the world (Pavlenko, 2003). It also includes helping student-teachers recognize cultural groups’ power differences and how they position themselves and create a difference in their culture (Stein, 2004). In Lin’s (2004) example, she integrated critical pedagogy into her course by giving her students the chance to identify their struggles and feelings of being powerless through critical self-reflective writing.

**Critical pedagogical relations.** The goal here is focused on student-teachers’ empowerment. It aims at constructing equal and just relationships between student-teachers and teacher-educators. An example of praxis includes providing student-teachers the opportunity to design a critical curriculum (Crookes & Lehner, 1998). Another example of praxis includes creating opportunities for dialogic engagement, which involves students and teachers in learning with the aim of changing classroom practices (Willett & Miller, 2004).

In the three areas of critical teacher education practices, teacher educators facilitate discussions and provide opportunities for reflection, with the aim of helping student-teachers become critical thinkers by helping them break oppressive boundaries, encouraging them to help rearrange power relations.

The purpose of this section was two-fold: it was to briefly define and specify how critical pedagogy is implemented in the ELT classroom and in TESOL teacher education, as well as to connect its significance to the Libyan context, given the on-going
social and political changes in Libya since Qaddafi began his rule. For this reason, this study investigates the perceptions of the Libyan teacher-educators, student-teachers and in-service teachers on critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform.

**Chapter Summary**

To focus my discussion in this final section, it is essential to return to the main aim of the study, which resulted in this literature review. The study aimed to explore a TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints, as reported by the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates, who are in-service teachers. The study also intended to investigate their perceptions on critical language teacher education as an approach for program reform.

As discussed in the literature review, effective teacher education programs provide future teachers with the knowledge, experience, and guidance that lead them to success. TESOL teacher education programs should prepare teachers for real classroom challenges and should help them prevent failures and burnout. Their role also includes preparing student-teachers to teach English in conflict and post-conflict zones. This is by providing future teachers with opportunities to understand and apply effective benchmarks for student achievement and offering practice in controlled environments with effective feedback and mentoring. TESOL teacher education programs should stop costly experimentation on students by providing appropriate training on lesson planning and teaching techniques, as well as providing them with a space that prepares them as transformative intellectuals through approaches that empower them and get them ready for real classroom challenges.
Although research in TESOL teacher education has furthered our understanding of teachers’ knowledge and has determined what constitutes TESOL programs, research about the effectiveness of these programs in preparing qualified language teachers is still limited, especially in what Wright (2010) termed as the “less-documented contexts” (p. 289). Research on preparing TESOL teachers to teach English in conflict zones is limited, too. Research on TESOL teacher education programs in Libya is very limited and can be considered as in its early stages. Therefore, conducting this study not only filled the existing gap in the Libyan context but also examined and supported the existing literature and took research on the role of TESOL teacher education in conflict and post-conflict zones further.

Graves (2009) identified “three issues that require further exploration and research” (p. 121). One issue in need of further investigation should examine “whether the teacher education curriculum is educating teachers to replicate practice or to challenge and change it” (Graves, 2009, p. 121). Thus, this study intended to explore how Libyan students are being prepared and whether they are being prepared for real classroom challenges.

The review of research on TESOL teacher education programs in the Arab world and in Libya revealed that there was increasing dissatisfaction, with a number of constraints. One of the obvious constraints that were reported within the two studies that were conducted in the Libyan context revealed that the Libyan TESOL teacher education programs prepare student-teachers to become primary, preparatory, and secondary school teachers with one curriculum. This is without taking into account the differences between
these three educational levels. It is of significance, therefore, to explore this issue from my participants’ perspectives.

Taking into account Baartman, Bastiaens, and Krischner’s recommendations about teachers’ opinions, Elhensheri’s (2004) methodological suggestions for further research, Graves’s (2009) suggestion about TESOL teacher education programs, and Wright’s (2010) emphasis on investigating other less explored contexts, this case study aims to examine the effectiveness of the existing TESOL teacher education program within a Libyan public university through the program’s curriculum, teacher-educators’ understandings and practices within the program, as well as pre-service and in-service teacher-educators’ understandings of the program, which prepares them to become English language teachers. In the next chapter, I provide detailed explanations of the chosen research approach and the procedures of the research design.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

In the previous chapter, I discussed the current evolving concerns in the literature related to TESOL teacher education and critical language teacher education. In the following sections of this chapter, I discuss the methodology of the study. The chapter begins with a brief discussion of the rationale for conducting qualitative research and how the study’s approach changed from being a case study to an adaptive methodological inquiry. Following that is a description of the research site and the participants, an explanation of data collection methods and procedures, a discussion of my researcher insider and outsider positionality, and an explanation of data analysis procedures. Then, I explain the methodological disruptions and challenges I encountered while conducting the study and the steps taken to ensure the study’s trustworthiness and ethical considerations. I conclude this chapter with a brief report about the limitations of the methods.

Research Design

Taking into account Wright’s (2010) claim for the need for further research in “less well-documented contexts” (p. 289), having considered Libya as one of the less-documented and studied contexts and the English Department’s need for a program reform after the political and social changes, this study intended to examine and understand how teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceive and understand the affordances and constraints of the existing TESOL teacher education program in one of the Libyan universities’ Faculty of Education. This study also aimed to explore their perceptions on critical language teacher education as an approach for
curriculum reform. Thus, this study was designed to understand the existing program’s curriculum as perceived by the participants and to provide insights on effective program reform as suggested by the program’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates.

The two research questions that grounded this study asked: (1) How do the teacher-educators, the student-teachers, and the graduates of the English Department at the Faculty of Education (EDFE) at Oya University perceive and understand the affordances and constraints of their existing TESOL teacher education curriculum?, and (2) How do the English department’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates perceive and understand critical language teacher education as an approach for program/curriculum reform? To answer these research questions, I planned to use the qualitative case study approach. Since the choice of the research methodology depends on the research questions, this study’s research questions determined the preference of qualitative research over another methodology. Another point of significance is that the TESOL teacher education program that is the focus of this study is not a quantifiable phenomenon. The complexities of the objectives and the content of such programs cannot be illuminated and understood through measuring.

Qualitative research is “a situated activity” that involves “an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world”, trying to understand “meanings people bring to them” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011, p. 3). There is a consensus that qualitative research is interpretive and seeks to understand people’s descriptions and meanings of problems (Creswell, 2013; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Qualitative researchers, and here I borrow Merriam’s (2009) words, try to find ways people see reality and understand “how people interpret their experiences, how they construct their worlds, and what meaning they
attribute to their experience” (p. 5). These descriptions align with this study’s objectives in looking at how teacher-educators, student-teachers and in-service teachers, who graduated from the same program, perceive and understand their TESOL teacher education program’s affordance and constraints.

My reasons for choosing qualitative research align with Maxwell’s (1996) five research purposes: (1) to understand meaning(s); (2) to understand a particular context; (3) to identify unanticipated phenomena and influences; (4) to understand processes; and (5) to develop casual explanations. This study aimed to (a) understand and describe the English Department’s curriculum; (b) to identify the perceptions of the English Department’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates on the existing curriculum; (c) to gain their understandings of the curriculum’s constraints and affordances; (d) to identify their perceptions on critical language teacher education; and (e) to develop an explanation of the existing curriculum and how it could be reformed. The primary goal of the study is to understand and specify the program’s affordances and constraints in order to provide insights that would help in program reform.

I chose case study as the methodology of this study since the features of a case study are particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic (Merriam, 1998) and because it allows the researcher to collect and analyze various information sources (Creswell, 2013). Using varied sources of information in a case study enables me, as a researcher, to have a “holistic description and explanation” for the case (Merriam, 1998, p. 20).

However, the sociocultural and sociopolitical circumstances in Libya had an impact on the progress of my study. Conflict zone researchers usually face practical,
methodological, and ethical challenges (Goodhand, 2000). What I faced as a researcher in a conflict zone forced me to make essential methodological changes.

During data collection period, Libyans were suffering the consequences of the ongoing conflict between armed groups and militias, which affected many services. There were long hours of power failure and low Internet service. Since the participants were encountering long hours of blackouts and really low Internet services, all of those who agreed to be interviewed withdrew from the study. As I was forced by the participants’ decisions to not to conduct the interviews, the study can no longer be considered as a case study, especially that the blackout are longer than they can bare.

To answer the research questions and move forward with the data, an adaptive methodological inquiry was used. After failing to get any response from my interviewees, I had to rely only on the data that was collected. Data was generated through the gathered documents and the participants’ questionnaire responses. Losing the opportunity of conducting the interviews as planned affected the depth of the holistic descriptions I was able to generate. It also made it difficult for me to interpret the data without using my knowledge of the context as an insider. I had to adapt to the current circumstances and accept the fact that it was difficult to take the researcher only stance and become involved in personal immerse in the interpretation of data as an insider.

Data that was generated from the questionnaires is constrained by my own interests that helped in creating the questionnaire. Therefore, the emerging themes are a result of the findings gathered from the documents and my interpretations of the questionnaire responses. More details are discussed in the researcher’s insider and
outsider positionality, the methodological disruptions and challenges sections, and in Chapter 5 before discussing the themes.

In the following section, I present the research site by introducing brief background information about the Faculty of Education and the English Department; and briefly describe the investigated program’s curriculum.

The Research Context

The context of this study was a TESOL teacher education program in the Faculty of Education at a Libyan public university in the western side of Libya, which is acknowledged as Oya University in this study for privacy reasons. This site was selected because the department is in need of exploring the affordances and constraints of the program’s curriculum, especially after the political and social changes that occurred in Libya after Qaddafi was overthrown. It is also of significance because I taught there from 2006 to 2010 and was a member on the curriculum development committees. The study not only provides insights on reforming the existing curriculum, but it also extends my understanding of TESOL teacher education programs, as a former curriculum development member, as a teacher-educator, and as a scholar, which provides me with a solid background for future program development responsibilities. Below, I provide background information about the investigated program and a description of the program’s curriculum.

Background

Oya University was established in 1957 as a branch of the only university in Libya and then was acknowledged as a separate university in 1973. It provides Libyan students with study opportunities at various faculties, which include: the Faculty of
Agriculture; the Faculty of Arts; the Faculty of Arts and Media; the Faculty of Dentistry; the Faculty of Economics and Political Science; the Faculty of Education (three campuses); the Faculty of Engineering; the Faculty of Information Technology; the Faculty of Languages; the Faculty of Law; the Faculty of Medical Technology; the Faculty of Medicine; the Faculty of Nursing; the Faculty of Physical Education; the Faculty of Sciences; and the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine. Each of these faculties consists of a number of departments in order to meet the Libyan society’s needs by providing different levels of study to undergraduates, graduates, and postgraduates.

Below, I briefly introduce the Faculty of Education, which is one of the three faculties of education at this public university, and the program that is the focus of the study.

**Faculty of education.** The Faculty of Education went through various changes since it was established. It was first established as a teacher-training institute. Unfortunately, I was not able to get any documents that would specify when it was established. From my personal communication with some of the faculty at the Faculty of Education, they said it was established during the 1996 – 1997 academic year. However, another colleague refuted what had been said and considered the dates as being wrong since there are not any official documents supporting the dates.

In 2004, in response to Decree number 118 23, the Teacher Preparation Higher Institute was recognized as a Teacher Training College and joined the list of faculties at the university. Then, during the academic year 2008 - 2009, the faculty was recognized as

---

23 See page 54.
the Faculty of Education as a response to Decree number 55\textsuperscript{24} during the same academic year.

The faculty consists of 12 departments that accept students who have graduated from secondary schools. These departments are: Arabic Language; Art Education; Biology; Chemistry; Computer Science; Early Childhood Education (Classroom Teacher\textsuperscript{25}); English Language; Kindergarten Education; Mathematics; Physics; Psychology; and Special Needs Education. Acceptances in three other departments were put on hold temporarily, which are Geography, History, and Social Sciences, since there was no longer a need for teachers in these specializations in secondary education.

The main aim of the faculty is to meet the Libyan public schools’ needs. These needs can be summarized as preparing skilled, competent, and qualified teachers to teach in Libyan schools by providing them with the opportunities to develop their language and teaching through teacher education programs. For the TESOL program graduates, being skilled, competent, and qualified teachers can be further explained as being “aware of the complexity of their job and to be conscious and deliberate about what they do” (Saphier, Haley-Speca, & Gower, 2008, p. 2). Being competent teachers constitutes their language proficiency and “provide[s a] good language model” (Richards, 2011, p. 3). Finally, being qualified is fulfilling the Faculty of Education’s requirements to teach English at Libyan schools (Program Curriculum, 2015). In the following sections, I briefly introduce the English Department and describe its curriculum.

\textsuperscript{24} See page 54.
\textsuperscript{25} Classroom teacher = (mualim fasl معلم فصل).
The Focal Program/department

Unfortunately, there are no documents that specify when the department was established as one of the Faculty of Education’s departments. During the time of data collection, there were 20 full-time faculty, 8 part-time faculty, and 800 registered students (as reported by the former Study and Exams Coordinator). Six of the full-time faculty were from other nationalities, which included India, Iraq, Jordan, and the Philippines. Thirty students were practicing teaching at Libyan public schools.

The department does not have an official website that would provide information about the program to everyone, so all information was gathered either by personal communication or from documents. The first curriculum was a replica of the Faculty of Art’s curriculum, with the exception of the educational courses that were taught in Arabic. The second version of the curriculum was created as a response to the changes from being a teacher-training institute to a faculty of education institute. The current curriculum was a revised version of the second version that was redesigned as a response to the social and political changes that took place in 2011, which included removing all courses that were related to Qaddafi’s era. The program’s main aim is to prepare Libyan students to become competent ESOL teachers. The enrolled students in the English Department of the Faculty of Education follow a four-year program that comprises a tripartite curriculum related to university, faculty, and departmental requirements. More details about these requirements are discussed in Chapter 4. In the following sections, I specify the participants’ sampling strategies and describe the participants.
The Participants

Following the recommendations of Wallace (1991), Weir and Roberts (1994), and Peacock (2009), I gathered the views of three different groups of participants. Since Baartman, Bastiaens, and Krischner emphasize the significance of teachers’ opinions, the participants of this study included not only teacher-educators, but also student-teachers and program graduates who are in-service teachers. Thus, the participants of the study were 15 teacher-educators from the English Department, 10 third and fourth-year student-teachers, who were practicing teaching at Libyan schools or on campus, and 10 graduates who were teaching at Libyan schools.

Participant Sampling Strategies

The sampling strategy that I used was purposive sampling. To facilitate this purposive choosing of participants, I created a list of the characteristics of my participants and then started crossing out the characteristics that limited my sampling choices.

Teacher-educators’ sampling strategies. Since I knew that the teacher-educators in this department were from diverse cultures and nationalities (Libyans, Indians, Iraqis, Jordanians, and Filipinos), I did not limit my choices to the Libyan faculty. This was to ensure ‘maximum variation’ and to make sure that I represented the faculty’s diverse perspectives and practices. In fact, the following is the criteria for choosing the teacher-educators:

- Teacher-educators are from various nationalities.
- To ensure the inclusion of various voices, especially of those who did not participate in the program’s curriculum design and development, all faculty members are included with no age or gender restrictions.
• All teacher-educators are professors holding a master’s and/or doctorate degree.

• All faculty participants have been teaching in the department for more than one semester.

Therefore, the characteristics of the participants are summarized as being current faculty in the department of English language in the Faculty of Education at Oya University in Libya. With regard to the sample size, I aimed to recruit all participants who were willing to volunteer, since the department’s faculty consisted 20 full-time individuals with doctorate and/or master’s degrees and have been teaching in the department for more than one semester at the time of data collection. The number of interviewees depended on who was willing to be interviewed.

**Student-teachers’ sampling strategies.** Similarly, purposive sampling was used to recruit the student-teachers. The criteria for choosing the student-teachers included the following:

• All student-teachers are full-time students.

• They are in their final years of study: third or fourth-year students.

• Student-teachers have already taken, or are taking, the Strategies 1 and Strategies 2 courses.

• Student-teachers are practicing teaching or have practiced teaching either on campus or at Libyan schools.

Thus, student-teachers were full-time undergraduates who were in the final years of their study (third/fourth-year students), took, or were taking, the Strategies 1 and Strategies 2 courses, and were practicing teaching at schools or on campus.
Graduates’ sampling strategies. Likewise, purposive sampling was used to recruit the graduates. The criteria for choosing the graduates were as follows:

- All graduates have to be graduates of the investigated TESOL teacher education program.
- All in-service teachers are full-time teachers at Libyan public or private schools.
- In-service teachers’ teaching experience ranges from one year to eight years of teaching.

The in-service teachers were the English language teacher education program alumni who graduated from the English Department in the Faculty of Education. Their experiences ranged from teaching one to eight years.

Description of the Participants

The first part in the three questionnaires included questions that gathered some information about the respondents. The following is a detailed presentation of the respondents’ background information.

Teacher-educators. Fifteen teacher-educators completed the questionnaires. For privacy reasons, and to keep their identities anonymous, the information that might reveal their identities will not be included in Table 5. Thus, teacher-educators’ information will be discussed in separate sections: the educational level and specialization, nationality and L1 language, and teaching experience. All names are pseudonyms. I decided to use the pronoun ‘she’ to represent all my participants.

Educational level and specialization. Twelve of the teacher-educators had master’s degrees, whereas only three of them had doctoral degrees. The teacher-
educators’ specializations included a range of fields, including Applied Linguistics & TESOL, Education & Applied Linguistics, Information Technology, Literature, and TESOL.

Table 5

*Overview of the Teacher-Educators’ Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>University Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Angel</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>2 - 5 Years</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Blake</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charlie</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Chris</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dylan</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Harper</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jamie</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jessie</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Max</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Morgan</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Pat</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Reed</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Riley</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sam</td>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>1 Year</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Taylor</td>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>More than 5 Years</td>
<td>Assistant Lecturer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nationality and L1 language.* The teacher-educators’ nationalities included two Filipinos, one Indian, one Iraqi, and eleven Libyans. Thus, the participants’ first languages were varied and included Filipino, Hindi, and Arabic.

*Teaching experience and positions.* The teacher-educators’ years of teaching experiences varied. Nine of them had been teaching in the program for more than five years, whereas two of them had been teaching for two to five years. Three participants had been teaching for one year. Their positions ranged from assistant lecturers to professors.
Teacher-educators’ curriculum development experience. Only three of the fifteen teacher-educators had some kind of experience in curriculum development that was not related to TESOL teacher education curriculum development. One of the teacher-educators specified that she attended “a seminar about curriculum development [in] the Computer Science department” (Q10, 2015, p. 1). The other two participants did not provide details about the courses they took.

With regard to who participated in the curriculum development, six teacher-educators took part in the program’s curriculum development process. One of them had a background in curricular design for language courses. Two teacher-educators were literature majors and had no background in TESOL teacher education curricular development. Another teacher-educator was an Information Technology major with no TESOL teacher education curricular development experience. The other teacher-educators were from the field of Applied Linguistics, but only one of them had a course on curriculum design, in general, and not on teacher education programs.

Student-teachers. Ten student-teachers completed the questionnaires. All student-teachers were Libyans and spoke Arabic as their first language. Eight of the student-teachers practiced teaching at Libyan public schools as part of their practicum, whereas two of them did not yet take a practicum (see Table 6).

While six of the student-teachers were planning to become secondary school teachers, three of them were planning to become primary school teachers. One of the student-teachers indicated that she is planning to become a university professor.
Table 6

Overview of the Student-Teachers’ Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Would like to become</th>
<th>Teaching Practice</th>
<th>School (Primary – Preparatory – Secondary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addy</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adele</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>University Professor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Preparatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>Preparatory School Teacher</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camellia</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>Primary School Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>3rd Year</td>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>Primary/Preparatory School Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Primary/Preparatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tabby</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>Secondary School Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talisha</td>
<td>4th Year</td>
<td>Primary/Preparatory School Teacher</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in Table 7, all fourth year student-teachers took the following courses: Methods of Teaching, Strategies 1, Strategies 2, CALL, Teaching English to Young Learners, and Teaching English Skills. Third year students took the following courses: Methods of Teaching, CALL, and Strategies 1.

Table 7

Courses Student-Teachers Took

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Methods of Teaching</th>
<th>Strategies 1</th>
<th>Strategies 2</th>
<th>CALL</th>
<th>TEYL</th>
<th>Teaching English Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program graduates. Eight graduates completed the questionnaires. All the graduates were Libyans and spoke Arabic as their first language. Table 8 provides an overview of the graduates. Two of the program’s graduates were graduate assistants; both
of them taught at Libyan private schools after graduation and are now teaching English to first year students. They have taught English for two years.

Table 8

Overview of the Graduates’ Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonyms</th>
<th>Which Educational Level?</th>
<th>Which Grade?</th>
<th>Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Teaching Practice?</th>
<th>Which Educational Level?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agatha</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edda</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>5 – 6</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halina</td>
<td>Primary/Preparatory</td>
<td>5 – 7</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Preparatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heaven</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imma</td>
<td>Graduate Assistant</td>
<td>1st Year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy</td>
<td>Primary/Preparatory</td>
<td>6 – 7</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nannie</td>
<td>Primary/Preparatory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2+</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other graduates were in-service teachers at Libyan public schools. Two of them were secondary school teachers, whereas the other four were primary/preparatory school teachers. Four of the graduates had been teaching English for more than two years, and two of them were teaching English for more than five years.

Data Collection

Data help me as a researcher to gather information that would lead to an understanding of the investigated program. I planned to gather data using written artifacts, questionnaires, and interviews. However, data were only gathered through written artifacts and questionnaires. The allocated time for data collection was between six to twelve months. In the following sections, I explicate data collection methods and procedures. In the following sections, I explicate each method.
**Documents**

Yin (2009) states that documents are used to “corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (p. 103). Documents provide specific details to support other sources and enable the researcher to make inferences that can be treated as “clues worthy of further investigation” (Yin, 2009, p. 103).

To verify and develop an in-depth understanding of the existing TESOL teacher education program, the collected documents included the Faculty of Education’s guidebook, English Department’s curriculum, lists of the departmental requirements, teaching practice and graduation project assessment forms, a list of student-teachers’ graduation project titles, and one of the departmental meetings’ minutes, which was related to curriculum changes. I planned to collect the Libyan ministry’s objectives and expectations of ELT in Libya; however, I was not able to locate any documents that would explain the ministry’s English language teaching aims and objectives.

**Questionnaires**

Johnson and Christensen (2004) define questionnaires as “self-report data collection instrument[s]” that are completed by each participant of the research study (p. 164). They are ‘written instruments’ in which respondents either write answers to questions or choose from a list of statements. Questionnaires are usually used to gather factual, behavioral, and attitudinal data (Dornyei & Taguchi, 2010). Researchers choose to use questionnaires because of the questionnaire’s “unprecedented efficiency”, for being “versatile”, and for helping to “reduce bias” (Dornyei & Taguchi, 2010, p. 6). Questionnaires have advantages; in fact, not only are they efficient in saving a researcher time, effort, and money, but they are also advantageous in that they help to reduce a
researcher’s bias, which might exist during interviews. Questionnaires might be distributed in various formats, such as in paper, through phones, or via emails. Dornyei and Taguchi (2010) specify that the length of the questionnaire should not be more than four pages and should not take more than 30 minutes to complete.

In this study, questionnaires were designed to gather specific information about the program’s affordance and constraints, to recruit the interviewees, and to prepare the primary questions for interviews. There were three types of questionnaires: teacher-educator questionnaires (Appendix E), student-teacher questionnaires (Appendix F), and graduates questionnaires (Appendix G). Each questionnaire was divided into seven parts: the Background section, A, B, C, D, E, and the Interview section, which includes if the respondents stated whether they were willing to be interviewed or not. Table 9 details the sections of the questionnaires and their relationships to the research questions. As can be seen, each section had a specific focus:

- The Background section was devoted to getting participants’ background information.
- Section A included two questions that asked participants about their views on which English should be taught and which of the given expressions (ESL/EFL/EIL) should be used.
- Section B included two questions and inquired about the participants’ views on TESOL teacher education, in general.
- Sections C was devoted to answering the first and second research questions. It included five questions that explored the participants’ perceptions of their program’s affordances and constraints.
- Section $D$ included six questions that elicited participants’ suggestions for an effective curriculum reform.

- Section $E$ was related to the third research question. There were four questions that explored participants’ perceptions on critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform.

- Finally, the Interview section aimed at gathering participants that would like to be interviewed for further details about their perceptions on their programs and their responses in the questionnaire.

Table 9

*Questionnaire Sections and Their Relation to the Research Questions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Sections / Questions</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RQ1: How do the faculty members in the English Department at the Faculty of Education (EDFE) at Oya University perceive and understand the affordances and constraints of their existing English language teacher education curriculum?</td>
<td>A: 1 - 2</td>
<td>Views about English and its position in Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B: 3 - 4</td>
<td>Views about TESOL teacher education in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: 5 - 9</td>
<td>Views about program’s affordances and constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: 10 - 15</td>
<td>Suggestions for program reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ2: How do the student-teachers and in-service teachers who have graduated from EDFE perceive and understand how they were prepared to teach in Libyan public schools?</td>
<td>A: 1 - 2</td>
<td>Views about English and its position in Libya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C: 5 - 10</td>
<td>Views about program’s affordances and constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D: 10 - 15</td>
<td>Suggestions for program reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RQ3: How do the English Department’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates perceive and understand critical language teacher education as an approach for program/curriculum reform?</td>
<td>E: 16 - 19</td>
<td>Critical language teacher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Participants state whether they agree to be interviewed or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The final version of the questionnaire was a result of discussions with two of my friends who were teacher-educators and had previous experience with curriculum development. They looked at the first draft of the questionnaires and suggested ideas on what to delete and what to keep, which would help gather data while answering my research questions.

**Interviews**

Richards (2009) states that interviewing “is not a matter of using questions and answers”; it is “a data collection tool that offers different ways of exploring people’s experience and views” (p. 183). This means that it is a “conversation with a purpose” (Burgess, 1984; quoted in Richards, 2009, p. 183). Likewise, Duff (2008) states that interviews produce “a version of truth, a snap shot of competence or of ideas elicited for a specific purpose in a particular space and time” (p. 133).

The purpose of the interviews was to explore the teacher-educators’, student-teachers’, and in-service teachers’ understandings and perceptions of the existing TESOL teacher education program’s curriculum. Individual semi-structured interviews with participants were planned. Interviews were supposed to be conducted with purposefully recruited participants after gathering and analyzing the questionnaires. The interviews were planned to be semi-structured interviews to cover the questions that were prepared from the questionnaires and helped allow “the interview to develop in unexpected directions” (Richards, 2009, p. 186).

Only two teacher-educators, three student-teachers, and one graduate agreed to be interviewed. All of them withdrew due to the existing unrest in Libya, which caused continuous blackouts and low Internet service. Unfortunately, I was neither able to travel to Libya to conduct the interviews, nor was I able to conduct them through social
networking services as planned. A detailed discussion of this issue is in the methodological disruptions and challenges section.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The following process offers an overview of the basic steps that constitute the data collection procedures:

**Step 1.** As a first step in the data collection process, I submitted the research proposal to be approved. After the proposal had been approved, I officially applied to obtain approval from the English Department at the Faculty of Education in order to conduct the study. As soon as I received the department’s approval (Appendix B), I applied to obtain the Institutional Review Board’s (IRB) approval in order to continue on with the study.

**Step 2.** Upon getting IRB approval (Appendix A), the required documents were collected from the English Department. They were the faculty of Education’s guidebook, the English Department’s curriculum, lists of the departmental requirements, teaching practice and the graduation project assessment forms, and one of the departmental meetings’ minutes, which was related to curriculum changes.

**Step 3.** A recruitment email/Facebook inbox messages (Appendix C) were sent to the English Department’s faculty, student-teachers, and graduates. The following emails/Facebook messages included the consent forms (Appendix D). The researcher and the participants signed the consent forms, and each kept a copy for their records. As soon as the signed consent forms were received, questionnaires were distributed electronically via email and through Facebook Messenger. Even though I sent emails and Facebook inbox messages to all of the participants, two of my colleagues helped in distributing hard
copies of the introductory letter, the consent forms, and the questionnaires in order to maximize the participation rates.

All the program’s teacher-educators were invited to participate in the study. Out of 18 teacher-educators who signed the consent forms, only 15 of them completed the questionnaires. Three questionnaires were incomplete, which made me decide to exclude them from the data analysis procedure.

Likewise, all the program’s third/fourth year student-teachers were invited to participate in the study. When my colleagues noticed that three student-teachers found difficulty in completing the questionnaires, they focused on choosing student-teachers who could complete the questionnaires. Thus, from the thirteen completed questionnaires, three questionnaires were excluded from the data analysis procedure because they were incomplete.

With regard to the program graduates, most of them were my Facebook friends. From the ten questionnaires I received, eight were complete, and two were excluded from data analysis.

**Step 4.** Interviewees were recruited through questionnaire responses. I planned to conduct interviews via one of the social networking tools that were convenient to the participants using Skype, Viber, or Facebook Messenger. Unfortunately, all the interviewees withdrew after sending the first question due to network outages. More details are discussed in the methodological disruptions and challenges section.

**Researcher’s Insider and Outsider Positionality**

I began this study with a belief that my positionality should only be as a researcher. As I progressed in this study, I realized the complexity of my positionality as
a researcher and an insider and how it is not possible to keep my positionality to one role. In this section and other sections of Chapter 4 and Chapter 5, I try to acknowledge how I might have influenced the interpretation of the data to help the readers determine the extent to which I have influenced the interpretation of the data.

Taking the researcher stance, while collecting and analyzing data from the program that I was a part of, was not as easy as I had expected. The moment I received the faculty’s guide and the program’s meeting minutes, and the moment I saw the changes that were made to the work I made as a program developer, I struggled with sticking to my researcher position. First, I struggled in that the work I had once done when I was the head of the program at the investigated TESOL teacher education program was attributed to the head that came after me. Then, I noticed what was written about the changes in the curriculum that had been done while I was in the US. For example, upon reviewing the meeting minutes of the English Department, I noticed that the new head of the English Department stated that the IT major teacher-educator suggested adding CALL as a new course. The fact that I was the one who had suggested the CALL course and prepared the objectives and content for the course was not mentioned. The teacher-educators at Oya University in the TESOL teacher education program still used the document I created, the same font, and the content documents still contained the same errors. The only change that was made to the curriculum was that they took out my name and added their names on the revised document. I was hurt and disappointed.

It was not easy for me to keep a distance and to just look at the data as a researcher. It hurt me deeply that all the work I did was attributed to others. I still do not
understand why! Each time I looked at those documents, I was in pain, feeling like someone denied me all the hard work I had done before I came to the US. However, I learned how to look at my data without taking it personally. To overcome those feelings, I reminded myself that I was the researcher and that I should just analyze those documents as I had planned. It was not easy. The process of getting used to the idea of being an outsider and outweighing the researcher mind over my personal feelings was slow but fruitful. After a while, I was able to read the documents without feeling hurt and betrayed. I was able to analyze the documents while applying Wallace’s (1991) and Wright’s (2010) frameworks. I learned to look at the documents, keeping a specific focus on the questions I needed to answer.

Nevertheless, keeping the researcher positionality was so difficult and sometimes impossible when I lost the chance of conducting the interviews. I lost the chance of triangulating the data when interviews were not conducted as planned. Even though I made attempts to remain aware of how I might influence the study by explaining my personal reactions in my journals, being involved in and affected by my context’s the sociocultural and sociopolitical circumstances as well as enthusiasm about the significance of transformative education for the Libyan context might have influenced my interpretations of data and formation of themes. As I was left with just the questionnaire results that sometimes included really short and vague responses, I had to interpret some of those answers from my own understandings as an insider. For example, when the participants were asked about whether they perceived critical language teacher education as relevant to the Libyan context, they justified their perceptions using short and vague phrases or statements such as “the political and social challenges” (Q14, 2015,
p. 6), “the situation in Libya” (Q5, Q12, Q23, Q29, and Q32, 2015, p. 6), and “our situation” (Q8, 2015, p. 6). Since all interviewees withdrew, I was not able to explore these perceptions with my participants. Thus, my insider role took place in understanding their responses. These responses show that they assumed I will understand them given my familiarity with the Libyan context. My familiarity with the Libyan context helped me understand what they meant when they used the words “challenges” and “situation” and the phrase “historical, social, and political context” (Q5, Q7, Q8, Q12, Q14, Q23, Q29, and Q32, 2015, p. 6). Even though I was not able to elicit more details from the participants themselves, I was able to understand cultural and political information as an insider and analyze the data.

My researcher identity and positioning was reconstructed through interaction with the program documents and questionnaire responses. Reconstructing my positionality can be described as a “process of achievement” (Alzbouebi, 2006, as cited in Giampapa, 2011, p. 140) that was “continually evaluated and contested” (Giampapa, 2011, p. 140) through my continuous critical reflections on my engagement with the discourse in the documents and the questionnaire responses.

**Data Analysis**

In qualitative research, data collection and data analysis are not linear processes that can be described step-by-step. Since they are simultaneous and interactive (Merriam, 1998), data analysis was conducted during and after the process of collecting data. I managed data skillfully to achieve efficiency in the process of collecting data. The qualitative data that was gathered for this study included data gathered from the analyzed documents and responses gathered from the questionnaires.
After line-by-line reading and memoing of each data, a thematic inductive approach was used to code and analyze the data (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996). Coding was used to condense the significant data and was used to help me identify, analyze, and interpret data. Data was analyzed through axial and selective coding (Corbin & Strauss, 1990). Axial coding is the process of interconnecting the developed categories and exploring how codes are related to each other, whereas selective coding is the process of identifying a single category/theme as the central phenomenon. After hand coding, I used NVivo to analyze my data. In the following sections, I explain data analysis procedures.

**Data Analysis Procedures**

All data analysis was qualitative. The procedures of data analysis were as follows:

**Preparing and organizing data from documents.** Documents that were collected included copies of the Faculty of Education’s guidebook, the English Department’s curriculum, lists of the departmental requirements, teaching practice and the graduation project assessment forms, and one of the departmental meetings’ minutes, which was related to curriculum changes.

After gathering the documents, they were classified, labeled, and organized in separate folders; all were then analyzed. All the documents were analyzed by applying Wallace’s (1991) and Wright’s (2010) frameworks. A brief description of the findings was written to support the other sources of data. Analyzing the gathered documents provided me with a deeper understanding of the curriculum, teaching practice, and the graduation project.

**Preparing and organizing data from questionnaires.** Data that were collected from questionnaires were analyzed qualitatively. The process included analyzing the
gathered questionnaire responses by first hand coding them and then using NVivo. The process included describing the content of the responses and relating them to codes, and then categorizing codes (axial coding) and organizing them into categories and themes (selective coding) that were consistent with their characteristics. To answer the research questions, I focused on participants’ perceptions on English and its position in Libya, their perceptions on their TESOL teacher education programs, their perceptions on their TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints, their views on critical language teacher education as an approach for program reform, and their insights and suggestions for an effective curriculum reform.

The first round of reading and hand coding allowed me to become familiar with the data; it further allowed me to generate initial codes, to prepare specific questions for the interviews, and to verify who agreed to participate in the interviews. Following that was a more focused process of reading and hand coding, which included reading the questionnaire responses carefully, searching for codes, and writing notes in the margins of the questionnaires. These notes included words, phrases, and short sentences that were taken from the participants’ responses. This initial coding resulted in 90 distinct codes. Then, I thoroughly examined and compared the codes multiple times to specify which codes were tied to my research questions. Following that was the axial coding; this is where I searched for themes and categories among codes by carefully examining the specified codes, discovering their interrelationships, and creating categories. Another round of reading and examining codes and categories was completed in order to find overarching categories. This process led me to selective coding, which helped me move to exploring data from individual questionnaires to the entire set of data that was derived
from all the questionnaires, which answered each research question. After I finished hand coding, I began coding using NVivo.

**Using NVivo.** After hand coding, I used NVivo to code data. NVivo is a “qualitative data analysis software package designed for researchers working with very rich text-based and/or multimedia information, where deep levels of analysis on small or large volumes of data are required” (IUP website). Using NVivo helped me “analyze, manage, shape, and analyze” the data, and it helped “display graphically the codes and categories” (Creswell, 2013, p. 204). Codes and sub-codes were grouped into themes and provided me with a framework to describe the case, which then helped me to relate the findings to the literature.

After importing all questionnaires and sorting them in files according to their relevance to the research questions, the first coding I did was auto coding. Auto coding automatically codes sources according to questions. Thus, all relevant responses for all of the questions of the questionnaire were coded in one node that organizes all data, i.e., all the responses for each question are gathered in one code. Using NVivo helped in reviewing the codes and categories and in defining/redefining and naming the categories and themes.

**Methodological Disruptions and Challenges**

A number of challenges emerged during data collection due to the critical situation in Libya. As I was doing research in a war-torn context, Libya’s crisis affected all sorts of communication. The continuing fights between armed militias and the current political crisis had “a devastating effect on [I]nternet freedom” and “disrupted the country’s tele communication” (Freedom on The Net, 2015, pp. 2-4). In the following
sections, I discuss the challenges I encountered while reviewing the relevant literature and collecting data.

**Challenges While Reviewing Relevant Literature**

The first challenge I encountered when I began this study was in finding the relevant literature in the Libyan context. This is because there are no databases for studies that are conducted in the Libyan context, even though there is an archive of hard copies of theses and dissertations of studies that were conducted in Libya or abroad. I keep thinking that there might have been studies that explored TESOL teacher education in Libya, other than the ones I reviewed, but since they are not published online and cannot be found in any electronic database, they are unknown; their results are a mystery and have no effect on the Libyan academic and educational culture. Since I was not able to go to Libya to see if there were any other studies, other than the ones I found, and because my friends and colleagues were not able to help me find more studies, my review included only two studies that were conducted in Tripoli. I relied on what was available online, really a limited number of studies, and what my friends sent to me. As I mentioned in the literature review, one of my colleagues, a recent MA graduate, refused to send me her thesis, fearing that I might plagiarize her ideas.

Additionally, the website of the Libyan ministry, and most of the websites of the Libyan universities, did not provide details about their programs. If someone needed information, personally contacting people at the Libyan ministries was the most effective way to receive information; however, this method is not convenient for Libyan students who are studying abroad, especially when their cities are facing different economic, social, and political conflicts.
Challenges While Collecting Data

I have to confess that I was naïve. I thought that data collection would be the easiest part of my study. I expected that all members of the program would be willing to participate and that they would enrich my study by providing rich data, especially given the fact that they all welcomed my research idea with enthusiasm when I visited the investigated program in 2012, especially that they were planning for a program reform. What was missing in my thoughts was how bad the situation was in Libya, even though I have not missed anything, as I have followed Libyan news on Facebook because it is my only way to reach my family members, friends, and colleagues.

When I began data collection, Libyans living in the capital were under the stress of living without power. Long blackouts and really low Internet services affected most of those living in a number of Libyan cities, especially the context of the study. In the beginning, the hours of continuous blackouts ranged between eight to twelve hours. Then, blackouts continued for twenty hours and sometimes more. In some areas, the participants told me they were without power for more than 24 hours. Many of my participants expressed that they were not able to engage in any activity that required using computers or the Internet. Thus, the participants were emotionally drained and stressed, which resulted in not hearing from two colleagues who signed consent forms for my study. Additionally, due to the complications in Libya, I was unable to acquire copies of the questionnaires that I had sent to two of my colleagues, and, moreover, due to the complications, I received very brief responses on questionnaires from many of my participants. Finally, the complications in Libya caused some of my participants to withdraw from the study.
I was so scared that I would not be able to collect my data because of the critical situation in my beloved city. Thanks to three of my colleagues and a number of my former students who are close friends, along with my sister, data collection became less taxing, thanks to their help and support. Their unconditional help was an asset in gathering the questionnaires from the teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates. The unstable situation in Libya affected all Libyans, not just those who were studying abroad.

**Documents.** I was planning to collect documents that elicit the Ministry of Education’s objectives of ELT in Libyan schools and the reasons behind implementing the communicative approach to teach English in the Libyan context. As the Libyan Ministry of Education’s web site did not include any information, I tried to find the documents using different strategies. First, I asked the head and the Study and Exams Coordinator of the investigated program and they responded that they do not have the documents. Then, I sent an inbox Facebook message to the official Facebook page of the ministry. No one responded to my message until this day. Finally, I tried to gather the data by asking friends who are in positions that make them able to ask for the documents. One of them did not respond to my messages until this day. The other two promised that they will do their best to find the documents and kept sending me messages to be optimistic and then when they knew that they were not able to locate the documents, they stopped responding to my messages. This made me realize the difficulty of locating documents in a conflict zone. Being away from Libya made it so difficult to gather those documents, as well.
**Questionnaires.** When I sent the consent forms to all participants, they were not able to download them because Internet services were too low. When I discussed the situation with two of my colleagues, they suggested sending printed copies of the consent forms and assured me that they would gather them. Thus, they printed and distributed the hard copies to the participants, and they then collected the signed forms, took photos of them, and sent the photos via Viber.

I came across another challenge related to the questions of the questionnaire. Since questionnaires were distributed to third and fourth year student-teachers that I know, some of the student-teachers complained that they found difficulty in completing the questionnaires. Most of the students I taught had graduated and were teaching. Those that I know were student-teachers who had to retake many courses and did not graduate in four years. When I received two incomplete questionnaires, I relayed this information to my colleague, who helped me throughout the data collection process. Accordingly, she, another colleague, and one of my close student-teachers began encouraging student-teachers with high language proficiency to participate, which boosted the participation levels (snowball sampling).

**Interviews.** I encountered the most unexpected challenges during the interviews. The first obstacle was with conducting interviews through Viber/Skype video calls. Since Internet connections were too low in Libya, video calls were impossible. I decided to conduct my interviews through Instant Messaging; that is when I had to make changes to my proposal and get IRB approval once more. After receiving IRB approval, I sent my first question to all participants who agreed to be interviewed. After a week of waiting for a response, I received a Facebook message from the only graduate who agreed to be
interviewed, but she later apologized and withdrew from the study. Then I received another message from one of the teacher-educators. She stated that she was so stressed because of the long blackouts. Her message was short and informative. What was more stressful is that not one of the three student-teachers who agreed to be interviewed answered my messages. After a month, one of them sent an apology Facebook message stating that she did not have Internet because blackouts continued for 18 hours a day. Consequently, I had to cancel interviews. In fact, these circumstances are still affecting all people I know. They still suffer from continuous hours of blackouts, even as I am completing this study. Consequently, I am not able to conduct the interviews until this moment.

Doing research in a war-torn conflict zone was neither an easy process for me as a researcher, nor was it for the participants. Even though the study’s results might help in taking the program a step forward in contributing to exploring ways for engaging TESOL teacher education programs as agents of peace, social justice, and reconciliation (Nelson & Appleby, 2015), it was conducted while the participants and the researcher, herself, were in the middle of conflicts and educational challenges that were caused by Libya’s crisis.

Trustworthiness of the Study

Research trustworthiness is the umbrella term that is used to discuss the steps that are taken to ensure the validity and reliability of any research. To ensure the “validation” of the process of this research, “multiple validation strategies” were used (Creswell, 2013).
Since clarifying researcher bias is of significance to the study, I began this study with a narrative of my past and present experiences and biases in order to reveal how both might shape my interpretations. I discussed my interest in this topic and my reasons for my commitment to the study. I also explored certain critical moments in my own past and while conducting the study that might have shaped my understanding and approaches to this study. My reflections on my past and present experiences with TESOL teacher education and my study helped me and the reader understand the foundations of this study. Writing about myself and my personal experiences in the Prologue and Epilogue can be considered a conscious move towards recognizing what influenced my ideas concerning TESOL teacher education and the study.

The reliability of data is assured by ensuring “‘blind’ coding, without knowledge of the expectations” (Creswell, 2013, p. 253) and using NVivo to analyze the data, along with hand coding. To ensure research trustworthiness, I tried to provide readers of this study with rich, thick description of the study. Rich, thick description is important to ensure that the study’s design is clearly described so as to help with transferability, rather than generalizability. Providing detailed descriptions of the study helps readers determine the possibility of transferring the study’s information to other settings. Thick descriptions mean providing detailed explanations of the case and the themes.

Merriam (1988) and others call for the significance of asking a peer to check the research process to maintain validity. This is to help the researcher be honest; to help question the methods, meanings, and interpretations; and to help purify the researcher’s feelings (Creswell, 2013). Thus, I asked a friend to look into the research process and then discussed it to enhance interpretive credibility.
Member checking is considered as being “the most crucial technique for establishing credibility” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 314; also cited in Creswell, 2013, p. 252). Stake (1995) claims that participants should “play a major role directing as well as acting in [a] case study” (as cited in Creswell, 2013, p. 252). Thus, in this phase, researchers are asked to involve their participants in the research by asking them to review the findings and interpretations and provide their views on it. The participant’s judgment is considered a great “validation strategy” and can help the researcher specify “what was missing” (Creswell, 2013, p. 252). Therefore, I solicited my participants’ views to ensure the credibility of my findings and interpretations.

**Ethical Considerations**

Ethical considerations are of significance in any kind of research. According to Creswell (2013), ethical issues “arise” not only during the phase of collecting data, but also during the other phases of research (p. 56). Therefore, researchers need to consider the ethical issues that might arise by thinking about what should be done before conducting the study, while conducting the study, and after conducting the study. Creswell (2013) states that Lipson (1994) grouped ethical issues into “informed consent procedures; deception or covert activities; confidentiality toward participants, sponsors, and colleagues; benefits of research to participants over risks; and participant requests to go beyond norms” (p. 174). Accordingly, the following paragraphs detail how I carefully considered the ethical issues of this study by taking into account the ethics of including human participants in the study and the ethics of data collection and analysis.
In studies that involve human participants, researchers have to follow and explain the procedures they took to protect their participants from potential threats or harm. Thus, I followed several significant steps in order to ensure the participants’ protection.

The first step involves the procedures taken to gain access to the research site. Before beginning the study, the idea of conducting a study about the program was discussed with the head of the English Department, and his permission was formally received in order to conduct the study on site. Then, a proposal that provided details about the study was submitted to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at IUP (Appendix A).

As soon as the proposal was approved, and after deciding who was going to participate in the study, two copies of the Informed Consent Form (Appendix D) was presented to the participants in the first meeting. The consent form was designed according to criteria shown in the IRB. It included: 1) “the right of participants to voluntarily withdraw from the study at any time”, 2) “the central focus of the study and the procedures to be used in data collection”, 3) “the protection of confidentiality of the respondents”, and 4) any risks that might have been associated with participation (Creswell, 2013, p. 153). After the participants signed the consent forms, the participants and I retained a copy. From first meeting with the participants, and throughout the data collection period, I always reminded them that they had the right to not answer any questions that made them feel uncomfortable. Further, I reminded them that they had the right to withdraw at any time. I also reminded participants that their participation was completely voluntary. In order to further protect participants, and in order to protect their identities, pseudonyms were used; ultimately, this helped to ensure participant
confidentiality. Finally, participants were given access to the final version of the analyzed data.

Qualitative researchers confront many ethical issues during the process of data collection and while analyzing and disseminating their qualitative data (Creswell, 2013; Merriam, 1988). Thus, as recommended by Creswell (2013), I followed the following data collection and analysis recommendations:

1. I developed “a data collection matrix as a visual means of locating and identifying information for [the] study”;
2. I developed “a master list of types of information gathered”;
3. I ensured that data regarded as “off the record” was kept confidential and was deleted from analysis;
4. I ensured that all data was kept in a locked cabinet and was then destroyed following the federal regulations;
5. I ensured that all analyzed data was kept on an external flash memory in a safe place; and
6. I prepared backup copies of all data. (Creswell, 2013, pp. 174 – 175)

Finally, regardless the fact that the head of the program and some of the teacher-educators encouraged the conduct of this study and that they were planning to reform the program through my study’s results, I had disturbing feelings that I may have imposed on the participants as they were living in an area of a conflict zone. I was doing research in a context that is war torn. Even though I have had enormous support from the program head and some of my colleagues while writing about my context during the three chapter stage and during the data collection phase, I sometimes felt very torn, as my participants
were experiencing challenges related to continuous blackouts, militia fights, and disturbing political issues. For me, data collection was of importance since it leads to revealing the program’s affordances and constraints. The program needed this study’s results to understand the student-teachers’ needs and to know, in the future, how to meet them. Further, the program needed this study’s results in order to know how to educate future teachers as language teachers and as activists for peaceful, positive change. However, deep inside, I felt as if I was torn between those mixed feelings that were bothering me as an insider and outsider. What kept me going throughout the process is the fact that this study’s results are for the good of the program and will hopefully help make a positive change in Libya.

**Limitations of Methods**

This qualitative case study explored teacher-educators’, student-teachers’, and graduates’ perspectives on their Libyan TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints, as well as their perspectives on critical language teacher education as an approach for program reform. Since data collection took place during a critical period in the lives of my participants, as they were living in areas that were threatened by bombings, militia fighting, and long, continuous hours of blackouts, the study may have encountered a number of limitations, which need to be considered.

As mentioned earlier, I planned to conduct interviews to explore the participants’ perceptions on their program’s affordances and constraints. However, due to Libya’s unrest, the main services of electricity and Internet were affected; as a result, interviews with respondents were not conducted. I was not able to conduct interviews because all the respondents who agreed to be interviewed withdrew due to the situation in Libya, which
caused long, continuous blackouts and low Internet service. Even though data gathered from the questionnaires was reliable, interviews might have provided further details about what the participants reported as their program’s affordances and constraints. Another point to mention is that as a result of Libya’s critical situation, some of the participants’ responses to some of the questions were really succinct. Even though their responses were reliable, I assume that if the situation in Libya was less stressful, their responses might have been more detailed.

Finally, data was gathered from one of the Libyan TESOL teacher education programs, which means that the study’s findings may not be generalized. However, the findings of the study may provide insights for Libyan researchers to explore similar programs’ affordances and constraints. Libyan researchers might conduct a study that compares between a number of Libyan TESOL teacher education programs’ curricula as well. The study’s findings also contribute to the field, especially in that it explored one of the less-documented contexts, which was affected by after war consequences and social injustice incidents.

Chapter Summary

This study was concerned with the affordances and constraints of the TESOL teacher education program in the Faculty of Education at Oya University, a Libyan public university located in the western side of the country. In this chapter, I briefly described the chosen methodology and approach, which was a qualitative case study. The chapter provided a brief description of the chosen data collection methods and the procedures taken for data collection. It also provided a detailed description of data analysis
procedures, along with the steps taken to ensure the study’s trustworthiness, as well as steps taken for ethical considerations.

In the following chapters, Chapter Four and Chapter Five, I discuss my findings. Chapter Four begins with an overview of the study’s site and the investigated program, and it then provides a discussion of the findings from the documents analysis. Chapter Five discusses the findings from the questionnaires.
CHAPTER FOUR

STUDY FINDINGS ON OYA UNIVERSITY’S TESOL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM

This study investigated the affordances and constraints of a Libyan TESOL teacher education program as perceived and reported by its teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates. It also explored their perceptions on critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform.

The two research questions that grounded this study are: (1) How do the teacher-educators, the student-teachers, and the graduates of the English Department at the Faculty of Education at Oya University perceive and understand the affordances and constraints of their existing TESOL teacher education curriculum?, and (2) How do the English department’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceive and understand critical language teacher education as an approach for program/curriculum reform?

Data was collected through 33 completed questionnaires and seven of the program’s documents. The analyzed documents included copies of the Faculty of Education’s guidebook, the English Department’s curriculum, the program’s mission and vision, lists of the departmental requirements, a teaching practice evaluation form, a graduation project evaluation form, and one of the meeting’s minutes that included curricular changes. Unexpectedly, all the participants who agreed to be interviewed withdrew due to the critical situation in Libya that affected electricity and Internet services during the time of data collection. Long periods of blackouts and low Internet connections made it difficult for them to communicate with me.
Data collected from the documents and questionnaires were examined and analyzed to answer the research questions. Data collected from the documents was analyzed by applying Wallace’s (1991) and Wright’s (2010) frameworks that included answering a number of questions and content analysis. Data collected from the questionnaires was analyzed through a process that (1) familiarized me with the data, (2) helped me generate initial codes, (3) enabled me to search for the themes and then review the themes, and (4) enabled me to define and name the themes, and (5) report the findings (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

In this chapter, I present the findings of the study, which are introduced in the order of the study’s research questions. The chapter is divided into five parts that are devoted to presenting (1) a description of the programmatic components of the investigated program, (2) the participants’ perceptions on TESOL teacher education programs, (3) the participants’ perceptions on the program’s affordances and constraints, (4) the participants’ perceptions on critical language teacher education, and (5) the participants’ insights and suggestions for program reform.

**A Description of the Programmatic Components**

As discussed in Chapter 3, documents’ analysis was done by applying Wallace’s (1991) and Wright’s (2010) frameworks that included answering specific questions that explores the components and content of the program’s curriculum. Before embarking in the discussion of the participants’ perceptions on the program and their connection to the findings from documents’ analysis, there is a need to thoroughly understand the structural and programmatic components of the investigated program housed within the Faculty of Education. As interviews were not conducted, this specific description of the structural
and programmatic components will enable the reader to recognize the commonalities and particularities of the program. It will also help the reader create a picture of the program and then understand the participants’ perceptions on the program’s affordances and constraints.

The findings show that the programmatic components of the investigated program include entry requirements, duration and credit distributions, curriculum structure, coursework, and exit requirements. I conclude this part of the chapter with a brief description of the curriculum development process and the changes that have been made.

**Entry Requirements**

The programs’ documents do not mention any specific requirements whereas the faculty guide includes a section about entry requirements in the policy chapter. The entry requirements section in the guide states that the programs of the Faculty of Education accept secondary school graduates with satisfactory GPA, without mentioning a specific GPA. The section also states that the applicants have to submit all the required documents as listed by the university without mentioning specific documents.

**Duration and Credit Distributions**

The investigated TESOL teacher education program is a four-year and 196-credit program that prepares student-teachers with a strong foundation to teach English language at Libyan primary, preparatory, and secondary schools. Student-teachers are required to (1) complete the required courses that are relevant to their field, (2) integrate both theory and practice through school-based intensive full-time teaching experience, and (3) demonstrate their mastery of the subject matter by showing their ability to
critically evaluate and communicate their research in the graduation project. The program admits student-teachers both in Fall and Spring semesters.

The requirements are divided into eight semesters. Each semester, student-teachers take a certain number of credits that include a combination of courses taught in Arabic and in English. Appendices O, P, Q, and R include tables that show how the TESOL teacher education curriculum is divided into eight semesters. Besides, student-teachers are required to practice teaching at schools and are required to conduct a graduation project as part of their compulsory requirements for graduation.

**Curriculum Structure**

As shown in Figure 6, the program is designed so that student-teachers go through three phases to meet the program requirements. In Phase I, student-teachers are exposed to courses that aim to develop their language proficiency and cultural understandings, as well as courses that aim to raise their understandings of the scientific knowledge of the English language. In Phase II, emphasis is turned to teaching student-teachers how to teach English and training them by giving them the chance to practice peer teaching. In Phase III, student-teachers practice teaching at schools and work on their graduation projects.

![Curriculum Structure Diagram](image)

*Figure 6. The three phases of curriculum progression.*
There is no indication of the approaches and models that are followed in the curriculum. The analysis of the curriculum revealed that the underlying curriculum model is the applied science model since it is designed with the idea that student-teachers learn the theory first and then apply it as the “rationalist learn-the-theory-and-then-apply-it model” (Ur, 1992, p. 56).

**Coursework**

As shown in Figure 7, coursework is comprised of 94% of the credits. The four-year program comprises a tripartite curriculum related to university, faculty, and departmental requirements. The curriculum design of the program is detailed below.

*Figure 7. The percentage of coursework compared to the exit requirements.*

**University requirements.** University requirements include 16 credits of courses taught in Arabic and that are considered as compulsory courses throughout all the faculties at the university level. These include Arabic Language, Computer Science, English Language for non-majors of English, Principles of Statistics, and Quranic Studies. Each of these courses’ main objectives is familiarizing student-teachers with the basic information about the subjects that are needed at the university level. Appendix K includes a table that shows the number of courses and credits of each subject that student-teachers in the English Department are required to take.
Faculty requirements. Faculty requirements include 22 credits of courses taught in Arabic and include courses that develop student-teachers’ understanding of psychology, education, evaluation and assessment, teaching methods and materials, and other courses. The aim of these courses is to raise student-teachers’ educational and psychological awareness and to prepare them to understand their students’ needs and their educational requirements. Appendix L includes a table that provides details on the educational subjects that all students of the Faculty of Education are required to take.

English department requirements. The requirements of the English department aim for student-teachers to gain language proficiency and teaching competence. These requirements are divided into core compulsory requirements and elective requirements. The compulsory requirements constitute 92 credits. Student-teachers are required to take courses that develop their competency in grammar and the following basic skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. They are also required to take courses in phonetics, linguistics, applied linguistics, and varied teaching related courses that aim to prepare them to become effective language teachers. Appendix M includes a table that shows the departmental compulsory courses. The elective requirements constitute only four credits. The department aimed to give the student-teachers the chance to choose from a number of courses that suited their needs. Appendix N includes a table that shows the elective courses that student-teachers can choose.

As can be seen in Figure 8, the number of the credits shows a heavy focus on grammar and language skills, whereas the number of ELT related courses that are taken before teaching practice constitutes only nine percent of the overall credits. This focus on
grammar and language proficiency seems to be at the expense of language teaching training.

Figure 8. Program’s courses.

Exit Requirements

Exit requirements are the components in which student-teachers demonstrate their competencies as teachers and researchers in addition to satisfactory completion of coursework. These requirements include teaching practice and graduation project.

Teaching practice. The program’s curriculum does not include details regarding the procedures that are in place for teaching practice. Teaching practice “trains students to 'learn teaching’” by helping them “understand the basic principles of working in a language classroom”, by helping them “plan successful lessons and activities”, and by helping them “use materials to make their lessons more interesting” (Program Curriculum, 2015, p. 53). The program’s aims for teaching practice are listed as (1) “help[ing] students practice teaching English and prepar[ing] them for real classroom
management”; (2) “equip[ing] students with [the] necessary skills to make them become better teachers of the English language”; and (3) “mak[ing] them appreciate the nobility of their role as future teachers” (Program Curriculum, 2015, p. 53).

Appointing student-teachers to schools is not the responsibility of the English Department. The program creates lists of the student-teachers who are required to teach at schools and assigns them to their academic supervisors. According to the English Department’s Teaching practice assessment form, three teacher-educators assess student-teachers’ performance: an academic supervisor (a teacher-educator from the English Department), an educational supervisor (a teacher-educator from the Psychology Department), and the school principal. Forty percent of the student-teachers’ final grade is given by the educational supervisor, whereas 50% of the grade is given by the academic supervisor. The remaining 10% of the grade is given by the school principal.

Appendix S includes a form that shows the criteria that are used by the academic supervisor to evaluate the student-teachers’ performance. Areas of evaluation include lesson planning, lesson delivery, linguistic competence, classroom management, and teaching aids. Lately, another area was included in Fall 2015 that assesses student-teachers’ observation, self-reflection, and development. As can be seen on the assessment form, 30% of the grade is given to student-teachers’ linguistic competence, in which student-teachers’ pronunciation, language fluency and accuracy, vocabulary range, clarity of instruction and communication, content knowledge, and first language use is evaluated. The remaining 70% of the grade is about their teaching and is divided as 12% for lesson planning, 20% for lesson delivery, 20% for classroom delivery, 8% for teaching aids, and 10% for the newly added observation, self-reflection, and
development. The form shows that the student-teachers’ assessment is a result of at least four visits, from which the final assessment is given by taking into consideration the average grade from the last three visits.

Appendix T includes a form that shows the educational supervisor’s criteria that were used to evaluate the student-teachers’ performance. An evaluation of a lesson planning notebook, lesson implementation and learning environment management, students’ learning evaluation, and weekly meetings are the areas of evaluation. As can be on the assessment form, 63 points of the grade is given to lesson application and management, in which student-teachers are assessed on their lesson planning and application, use of different approaches, lesson materials, talk and questioning, voice clarity, language accuracy and fluency, feedback, class time, lesson sequence and coherence, and use of the textbook and the board. The other points are divided as follows: 15 points for the lesson planning notebook, 10 points for students’ learning evaluation, and 10 points for weekly meetings. The form shows that student-teachers are assessed during the observation stage and while teaching. Two visits are for assessing them during observation, and six visits are for assessing them while teaching. The overall grade is given as the average grade of these visits.

The principal’s assessment form, as shown in Appendix U, evaluates the student-teachers’ performance in five areas, each of which is given two points, and the overall grade is out of ten points. The first area is student-teachers’ daily attendance, which assesses their commitment to coming to school every day and avoiding absences during the practicum period. The second area is student-teachers’ commitment to the school’s morning and recess assembly attendance. Morning and recess line-up are
required activities in the Libyan public schools, in which students stand in lines and do certain activities before entering their classrooms. The third area of assessment is student-teachers’ commitment to class time. They are assessed on whether to go into and out of the class on time. The fourth area is related to socialization. Student-teachers’ socialization with the school’s administration and teachers is assessed. The final area is student-teachers’ participation in the school’s activities.

The three forms cover the four domains of teacher evaluation, which are planning and preparation, learning environment, instruction, and professional responsibilities. Both of the academic and educational supervisors’ forms cover all the aspects that are evaluated under these domains; the principal’s form, however, is concerned with the student-teachers’ professional responsibilities.

**Graduation project.** Having a required graduation project provides an impression of the program’s belief in preparing teacher-researchers. The main aim is to “show students how to write a research paper” by providing “support” that would enable them to “practice … gathering and interpreting data” and learn “referencing and avoiding plagiarism” while working on the project (Program Curriculum, 2015, p. 70).

According to the process assessment form, the supervisor’s grade is 60 points, whereas the examiner’s grade is 40 points. Students are divided into groups of three and sometimes four for each project, and the students work together until they submit their final draft to their supervisor on a specified date. Each project is monitored and documented by three teacher-educators, one of them is the supervisor.

There is neither indication of the type of research that is required, nor is there indication of the topics that are preferred in the curriculum. However, the list of titles that
was provided to me shows that most of the studies can be considered as empirical qualitative research. The topics mostly cover classroom practices, with some focus on new ideas, such as blended learning and using TED Talks in the speaking classroom.

The supervisor’s and examiner’s assessment forms show that students’ projects are assessed by looking at the preliminary pages, the introductory chapter, the literature review chapter, the methodology chapter, the data analysis chapter, the results and discussion chapter, and the references and appendices. The form includes points that students should have covered, which the assessors use to check the quality of the project. The graduation project’s assessment was not clear, especially how grades were divided between the assessed parts and among the assessors. This uncertainty about grade division might have been because of the unclear documents. Therefore, I think that the grade will mostly depend on the assessors’ views of what is covered and what is not.

Having a research component and students’ collaboration in conducting their studies can be considered as one of the program’s affordances. Training student-teachers to explore certain topics while working in pairs or groups reinforces the significance of research and collaboration after graduation as the basis of professional development.

**Curriculum Development Process**

The analysis of the documents gathered from the program showed that curriculum development follows a bottom-up approach. The program head forms committees that develop the program’s requirements and curriculum, which then, the university approves. The department head and teacher-educators meet and discuss the curriculum and make revisions regularly. Teacher-educators are in a position that allows
them to show concerns about the curriculum and ask for changes. Student-teachers and graduates, however, are not included in the process.

There are not any documented proposals or explanations for the changes that had been made. All the change requests were done orally during the departmental meetings, and then, a summary of the changes were written in Arabic by the head of the department, which was then added to the meeting minutes and then sent to the dean. Thus, all the changes that were made were ad hoc adjustments for the first version of the curriculum. The changes were mainly made by making some courses electives, changing the number of credits, changing the overall credits/requirements, and deciding which textbooks to use.

**Curriculum changes.** The meeting minutes indicated that the program head and faculty met on Thursday, March 8, 2012, and they discussed the curriculum components and made a number of decisions regarding the courses’ content and credits/hours.

The two teacher-educators who were chosen by the head of the department to revise the curriculum were previous literature majors with no background in TESOL teacher education. The minutes also showed that decisions were made without having written proposals that would have provided explanations for those changes. The curriculum that was analyzed in this study was a result of this meeting.

No changes were made to the program’s mission, vision, or objectives; changes were also not made to the courses’ descriptions and objectives. The changes that were made included revising the courses’ content and credits, along with making decisions as to whether to make courses compulsory or elective. Changes also were made on which
textbooks to adapt for certain courses. The basic changes that were related to textbooks were in the Speaking and Listening courses.

Changes also included a section in which the department head stated that the IT major teacher-educator suggested adding CAL as a new course. These changes included changing the title of the course from Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) to Computer Assisted Learning (CAL), along with adding “photo composition, graphic and animation, editing photo, photo capture, and web design” to the list of the other course’s components (Program Curriculum, 2015, p. 50).

As part of the changes, the following courses became electives: Varieties of English, Vocabulary Development, Teaching English Language Skills, Teaching English to Young Learners, Psycholinguistics, and Sociolinguistics. There were no explanations in the meeting minutes as to why the courses were changed to electives. Also, there were no written proposals for these changes since they were proposed orally by the program faculty as decisions were made according to these discussions.

The meeting minutes also included a suggestion to teach some of the educational courses in English, rather than in Arabic. These courses included: Teaching Methods, Research Methodologies, and Teaching Aids. Additional suggestions included requests about class sizes, urging that the number of students should be 25 in certain classes and that it should not exceed 35 students in other classes.

Accordingly, the revised curriculum does not include any sections about the social, economic, and political changes happening in Libya and how student-teachers are being prepared to teach English in Libya as a conflict zone. It neither includes statements about how it facilitates criticality nor how it empowers critical and creative engagement.
with English. There is no reference to conflict-peace relevant approaches that aim for preparing student-teachers to be prepared for the challenges of teaching English in their war-torn country, as well.

**Participants’ Perceptions on TESOL Teacher Education Programs**

Since Libyan teacher education programs are aiming for program reforms that would prepare the Libyan student-teachers for the current contextual challenges, it is better to understand the Libyans’ perceptions on the English language and teacher preparation programs. As an insider, I knew that the program has never sought the participants for their views on English and TESOL teacher education program. Thus, with the aim of including my participants’ in the conversation, Part A of the questionnaire explored the participants’ perceptions on English language and its position in the Libyan context, whereas Parts B of the questionnaire explored the participants’ perceptions on TESOL teacher education program’s roles and responsibilities and the program’s essential elements. In the following section, before exploring the participants’ perceptions on their program’s affordances and constraints, I present how they perceive the English language and its position in the Libyan context as well as their perceptions on the roles and responsibilities of TESOL teacher education programs and their basic elements.

**Participants’ Perceptions on English and Its Position in Libya**

Part A of the questionnaire included two questions in which the first question asked the teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates about their perceptions on English and the second question asked them about its position in the Libyan context. These two questions were designed to understand the participants’ views about which
English should be taught and its position in the Libyan context that would help program developers in making their decisions. The participants were asked to choose between four options and to specify their reasons. I planned to discuss the participants’ views in details in the interviews; however, not conducting the interviews left me with the findings from the questionnaires and the documents and my personal involvement and interpretations. In the following sections I present their views and perceptions.

**Participants’ perceptions on English.** As an insider, I know that the dominant assumption in the Libyan TESOL community is that either British or American English are what Libyan teachers and learners are expecting to be taught/learned. Other varieties seem to be undervalued and not taught. As TESOL scholars, such as Alsagoff (2012) and Matsuda (2012), have been “argu[ing] for paradigm shift in the field of ELT in order to meet the complex and diverse uses and users of English” (Matsuda, 2017, p. 224), I believed that Libyan TESOL scholars should think about paradigm shifts in ELT in the Libyan context. Thus, the first question of Part A of the questionnaire explored the participants’ perceptions on which English to teach with the aim of revealing the preferred English in the program. The question included four options to choose from, which are (1) British English, (2) American English, (3) British & other varieties, and (4) American & other varieties.

I did not consider adding “World Englishes” as one of the choices in the question as I assumed that it was not a widely known phrase in the Libyan context; the category emerged from some of the participants’ responses. There were reactions that asked “why not teach both” or stated that they were World Englishes advocates (Q526 & Q15 2015, p.

---

26 Q is the abbreviation for Questionnaire.
One of the teacher-educators pointed out that it is not easy to choose which English to teach since there “is no simple answer for this question” (Q4, 2015, p. 1). Her reasons were that “it depends on the situation where English is being taught and the goal behind learning English” (Q4, 2015, p. 1). For other participants, however, their responses showed that it was not difficult to decide which English to teach. Participants’ perceptions about which English to teach were divided between Standard English and World Englishes. While one group of the participants perceived Standard English as the mostly preferred and widely accepted academic variety, the other group of the participants perceived World Englishes as of significance because it leads to the implementation of a more balanced approach, appreciation for all language varieties, and better international communication skills.

Document analysis showed that the program developers perceived Standard English as the preferred academic variety. There is no specific section or statement in the curriculum that indicates whether British or American English is the chosen language to be taught in the program.

**Standard English.** From the 33 participants, eight teacher-educators, five student-teachers, and six graduates perceived Standard English as the one that should be taught. Standard English is perceived as “an international dialect” that is “widely accepted” (Q9, 2015, p. 1). It is preferred in the academic contexts “because students are required to conduct different assignments that are usually assessed and evaluated according to Standard English rubrics or criteria” (Q4, 2015, p. 1).
The participants’ perceived Standard English as either British or American English. Teacher-educators indicated that the program should focus on one of them while providing the student-teachers with some instruction about the differences between the two. They asserted that teacher-educators should “pick one variant and stick to it” (Q4, 2015, p. 1). Likewise, student-teachers and program graduates viewed both British and American English as the “known Standard English”; both British and American English should be “the focus” of the program because they represent the widely known and taught “academic language” (Q32, 2015, p. 1). They asserted that British and American English should be taught because “it is useful to know about the differences between the two, so [student-teachers] can teach that when [they] become teacher[s]” (Q25, 2015, p. 1). It seems that the program’s curriculum developers have similar perceptions as documents analysis showed that the program’s preferred approach is to teach both British and American English.

**British English.** Teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates who perceived British English as the language that should be taught had different reasons. A number of them stated that it is the internationally accepted variety. Dr. Jamie, one of the participants, asserted that the program should use Standard English in teaching and designing the curriculum because it is “an international dialect and widely accepted” and claimed that teacher-educators can “highlight” the differences between British and American English in “vocabulary, accent (pronunciation), and spelling” whenever they encounter them (Q9, 2015, p. 1).

One more reason was related to grammar. Dr. Morgan believed that British grammar should be taught first. She explained the following:
British English focuses more on standard grammar and proper language. If students learn British English first, it will be easier for them to learn other varieties later, such as American English, which focuses less on grammar and gives more attention to communication. (Q6, 2015, p. 1)

Like Dr. Jamie, Dr. Morgan pointed to the significance of highlighting the differences in vocabulary and grammar to not only learn British English but to also get introduced to American English “so that [students] can later choose which one to adopt” (Q6, 2015, p. 1). Similarly, Student-teachers and graduates, who perceived British English as the language that should be taught, believed that American English should be introduced with British English to help clarify the differences between the two.

*American English.* It was surprising to find that only one teacher-educator perceived American English as the language that should be taught. Dr. Blake thought that American English should be taught because she heard that it is “more comprehensible to foreigners than British English”, even though Dr. Blake was “not sure it was based on any comprehensibility studies” (Q14, 2015, p. 1). Student-teachers and graduates who perceived American English as the language that should be taught stated that it is the language of famous movies and television shows, social media, communication, and business.

*World Englishes.* Out of the 33 participants, seven teacher-educators, two student-teachers, and five graduates perceived World Englishes as the language that should be taught. The participants thought that student-teachers should be exposed to both British and American English, along with other varieties of English for varied
reasons. The main reason for choosing World Englishes was that student-teachers need to know about all the varieties as future teachers to be able to teach that in schools.

One of the reasons for their perceptions about World Englishes was that the program is preparing student-teachers “for global English” (Q15, 2015, p. 1). For instance, Dr. Bailey explicated that since Libya is a country that depends on multinational companies for the export of oil and gas, “it is more important for Libyans to be able to understand and communicate in English on a global level, not just [communicate in] either British or American English” (Q15, 2015, p. 1). Dr. Bailey added that there are books that teach global English, and she provided *Global* I think as an example. With a similar perspective, one of the student-teachers thought that learning about all varieties of English is a necessity for communicative purposes, “because communication around the world is through English” (Q18, 2015, p. 1). Similarly, for one of the graduates, she believed the other varieties could be introduced for conversation and communication purposes, for student-teachers “need to understand and know about all of them and how they are used [to] facilitate better communication” (Q32, 2015, p.1). More specifically, since student-teachers interact with their professors who use the other varieties of English more than the native speakers of English, student-teachers need to understand the different types of English for effective communication. Thus, student-teachers perceived World Englishes as of significance because their program includes professors who speak the other varieties. One of the student-teachers explained the following:

> We are learning both British and American English in different courses. So why don’t we learn about the other varieties? Before [our cohort], students who graduated took the varieties course, and then it became an elective. I think the
department has to make it necessary to take it to prepare students for the other varieties and [to] help them understand them, especially [since] we have teachers using English from the other varieties. (Q17, 2015, p. 1)

Addy here urges the program to change the varieties course from being elective to being one of the compulsory courses because the program includes teacher-educators who use different varieties of English and to facilitate better understanding and communication.

Another reason for participants’ perceptions on World Englishes is that it prepares student-teachers for the global world and “help[s] them [to] appreciate their English” (Q5, 2015, p. 1). With this perception, Dr. Sam explicated that teaching World Englishes is preferred since the program’s student-teachers “will be using English in their own way”, which he described as “a unique variety” (Q2, 2015, p. 1). Dr. Sam agrees with Dr. Pat in that teaching World Englishes creates an atmosphere of appreciation for all the English varieties among students, “especially theirs” (Q2, 2015, p. 1). There is a belief among some of the teacher-educators that teaching World Englishes leads the program to “implement a more balanced approach” that includes all the varieties, not just British or American English (Q5, 2015, p. 1).

Moreover, participants’ perceptions on World Englishes were connected to taking IELTS\textsuperscript{27} and/or TOEFL\textsuperscript{28} tests. Dr. Riley asserted that learning about the different varieties of English is of significance “so that students would be able to understand other dialects” if they were planning to take the IELTS or TOEFL test (Q3, 2015, p. 1). Dr. Riley provided IELTS as a specific example, indicating that on the IELTS test, test-takers’ understanding of different varieties is assessed. Similarly, student-teachers

\textsuperscript{27} International English Language Testing System.  
\textsuperscript{28} Test of English as a Foreign Language.
thought that the program should introduce students not only to British and American English, but also to the other varieties “because they have them in the IELTS and TOEFL tests” (Q18, 2015, p. 1). For Camellia, the program should introduce students to all varieties in order to prepare them for taking the IELTS test “because it includes many [language] varieties in the listening part” (Q20, 2015, p. 1).

Documents analysis revealed that there is no specific section or statement in the curriculum that indicates whether British or American English is the chosen language to be taught in the program. However, documents analysis supported the participants’ claims in which they state that both British and American English are being taught in the program as explained below.

Looking at the chosen textbooks of the listening and speaking, reading, writing, pronunciation, grammar, and literature courses, it seems that both British and American English are being taught. For instance, the textbooks that are chosen for the Phonetics courses are “English phonetics and phonology”, “English pronunciation in use”, and “Pronunciation tasks”. The three books are teaching British English. On the other hand, the textbooks that are chosen for Listening and Speaking courses are “Communicate” and “Presentations in English”, which teach American English.

Even though it was indicated that no specific textbook is required for the literature courses and that the students will get handouts, *The Norton introduction to literature* was chosen as the reference book for both of the literature courses. The chosen book shows that the focus in the two literature courses is on British literature, which covers the Victorian era, the Renaissance, and the Elizabethan era.
In the former curriculum, there was a compulsory course titled “History and Varieties of English” that aimed to inform student-teachers about the history of the English language, along with introducing them to some of the varieties of the English language. However, in the current curriculum, this course has been changed to an elective course. The department minutes, which included a report about the changes the committee agreed upon, did not explain why they decided to make this course an elective course. Also, there were no written proposals that might provide an explanation. Changing the course to an elective gave an impression that the other varieties of English are not of a similar importance to British and American English. By adding the History and Varieties of English course to the elective courses, there is an assumption that only student-teachers who are interested in the topic will be taking it.

Perceptions on English’s position in Libya. As an insider, I grew up considering English as a foreign language as I was taught. When I began my PhD study, I had no idea about World Englishes and IEL. Having the chance to understand World Englishes and EIL and TESOL scholars’ call for implementing them in TESOL teacher programs, I had a belief that my study should explore the position of English in Libya from the participants’ perspectives, especially that the national curriculum implements the communicative approach. Even though I was not able to conduct interviews for more in-depth discussions, I believe that exploring my participants’ perceptions stated in the questionnaires will open the door for more investigations and discussions in the Libyan context.

The second question of Part A of the questionnaire explored the participants’ perceptions on the position of English in the Libyan context. They were asked whether
the English language should be taught as a second language, a foreign language, or an international language and they were given three options to choose from: (1) ESL, (2) EFL, and (3) EIL. The participants’ perceptions were divided between EFL and EIL. TESOL emerged from the responses of one teacher educator. Unfortunately, some of the responses were succinct, with no detailed reasoning for the participants’ choices. Since I was not able to interview any of those who agreed to be interviewed, I lost the chance to ask the participants to elaborate on their views.

**EFL.** English was perceived as a foreign language by nine of the 15 teacher-educators and nine of the 18 student-teachers. The participants’ reasons varied and ranged from considering Libya as one of the countries in the Expanding Circles under Kachru’s circles to that English is not an official language and is rarely used outside of the formal context. With a similar perspective, Dr. Morgan explained that English is perceived as a foreign language because “the use of the language in Libya is very limited and it's taught as one subject at schools, and it's not given much attention” (Q6, 2015, p. 1). Likewise, Dr. Max indicated that the use of the English language in Libya is limited to English classes and academic studies. Another participant gave a similar reason for perceiving EFL and related it to the nature of the program. Dr. Dylan explained that EFL is “the general orientation of all the courses given at the department”, and it is “one of the aims of the college” (Q11, 2015, p. 1). She further specified these aims as “to qualify people to become competent TEFL teachers” (Q11, 2015, p. 1).

Document analysis supports the participants’ claims in that EFL is the program’s “general orientation” (Q11, 2015, p. 1). In the “Description, Vision, and
Mission” section of the curriculum, it is stated that English is considered and taught as a foreign language.

**EIL.** Five of the 15 teacher-educators, nine of the 18 student-teachers, and all graduates perceived English as an international language. The teacher-educators who perceived as an international language are educators from other nationalities and are recent Libyan graduates of Master’s programs. English was perceived as an international language because “treating English as just another foreign language will put it on equal footing with Spanish, or Nippongo, or Korean, which are not as internationally accepted as the language used, in business, trade, or the academe” (Q15, 2015, p. 1).

Student-teachers stated that even though they were taught that English is a foreign language in Libya; they perceived English as an international language. One student-teacher, Barbara, assumed that considering English a foreign language “makes it seem as if it is an unimportant language” (Q19, 2015, p. 1). Adele, another student-teacher, explained that EIL is “the best choice” because the program includes teacher-educators from around the world (Q18, 2015, p. 1).

Student-teachers also perceived English as EIL because it is a global language that is widely used for communication, not only with natives, but also with non-natives; the language is used in scientific and medical fields, and it is also used for academic and governmental purposes. Daisy explained that English “is needed by all people, no matter what field they are in; wherever and whenever they travel or study abroad, they need to use English communicatively” (Q21, 2015, p. 1). For Camellia, English is “the language used internationally for different academic and governmental purposes. It is also the language used by people from different countries to communicate with other people in
social media from almost all around the world” (Q20, 2015, p. 1). Talisha’s explanation sums up some of her peers’ reasons for choosing EIL over the other language options, and she links her choice to one of the approaches in ELT:

Teaching English as an international language in Libya has many advantages. Firstly, this will help to create curriculums that include all the purposes of learning English, since some learn it for educational purposes, some for political, and some for economic and company related purposes. Also, it will help teachers to follow CLT [a communicative language teaching approach] as a method in the classroom. Another point is that establishing English is an international language will help to communicate not only with natives, but also with non-natives using English. (Q25, 2015, p. 1)

Like student-teachers, graduates English as an EIL, even though they were taught that English is known as a foreign language in the Libyan context. Imma explained her perceptions in some detail:

We were taught to say “Foreign language”, as English is not widely spoken in Libya, so we can’t consider it as a second language. We study English so we can communicate with non-Arabic speakers, and so, it should be emphasized as an international language because if we just consider it as a foreign language, [we] would be underestimating it. (Q28, 2015, p. 1)

For some graduates, English is no longer a foreign language because it is available through varied sorts of media. From this perspective, Agatha believes that EIL should be chosen by the program because “English is available for Libyans through
different kinds of media, so it is not a foreign language, as it was before” (Q33, 2015, p. 1).

Another significant reason for perceiving English as an EIL is that English is a “global language” that is used in technology, education, commerce, science, business, communication, entertainment, social media, and other sectors. Heaven emphasized that the “English language has become the medium of international communication, education, commerce, science, technology, and entertainment. So, English should be taught as an international language in Libya to prepare students for these opportunities” (Q30, 2015, p. 1). With a similar perspective, Agatha indicated that today, “English is known as the language of communication in business and social media. So we should teach it as an international language (Q33, 2015, p. 1). Likewise, Edda considers it a global language that provides “access” to various sectors (Q32, 2015, p. 1). She explained that choosing EIL will provide student-teachers with what she called “access to the world” and detailed:

because it’s a global language which is globally used, it is most important for acquiring access to the world. It is the language of wider communication. It is used in university studies and as the medium of science, as a library language, [as a language for] technology and international trade, and as a contact language between nations and parts of nations. (Q32, 2015, p. 1)

Another graduate asserted that English should be considered as an EIL, asserting its significance in many sectors. Nannie stressed that teaching English as an International Language is “the best choice” because it is spoken in many countries around the world. She added that it is the language of business and finance, the language that is used for
education, the language of the Internet, and the language that is used when travelling” (Q26, 2015, p. 1).

Document analysis revealed that there is no indication of EIL in the “Description, Vision, and Mission” section of the curriculum. Even though some of the program’s teacher-educators are international teacher-educators, the program still considers English as a foreign language.

**TESOL.** One of the teacher-educators perceived English as the language that is taught to speakers of other languages (TESOL). Dr. Jessie stated that “TEFL is and has been used widely in the literature in relation to teaching contexts where English is a foreign language” (Q8, 2015, p. 1). She noticed that I used TESOL in my questionnaire and indicated that TESOL “appears to be a reasonable choice, which neutralizes the argument for or against the foreign/second dichotomy” (Q8, 2015, p. 1). This note made me realize that I should have added TESOL among the other choices in the questionnaire.

**Participants’ Perceptions on the TESOL Teacher Education Program’s Responsibilities**

Before exploring the participants’ perceptions on their program’s affordances and constraints, it was necessary to understand their views about the roles and responsibilities of TESOL teacher education programs. It seemed necessary to understand what the participants perceived as TESOL teacher education programs’ responsibility to explore if the investigated program meets the participants’ expectations. The first question in Part B of the questionnaire was an open-ended question that asked the teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates about the roles and responsibilities of TESOL teacher education programs.
TESOL teacher education programs were described as being “significant” because they are responsible for preparing student-teachers as future ESOL teachers. One of the participants specified that the program’s basic responsibility is designing curriculum that she described as being “dynamic, updated, and relevant to the [student-teachers’] needs” (Q15, 2015, p. 2). She further explained that technology use is emphasized in a dynamic curriculum, which trains student-teachers to use technology in language teaching. For her, an updated curriculum is a curriculum in which its content reflects recent research findings and TESOL standards. The curriculum becomes relevant to student-teachers when it reflects the Libyan national curriculum and meets the Libyan Ministry of Education’s ELT objectives. It was surprising to find that one of the Libyan teacher-educators thought that the program should meet the TESOL standards.

Most participants perceived TESOL teacher education programs as programs that provide “guidance” for student-teachers to understand their responsibilities as teachers, what is expected of them, and how they can teach. Thus, they perceived the basic role of TESOL teacher education programs as to prepare student-teachers to become effective ESOL teachers by setting clear objectives and by providing teacher preparation and training courses, language proficiency developmental courses, and school-based teaching practices, along with other responsibilities.

Document analysis showed that the program meets the participants’ perceptions regarding the program’s responsibility as a TESOL teacher education program. As shown in Figure 9, even though there is a focus on one aspect on the expense of the others, the program components include courses that prepare and train student-teachers to become ESOL teachers and courses that develop student-teachers’ language proficiency.
Document analysis also showed that the program provides student-teachers with school-based teaching practice. What seemed to be different from what the participants perceived as the program’s objectives since the objectives seemed to be simplistic and vague. In the following sections, I present the participants perceptions on the responsibilities of TESOL teacher education programs.

![Pie chart showing program responsibilities](image)

**Figure 9. Courses that show the program’s responsibilities.**

**Setting clear objectives.** Setting clear program and course objectives is perceived as the most significant responsibility for TESOL teacher education programs. Participants believed that having clear program objectives would provide student-teachers with a clear, long-term vision of what they need to achieve and how they can go about accomplishing their goals. One of the graduates stated that the set of clear objectives should be supported by “a modern curriculum” with “updated course content” and student-teacher training (Q31, 2015, p. 2). She explained that the modern concept of curriculum in TESOL teacher education in their program helps in moving from emphasizing textbook knowledge and memorization of information and content to engaging students in potential experiences that help them to become effective English
language teachers. She also emphasized the necessity of including topics that are relevant to students’ contexts and needs as future teachers.

**Providing teacher preparation and training courses.** Participants perceived teacher preparation and training courses as the basic role of TESOL teacher education programs. They believed that TESOL teacher education programs should educate student-teachers about language learning, teaching theories, and ELT methods and approaches, and then provide them with the chance to practice and apply what they have learned before they go to school-based teaching practice. As stated by one of the teacher-educators, TESOL teacher education programs should “provide the formal study of teaching and the teaching experience itself, which provides a sense for what to expect from [learners] and the kinds of classroom routines that can be used to organize [learners] and [their] work” (Q10, 2015, p. 2). With this perception in mind, the participants perceived courses that prepare student-teachers theoretically and courses that provide practical training as of significant in preparing student-teachers as effective English language teachers.

**Providing teacher preparation courses.** All participants perceived the Applied Linguistics and ELT Methods courses as the courses that prepare student-teachers theoretically to help them understand their responsibilities as language teachers. More specifically, the participants identified the basic responsibilities of teacher preparation courses as (1) preparing student-teachers for their roles as English language teachers and helping them identify their responsibilities to “understand what they must do as teachers” (Q19, 2015, p. 2), (2) helping student-teachers become familiar with ELT methods and approaches and “the newest techniques in teaching” (Q14, 2015, p. 2), (3) helping
student-teachers know how to choose/implement the appropriate ELT methods and approaches that are suitable to their contexts, (4) helping student-teachers learn how to design syllabi and lesson plans, (5) showing the student-teachers “the characteristics of effective teaching” (Q15, 2015, p. 2), (4) helping student-teachers understand how to create “good language learning environments” (Q27, Q29, & Q30, 2015, p. 2), (6) preparing the student-teachers for classroom challenges by familiarizing them “with the different methods of teaching and [with different methods for] dealing with students” (Q30, 2015, p. 2), and (7) helping the student-teachers understand the benefits of technology in language learning and how to use that in class.

Besides, some teacher-educators perceived the educational courses that are taught in Arabic as part of the program that help student-teachers to become effective teachers. They claimed that the educational courses help student-teachers to understand the characteristics of their learners and how to deal with them. The courses expose student-teachers to learners’ progressive psychological changes that learners go through from childhood to adolescence.

**Providing teacher training courses.** All respondents perceived providing teacher training courses as one of the basic roles of TESOL teacher education programs since these courses train student-teachers to teach before school-based teaching practice. For instance, one participant, Abigail, assumed that it is the program’s responsibility to train student-teachers after “introducing them to classes that explain how to teach English” to “practice teaching and be prepared for real classroom” challenges (Q16, 2015, p. 2). All participants referred to the Strategies 2 course that is offered in their program, and they
said this class is of significance since student-teachers are trained by preparing lesson plans and teaching their peers.

**Providing school-based teaching practice.** Providing school-based teaching practice was perceived as the basic responsibility of TESOL teacher education program by all the participants. They believed that the program’s basic responsibility is not only to provide school-based teaching practices, but also to ensure effective teaching practice assessment criteria. As stated by one of the participants, providing school-based teaching practice to student-teachers to “practice teaching for a long period of time” helps them “learn from their mistakes” (Q16, 2015, p. 2).

Participants believed that school-based teaching practice provides opportunities for student-teachers to prepare themselves for their future jobs when they go teach at schools after graduation. Putting student-teachers in real classroom teaching experiences at schools was perceived as a chance for student-teachers “to implement what they have already studied”; in doing so, they can gain sufficient experience from their teaching and be prepared for their future responsibilities (Q21, 2015, p. 2). In a similar manner, Nancy, one of the graduates, explained the significance of teaching practice in that it “helps [student-teachers] practice the job even though they didn't turn to teachers yet, which in turn will make them capable of overcoming challenges and solving the problems they might have in future” (Q27, 2015, p. 2). For her, teaching practice places student-teachers in situations that they might face in the future and prepares them to help solve problems. Teaching practice helps student-teachers to avoid making mistakes through teaching and using the language that is needed in the classroom.
Providing language proficiency development courses. Out of the 33 participants, one teacher-educator, two student-teachers, and three graduates perceived improving student-teachers’ language proficiency as the responsibility of the TESOL teacher education programs. Participants explained that having courses that are devoted to grammar and the four macro-skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking) is of significance since they aim to improve student-teachers’ language proficiency. They believed that the program’s role is to stimulate students to learn English, to help them overcome the difficulties that are related to their language proficiency, and to provide them with chances that help them have “good” pronunciation and accents through listening and phonetics courses (Q23 & Q24, 2015, p. 2).

Student-teachers and graduates had specific views in regard to the significance of language improvement courses. The graduates claimed that the program needs to “emphasize the development of oral language skills” and believed that it should have a specific “focus on academic language and culturally inclusive practices” while equipping students with the skills they need in order to become effective teachers (Q29, 2015, p. 2). On the other hand, the student-teachers asserted that TESOL teacher education programs “should provide [student-teachers] with opportunities to communicate with native speakers as part of the educational program” (Q24, 2015, p. 2).

Other responsibilities. There were other responsibilities that were perceived by the teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates as of significance. The perceived other responsibilities included ensuring the selection of qualified instructors, providing effective learning environments, ensuring reliable assessment procedures throughout the
Participants’ Perceptions on TESOL Teacher Education Programs’ Essential Elements

When teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates were asked about the essential elements of TESOL teacher education programs, surprisingly, there was a consensus among the three groups of participants in that they perceived teacher preparation and training courses, teaching practice, and language proficiency development courses as the TESOL teacher education programs’ fundamental elements. In addition, some teacher-educators perceived independent learning practice among the programs’ fundamental elements.

Document analysis showed that the program’s curriculum consists of what the participants perceived as the programs’ fundamental elements. As shown in Figure 14 (p. 168): teacher preparation and training courses constitute 8% of the program, teaching practice constitutes 4% of the program, and language proficiency development courses constitute 62% of the program. There is no indication of independent learning practice in the program’s documents, which explains why the teacher-educators perceived it among the programs’ fundamental elements. In the following sections, I present the participants perceptions on the responsibilities of TESOL teacher education programs.

Teacher preparation and training courses. All participants perceived the courses that prepare student-teachers and train them to learn to teach as the most fundamental elements of TESOL teacher education programs. Courses, such as Applied Linguistics, ELT Methods, and Materials Development, were reported as teacher
preparation courses that teach student-teachers about language learning and teaching theories, methods and approaches of ELT, and preparing teaching materials. The Strategies 1 and Strategies 2 courses were reported as the courses that provide student-teachers with opportunities for training through peer teaching.

**Teaching practice.** All participants perceived school-based teaching practice as an essential element for designing an effective TESOL teacher education program. Participants believed that teaching practice provides student-teachers with opportunities to teach in a real classroom environment and learn through practice by dealing with real language learners.

**Language proficiency development courses.** Courses that give more attention to improving student-teachers’ language proficiency were perceived as one of the essential elements of TESOL teacher education programs. Participants emphasized the significance of nurturing student-teachers’ knowledge of the English language and developing their language proficiency through “well-designed” listening, speaking, reading, writing, and grammar courses.

**Independent learning practice.** Some of the teacher-educators perceived independent learning practices as an essential element in TESOL teacher education and stressed the significance of adopting learner-centered approaches. Those educators believed that in order to meet the 21st century’s needs, and in order to train student-teachers to be professional English language teachers, TESOL teacher education programs should concentrate on helping student-teachers acquire all the necessary teaching skills that are directly related to learner-centered approaches. With this perspective, Dr. Sam, one participant, detailed that “independent learning practice and
critical thinking habits are to be fostered by certain ‘open’ courses or original assignments, and these assignments should be given more credit than testing the memory [through] exams” (Q2, 2015, p. 2).

As seen, teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates had a consensus on the basic elements of TESOL teacher education programs. They agreed that TESOL teacher education programs should include (1) courses that provide the theoretical and pedagogical knowledge, (2) courses that provide opportunities to learn lesson planning and teaching through peer teaching, (3) courses that provide language improvements opportunities, and (4) school-based teaching practice as the essential elements.

**Participants’ Perceptions on the Program’s Affordances and Constraints**

The first research question inquired about how the teacher-educators, the student-teachers, and the graduates of the English Department at the Faculty of Education at Oya University perceive and understand the affordances and constraints of their existing TESOL teacher education program. I planned to collect data using three sources; however, data was only collected through documents and questionnaires. All interviewees who agreed to be interviewed withdrew from the study due to a lack of electricity. Libyans have been suffering from outages since 2011 and the situation got worst since 2014 as outages last longer than 10 hours (Libyan Express, 2016a, 2016b; Matar, 2015; Reuters, 2015a, 2015b). Consequently, the participants were unable to reach me due to the continuous blackouts and low Internet services that were taking place during data collection period and are still affecting the people living in the context of the study.
To answer the first research question, findings of participants’ perceived affordances and constraints are presented jointly with the findings from the documents. Documents included information about the investigated program’s curriculum, teaching practice and graduation project evaluation, and the changes that were made after Qaddafi was overthrown. The documents’ analysis was done by applying Wallace’s (1991) and Wright’s (2010) frameworks that included answering specific questions that are discussed in Chapter 3 and content analysis. Questionnaires included questions that examined the participants’ perceptions on their program’s affordances and constraints.

The participants’ responses were read thoroughly and were divided into piles in order to gather the emergent affordances and constraints. As discussed in the methodology chapter, I lost the chance of triangulating data because interviews were not conducted as planned, and therefore, my interpretations are affected with my personal involvement, values, beliefs, and reflection. As the researcher and an insider, I reviewed the data that was collected through questionnaires, and then determined the codes, categories, and themes and their meanings through reflection and analysis as well as by using NVivo.

As discussed in Chapter One, affordances are the actual and perceived properties of the program that the participants’ believed lead to their preparedness to teach as interactionists, whereas the perceived constraints are what the participants identified as limitations that inhibit goal achievement with the aim of improvement (Fu, Chu, & Kang, 2013; Greeno 1994; Haines, 2015; Murphy & Coffin, 2003; Norman, 1988). Accordingly, categories that clarify the participants’ perceptions on the program’s affordances and constraints were established. The participants’ perceived affordances are
the characteristics of the program that they seem to associate with their preparedness to teach. On the other hand, their perceived constraints are the conditions they believed affected and hindered their preparedness to teach and need action. The findings from the questionnaires showed that the three groups of participants had similar perceptions on the program’s affordances and constraints and the appropriateness of critical language teacher education as an approach for program reform. In the following sections, I provide an in-depth look at the perceptions of the teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates on their TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints.

**Participants’ Perceptions on the Program’s Affordances**

The three groups of participants’ perceived affordances were similar in believing that the assets of the investigated program lie in that it offers theoretical knowledge and practical training, focuses on developing student-teachers’ language proficiency, and provides school-based teaching practice. The relationship between their perceived affordances and the program is that the identified affordances are what the participants’ believed visible in preparing student-teachers to become effective ESOL teachers.

The findings of the analysis of the documents gathered from Oya University’s TESOL teacher education program support the participants’ perceptions. The program consists of diverse courses that develop student-teachers’ language proficiency, introduces them to the target language’s culture, and prepares and trains them to become language teachers. Participants’ perceptions align with the findings from document analysis in that the program provides theoretical knowledge and practical training, language development courses, and school-based teaching practice.
**Offering theoretical knowledge and practical training.** Ten of the teacher-educators and all student-teachers and graduates perceived offering theoretical knowledge and practical training as one of the program affordances. Offering teacher preparation and training courses that provide student-teachers with knowledge on how to teach and a chance to practice teaching on campus were considered as program affordances because student-teachers are being “prepared and trained for real classroom challenges” (Q2, Q13, Q19, Q25, 2015, p. 4).

**Teacher preparation courses.** Document Analysis revealed that teacher preparation courses are the courses that educate student-teachers and help them learn how to teach English, which include courses that focus on teaching methods, lesson planning, classroom management, and assessment, which explains the participants’ perceived affordance. For instance, the participants perceived the ELT Methods and Approaches course as an affordance because it gave them a chance to know what methods to use when teaching English.

**Teacher training courses.** Document Analysis showed that teacher training courses are the courses that provide student-teachers with opportunities for peer teaching. Strategies 1 and Strategies 2 courses were perceived among the program’s affordances because the courses still help the student-teachers become “prepared to play the role of a real teacher” (Q27, 2015, p. 4).

The findings from document analysis support the participants’ perceptions in that the program provides student-teachers with diverse courses that prepares and trains them to become language teachers through on-campus and school-based teaching practice. As shown in Table 10, the investigated program’s knowledge base covers pedagogic
knowledge, pedagogic content knowledge, technological pedagogical content knowledge of TESOL teacher education knowledge base.

Table 10

*Compulsory/Elective Courses Representing the Program’s Knowledge Base (1)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Base</th>
<th>Compulsory / Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>No. of Courses</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogic Knowledge</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strategies 1 &amp; Strategies 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogic Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Methods of ELT. Teaching English to Young Learners, Teaching English Skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pedagogic knowledge is covered in two courses—Strategies 1 and Strategies 2. In these courses, students learn about teaching strategies, beliefs, and practices, as well as lesson planning and classroom management. Pedagogic content knowledge is taught in Methods of Teaching, which deals with English, in general, and how English language skills are taught. Technological pedagogical content knowledge is represented in the Computer Assisted Language Learning course; in this class, student-teachers formally learn how to use technology to teach English and help learners learn the language using technology. There is a connection between the ELT courses and teaching practice. However, ELT courses have fewer credits compared to the number of courses and credits student-teachers take.

**Focusing on developing student-teachers’ language proficiency.** Nearly all the teacher-educators and all student-teachers and graduates strongly perceived the program’s focus on developing student-teachers’ language proficiency as an affordance.
They declared that the program provides courses that focus on language with varied content, which “helps student-teachers improve their language” proficiency (Q4, 2015, p. 2). For them, focusing on improving student-teachers’ spoken and written language proficiency is of significance since they are going to teach English. For instance, Dr. Dylan explained that the program focuses “on the four macro skills”, in which student-teachers take several courses related to each skill with the aim of helping them improve their spoken and written language (Q11, 2015, p. 2).

As shown in Table 11, the investigated program’s knowledge base covers content knowledge and support knowledge. Content knowledge courses focus on student-teachers’ knowledge of subject matter, which includes courses that develop students’ listening, speaking, reading, writing proficiency, grammar, literature, phonetics, and translation. Support knowledge is covered through different courses that are related to linguistics, applied linguistics, and research methods.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Base</th>
<th>Compulsory / Elective</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>No. of Courses</th>
<th>Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Knowledge</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>All language skills courses, Literature, and Phonetics courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Language skills courses, History &amp; Varieties of English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Knowledge</td>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Linguistics and Applied Linguistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elective</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics and Psycholinguistics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Document analysis revealed that 62% of the 94% of coursework is in language proficiency development, which explains the participants’ perceptions on language.
development courses. The program has “many different compulsory courses focusing on all areas of the English language, as well as the option to choose a few courses of [their] preference” that aims to develop students’ grammar and the macro skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) (Q23, 2015, p. 4). Two student-teachers specified precise tasks those courses provided that helped to increase their language proficiency. For instance, Camellia claimed that the listening and speaking courses gave them “the opportunities to give presentations”, which not only helped to improve their language skills, but also helped to raise their self-confidence and self-esteem.

Providing school-based teaching practice. All teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates strongly perceived school-based teaching practice as the most significant program affordance. Providing student-teachers with opportunities “to teach in [the] real classroom” (Q3, 2015, p. 2) enables them to connect between theory and practice while teaching. School-based teaching practice helps student-teachers apply what they have learned in their classrooms to their real teaching contexts before graduation and strengthens their teaching skills to overcome any real classroom challenges, which prepares them for their future jobs as English language teachers. Documents analysis supported the participants’ perceptions and showed that the program perceived school-based teaching practice as an opportunity for student-teachers to connect between theory and practice and apply what they have learned. As stated earlier, the analysis of the program’s Teaching practice assessment form revealed that student-teachers’ performance is evaluated by one teacher-educator from the program, one teacher-educator from the Psychology program, and the school principal, which gives the student teachers the chance to understand the complexity of TESOL from different perspectives.
These different perspectives help the student-teachers to be prepared for real classroom challenges and evaluations.

**Participants’ Perceptions on the Program’s Constraints**

The three groups of participants’ perceived constraints were not meeting the Libyan ministry’s objectives, having one program for three educational levels, not achieving program objectives, having curriculum deficiencies, having one form of assessment, not having quality assurance, and other limitations. The relationship between their perceived constraints and the program is that the identified constraints are what the participants’ believed were noticeable obstacles and limitations that inhibit student-teachers’ preparedness as ESOL teachers, which require actions that would eliminate perceived obstacles and limitations to help them become effective ESOL teachers.

The findings of the analysis of the documents gathered from Oya University’s TESOL teacher education program revealed that the program constraints include having simplistic goals and objectives, having one program designed for three educational levels, focusing on language development at the expense of teacher preparation and training, focusing on Standard English on the expense of other varieties, and having deficiencies in the curriculum adjustments that have been made in 2012.

Even though the program claimed that they were making changes to meet the needs of their student-teachers, the changes that were made in the curriculum do not take into account Libya’s current, unstable political and social situation that caused trauma and injustice. There is a need to prepare student-teachers for the challenges of teaching English in a context that is a conflict zone (Nelson & Appleby, 2015). Since the program is located in a country that is torn by war, social inequities, economic problems, and
political crisis, the investigated program seems to lack having a component on teaching in conflict zones as part of its knowledge base to prepare the student-teachers for the current classroom challenges. There is a need to consider the learners’ war-torn context and reform the curriculum to prepare TESOL teachers to teach English in a conflict zone, as well as a need to prepare them for post-conflict challenges and reconciliation.

In the following sections, I provide an in-depth look at the perceptions of the teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates on their TESOL teacher education program’s constraints along with the findings from the document analysis wherever necessary.

**Not meeting the Libyan ministry’s objectives.** Teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceived not meeting the Libyan ministry’s objectives as one of the program constraints. One of the teacher-educator’s reasons was related to how English was taught in Libyan public schools. She explained that the program did not meet expectations because English is taught for specific purposes “that are related to certain specializations, like medicine or engineering, which require knowledge about those areas” (Q3, 2015, p. 3). She believed that the program did not take those points into account when preparing student-teachers for real world teaching. One of the student-teachers explained that she thinks the program did not meet the ministry’s objectives because of the “low level students who graduated from the department and went to teach and failed in teaching effectively” (Q18, 2015, p. 3). Likewise, two graduates indicated that the program did not meet the Libyan MOE’s ELT objectives because some of the students were “neither highly proficient in their language nor in their teaching” (Q31, 2015, p. 3). Similarly, Agatha thought that the program did not meet the objectives and
hoped that the program would “deal with it [not meeting the MOE’s ELT objectives] in the future” (Q31, 2015, p. 3). She added that student-teachers did not take any courses that educated them about the Libyan curriculum. She explained that they “were left alone to tackle it during the teaching practice period” (Q33, 2015, p. 3). As I was not able to locate the documents that show the ministry’s objectives, I have nothing to support or refute the participants’ claims.

**Having one program for three educational levels.** Out of the 33 participants, ten of the teacher-educators, three student-teachers, and four graduates perceived having one program for three educational levels as a constraint. As one of them explained: “all students study the same courses” that prepare them for different educational levels (Q5, 2015, p. 3). Having all student-teachers to take the same courses to become English language teachers who can teach at primary, preparatory, and secondary schools was considered a constraint because they believed each level should have its own specific objectives and curriculum. They considered taking the same courses as one of the constraints because student-teachers are not being introduced to specific courses that deal with each level and show them how to help their learners. All of them believed that the department needs to have “a specific program for each educational level” (Q18, Q21, Q22, Q30, Q31, Q32, & Q33, 2015, p. 3).

Documents analysis supports the participants’ claims of having one curriculum for three educational levels. The program objectives include a statement that states the programs aims to “prepare English language teachers for all the different educational stages in Libya (primary, preparatory and secondary schools)” (Program Curriculum, 2015, p. 2).
Not achieving objectives. A number of teacher-educators perceived not achieving program objectives as a program constraint. One of them indicated that the “desired results are not achieved due to various reasons” (Q2, 2015, p. 3). One of the reasons for not meeting the ministry’s objectives is that the program’s outcome was “still limited to the cognitive domain”, even though it was designed to develop and enhance the student-teachers’ “cognitive, effective, and psychomotor skills” (Q4, 2015, p. 3). Another reason for not meeting the objectives was because of some of the university and institutional policies. Dr. Max assumed that some of the university and institutional policies “control” the program and “make it difficult to achieve its goals”, especially when university and faculty program developers “do not allow for changes, such as the ones related to university or faculty requirements” (Q7, 2015, p. 3). She further explained that when the program asks for changes in some of the university or the faculty requirements, this was usually faced with refusal, especially when the program requested that the educational courses should be taught in English.

The program’s goals and objectives are too simplistic and do not show the program’s educational ideologies. In the curriculum, it is stated that the program aimed to prepare the student-teachers to become effective teachers by improving their language proficiency and by helping them learn to teach through a number of courses and through a practicum (microteaching and teaching practice). The program objectives were as follows:

1) [To] prepare English language teachers for all the different educational stages in Libya (primary, preparatory and secondary schools).
2) [To] concentrate on scientific programs to develop listening, speaking, reading and writing skills.

3) [To] study [the] English language, its sounds and letters, its development and the relation between language and its teaching as a foreign/second language.

4) [To] develop students' ability[ies] to use modern technical strategies used in teaching language.

5) [To] develop students' spirit of thinking and creativity.

6) [To] develop students' aesthetical sense. (Program Curriculum, 2015, p. 2)

This set of goals seems too simplistic and does not show the program’s educational ideologies. The program’s goals are designed to prepare English language teachers for three educational levels. Also, in one of the objectives, the phrase “scientific programs” is vague and is not clearly defined (Program Curriculum, 2015, p. 2). This explains why teacher-educators’ perceived not achieving objectives as a constraint and called the program to revisit these goals and objectives.

**Having curriculum deficiencies.** Teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceived program-related deficiencies as constraints that hindered the effectiveness of the program. They identified the following curriculum deficiencies as program constraints: deficiencies in the number of courses and course content, repetition, irrelevant courses, elective courses, graduate project, assessment, quality assurance, and other limitations.

**Quantity vs. quality.** Teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceived the program’s focus on quantity over quality as a constraint that affected student-teachers’ preparedness to teach. As stated by one of the teacher-educators, the
program’s focus is “on quantity, rather than quality” (Q8, 2015, p. 4). This is explained as having “too many language courses” (Q3, 2015, p. 4) and “too many content and educational courses that students have to study at the expense of teaching practice” (Q4, 2015, p. 4). They specified that the program’s focus on offering them a large number of courses that are devoted to improving student-teachers’ language proficiency is regarded as one of the program’s constraints (Q3, Q4, Q8, Q19, Q23, Q24, Q31, & Q33, 2015).

As stated earlier, document analysis revealed that 62% of the coursework is in language proficiency development. As seen in Figure 10, 27 of the compulsory and elective courses are devoted to grammar, listening and speaking, reading, and writing, which explains why the participants indicated that the focus should be on the quality of the content of those courses, rather than on having a large number of courses that limit students’ chances of having more time on their practical training.

Figure 10. Number of grammar and basic skills courses.

**Content vs. time.** All participants perceived having the content of some courses that is more than the given course hours as a constraint that affects student-teachers’
development as effective teachers. There was a consensus between the participants in that the content of some courses was more than the given course hours. As a result, some of the requirements of the courses were either covered in a rush at the expense of the students’ learning or were left uncovered, which affected student-teachers’ understanding of similar topics in the advanced courses. More specifically, student-teachers and graduates complained that this procedure affected many student-teachers who failed or passed such courses with really low grades.

Documents analysis supported the participants’ claims and showed that the content of the following courses can be considered as more than the time offered: writing courses, grammar courses, linguistics, literature, and applied linguistics. For instance, in the writing courses, student-teachers are required to learn about the writing process and write different kinds of Essays. In the Writing 2 course, student-teachers are required to write seven types of essays that include: description, process, example, opinion, narrative, comparison/Contrast, and problem/Solution essays. Likewise, in the Writing 3 course, student-teachers are required to write 11 types of essays that include: description, narrative, opinion, comparison/contrast, process analysis, cause/effect, argumentative, reaction, literary, and suggesting solutions to problems essays. As can be seen, the content of the two courses is larger than the time given for the course, which leads to what the participants explained, i.e. content is not being covered or covered on the expense of student-teachers’ understanding.

**Repetition.** Teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceived the repletion of certain courses and courses content as a program constraint. The participants explained that there is some kind of redundancy in the types of courses and course
content. The participants provided a number of examples that show their perceptions on redundancy. One of the participants’ examples of redundancy was related to the writing courses in which they claimed that student-teachers learn to write essays. Another example was in the Research Methods course and the Academic Writing and Project Writing courses (Q12, 2015).

Some of the teacher-educators considered having a large number of courses that are dealing with improving student-teachers’ basic skills as some form of repetition. One example of having a large number of courses was the six reading courses that had the same objectives and purposes (Q14, 2015). Similarly, student-teachers and graduates accused the program of “wasting” their time; in fact, they believed that their time should have been spent on learning more about “advanced and challenging topics”, rather than spending time on repeating content that students had previously encountered at their secondary schools (Q17, Q19, Q20, Q24, Q26, Q30, & Q33, 2015). Camellia discussed this issue in detail:

It is good to focus on language development, but to have so many courses that repeat what we already took in the secondary school and be forced to retake that in the department is so not fair and doesn’t help. For example, having five courses of reading doesn’t mean that the student is going to improve his/her reading skills. It is better to have fewer courses with more challenging content, especially if the readings are about teaching or what is taught in the Libyan curriculum. (Q20, 2015, p. 4)

As stated by Camellia, forcing student-teachers to take five courses that aim at improving their reading comprehension and academic reading skills does not necessarily ensure
student-teachers’ language proficiency improvement. With a similar perspective, Sally insisted the following:

The first limitation of the program is the repetition of what had been previously studied in high school, which is, in my opinion, a mistake, because it doesn't allow the student to develop as a university student. In addition, it is a waste of time to spend more than a year at the university studying the previous curriculum.

(Q23, 2015, p. 4)

In a similar manner, as a graduate, Halina argued the following:

Some of the courses repeated what we took in the secondary school, so they were not as challenging as they should have been. Students with low language proficiency passed the courses easily and then got stuck in the advanced courses. There should be a focus on advanced levels from the beginning so the students would be prepared for the teacher preparation courses and teaching practice.

(Q31, 2015, p. 4)

All student-teachers and graduates believed that the program is offering “so many repeated courses”, which include the macro skills and grammar courses. Student-teachers and graduates believed it was unnecessary to offer these courses for three years, as they were not challenging. As a result, many student-teachers thought that they “did not learn anything new in these courses” (Q17, Q19, Q20, Q24, Q26, Q30, & Q33, 2015).

Finally, teacher-educators indicated that repetition is evident in the content of courses that are taught in Arabic and those that are taught in English. An example of repetition was found in the courses that educate student-teachers about the teaching methods and assessment (Q3, 2015). Likewise, student-teachers and graduates reported
that there is a redundancy in the types of courses and the content of some courses. An example of redundancy in courses is in the Writing, Reading, and Listening & Speaking courses, in which student-teachers are supposed to improve their language proficiency. Student-teachers and graduates claimed that all the courses aimed to meet the same objectives, even though they were divided into five courses. In fact, one student-teacher claimed that the Reading Comprehension courses and Advanced Reading courses had similar objectives. They indicated that the reading courses were taught in the same way by which student-teachers were required “to read and answer the questions with no discussions that would enrich [their] understandings about the topics” (Q22, 2015, p. 4).

Document analysis revealed that there is some kind of course repetition as the participants’ claimed. As shown in Figure 11, there is a pattern of repetition in the language development courses. Grammar and language skills courses are offered as seven courses that range in the level and difficulty of the content. All of the repeated compulsory and elective grammar and language skills courses aim for improving student-teachers’ language performance. Document analysis also supported the participants’ claims regarding repetition in some courses’ content. As stated by the participants, the basic skills courses include repetitive content.

![Figure 11. Repetition of some courses.](image)

*Irrelevant courses.* Some of the student-teachers and graduates perceived linguistics courses as irrelevant to their program. They blamed the program for focusing
on linguistics by offering Introduction to Linguistics, Theoretical Linguistics, and two
courses on phonetics on the expense of teacher training courses. The participants insisted
that the program was giving more time to these courses at the expense of the courses that
should provide them with the chance to practice teaching. Documents analysis revealed
that the program offers two linguistics courses and two phonetics courses as stated by the
participants.

The content of the Linguistics courses engages student-teachers in language and
its characteristics, major branches of linguistics, major school and basic distinctions in
linguistics, morphology, syntax, and semantics. The main of the two linguistics courses is
to “introduce students to some of the important theoretical concepts and empirical
findings of modern linguistics” and to “emphasize the connections between linguistics
and the many other academic disciplines that are concerned with the study of language”
(Program Curriculum, 2015, p. 30).

The phonetics courses engage student-teachers in the definition of phonetics,
pronunciation activities related to the consonants ad vowels, and the study of syllables,
stress, intonation, clusters, and aspects of connected speech. The main aim of the
phonetics courses is to “assist [student-teachers] to improve their performance” by
helping them understand “particular pronunciation difficulties” that would lead to
“improving their production of the sounds of the English words” (Program Curriculum,
2015, p. 28).

_Elective courses_. Two of the student-teachers perceived elective courses as one of
the program constraints. They complained that the program does not offer “interesting
and engaging” elective courses (Q18 & Q24, 2015, p. 4). They stated that the current list
of elective courses include more courses that focus on teaching basic macro skills and grammar. They thought that these elective courses were not challenging.

As can be seen in Table 12, the program’s focus is on language proficiency by offering eight courses that aim for improving students’ vocabulary, grammar, reading, listening, and spoken and written language. The program also provides 2 courses that aim for preparing and training student-teachers on teaching language skills and young learners. The other courses are concerned with educating student-teachers on the history of English language and its varieties, psycholinguistics, and another course of applied linguistics.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Focus</th>
<th>Program Courses</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language development courses</td>
<td>Advanced Reading 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Listening &amp; Speaking 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creative Writing 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical Structures 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Reading 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Listening &amp; Speaking 3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic Writing 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary Development</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher training courses</td>
<td>Teaching English Language Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching English to Young Learners</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other courses</td>
<td>History and Varieties of English</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Linguistics 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduation project challenges.** Some of the student-teachers and graduates perceived the graduations as one of the program constraints. It was surprising to find that some of the student-teachers and graduates did not know the reason behind having the graduation project as one of their program requirements. They were annoyed that they were required to write the graduation project, even though they found difficulty in finding
books and articles related to their research topics. They also confessed that they were “confused” because they did not know the purpose of including the graduation project in the requirements, since the project “would not be helpful after graduation” (Q16, Q18, & Q22, 2015, p. 4).

Document analysis showed that the program valued the graduation project and chose it to be among the Exit Requirements along with the school-based teaching practice. Also, giving the student-teachers the chance to conduct research as pairs and groups meant that the program valued collaboration. What seems missing is how this information is being transferred to student-teachers who are conducting and reporting their research.

**One form of assessment.** Four of the 15 teacher-educators perceived having one form of assessment as one of the program constraints. They complained that most of the program’s courses are assessed through midterm and final exams, which limited the forms of assessment. As stated by Dr. Pat, assessment “is mainly taking exams with no other forms of assessment that encourage students’ critical thinking and creativity” (Q5, 2015, p. 4).

Document analysis supports the participants’ claims in that the program is over-relying on one form of assessment that is exams. However, as an insider, I know that student-teachers are usually asked to give presentations in the Listening and Speaking courses and practice peer-teaching in the Strategies course.

**Not having quality assurance.** From 15 teacher-educators, four teacher-educators perceived lacks of quality assurance procedures as one of the program constraints. They stated that program does not follow specific standards and does not implement any
specific process for quality assurance to help monitor the standards of teaching and assessment (Q8, Q9, & Q11, 2015).

As an insider, I knew that here is a quality assurance committee, so, I sent an email asking for documents that show the responsibilities of the members of the committee. Unfortunately, I have not received any document. Thus, I have no data that would support or refute my participants’ claims.

**Other limitations.** All of the participants indicated that their program is affected by other limitations that hinder its effectiveness in preparing student-teachers. They perceived lack of applicable acceptance criteria, shortage of teaching staff, lack of resources and facilities, and lack of professional development opportunities as other constraints that influenced the program’s effectiveness in preparing student-teachers. They believed that having these multiple items would help make the program more effective when preparing student-teachers.

*Lack of acceptance criteria.* All teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceived the program’s lack of acceptance criteria as a constraint that caused a number of problems in the program. They stated that new applicants are usually accepted by the university and sent to the program, regardless of the program’s conditions or readiness. This forced acceptance leads to having overly crowded classrooms and student-teachers who lack language proficiency.

*Shortage of teacher-educators.* All participants perceived the program’s shortage of teacher-educators as a constraint that caused a number of problems in the program. They reported that their program is affected by the shortage of teaching staff that is caused by the Ministry of Education, which is “making it very hard to employ new
members” (Q6, 2015, p. 4). Teacher unavailability has caused several problems, such as maximizing the teaching hours of the current teacher-educators and having them teach large size classes. Dr. Jessie explained that the issue of full-time teacher-educator unavailability has resulted in hiring adjuncts who are “local part-time [teacher-educators] that are below the required standards” (Q8, 2015, p. 4). Besides, Dr. Morgan stated that teacher-educator shortage has forced some student-teachers “to drop some courses” (Q6, 2015, p. 4).

All student-teachers and graduates complained that the problem of not having enough teacher-educators leads the program to either cancel some courses or to hire unqualified educators. Student-teachers and graduates claimed that as a result of a shortage of educators, some of the student-teachers’ progress was affected. The other consequence is that they were forced to be in large classes, where teachers relied on lecturing to help deliver course content. Finally, hiring unqualified educators meant that student-teachers’ chances of learning and improving were less than if they were taught by a qualified educator.

*Lack of resources and facilities.* All teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceived the program’s lack of resources and facilities as a constraint that hindered the program’s efficiency in preparing the student-teachers to become successful ESOL teachers. All the participants outlined that the program lacks the needed number of classrooms, teaching resources, library resources, and other facilities.

They indicated that they always had problems in providing all teacher-educators with classrooms, which resulted in having crowded classes. Teacher-educators also affirmed that the program does not have the necessary teaching aids, especially the
technological teaching resources. Another shortage is related to library resources.

Teacher-educators declared that the number of books in the library is really low, with no academic journals or online library electronic collections available. Finally, teacher-educators indicated that the program does not provide any kind of facilities to both teacher-educators and student-teachers. They declared that the Internet is not available to anyone. Dr. Jessie’s words sum up the situation in the program:

Teaching resources are poor, to say the least. At the moment, there is no language lab for listening and speaking; the computer lab is there but used for computer classes (1 & 2 & CALL). The number of PowerPoint projectors is insufficient and requires maintenance (input socket). The staff has to buy their own markers. The photocopier really needs maintenance, and white paper is scarce, too. The English section in the library (old fashioned manual system) is poorly stocked. (Q8, 2015, p. 4)

All student-teachers and graduates critiqued the program’s lack of resources and facilities. They agreed that the program’s constant shortage in the needed number of classrooms, teaching materials, library resources, and other facilities were constraints. They specified that classroom shortages resulted in having crowded classes, and this issue hindered student-teachers’ chances of language use in class. The participants claimed that most of the educators rely on lecturing instead of using more engaging teaching methods because the program does not have the essential educational and technological resources.

They complained that the program does not have enough computer labs, PowerPoint projectors, projector screens, printers, scanners, CD players, overhead
projectors, transparency sheets, and good quality whiteboards. The participants also criticized the program for not having Internet access and the difficulty of electronic communication between teacher-educators and student-teachers. Additionally, the participants condemned the program for the lack of availability and the expensive cost of textbooks. Besides that, they were critical of the availability of resources in the library with specific reference to the unavailability of journals and online resources, i.e., eBooks and e-journals. Finally, student-teachers criticized the program for not maintaining their privacy by posting their names and grades on Facebook and on the walls instead of providing them with secure online access that keeps personal information private.

Student-teachers and graduates complained about their program’s limited library resources. In fact, with a limited amount of library resources, student-teachers would face greater challenges in writing their graduation projects. They agreed with their teacher-educators in that the number of books in the library is really low, and no academic journals or electronic collections are available. Finally, student-teachers complained that the program does not provide Internet.

I was not able to gather any document that supports the participants’ claims about what they perceived as the program’s other constraints, which included the program’s lack of acceptance criteria, shortage of teacher-educators, and lack of resources and facilities. However, as an insider, and a former head of the program, I know that the program lacks what the participants specified and I guess that the situation is worse than when I was there due to the economic, social, and political challenges the country is facing.
Participants’ Perceptions on Critical Language Teacher Education

The second research was created as a result of my belief as an insider of the significance of implementing approaches that employ the concept of language teaching as a liberatory practice and teacher preparation programs that establish a dialogic process and engage student-teachers as transformative ESOL teachers to the Libyan context. I believed that the program needed to find approaches that help in preparing Libyan student-teachers to not only teach English in a conflict zone effectively, but also to be prepared to use ELT to create a positive change.

Thus, the second research question inquired about the perceptions and understandings of the investigated program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates on critical language teacher education as an approach for program reform as an opening for a serious discussion about the role of TESOL teacher education programs in Libya as a conflict zone. To answer this question, the questionnaire included Part E that asked the participants four open-ended questions in which the participants were asked to define critical language teacher education, to identify the relevance of critical language teacher education in the Libyan context, to determine their perceptions on having critical language teacher education as an approach for reform, and to classify their perceptions on peace, social justice, and humane education. I planned to use the participants’ questionnaire responses to begin a detailed discussion in the interviews. However, I found myself left with only the questionnaire results when all the interviewees withdrew from the study as a result of the stressful circumstances that was affected by long periods of blackouts.
Questionnaires data revealed that most of the participants perceived critical language teacher education as an effective approach for program reform, even though their responses showed that they do not understand the definition and role of the approach. They also perceived the inclusion of humane education in the curriculum as a necessity with regard to the ongoing social and political challenges that Libyans are facing. Document analysis revealed that critical language teacher education is not implemented in the program. There is no indication of the approach in any way in the program’s vision, mission, and goals sections and in the program’s other documents.

In the following sections, I present the participants’ perceptions and understandings of critical language teacher education and humane education. As I was not able to conduct interviews, my interpretation of data might have been affected by my own involvement as an insider.

Participants’ Perceptions on the Definition of Critical Language Teacher Education

In the first question of part E on the questionnaire, participants were asked to define critical language teacher education. Out of 33 participants, six teacher-educators, three student-teachers, and two graduates reported not having prior knowledge of critical language teacher education. Three of the teacher-educators explained that their lack of knowledge about critical language teacher education could have been attributed to the fact that they were literature majors, while one participant explained that his lack of knowledge could have been due to the fact that he was an IT major. Student-teachers and graduates stated that they have never studied the approach. The participants who claimed knowing the approach perceived training student-teachers to become critical thinkers and
raising student-teachers’ awareness of diversity as the defining features of critical language teacher education.

**Training student-teachers to become critical thinkers.** All participants, who defined critical language teacher education as an approach that trains student-teachers to become critical thinkers, believed that it aims at training student-teachers to become critical thinkers as students and future teachers. They perceived critical language teacher education as an approach in which student-teachers “learn critically and develop critical acumen” through questioning and critical evaluations and reflections (Q2, 2015, p. 6). The participants perceived critical language teacher education as an approach that engages student-teachers in activities that encourage them to “question ideas and conclusions” and “wonder why” (Q12 & Q13, 2015, p. 6). They also perceived it as an approach that helps student-teachers to become critical teachers. The participants thought that in this approach, student-teachers learn how to ask questions, they learn to critically evaluate the curriculum, they learn about their teaching practices, they learn to evaluate their teaching performance, and they learn how to evaluate their teaching outcomes. The participants also believed that it encourages student-teachers to reflect on their teaching and classroom practices with the aim of improvement.

**Raising student-teachers’ awareness about diversity.** A number of teacher-educators and graduates perceived critical language teacher education as an approach that raises student-teachers’ awareness about diversity and promotes equality in the classroom and in the culture (Q3, Q7, Q29, & Q33, 2015). They acknowledged that the approach engages student-teachers in critical evaluation, where student-teachers think critically about their contexts’ social and political situations and how these circumstances influence
minority learners in the classroom, with the aim of spreading justice and accepting
diversity (Q3 & Q27, 2015). One participant, Nancy, explained that the approach aims to
educate student-teachers about how to “help minority language speakers (colored, poor
students, migrants and refugees)” and how to help other learners to “socialize with the
majority [of] language speakers” in the classroom, aiming for social justice in the
language classroom (Q27, 2015, p. 6).

Participants’ Perceptions on the Relevance of Critical Language Teacher Education
to the Libyan Context

As with the previous section, some of the participants indicated their unfamiliarity
with the critical language teacher education approach, which made them unable to state
the relevance of the approach to the Libyan context. Other participants who thought that
the approach is relevant to the Libyan context believed that the approach can help create
change in the Libyan educational culture. The participants, who perceived critical
language teacher education as being relevant to the Libyan context, believed that the
dominant views about teaching and learning in the Libyan context are that teachers are
the providers of knowledge and that students are the receivers of knowledge.
Accordingly, they thought that an effective educational change should be through
implementing critical language teacher education.

The participants believed that a critical language teacher education approach
would help train student-teachers to become critical learners, which would enable them to
“skillfully analyze, assess, and reconstruct information about their learning” (Q2, 2015, p.
6). According to them, the approach would also help the student-teachers to become
critical teachers, which would “enable them to find effective pedagogical practices that
are appropriate to their contexts and [to] evaluate their own practices for improvement” (Q4, 2015, p. 6). Finally, the participants believed that the approach would lead to a critical culture.

**Participants’ Perceptions on Critical Language Teacher Education as an Approach for Curriculum Reform**

Respondents who perceived critical language teacher education as an effective approach for curriculum reform specified that implementing critical language education would train student-teachers to become effective critical thinkers and critical English language teachers. They believed that implementing the approach would also promote a critical thinking culture, which would hopefully result in positive reform.

*Trains student-teachers to become effective critical thinkers and teachers.*

There is a consensus between the participants in that they perceived implementing critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform would be helpful in training student-teachers to become effective critical thinkers and teachers. Teacher-educators argued that the approach encourages the student-teachers to “analyze ideas and evidence”, “guide[s] them to learn how to make decisions”, and helps them to “become effective thinkers” (Q2, Q4, Q12, Q13, & Q15, 2015, p. 6). Like the other teacher-educators, Dr. Chris believed that critical language teacher education helps student-teachers to “redefine their goals and [to] rethink their teaching methods and [to] choose what is appropriate for their classes” (Q12, 2015, p. 6). Similarly, Dr. Sam asserted that the approach “w[ould] be very beneficial since it w[ould] promote critical thinking in language learning, teaching, and social communication” (Q2, 2015, p. 6). Thus, teacher-
educators consider the approach an asset that would result in having critical language learners and critical ELT teachers.

With a similar perspective, student-teachers and graduates perceived critical language teacher education as a significance approach for their program reform. They explained that the approach would teach them how “to be critical”, how to “question everything [they] read”, how make their “own decisions about teaching”, and how to create “critical ELT teachers” in society (Q23, Q24, Q25, Q27, & Q29, 2015, p. 6). Since they thought the approach’s focus is criticality, student-teachers and graduates believed that the approach would help in improving the program’s curriculum and the student-teachers’ performances as language learners and teachers.

**Promotes a critical thinking culture and encourages positive reform.** The participants who believed that critical language teacher education is an effective approach for program reform assumed that it would promote a critical thinking culture and would encourage positive cultural reform. With what is going on in Libya, the political and social changes that caused injustices and unbalanced culture, the participants doubted the program’s current objectives and believed that the goal of their educational program should be to equip learners with facing such challenges and to educate them to promote criticality, peace, and justice (Q2, Q4, Q5, Q12, Q13, Q23, Q29, & Q31, 2015). A number of teacher-educators indicated that even though it is not easy to reach these goals, they believed that opening up the critical thinking capabilities of the student-teachers would result in promoting critical thinking in schools when they became teachers, even with young learners. They believed that a “greater effort has to be made in this direction, rather than just teaching some courses to fulfill the requirements” (Q2, 2015, p. 6).
Participants’ Perceptions on Peace, Social Justice, and Humane Education

To understand participants’ perceptions on peace, social justice, and humane education, participants were given a question that included three statements in which they were asked to state their views about including courses that help to raise students’ awareness about peace, social justice, and/or place and environmental issues in the curriculum. Most of the responses of student-teachers and graduates were really limited to just stating whether they agree or disagree with the statements without giving a detailed justification for their choices/beliefs. As I was not able to conduct the interviews and there is no indication of the approaches in the gathered documents, the following findings are a result of the participants’ responses and my interpretations.

What was clearly apparent in the responses of the participants is that they perceived the three approaches of significance while their perceptions were divided. Some participants were in favor of offering courses that give student-teachers the chance of discussing these concepts in separate courses, whereas other participants preferred integrating them into the curriculum.

**Offer as separate courses.** Teacher-educators argued that peace, social justice, and environmental issues should be introduced to students in separate courses because of the ongoing conflicts in Libya. Doing so would help students to face these issues in their future teaching. There is a belief among teacher-educators that peace, social justice, and environmental issues have to be discussed with students for a number of reasons, which include spreading awareness and improving social and environmental communication in order to help eliminate injustice. With this perspective, Dr. Jamie believed that having “a course or two” that deals with these issues is necessary, “especially after what has been
She further explained that the war against Qaddafi and the ongoing militia fights caused segregation and inequality between Libyans and believed that peace and social justice education could help bring positive change and could help spread equality and justice in the Libyan culture (Q9, 2015). With a similar perspective, one of the graduates assumed that these approaches could help to eliminate the injustices that caused some Libyans to live in refugee camps and to be treated as bad minorities. She alleged that peace and social justice education could help “spread awareness of equality and justice and the right of respectful living for every Libyan” (Q27, 2015, p. 6).

Dr. Riley discussed another perspective that was related to the empowerment of student-teachers. For her, the necessity of social justice education is that it helps educate student-teachers about treating learners equally. With a communicative perspective, Dr. Reed’s justification for including the social justice course is to help “develop student-teachers’ social and communication skills”, as well as their “relationships with their environments” to help strengthen the relationship between them and their communities (Q4, 2015, p. 6). She further explains that having such courses “leads to a better understanding and more collaboration” (Q4, 2015, p. 6).

**Integrate them into the curriculum.** A number of teacher-educators indicated that peace, social justice, and environmental issues should be integrated into the curriculum. For instance, Dr. Bailey believed that peace, social justice, and environmental issues should be integrated into the curriculum and explained the following:
In my humble opinion, awareness about peace, social justice, and environmental issues should be integrated in all courses, using them as the content of lessons in English. There is no need to have specific courses on those subjects, not because they’re not significant enough, but because they should not just be confined in specific courses. If they would be limited to specific courses, only students who would enroll in those subjects would be aware of those issues. (Q15, 2015, p. 6)

For her, integrating these perspective into the curriculum and having them discussed in all of the courses spreads awareness and can make a difference, compared to if they were included in only a few courses. Other teacher-educators thought that peace, social justice, and environmental issues should be integrated into the “macro skills courses” (Q1, Q3, Q12 & Q13, 2015, p. 6). With this perspective in mind, Dr. Charlie and Dr. Chris specified that peace, social justice, and place-based issues should be integrated into the reading courses, whereas Dr. Taylor and Dr. Riley indicated that they could be implemented in the listening and speaking, reading, and writing courses (Q1, Q3, Q12, & Q13, 2015).

**Participants’ Insights for Program Reform**

As the aim of this study was to identify the perceptions of the investigated program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates on their program’s affordances and constraints with the aim for action, the questionnaire included questions that explored the participants’ insights and suggestions for program reform. Thus, Part D in the questionnaire included six questions that encouraged the participants to provide their insights and suggestions for effective program reform. The participants called for
action and believed that the program needs to redesign the curriculum in the following ways:

- By acknowledging the significance of World Englishes in the program;
- By meeting the Libyan Ministry of Education’s ELT objectives;
- By revising the program’s policies;
- By revising the program’s objectives;
- By redesigning the overall program;
- By reconsidering assessment practices;
- By adopting/adapting new approaches;
- By offering students teaching internships; and
- By providing the program with the essential sources and services.

In the following sections, I discuss the participants’ insights and suggestions for actions that the participants thought would lead to an effective program reform.

**Acknowledging the Significance of World Englishes**

The participants, who perceived World Englishes as of significance that is similar to Standard English, disagreed with the program’s decision in changing the Varieties of English course into an elective course. They asserted that the program should introduce the Libyan student-teachers to the concept of World Englishes by adding the varieties course to the compulsory requirements of the program as it can lead to an appreciation in language varieties.

**Meeting the Libyan Ministry of Education’s ELT Objectives**

Participants who believed that the program did not meet the Libyan Ministry of Education’s ELT objectives proposed that the program should follow those objectives
when making revisions on the curriculum and that the program should teach the ministry’s ELT objectives, which would help in improving the effectiveness of ELT teacher preparation and training.

**Following the objectives of the Libyan ministry.** The participants suggested that one way to meet the ministry’s expectations is by taking into consideration the ministry’s “mission and the vision” and “the aims of the program” when designing and developing the program’s curriculum (Q4 & Q14, 2015, p. 4). In fact, participants considered the ministry’s objectives as the basis of the curriculum of the Libyan TESOL teacher education program.

**Teaching the ELT objectives.** Since many of the teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates did not know what the ministry’s objectives were, it seems acceptable to see that most of them necessitated everyone’s right to knowing those ELT objectives. Thus, they demanded including them in one of the courses to help educate student-teachers about the Libyan curriculum and to help teach them how to meet these objectives (Q3, Q8, Q12, Q13, & Q14, 2015, p. 4).

**Revising the Program’s Policies**

Several participants blamed their current dissatisfaction with the program on not having what they called “strict policies” (Q4, Q5, Q7, Q8, Q12, Q13, & Q31, 2015, p. 5). The participants’ most cited reason for their dissatisfaction with the program is related to not having “strict” acceptance criteria. The participants stated that students are always accepted without referring to specific acceptance criteria. As a result, the program has a large number of students with really low language proficiency. Accordingly, participants stressed the significance of having acceptance admittance criteria; such criteria could
include making sure that potential students would have acceptable high-school grade point averages and acceptable English language proficiency scores (Q4, Q5, Q7, Q8, Q12, Q13, & Q31, 2015). They also asserted that it is the program’s responsibility to make sure that the acceptance criteria is strictly followed.

With the aim of advocating for specific program policies, three teacher-educators and one graduate proposed more detailed suggestions for new policies. Dr. Pat suggested that the program should have a policy where the program is divided into two phases: the language proficiency phase and the teacher preparation phase. She explained that student-teachers would have to successfully meet specific language proficiency requirements before moving on to the teacher preparation phase. She further explained that in the first “two years, students [should] focus on [their] English Language proficiency” (Q5, 2015, p. 5). She suggested that student-teachers should not “pass to the third year until they pass a TOEFL or IELT’s test” (Q5, 2015, p. 5). She then proposed that the third and fourth years of study “c[ould] then be devoted to ELT methodology and training, whereas the fifth year c[ould] be devoted to practicing teaching at schools” (Q5, 2015, p. 5).

In a similar manner, Dr. Riley suggested a policy for teacher training in the TESOL teacher education program. Dr. Riley explained the following:

First of all, students should go through a foundation year, and only those who passed can be accepted in the program. In the 5\textsuperscript{th} semester, students should go to schools for classroom observation under the supervision of subject teachers. The aim is to get used to the school environment and classroom management. In the 6\textsuperscript{th} semester, they can do some micro-teaching for 10 to 15 minutes with the help
of subject teachers and [can] observe colleagues and other teachers. In the 7th and 8th semesters, they should teach full lessons at least three times a week. They should be monitored and supervised by experienced teachers and provided with constructive feedback. (Q4, 2015, p. 5)

In this policy, Dr. Riley asserts that the focus on improving student-teachers’ language proficiency should take place in the first year, whereas the remaining years of study should be focused on training student-teachers to learn to teach by practice.

A final suggestion was put forward by Dr. Max and Halina, in which they recommended that the program should have a policy where graduates are given a chance to spend a year in a native language environment before they start teaching at Libyan schools. They thought that giving TESOL teacher education graduates the opportunity to visit schools where English is being taught as an ESL would not only help them to improve their spoken language proficiency, but would also help them to evaluate how English is taught in different contexts (Q7 & Q31, 2015).

**Revising the Program’s Objectives**

The participants who did not have prior knowledge of the Libyan Ministry’s ELT objectives proposed revising the program objectives and taking those objectives into account. Since they believed that the program did not meet the Libyan Ministry’s ELT objectives, the participants insisted that the program’s curriculum “should be redesigned” to meet these expectations (Q4, Q13, & Q14, 2015, p. 4). They asserted that the curriculum should be revised and updated to meet the needs of student-teachers and the objectives of the Libyan Ministry of Education so that when students become teachers, they would be prepared to achieve the ministry’s objectives.
Redesigning the Program

All participants, who were dissatisfied with the current program components, urged the program curriculum developers to redesign the curriculum and suggested a number of changes. They emphasized that the program should help prepare student-teachers for specific educational levels. They suggested that the program should make changes to the courses’ number and content. Additionally, participants suggested that the program should focus on practice, should focus on school-cased teaching practice, should offer online and engaging elective courses, and should highlight the significance of professional development.

Designing specialized programs. The participants, who criticized the program for having one curriculum that prepares student-teachers to become primary, preparatory, and secondary school teachers, recommended that future program reform should include redesigning the program to include “two” or “three” curricula (Q14, Q18, & Q31, 2015, p. 6). This is to develop curricula that aim for preparing student-teachers for specific educational levels with a focus on learners’ needs and student-teachers’ needs (Q14, Q18, & Q31, 2015). The new curricula will also meet the Libyan Ministry of Education’s ELT objectives (Q14, Q18, & Q31, 2015). Only two of the participants, who proposed designing specific programs, provided details that would explain their views on what constitutes these programs. It seems necessary to highlight that the two detailed proposals are from the graduates. In the first proposal, Imma proposed that there should be two programs that are:

for two educational levels, in which one is for primary and preparatory teachers, and the other one is for secondary teachers. Each program will have its specific
objectives and curriculum. There will be courses that can be taken by students from both programs and different courses for each section. (Q28, 2015, p. 6)

As can be seen in her proposal, Emma suggested having two programs that aim at preparing student-teachers for specific educational levels and includes precise purposes to train student-teachers to either become primary, preparatory, or secondary teachers. She explained that the program might have courses that are taken by student-teachers from both of the programs, while there could be courses that aim at training them for the educational level in which they choose. With a similar perspective, but through a different design, Halina proposed that the program should design three different programs that each prepares one educational level, not one program for primary, preparatory, and secondary school teachers. Each of the two programs will have its own objectives and curriculum. The first program will target students who would like to become teachers of young learners and will provide them with instruction on how to approach and plan for and teach young learners. The second program will target students who would like to become teachers of preparatory school learners and will provide them with instruction on how to deal with them and how to teach them. The third program is for students who would like to become secondary school teachers. If I were on the committee, I would make policies that would require having a specific number of students in each program so that students do not crowd into one program and leave the others. (Q28, 2015, p. 6)

In her proposal, Halina preferred designing programs that aim for preparing teachers for three educational levels (i.e., primary, preparatory, and secondary schools). She preferred
having a separate program that prepares student-teachers for young learners. Her proposal was so detailed that she even thought of having a policy that helped to prevent having large numbers of student-teachers in one program over the other.

**Making changes to course numbers.** The program was criticized for focusing on “quantity” over “quality” by having a large number of language courses (Q3, Q4, Q8, Q19, Q23, Q24, Q31, & Q33, 2015, p. 6). The participants suggested that the program should reduce the number of courses by integrating courses that can be taught together and by providing courses that can be taken online.

**Integrating courses.** Participants thought that the program could reduce the number of language development courses and could focus on quality over quantity by integrating some of the courses. One example was proposed by Dr. Max, in which she suggested integrating reading and writing courses. She indicated that the program can “have one reading comprehension and one writing course in the first semester. Then, the program can integrate reading and writing” (Q7, 2015, p. 6). She explained that “the two skills complement each other and should be taught and learned together” (Q7, 2015, p. 6). In a similar manner, Dr. Blake thought that “some courses should be integrated and shortened” (Q14, 2015, p. 6). Like Dr. Max, Dr. Blake suggested integrating the reading and writing courses, making a specific reference to “the advanced level” courses (Q14, 2015, p. 6). Dr. Blake further explained that the program could “have two reading comprehension courses and two writing courses in the first year, and then have them as integrated skills in the second year (Q14, 2015, p. 6).

All of the participants complained that some of the course hours are not suitable to cover the content of those courses. Teacher-educators usually find difficulty in
covering all the requirements of the courses, which usually have negative consequences on students’ learning and achievement. Accordingly, they suggested revising the content of the courses and making a decision on how to reduce the content by evaluating the content and deciding what should be among the course requirements.

**More focus on practice.** Most of the participants urged the program to focus on practice and proposed a number of suggestions. To begin with, they suggested adding more time to the theoretical courses and courses that train the student-teachers to learn how to teach. They proposed adding more hours to the courses that engage student-teachers with the theoretical components of the program so that they could learn how to implement what they had learned. Participants also agreed that it would be important to add more course hours to the Methods of ELT, Strategies 1, Strategies 2, and CALL courses.

In addition, the participants assured the significance of the ELT methods and approaches course in familiarizing student-teachers with the different methods and approaches that are used to teach English and to facilitate learning. They suggested adding a practical component in which student-teachers learn how to choose the appropriate teaching methods and approaches. They also encouraged using videos and observations instead of lecturing and memorization to help them learn and practice critical evaluation of those methods and approaches. Videos and observations were also suggested as tools to help student-teachers predict real classroom challenges.

Moreover, participants suggested adding a course that is devoted to teaching the student-teachers about testing and ELT assessment and evaluation because they thought that the course that is taught in Arabic was “not meeting [their] student-teachers’ needs”
In addition, a number of the participants criticized having the Teaching English Skills and Teaching Young Learners courses as electives and proposed changes to include them among the core program requirements.

**Focusing on school-based teaching practices.** All participants agreed on the necessity of school-based teaching practices for student-teachers. Thus, they suggested that there should be a seminar that aims to familiarize student-teachers with the kind of responsibilities and roles they play and informs them about the kind of teaching challenges they might face. Student-teachers and graduates insisted on informing teacher-educators about the significance of having respectful relationships between them as supervisors and training teachers. A number of student-teachers emphasized that the supervisors’ roles were not to find errors and faults, but to help student-teachers be more confident and improve as teachers.

Their suggestions for improving teaching practice included having a longer observation period, with a focus on evaluating and reflecting on what they had observed. The participants also suggested showing student-teachers sample videos of older student-teachers to make them feel more comfortable about teaching. They also suggested training them through observations and discussions in which they observe teachers teach and then discuss their observations on different topics, such as classroom interaction, teachers’ way of teaching, and the types of challenges the teacher and students faced.

They also suggested making the teaching practice at schools longer. Some proposed a semester-long teaching practice, whereas others proposed a year-long teaching practice (Q3, Q4, Q8, Q18, Q19, Q23, Q26, Q29, Q31, & Q33, 2015). The
participants also mentioned that the program should create “clear criteria for evaluation” (Q31, 2015, p. 6).

**Offering online courses.** Three of the international teacher-educators suggested providing student-teachers with a chance to take online courses (Q2, Q10, & Q15, 2015). They explained that the program should at least provide one online course for student-teachers to foster independent study skills, to teach them about the significance of virtual classrooms and online teaching, and to help familiarize them with online teaching models (Q2, Q10, & Q15, 2015).

**Offering more engaging elective courses.** Three student-teachers suggested that the program should revise the elective courses and should provide more engaging courses. They claimed that the program did not consider offering elective courses that would add to their knowledge because the list of electives included courses that were compulsory and were changed to be electives. One of them suggested adding seminars and public speaking as a course (Q18, 2015).

**Highlighting the significance of professional development.** When participants were asked about how the program could help its graduates understand the importance of engaging in professional development projects or activities, they proposed a number of suggestions that should be taken into account in the program’s future reform. First, eight of the student-teachers and six graduates insisted on the significance of clarifying the purpose of having the graduation project among the program requirements. This is because many of them indicated their confusion about how it could help them when they became teachers. As stated by one student-teacher, it is the responsibility of the program to help the student-teachers understand that the graduation project is “more than just a
requirement for graduation” (Q23, 2015, p. 6). Teacher-educators need to explain that the graduation project “is training students on research so that they [can] learn what to do after graduation and to learn that collaboration with peers is essential” (Q23, 2015, p. 6).

Student-teachers and graduates complained that the program does not provide any kind of professional development opportunities, either for current students or graduates. For that reason, they proposed that the program offers “workshops, seminars, and/or conferences” that would provide them with avenues for professional development during their study and after graduation (Q18, Q21, Q25, Q30, & Q33, 2015, p. 6).

Reconsidering Assessment Practices

A number of the participants complained about the program’s overreliance on exams as forms of assessment in most of the courses and urged for a reconsideration of the teacher-educators’ assessment practices. Their suggestions covered formative, interim, and summative assessment in that they are assessed throughout their learning process and not just in the middle and end of the semester. They recommended including homework, quizzes, discussions, presentations, written essays, reflections, multimedia projects, and group projects as various assessment forms, along with midterm and final exams. Using different forms of assessment in each course encourages student-teachers to not solely rely on memorization (Q8, Q10, Q22, & Q33, 2015).

Another complaint that is related to assessment was offered by some of the student-teachers and graduates. They indicated that the assessment of student-teachers’ graduation projects and teaching practices were not clear. Thus, they advised revising the rubrics and making them more effective in order to assess the performance of the student-teachers.
Finally, one of the teacher-educators suggested that there should be a form of assessment that mainly focuses on student-teachers’ language proficiency and takes place before making decisions on who goes to schools to practice teaching. She explained that this assessment helps in that only “those who pass on to the next stage [of the program] ‘deserve’ to be in the program until graduation” and described this phase as “the last gate” (Q8, 2015, p. 6). With a similar perspective, another teacher-educator suggested that the “department forms a committee that examines students’ language proficiency” (Q10, 2015, p. 6). The main purpose of the committee is to identify the student-teachers who have high language proficiency and met the requirements of school-based teaching practice. She further asserted that her suggestion would help to prevent the program from having graduates with low [language] proficiency” (Q10, 2015, p. 6).

**Adopting/adapting New Approaches**

A number of teacher-educators and student-teachers argued that the program relies heavily on the role of teacher-educators in helping student-teachers learn. They believed that the program should engage the student-teachers in their learning responsibilities and recommended exploring new approaches for teaching, such as learner-centered instruction and task and project-based approaches. Dr. Sam explained that “independent learning practice and critical thinking habits are to be fostered by certain ‘open’ courses or original assignments, and these assignments should be given more credit than testing the memory by exams” (Q2, 2015, p. 6).

**Teaching Internship**

Even though this suggestion came from only one of the teacher-educators, it is considered as one of the significant suggestions. As a recent graduate of an American
Master’s program and a former intern herself, the teacher-educator suggested including “one semester of [an] internship” to the program (Q1, 2015, p. 5). She explained that, as interns, student-teachers learn the details of teaching that they might not come across while peer teaching or during teaching practice. Her examples included dealing with learners’ learning problems and maintaining classroom discipline.

Providing Program with the Essential Resources and Services

All participants believed that the university should provide the program with basic needs, which include hiring qualified teacher-educators, guaranteeing the availability of teaching materials and library resources, and ensuring the availability of other services that teacher-educators and student-teachers need. The participants argued that relying on adjuncts that are unqualified to teach at a TESOL teacher education program would not help student-teachers to achieve their goals. They also insisted on the university’s responsibility in providing classrooms, labs, and necessary teaching materials. They requested providing Internet services and any other services that might improve the program’s efficiency in preparing competent English language teachers.

Summary of Interpretive Analysis Findings

In this chapter, I presented the results of the study that investigated one of the Libyan TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints, as reported by its teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates along with my views as an insider whenever needed. I also presented the participants’ perceptions on critical language teacher education as an approach for program reform as well as their insights and suggestions for curriculum reform. The study results show that even though the participants were satisfied with some of the components of the current curriculum, they
were dissatisfied with a number of issues. What follows is a summary of the interpretive analysis of findings.

**Program Affordances**

What the participants’ perceived as the program affordances showed their satisfaction with what the program offers to prepare the student-teachers to become effective ESOL teachers. The participants perceived the courses that the program offered to provide student-teachers with theoretical knowledge about teaching and practical training, the courses that aimed for improving student-teachers’ language proficiency, and school-based teaching practice as the program affordances because they perceived them as the basic components of effective TESOL teacher education. The participants’ perceptions confirm what scholars stated on the relationship between the affordances and the environment provides and how the perceivers utilize the program affordances for efficient ESOL teachers’ preparation.

**Program Constraints**

Even though they were satisfied with a number of the program’s components, the participants’ perceptions on the program’s constraints showed dissatisfaction with other components of the program. The participants perceived the following as program constraints:

- **Goals and objectives.** The participants believed that the program neither met the MOE’s ELT objectives, nor did it achieve its goals and objectives.

- **One program designed for three educational levels.** The participants were dissatisfied that curriculum is designed to prepare student-teachers to teach English at Libyan primary, preparatory, and secondary schools.
• **Curriculum deficiencies.** The participants reported that curriculum includes a large number of courses at the expense of quality. They believed that the content of some of the courses cannot be covered within the course time. They considered repetition of some of the courses as ineffective and a waste of time. Some student-teachers and graduates complained that the program offers too many linguistics courses at the expense of ELT related courses. They considered linguistics as irrelevant to ELT. Some student-teachers and graduates also criticized the elective courses as being uninteresting and not challenging. They considered the graduation project as a requirement that would not be helpful after graduation.

• **Focus on British/American English and culture.** The participants reported that student-teachers are introduced to the British language and culture in the grammar and literature courses and to the American English and culture in the listening and speaking courses. They stated that World Englishes and the English varieties course are offered as an elective course.

• **One form of assessment.** The participants showed dissatisfaction with assessment because assessment in most of the courses depends on midterm and final examinations.

• **No quality assurance.** Some teacher-educators thought that the program lacks any effective form of procedure to maintain quality or to monitor teaching excellence.

• **Other limitations.** The participants reported the program’s shortage of teacher-educators, lack of acceptance criteria, and lack of resources and
facilities as the other limitations that influenced the program’s efficacy in student-teachers’ preparation and training.

The participants perceived the previously mentioned limitations as constraint that influenced students-teachers’ preparedness as ESOL teachers. They believed that their perceived constraints should be taken into consideration in the program’s future reform.

**Critical Language Teacher Education as an Approach for Curriculum Reform**

The participants believed that critical language teacher education is an effective approach for curriculum reform. However, their responses showed that they do not truly understand the approach’s definition, as they only focused on critical thinking, even though they admitted the need for the approach due to Libya’s current crisis.

**Participants’ Suggestions and Insights**

Participants provided a number of insights for efficient curriculum reform that urged the program to acknowledge the significance of World Englishes in the program, meeting the Libyan Ministry of Education’s ELT objectives, revising program policies, revising the program objectives, redesigning the program, reconsidering assessment practices, adopting/adapting new approaches, including a teaching internship, and urging the Libyan university to provide the program with its essential needs.

In a country that is considered a conflict zone, education plays a great role in making a positive change. Program reform should not only consider what constitutes preparing effective TESOL teachers, but should also consider how to prepare student-teachers to teach in conflict/post-conflict zones. Since the participants were in favor of implementing empowerment approaches, it seems that participants acknowledged the need for more empowering pedagogies and approaches, which should be considered in
the program’s future reform. Participants’ lack of detailed explanations might have been a result of the dominant “fear of retribution from armed groups and non-state actors” that lead to avoiding criticizing the 2011 revolution, the current struggles, and the relevance of the critical language teacher education, peace education, social justice education, and humane education to the Libyan context (Freedom on The Net, 2015, p. 8).
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS, AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This exploratory study sheds light on the affordances and constraints of a TESOL teacher education program in Libya as a conflict zone as reported by its teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates. The study also illustrates their perceptions on critical language teacher education as an approach for program reform.

In the following sections, I discuss the themes that have been identified in the data in relevance to the current research on TESOL teacher education. I then explore the implications my findings have in TESOL teacher education in the Libyan context. Finally, I present a number of ideas for potential future research.

A Libyan TESOL Teacher Education Program’s Affordances and Constraints

The concepts of affordances and constraints were defined and briefly discussed in Chapter 1. In this section, I discuss my participants’ understandings of their program’s affordances and constraints. It seems necessary to always remind readers of this dissertation that since I was not able to conduct the interviews, participants’ perceptions are a result of the data that was constrained with my questionnaire questions for transparency.

The participants’ perceptions of what they considered as program affordances show some satisfaction with what the program offers to prepare the student-teachers to become effective ESOL teachers. The participants perceived the courses that the program offered to provide student-teachers with theoretical knowledge about teaching and practical training, the courses that aimed for improving student-teachers’ language proficiency, and school-based teaching practice as program affordances because they
perceived those courses and teaching practice as the basic elements of any effective TESOL teacher education program. Their perceptions show that affordances are bound with what a specific environment provides to the perceiver (Gibson, 1979). In other words, what the program provides for the student-teachers and they were able to utilize for their preparedness as ESOL teachers is perceived as an affordance.

On the other hand, the participants’ dissatisfaction with some of the program’s components revealed their perceptions of what they considered as program constraints. The participants perceived not meeting the Libyan ministry’s objectives, having one program for three educational levels, not achieving objectives, having curriculum deficiencies, focusing on quantity over quality, having course content that cannot be covered within course time, redundancy in courses, offering some courses that are irrelevant to its objectives, offering some uninteresting and repeated elective courses, having problems with graduation project, having one form of assessment, not having quality assurance, and having other program limitations as program constraints. What they viewed as limitations that hindered students-teachers’ preparedness as ESOL teachers was perceived as constraints that the program should take actions for reform.

As an insider, I was familiar with the politics of the investigated program and the Faculty of Education (Unluer, 2012). More specifically, what is considered as an advantage for me as an insider is that I had “a greater understanding of” my context, had the ability to adjust the flow of social interaction, and (c) had “established intimacy which promotes both the telling and the judging of truth” (Bonner & Tolhurst, 2002; Unluer, 2012, p. 1). My knowledge of my context made it easier for me to understand my data (Smyth & Holian, 2008).
However, not being able to conduct interviews had drawbacks that lead to methodological challenges and influenced the benefits of being an insider (Dwyer & Bucle, 2009). Thus, my data was generated from the participants’ responses on the questionnaires and the documents that were gathered from the program. Not being able to conduct interviews and relying on data gathered from questionnaires and documents might have caused issues concerning my interpretation of the texts, responses, and analysis. Being an insider might have also affected how I presented my data since some of my participants’ responses would seem like facts to me.

Accordingly, like some of the researchers who had concerns about being insiders, such as Watson (1999) and Armstrong (2001), I have concerns about my interpretations of my data as an insider. As I was not able to elicit details from my participants, I am still unclear whether my interpretation is of an actual phenomenon or I am projecting my own perceptions onto my participants’ responses. This is because I had to make assumptions about the meanings of words and phrases when I could not seek clarification because my interviewees withdrew from the study. Another factor that might have affected my interpretation is my deep involvement with the social, economic, and political changes in Libya and my enthusiasm about social justice and peace education. Thus, even though I tried my best to overcome the drawbacks of being an insider and conducting my research in a conflict zone, the following themes might have been a result of being an insider.

1. Using TESOL teacher education programs as tools for empowerment in a conflict zone
   - Critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform.
   - Libya’s need for peace, social justice, and humane education.
2. Reforming a TESOL teacher education program in a conflict zone

- Making decisions on the position of English in Libya as a conflict zone.
- TESOL teacher education as a space for preparing transformative teachers.
- TESOL teacher education as a place for preparing effective ESOL teachers.
- Enforcing policies and providing essential resources to ensure program efficiency.

As an insider, I perceived my participants’ perceptions as facts and could not stick to the role of the researcher because of the deep and complex involvement with my context, especially with my belief in the significance of a revolutionary educational change in Libya. In the following sections, I discuss these two themes in some details.

**Using TESOL Teacher Education Programs as Tools for Empowerment in a Conflict Zone**

As I explained in Chapter 4, when the participants were asked about their perceptions on the relevance of critical language teacher education to the Libyan context, their responses revealed that they perceived it as relevant to the Libyan context. The participants’ justifications included statements such as “because of the political and social challenges” (Q14, 2015, p. 6), “because of the situation in Libya” (Q5, Q12, Q23, Q29, and Q32, 2015, p. 6), “helps students understand our situation” (Q8, 2015, p. 6), and “help students think and be critical in understanding the historical, social, and political context” (Q7, 2015, p. 6). Their responses showed that they assumed that I already know what they were talking about as an insider.
Since I was not able to explore these perceptions with my participants because they withdrew from the interviews, my familiarity with the Libyan context helped me understand what they meant when they used the words “challenges” and “situation” and the phrase “historical, social, and political context” (Q5, Q7, Q8, Q12, Q14, Q23, Q29, and Q32, 2015, p. 6). Even though I was not able to elicit more details from the participants themselves, I was able to understand cultural and political information as an insider and analyze the data because of my familiarity with the Libyan context. To avoid the inclusion of my personal justification that has already been discussed in the Prologue, I turned to articles that discussed the Libyan issues to answer the question that asked: what do my participants mean by the words “challenges” and “situation” and the phrase “historical, social, and political context”?

**A brief description of Libya’s “situation”**

Libya is a country that is “trapped in a spiral of deteriorating security, economic crisis, and political deadlock” (USIP, 2016, para. 1). Libyans are suffering from insecurity, economic crisis, armed fights between militias and between parties, and extremists’ violent activities (Combaz, 2014; Fetouri, 2015a; Stephen, 2016). Warring militias, contested leadership, decreased oil output, and DAESH have led the country to collapse (Combaz, 2014; Fetouri, 2015a; Stephen, 2016). Libya’s crisis has caused not only the spread of violence, but has also caused cultural, religious, economic, and political divisions among Libyans. War on Qaddafi and after war consequences resulted in the spread of different conflicts within the Libyan culture. For instance, those in the country are witnessing large numbers of displaced Libyans who are suffering for their needs, large numbers of Libyans who fled to the neighboring countries or to Europe
looking for safety, and large numbers of Libyan youth facing radicalization and social alienation (Combaz, 2014; Fetouri, 2015a; Stephen, 2016).

As mentioned in the Prologue, Qaddafi enforced his ideology in education and made reading his book and memorizing parts of it compulsory. The dominant ideology was to follow him as the leader without giving anyone the chance to challenge his ideas. Unfortunately, the act of enforcing ideologies is still dominant, even with the new political parties and militias who supposedly freed the country from Qaddafi’s dominant, oppressive ideologies looking for freedom of speech. Since the beginning and end of the war against Qaddafi, violence and gun power has prevailed in the Libyan context (Combaz, 2014; Fetouri, 2015a; Stephen, 2016). The reason behind Libya’s crisis is the belief that the armed violence is the only way to solve the country’s conflicts, especially with Qaddafi’s followers, which is imbedded in the culture due to Qaddafi’s long years of violence against opponents.

In addition, war on Qaddafi and Libya’s crisis has caused discrimination and racism that marginalized some Libyans. During the war against Qaddafi, people were divided into two groups: the “jirhan”\(^{29}\) and the “tahaleb”\(^{30}\). After the war against Qaddafi ended, and during the civil war between militias, new terms emerged that deepened this cultural division. Those terms are forms of discrimination that helped to spread injustice throughout the Libyan culture. What’s more, after Qaddafi was overthrown, armed groups displaced many Libyans because they supported Qaddafi (Fetouri, 2015a). For instance, Libyans from the city of Tawergha are still suffering from being away from

\(^{29}\) Jirhan means rats. It is a term that was used by Qaddafi to devalue his opponents who lead the uprise.

\(^{30}\) Tahaleb means mosses. It is a term that was used by Qaddafi’s opponents to devalue Qaddafi’s proponents.
their city and homes. They were tortured, scattered, and displaced in shelters in different places by armed groups who seek revenge. Until this date, Tawerghans are discriminated against and displaced because they were accused “of committing heinous crimes against [them] during the revolution, including rape and torture” (Al Jazeera, 2014, para. 6). On the opposite side, Tawerghans complain that their “entire community is being collectively punished for the deeds of pro-Gaddafi fighters among them” (Al Jazeera, 2014, para. 6).

Another form of injustice is what Libyan minority ethnic groups are facing due to their demands to be recognized in the constitution. Many Arab Libyans still do not accept the idea of including the Amazegh language as one of the official languages in Libya. One more issue is related to the Tuareg’s and the Tabu’s citizenship. Bolling (2015) explained the issue as follows:

the Tuareg and Tabu’s demands to be recognized as citizens are currently being overlooked. Both groups were promised citizenship by Gaddhafi if they fought the rebellion for him, and both groups were denied full identity cards by the transitional authorities, who perceive the Tuaregs as having supported the former regime. (para. 14)

These two ethnic groups were denied citizenship and were marginalized because they supported Qaddafi in 2011. Even though there were a number of reconciliation movements to resolve all the cultural issues that deepened the cultural divisions, these movements did not succeed in pulling the country out of this mess.

An additional form of injustice is violence against social justice and peace activists. Libyan women activists “suffered ironically at the hands of those who claim to have liberated them, most of whom became militias involved in crime” (Fitouri, 2015b,
This became apparent when Libyan women activists were murdered one after the other, such as Salwa Bugaighis, Ebtisam Eltreki, Fariha Al-Berkawi, Entisar Al-Hassaari, and Samira Albuzedi. It was found on social media that some girls and women were kidnapped and raped just to bring shame to opponents. One story of a woman being brutally raped by a group of militias went viral in December, 2016, and the reason of the rape was revenge from her sons. Kidnaps and assassinations also affected male activists, such as the human rights activist, Abdulsalam Al-Mesmari, and two teenage peace activists, Tawfik Ben Saud and Sami Elkawafi. These assassinations have caused many Libyans to “avoid criticizing the 2011 revolution” and the governments so that “armed groups and nonstate actors” do not chase them for revenge (Freedom on The Net, 2015, p. 8).

What’s more, Libya’s crisis has caused the rise of theft and human smuggling crimes. The daily crimes of killing people to steal their cars spread fear among Libyans. One of such crimes affected my friend’s family as they lost Dr. Naser Sarraj who was killed by some criminals who stole his car. Moreover, Libya’s crisis had increased human smuggling, which made Libya become the “modern day slave market” (Vick, 2016, para. 1). Human trafficking has affected many Africans who dreamt of immigrating to Europe for a better life as some were tortured and others lost their lives on their way to their dream lands (Vick, 2016).

On top all of that, Libya’s crisis had an impact on the environment. Libya’s most known environmental problems are desertification and water availability. Desertification is a result of climate change, landforms, overgrazing, over cultivation, and population growth (El-Tantawi, 2005). In Libya, water availability is threatened by the rising sea-
levels. The Man-made River Project was created to solve the problem of water availability, which “abstract[s] the ancient groundwater in the southern regions of the Sahara Desert and transport[s] it to the places where water is needed” (Elsherif, 2013b, p. 3). War against Qaddafi, the civil war between militias, and war against DAESH have caused more environmental issues. Oil tanks were attacked and caused fires that were not extinguished easily, which had negative consequences on the country’s infrastructure, threatened the people’s lives, and endangered the animals and the environment (Faucon, 2015). The absence of law has resulted in illegal overfishing and the unsustainable killing of wildlife (The Libyan Wildlife Trust, 2016). Unsustainable hunting is threatening some endangered animals, such as Libyan gazelles and foxes (The Libyan Wildlife Trust, 2016). Recently, persistent power cuts and then a total blackout have affected Tripoli residents, which resulted in “resorting to charcoal during unusually cold winter weather” (Reuters, 2017, para. 8). These blackouts lead many Libyans to buy electrical generators that cause noise pollution. Another issue affected Tripoli residents is water unavailability. Water “supplies to the capital have also been cut for several days”, which lead to serious environmental issues since many Libyans tried to get water through illegal digging of wells (Reuters, 2017, para. 8).

For all what have been discussed in the previous paragraphs, the participants perceived critical language teacher education, peace education, social justice education, and humane education as relevant to the Libyan context, even though they do not thoroughly understand these approaches. As an insider, I believe there is a need for serious educational change. Since a major purpose of education is to transform students into empowered, critical individuals who will be dedicated to conveying change in their
societies, educational transformation is the key to change “a culture of indoctrination and corruption” that Qaddafi “fostered in schools and universities” (Fordham, 2011, para. 3). Thus, what Libya needs is carefully planned educational reform to overcome the current conflicts.

With the aim of achieving an educational reform, after Qaddafi was overthrown, the first educational response of the Libyan Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education was to review and revise the Libyan National Curriculum and universities’ curricula by omitting all the courses that were related to Qaddafi’s ideology and any content related to it in other courses (Belaid, 2015). Paulson (2011) explains that “curriculum review, revision and reform are among the educational responses commonly employed in post-conflict situations” (p. 1). This explains the quick responses of these two Libyan ministries regarding the changes that were made after the end of the war against Qaddafi.

However, revising the national curriculum and universities’ curricula by just omitting what was related to Qaddafi’s ideology is not going to help the Libyan learners who are facing violence, injustice, and radicalization every day. As an insider, I know that there is a need for a revolutionary educational reform in Libya; there is a need to design new curricula that spreads the understanding of being a united nation and helps Libyans process trauma, eliminate injustice, and promote peace all around Libya (Nelson & Appleby, 2015; Shah, 2012). The new curricular reform needs to take into account the current social and political scenarios and needs to promote social justice and peace for a positive change that would end the civil war and foster social cohesion among Libyans (Nelson & Appleby, 2015; Shah, 2012).
TESOL teacher education can play a great role in the process of educational reform and bringing positive change into the Libyan context by preparing student-teachers to become critical English language teachers who are advocates of positive change and agents of equity, social justice, peace, and humane education (Gay, 1993; Nelson & Appleby, 2015). TESOL teacher education programs need to equip English language teachers “to facilitate critical and creative engagement with English” that is “not apart from [their] broader sociopolitical realities” (Nelson & Appleby, 2015, p. 309).

As the investigated TESOL teacher education program is planning to reform its current curriculum as a form of contribution to the Libyan educational reform, this study can be considered as the first that would help to explore the program’s affordances and constraints and the possibility of implementing approaches that prepare transformative teachers. This educational reform can be fostered through the implementation of approaches that lead to peace and social justice, such as critical language teacher education, peace education, social justice education, and humane education. Even though the participants’ responses did not show a thorough understanding of these approaches, they assured Libya’s need for implementing critical language teacher education, peace education, social justice education, and humane education to prepare student-teachers to become agents for a better future.

**Critical Language Teacher Education as an Approach for Curriculum Reform**

The findings showed that there was an agreement among the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates perceptions on the appropriateness of the approach to be implemented in the future reform. However, their responses revealed that they did not truly understand the approach, in which they focused on critical thinking and
its benefits to the student-teachers as individuals and future teachers. Critical language teacher education is more than being critical and using critical thinking skills. It is about understanding the issues of power that are inherent in both micro and macro societal level structures, the systemic inequity that is pervasive in the world around them, both within and beyond the classroom structure. It seems that the participants knew that they do not really understand the approach, as one of the participants asserted that the program should raise teacher-educators’ awareness on the approach by providing “a presentation, a workshop, or a seminar” to help them understand the approach, its relevance to the Libyan context, and how it can be tailored to and be implemented in the program (Q13, 2015, p. 6).

Due to the spread of violence that is caused by the social and political changes among different generations and groups in Libya, the participants’ beliefs in the approach seems to be understandable. The current, dominant ideologies have privileged some Libyans and marginalized many others. As discussed in the literature review, crucial approaches are implemented to construct understandings about privilege and marginalization in cultures (Hawkins & Norton, 2009; Park, 2015; Reis, 2011). Thus, implementing critical pedagogy and critical language teacher education into the investigated program requires transforming the program into “critical settings” that are built on “teaching the students’ culture” by introducing student-teachers to some of the local cultural issues and evaluating them from a critical viewpoint with the purpose of positive transformation (Akbari, 2008, p. 278). By implementing critical pedagogy in the program’s language courses, teacher-educators can train student-teachers to question texts and ideologies and become critical language learners.
Research has shown that through critical awareness, critical self-reflection, and critical pedagogical relations, teacher-educators can facilitate discussions and can provide opportunities for reflection, with the aim of helping student-teachers become critical thinkers by helping them break oppressive boundaries and by encouraging them to help rearrange power relations (Acevedo et al., 2015; Crookes & Lehner, 1998; Hawkins, 2004; Hawkins & Norton, 2009; Pavlenko, 2003; Pennycook, 2004; Sarroub & Quadros, 2015; Stein, 2004; Willett & Miller, 2004). As an insider, I know that the investigated program never conducted a feasibility study before implementing the new or the revised curricula. The program is advised to conduct a feasibility study before implementing the approach into the program. Using the postmethod’s parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility can help decision makers in deciding how to implement the approach in the Libyan TESOL teacher education program. TESOL teacher education curriculum developers in Libya need to include local values, morals, and beliefs and need to facilitate dialogue and debate that fosters criticality and interaction between different Libyan social groups and leads to the understanding of each other, which can create positive change (Hart, 2011; Nelson & Appleby, 2015; Rwantabagu, 2010).

Documents analysis of the participants’ responses showed that the program did not make notable changes that consider the Libyan context as a conflict zone. Since the current curriculum is not designed to help student-teachers be prepared to help their learners as trauma survivors, student-teachers can be considered as being “ill-prepared for the challenges of teaching” learners of their war-torn country (Nelson & Appleby, 2015, pp. 321-322). Conflict-affected learners need to be taught using “relevant and responsive” approaches that meet their “learning needs and aspirations” (Nelson &
Appleby, 2015, p. 323). Peace, social justice, and humane education can be considered, along with critical language teacher education, to prepare student-teachers for their new roles as TESOL teachers in a context that is a conflict zone.

**Libya’s Need for Peace, Social Justice, and Humane Education**

As Libya’s crisis continues to cause the spread of violence and cultural, religious, economic, and political divisions among Libyans, there is a need for transformative educational reform that would lessen social inequalities, promote peace, and lead to reconciliation. To understand the perceptions of the investigated program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates on peace, social justice, and humane education, I included a question in the questionnaire that asked them about their views on implementing peace, social justice, and humane education in the program to create an opening for discussion in the interviews. As interviewees withdrew, I found myself forced to rely on my knowledge of the context as an insider as well as knowledge of the topics to explain their significance to the Libyan context, especially that document analysis revealed that the program did not include any statement to show how student-teachers are being prepared for the current Libyan issues.

The participants perceived peace, social justice, and humane education as significant approaches that should be implemented in the program to spread awareness on the significance of peace and social justice, and sustainable use for the animals and the environment. TESOL teacher education can play a role in helping student-teachers to (1) empower student-teachers to be able to overcome conflicts without using power or force that might harm others, (2) be prepared to “adequately support” learners who represent
diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Hawkins, 2011, p. 1), and (3) be prepared to educate Libyan learners about sustainability and humans’ and animals’ rights.

**Peace education.** The participants perceived the implementation of peace education in their program as a form of empowerment for student-teachers to be able to overcome conflicts without using power or force that might harm others. Peace education can be recognized as a process and a philosophy (Kruger, 2012) that is concerned with “relationships between groups which are usually involved in conflict or tense relationships” (Salomon, 2004, p. 123). The main intention of peace education is “teaching the information, attitudes, values, and behavioral competencies needed to resolve conflicts without violence” (Johnson & Johnson, 2010, p. 226). Since the primary concern of TESOL is improving English language learners’ communicative skills for effective communication, the implementation of peace education into the curriculum “could promote peaceful communication” (Kruger, 2012, p. 22). According to Kruger (2012), the humanistic and communicative approaches are appropriate and should be combined with peace education.

TESOL teacher education programs in Libya should aim not only for empowering student-teachers’ language proficiency and teaching skills, but also aim for peace. Libyan student-teachers suffered from conquest, aggression, and violence in their struggle for the liberation and new life. Therefore, TESOL teacher education should aim for peace. The aim for teachers should be for “an education for cooperation, for caring and sharing, for the use of non-violence conflict-solving” (Brock-Utne, 1985, as cited in Blitz & Hurlbert, 1998, p. 66).
When participants were asked about implementing peace education into the program, their views ranged between integrating peace education throughout the program and offering specific courses that help to raise student-teachers’ awareness towards neglecting violence and using classroom strategies that foster peace. Many scholars integrated peace education into their classrooms and curriculum, and encouraged their students to read varied texts that included poetry, short stories, and essays, with the aim of introducing students to the concept of peace and helping them understand it. For instance, Blitz and Hurlbert (1998) gave their students the chance to understand their worlds through writing, and students learned “to exercise healing kinds of power” (p. 59). In *Writing to heal, understand, and cope*, Antzoulis (2003) presented the significance of making literature relevant to students by using poetry to help her students heal, understand, and cope. She used a number of carefully chosen poems to help her students understand and cope with the events of September 11, 2001. By reading and responding to certain poems, students were able to “utilize the materials to make sense of the world” (Antzoulis, 2003, p. 52). Thus, the program developers can integrate and offer a course that introduces student-teachers to peace-studies and ways that TESOL can address Libya’s conflicts and play a role in achieving peace.

**Social justice education.** The participants thought that social justice education should be implemented in the program to empower student-teachers. TESOL teacher education can play a role in helping student-teachers to be prepared to “adequately support” learners who represent diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Hawkins, 2011, p. 1).
Proponents of teaching for social justice assert the necessity for improving students’ learning, as well as their lives, especially those who are considered marginalized students (Michelli & Keiser, 2005; Villegas, 2007). Teaching for social justice is basically concerned not only with improving marginalized children’s learning, but also their lives (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Cochran-Smith, 1999, 2004; Michelli & Keiser, 2005; Villegas, 2007). Hawkins’s (2011) collection of essays, *Social justice language education* called for “a turn to social language teacher education” and stated that what differentiates social justice teacher education from critical language teacher education is that the former “highlights teachers’ responsibility to serve as agents of social change”, whereas the latter “puts focus squarely on societal inequities often based on differences” (p. 2). A social justice approach changes the understandings of how languages are learned, taught, and used, recognizes educational landscape injustices, envisages other ways for socially fair features, and reconceptualizes teachers’ roles in making effective cultural change (Hawkins, 2011). Since participants were divided between integrating social justice education throughout the program and offering specific courses, program developers can integrate and offer a course that introduces student-teachers to social justice and ways TESOL can address Libya’s issues of injustice.

**Humane education.** Humane education’s main concern is teaching compassion and sympathy towards humans, animals, and the environment (Domzaski & Gatarek, 2011). In the United States and Canada, humane education’s main concern was to ensure animal and child safety (Domzaski & Gatarek, 2011), and then it became concerned with building students’ characters and moralities (Unit & DeRosa, 2003) in the nineteenth century. In the beginning of the twentieth century, concern was paid to pet ownership and
animal-protection issues (Humes, 2008). Today, humane education’s conceptual goal is “connecting human, animal, and environmental issues” (Domzaski & Gatarek, 2011, p. 42).

The establishment of Roots and Shoots and the Institute for Humane Education were the ground-breaking developments in humane education (Domzaski & Gatarek, 2011). Roots and Shoots was concerned with serving communities through activities and service-learning projects, whereas the Institute for Humane Education offered the first master’s degree program in the field (Domzaski & Gatarek, 2011). Roots and Shoots and the Institute for Humane Education benefited the local communities and their environments and animals. Implementing humane education in the TESOL context has two benefits (Domzaski & Gatarek, 2011). Humane education facilitates positive change since it leads to behavioral improvements through teaching the value of kindness, respect, and empathy towards people, animals, and the environment. Humane education has language related benefits that include engaging students in discussions related to their own opinions and cultures.

In my review of literature on ecocomposition, i.e., place-based writing, I found that TESOL teachers can raise the learners’ place and environmental awareness by (1) discussing the significance of sustainability, (2) helping them appreciate and interact with their locations, (3) engaging them in service learning, (4) involving them in campus ecology and webbed environments, and (5) familiarizing them with suburban studies (Elsherif, 2013a). In humane education, service learning is considered the main source of bringing positive social change. Service learning is “a learning tool to empower students to solve problems in their own communities” (Farber, 2011, p. 5).
Service learning is a form of task-based learning that engages learners in language learning and use by involving them with and in natural contexts (Larsen-Freeman, 2003; Domzaski & Gatarek, 2011). I came across service learning when I took the Writing and Sustainability course at IUP, in which we discussed how we, as writing teachers, can raise our language learners’ awareness towards the environmental issues affecting them. I was required to envision a place-based course and chose service learning to raise my Libyan student-teachers’ awareness of water issues in Libya, so I decided that service learning could help my Libyan student-teachers investigate and write about Libya’s water issues in different assignments (Elsherif, 2013b). This assignment helped me realize the benefits of service learning in TESOL teacher education. Service learning engages students in different activities in their contexts that would not only improve their language proficiency, but also their understanding of their roles in their communities. In addition, service learning engages students in critical thinking and reflection, and it helps in creating positive change and reconciliation in the community (Domzaski & Gatarek, 2011; Elsherif, 2013a; Falasca, 2011). For all the previously discussed reasons, my participants and I argue that the investigated Libyan TESOL teacher education program should consider the implementation of humane education in the program’s future reform.

**Commentary**

The Libyan political parties are relying on foreign powers to solve many problems, fight extremism, and other challenges Libyans face in their deteriorated country. However, the Libyan ministries and teacher education programs around Libya have the power to begin the process of positive change. Peace, social justice, humane education, and critical language teacher education might be considered as Western
approaches to education. However, these Western approaches can be tailored and can be applicable to the Libyan context, leading the country to justice and reconciliation. TESOL teacher education programs can play a great role in implementing these approaches and preparing teachers as transformative intellectuals. Empowering Libyan student-teachers and giving them voice through approaches that empower them as language learners and teachers will eliminate those chances of ruling the country using terror and fear.

Reforming a TESOL Teacher Education Program in a Conflict Zone

Clark (2013) claims that the “existing institutions of higher learning [in Libya] are bursting at the seams and they are in need of modernization” (para. 3). With a similar perspective, many of my participants claimed that the investigated TESOL teacher education program needs modernization. They perceived modernization as a reform that includes making curricular changes along with the implementation of independent learning practices and learner-centered approaches. As an insider, I believe in what Clark claims and what my participants’ perceived, which is what made it difficult for me to keep a distance from my participants’ perceptions and suggestions, especially that interviews were not conducted as planned.

My participants suggestions perceived program reform as an action that eliminates what they perceived as constraints that hindered the effectiveness of student-teachers’ preparedness to teach. Since Libyans are living in a conflict zone as a result of the war on Qaddafi, war between militias and parties, and war against DAESH, there is a need for a program reform in the Libyan TESOL teacher education programs in order to prepare student-teachers for teaching in a conflict and post-conflict zone. Thus,
modernization and reform of the investigated TESOL teacher education program includes making decisions on the position of English in Libya as a conflict zone and making changes that lead TESOL teacher education programs in Libya to become a space for preparing transformative teachers while preparing student-teachers to become effective ESOL teachers.

**Making Decisions on the Position of English in Libya as a Conflict Zone**

As mentioned in the Prologue, English “was banned under a Gaddafi-imposed plan to ‘eliminate foreign influence’”, which affected Libya’s “infrastructure for teaching” English (Clark, 2013, para. 6). After the return of the English language to the Libyan curriculum, focus was on teaching British and/or American English.

Like many Libyans, I used to believe that Standard English (whether British or American) should be the target language for Libyan language learners and teachers. When I was introduced to World Englishes and EIL, and read about TESOL scholars’ argument about ELT field’s need for a paradigm shift “to meet the complex and diverse uses and users of English” (Matsuda, 2017, p. xiii), I believed that Libyan TESOL scholars should think about paradigm shifts in ELT in the Libyan context. There is a need “to prepare teachers who are aware of the complexity of the use of English in today’s world rather than to perpetuate the view with ‘native speakers’ as the sole target interlocutor and the target proficiency model” (Matsuda, 2017, p. xvi). For this reason, I included a part in the questionnaire that would open the discussion and leads Libyan scholars to think about which English to teach and the current paradigm shifts around the globe.
The question that asks which English to teach in a conflict zone is not an easy one to answer. However, having the participants’ perceptions on English and its position in the Libyan context will help the program developers to think seriously before making any decisions, even if my data are derived from documents and questionnaire and might have been affected with my own perceptions.

One of the participants acknowledged the difficulty of choosing one variety to be the focus. What influences deciding which English to teach is that those varieties might be mutually unintelligible (Farrell & Martin, 2009; Hamid & Baldauf, 2013; Smith, 1992). For instance, to speakers of English who do not live in Singapore, Singlish is considered unintelligible. Thus, teaching Singlish to Singaporean English learners “may limit [their] ability to communicate with speakers of English outside Singapore” (Farrell & Martin, 2009, p. 4). However, English learners’ familiarity with other English varieties facilitates communication. More specifically, their knowledge of English varieties facilitates understanding of others and being understood by others (Al-Asmari & Khan, 2014; Hamid & Baldauf, 2013; Smith & Nelson, 1985; Smith, 1992).

The analysis of the program documents revealed the program’s excessive focus on Standard English by teaching British English in the grammar, reading, and literature courses, along with American English in the listening and speaking courses, while offering the varieties course as an elective. Having an elective course that educates student-teachers about the different varieties of English shows that the program does not consider the student-teachers’ knowledge of the other varieties as significant as their knowledge of Standard English.
The findings showed that the participants were divided between teaching Standard English and World Englishes and recommended offering the varieties course as a compulsory course. Thus, it is necessary for the program to implement World Englishes into the curriculum. Infusing World Englishes in TESOL teacher education programs will “help change the learners’ opinion[s]” towards the different varieties of English and will “prepare them to realize the distinction between” them (Al-Asmari & Khan, 2014, p. 321).

Farrell and Martin (2009) suggested implementing what they called a “balanced approach” to teaching Standard English and World Englishes. In this approach, English language teachers and teacher-educators “can inform their practices about the different varieties of English that exist and consider a balanced approach to teaching English” (Farrell and Martin, 2009, p. 4). This is done by considering the teaching context, valuing their learners’ English, and preparing their learners for intercultural communication (El-Sayed, 1991; Farrell & Martin, 2009; Matsuda, 2003; McKay, 2002). Farrell & Martin’s (2009) guidelines can help teacher-educators prepare student-teachers for “real world interactions” (p. 7). For instance, they suggested two activities that expose student-teachers to a variety of Englishes and engages them with idiomatic expressions in their native language to raise their awareness and comprehension of different varieties of English and helps them to recognize the idiomatic expressions they can use in English. Even though a balanced approach to teaching Standard English and World Englishes in a war-torn context might not be easy to achieve, Farrell and Martin’s (2009) guidelines can help teacher-educators prepare student-teachers for “real world interactions” (p. 7). With a similar perspective, Lee (2012) suggested using movies, internet-based communication,
and a guest speaker and discussion activities to widen student-teachers’ understandings of the different varieties of English.

However, a balanced approach to teaching Standard English and World Englishes in a war-torn context might not be easy to achieve, and some might consider it as impossible and not equitable. Translingual proponents might critique this approach and propose “translanguaging pedagogies to build a bridge between current” practices and “the needs of teachers in dual language classrooms” (Palmer, Marteus, Martinez, & Henderson, 2014, p. 760). Researchers consider translanguaging as a move that takes multilingual language acquisition further (Canagarajah, 2011). Canagarajah (2011) explained that translanguaging is the multilingual speakers’ ability “to shuttle between languages, treating the diverse languages that form their repertoire as an integrated system” (p. 401). Unlike the previous dominant views of “separate bilingualism” that insists on using just the target language (Creese & Blackledge, 2010, p. 105), translanguaging allows language teachers to mix languages, to facilitate the use of codeswitching, and to use translanguaging practices to teach language and literacy (Adamson & Fujimoto-Adamson, 2012; Creese & Blackledge, 2010). The program needs to envision an approach that reframes the debates on language separation and Standard English and World Englishes with the aim of empowering student-teachers as multilinguals and as future ESOL teachers in a conflict zone.

The view that “the political movements of one generation may be obstacles to the next” (Poter, 2014, p. 538) is evident in the Libyan context where Qaddafi’s regime banned studying and using English and French in the Libyan social and educational context. The effect is seen in that the belief that Standard English is the “right” target
language is still dominant. I believe that “increased mobility, technological innovation, and more comprehensive understandings of language practices” in the Libyan context “demand[s] new conceptions of politics and language” (Porter, 2014, p. 538), which leads to the necessity of implementing EIL and teaching World Englishes. Implementing EIL, World Englishes, and translanguaging practices into Libyan TESOL teacher education will help student-teachers to consider themselves within the concept as multilingual Libyan speakers of English, which will encourage their sense of identification with a personalized variety of English (Mclean, 2014; Canagarajah, 2011). Their belief in English as being owned, rather than as a language they can learn to use, will result in better communication, as well as instilling a sense of confidence in learners (Mclean, 2014).

**TESOL Teacher Education as a Space for Preparing Transformative Teachers**

The basic role of teachers is helping learners maintain their cultural integrity (Gay, 2002). Therefore, TESOL teacher education should help student-teachers preserve their cultural integrity and be prepared to inspire their learners to preserve theirs. Since the dominant culture in the investigated program is the target language’s culture, the program needs to make changes to not only focus on the British/American culture, but also weave the student-teachers’ and teacher-educators’ cultures into the curriculum. Multiculturalism “needs to be woven into teacher preparation programs” to develop a cultural diversity knowledge base and to raise student-teachers’ intercultural awareness (Herath, 2015, p. 93).

Rather than avoiding addressing social inequalities, war consequences, environmental problems, and other societal issues, TESOL teacher education programs
can be designed to be a space for growth and intercultural awareness (Walker, 2004). Now in Libya, as a conflict zone, TESOL classrooms include learners who lived the consequences of war against Qaddafi, war between militias, and war against the DAESH. Some of them might have been war victims. They might have lost a parent, parents, a sibling, a relative, a friend, or a neighbor. They might have even been displaced or were discriminated and marginalized against because of their parents’ social, religious, or political choices. A number of them might have been victims of kidnapping and/or rape. Unfortunately, the investigated program does not prepare student-teachers for such issues that can affect learners. The program should be a space for student-teachers’ growth and for intercultural awareness by developing a cultural diversity knowledge base, by designing a culturally relevant curriculum, building creating culturally caring learning communities, and by developing a critical consciousness that helps to raise student-teachers’ awareness and helps to them be prepared for current, real classroom challenges.

In the investigated TESOL teacher education program, student-teachers are being introduced to various Western ELT methods that have been used for 20 years (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). However, the concept of method was criticized in the early 1990s (Karimvand, Hessamy, & Hemmati, 2014). Methods are (1) limited so that they do not explain language teaching and learning complexity, (2) do not provide space for creativity and autonomy, (3) limit learners’ roles and the amount of involvement with the target language, (4) do not consider teachers’ institutional, sociopolitical, and contextual conditions, and (5) do not differ in practice (Clarke, 1994b; Karimvand, Hessamy, & Hemmati, 2014; Kumaravadivelu, 2003a; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The demand to teach English without being restricted by method-based
pedagogies led to the emergence of postmethod pedagogy (Chen, 2014). Unlike the method concept, the postmethod concept allows the practitioners to “construct classroom-oriented theories of practice” and to “produce local, specific, and novel practices” (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, p. 29). Postmethod’s three distinct features are alternative to method, teacher autonomy, and principled pragmatism. Postmethod’s three pedagogic parameters, particularity, practicality, and possibility, promote a context-sensitive pedagogy that enables practitioners to focus on learners’ sociopolitical consciousness and transformative potential (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). Therefore, the program should familiarize learners with postmethod instead of being just introduced to the various ELT methods that lead student-teachers to uncritically accepting the superiority of the Western methods. This uncritical acceptance leads student-teachers to “legitimate their own marginalization” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, p. 548). On the contrary, helping student-teachers understand the postmethod pedagogy will help them be able to critically evaluate the Western methods and to create local methods that are context sensitive (Chen, 2014; Karimvand, Hessamy, & Hemmati, 2014; Kumaravadivelu, 2003b).

The findings from the document analysis and questionnaire responses revealed that the program really focused on improving student-teachers’ language proficiency and subject matter. A TESOL teacher education program in a war-torn country should not only focus on the “linguistic objectives in a narrow decontextualized sense”, but also should “equip students for critical communicative engagement with events in the world outside the classroom and in [a] wider sociopolitical sphere” (Nelson & Appleby, 2015, p. 323). For instance, program changes might begin by making learning participatory, using discourse inquiry, and experimenting with art-based learning (Kumaravadivelu,
A participatory approach will enable the student-teachers to discuss “class aims, content, methods, and/or interactions” (Nelson & Appleby, 2015, p. 324). Using discourse inquiry enables student-teachers to “identify, analyze, critique, and transform” their language use, as well as their courses (Nelson & Appleby, 2015, p. 324). Finally, art-based learning provides student-teachers with opportunities to learn using visual, performance, screen, and literary arts.

**TESOL Teacher Education as a Place for Preparing Effective ESOL Teachers**

The analysis of the responses of the participants revealed that the current curriculum seems to lack components that would help in preparing effective ESOL teachers. The intended future curricular improvements should aim to make TESOL teacher education a place for preparing effective ESOL teachers, which can help make a positive change in the Libyan educational, social, religious, and political cultures. The minor changes that have previously been made are not transformative and, therefore, do not prepare student-teachers for the real challenges of teaching English in a conflict zone and a war-torn context. The changes that were suggested by the participants included implementing learner-centered instruction, revisiting the program objectives, making curricular changes with a focus on practice, using alternative assessment, and emphasizing the significance of professional development.

**Implementing learner-centered instruction.** When participants were asked to provide their insights and suggestions for future program reform, some of the teacher-educators and student-teachers believed that the program should engage the student-teachers in their learning responsibilities and recommended implementing learner-centered instruction. Learner-centered approaches “stem from the notion of ‘learning by
doing’ rather than being led by the teacher” (Al-Humaidi, Al Barwani, & Al Mekhlafi, 2014, p. 93). Since TESOL teacher education programs prepare future teachers, it is the teacher-educators’ responsibility to consider student-teachers’ individual differences and to “assist [them] in discovering their own learning processes and preferences” (Altan & Trombly, 2001, para. 4). Learner-centered instruction involves student-teachers in the classroom organization and leads student-teachers and teacher-educators to understand, respect, and appreciate student-teachers’ needs, strategies, and styles (Altan & Trombly, 2001).

Unlike teacher-dominant classrooms, where the teacher leads the class and judges learners’ performances, in a learner-centered classroom, the teacher’s role becomes that of the observer and helper while students are working either independently or with peers and groups. Thus, learner-centered instruction is “a global shift away from instruction that is fundamentally teacher-centered” to focus on learning outcomes (Learner-Centered Task Force, 2005-2006). Learner-centeredness is context sensitive (Milambiling, 2001) because student-teachers learn to take culture into account when they learn about curriculum content and the appropriateness of the teaching methods and approaches to learners (Magno & Sembrano, 2009). For this reason, the Libyan TESOL education program developers should take the learner-centered concept into consideration for future program reform. It seems necessary to advise the program to offer workshops for teacher-educators and student-teachers to discuss any pedagogical change to spread awareness on how they can remain engaged with their students and empower student-teachers to learn.

**Revisiting the program objectives.** Document analysis showed that the program objectives seemed too simple and vague, with unclear description. Additionally,
document analysis revealed that the program’s educational ideologies were vague. Program teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates argued that having clear objectives is the basic responsibility of any TESOL teacher education program and urged the program to revisit the current objectives for future program reform. Their perceptions support what was discussed in the literature review in that program objectives are the “building block[s]” that should be “created, modeled, and revised” for a more effective teacher preparation program (Brown, 1995, p. 75; Brown, 2012). Thus, the revised objectives must include “precise statements” that would show the “content of skills” the student-teachers need to master (Brown, 1995, p. 75; Brown, 2012), the educational ideologies that showcase the selected educational philosophy and curriculum theory, and the identified goals (Eisner, 1994; Richards, 2001). The participants advised future program developers to consider the Libyan Ministry of Education’s ELT objectives, and the Libyan national English curriculum and its textbooks, which aligns with what postmethod promotes for context-sensitive practices (Kumaravadivelu, 2006).

One of the participants, who recommended following TESOL Standards, believed that the program can be developed and reformed by creating program specific standards that are organized around the TESOL Standards, as well as for the recognition of the program as it follows the international TESOL Association’s standards. This can be regarded as a result of the dominant belief and uncritical acceptance of the superiority of Western-based pedagogies or approaches as an answer to the program’s curriculum (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b).

TESOL Standards are the main source that teacher education programs in the US use to develop their programs’ requirements. To be more specific, TESOL Standards are
“designed for teacher education programs that prepare candidates for an initial certification, endorsement, or license in ESL teaching” (TESOL, 2010, p. 6). Even though they are designed for TESOL teacher education programs in the US, they can be consulted for an understanding of what constitutes a TESOL teacher education program’s standards. They can be evaluated through the postmethod’s parameters of particularity, practicality, and possibility to create standards that are “context-sensitive” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003a, p. 545). The Libyan TESOL standards can represent the Libyan student-teachers’ and teacher-educators’ “lived experiences, motivated by their own sociocultural and historical backgrounds”, and, therefore, can be appropriated and used “according to their own values and visions” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003a, p. 544).

Following the domains-based approach to create the TESOL Standards, TESOL (2010) specified five domains that create effective teacher preparation. These are: Language as a “foundation domain”, Culture as a “foundation domain”, Instruction as “an application domain”, Assessment as an “application domain”, and Professionalism as the “intersection of all the domains” (Kuhlman & Knzevic, 2011, p. 5). Each of the domains is “accompanied by an explanatory statement and a rubric of illustrative, not prescriptive, performance indicators described at three levels of proficiency: approaches, meets, and exceeds” (TESOL, 2010, pp. 6 - 7). The TESOL Association recognizes a teacher education program if the program addresses all 13 standards, meets at least 10 of them, and meets at least two standards in each of the five domains (TESOL, 2003, p. 50). Taking into account these criteria, the Libyan TESOL teacher education program can prepare a more effective program with clearer objectives and standards. The revised objectives should include the program’s perspectives on preparing the student-teachers to
teach English in conflict and post-conflict areas (Nelson & Appleby, 2015). With regard to the program specific standards, the program can define each of the four domains in ways that align with the Libyan context, as well as helping to define what professionalism means to understand how to prepare Libyan student-teachers. Even though the program did not attempt to be accredited by the TESOL organization, following these procedures might lead to program accreditation.

Making curricular level changes with focus on practice. The analysis of the documents and the participants’ questionnaire responses revealed that the program is overly focused on student-teachers’ language proficiency and knowledge of the theoretical aspects of the program, which resulted in having a gap in the convergence between theory and practice. The program is weak because it does not provide sufficient teacher training and teaching practice opportunities, and relies on one curriculum to prepare student-teachers for three different levels. This suggests that the program developers advocate a one-size-fits-all approach.

The current study findings affirm what previous researchers found with regard to their program’s gaps between theory and practice (Alshuaifan, 2009; Bani Abdelrahman, 2003; Coskun & Daloglu, 2010; Elhensheri, 2004; Hawana, 1981; Karimvand, Hessamy, & Hemmati, 2014; Nguyen, 2013; Raskhan, 1995). Like the participants of those studies, my participants asserted the significance of school-based teaching practice as “a core learning experience” in the program and called for some changes to make it more effective (Wright, 2010). The participants also asserted the importance of adding a practical component to the ELT methods course, which shows their intention for having the chance to understand the methods and practice, using them before going to school-
based teaching. They highly recommend focusing on training courses before getting student-teachers to teaching practice.

Since the participants asserted the significance of reflective practice, the program can implement all or some of the ways that Richards and Farrell (2011) suggested to help student-teachers explore the observed teachers and their teaching. Teaching portfolios, teaching journals, critical incidents, and lesson recordings are some methods that could be used to help student-teachers evaluate the observed teachers and their teaching. Student-teachers and graduates complained about some of the supervisors claiming that the way they treated them and how they assessed them were challenges that affected their performance. This supports Farrell’s (2007) and Richards’ (1998) claims that the quality of supervision and real learning opportunities might challenge the student-teachers and might affect their professional growth.

The one-size-fits-all approach is not an appropriate approach to develop a curriculum that aims for preparing effective ESOL teachers that can teach English in a conflict zone. The program needs to move beyond the one-size-fits-all approach and needs to design curricula that reflects the Libyan student-teachers’ social and political contexts and the Libyan classrooms, schools, and communities (Crandall & Christison, 2016). The curricular changes should include the insights of the participants, as well as what is needed to prepare teachers who are capable of teaching as agents for positive change and reconciliation, not as being agents of a foreign language that has nothing related to the Libyan context (Nelson & Appleby, 2015).

**Using alternative assessment.** Participants’ responses showed their dissatisfaction with the current assessment forms, which mostly rely on testing students-
teachers in mid and final exams, with a rubric that was used to evaluate their graduation projects, and with how they are assessed in teaching practice. They urged the department to reconsider alternative assessment forms to replace or accompany the program’s common approaches of assessment. With a sociocultural view of learning, alternative assessment focuses on student-teachers’ achieved performance and competence that usually is not assessed through testing. Portfolios, projects, journals, conferences, observations, interviews and simulations are the common forms of alternative assessment (Stoynoff, 2012; Ali & Ajmi, 2013). In this discussion, I will only focus on portfolios because they foster independent learning that the teacher-educators mentioned in their suggestions.

Unlike exams, portfolios showcase students’ learning journey and their “abilities and growth over time” (Freeman & Freeman, 1992, p. 225). Portfolios include students’ work that is gathered and assembled by them either in the form of a paper portfolio or an electronic portfolio (Kocoglu, 2008). Freeman and Freeman (1991) describe the portfolio as “a box, folder, or other container that contains various kinds of information that has been gathered over time about one student” (p. 225). In writing classes, portfolios are used to track students’ learning and progress and to assess their work during the writing process and the final product (Abrami & Barrett, 2005; Smith & Tillema, 2003). In teacher education, they are used for “multiple purposes” (Anderson & DeMeulle, 1998, p. 26), which include (1) promoting student learning and development; (2) encouraging student self-assessment and reflection; (3) providing evidence for assessment and accountability; and (4) documenting growth of pre-service teachers.
What to include in the portfolio depends on the teacher-educators’ purposes and objectives for portfolio assessments. The necessary components of the portfolios are a cover letter, a table of contents, artifacts representing the student-teachers’ work, teacher and peer feedback, and reflections that are written during the learning/collection process and about the final product (Adams & Hamm, 1994; Anderson & DeMeulle, 1998; Tannenbaum, 1996; Kocoglu, 2008). The information gathered in the portfolio includes different materials from the student-teacher’s work, such as a teaching philosophy, lesson plans, tests/exams, the learners’ work, photographs of the classroom, self-assessment and reflections, and evaluations (Wade & Yarbrough, 1996; Kocoglu, 2008). Portfolios involve student-teachers’ decision making activities and reflections that include their own voices during the five stages of putting the portfolio together: collection, selection, reflection, organization, and presentation. Thus, portfolios give student-teachers the chance to reflect on their learning and demonstrate growth over time (Barrett, 2000).

Since portfolios support the learner-centered instruction sociocognitive theory and the constructivist aspects of learning, I suggest that the program designs a conceptual framework for implementing portfolios in their writing courses, all teacher training courses, and teaching practice. In this framework, teacher-educators and program developers should make decisions on the role and purposes of portfolios by considering: the kind of portfolios to implement (paper-based or electronic); portfolio assessment procedures; their rationale and the criteria for evaluation; the ways student-teachers construct their portfolios; and the places where student-teachers can find samples of portfolios. This procedure will assist in creating a conceptual framework for using
portfolios in the Libyan TESOL education program and allows researchers to investigate the effectiveness portfolio assessment (Hauser, 1993; Kocoglu, 2008).

Implementing portfolios can develop student-teachers’ critical thinking, can involve them in multi-domain learning, and can enable them to practice autonomous learning (Lo, 2010). Implementing portfolios, along with projects, journals, conferences, observations, interviews, and simulations as different forms of alternative assessment in the program can enhance student-teachers’ teaching skills and their preparedness for their future positions.

**Emphasizing the significance of professional development.** Even though an analysis of program documents showed that the program involves student-teachers in professional development through the graduation project, the program’s student-teachers and graduates claimed that the program does not offer them professional development opportunities. Farrell (2006) states that a considerable number of first-year teachers assume that they have gained all the information they need in their teacher preparation programs and, therefore, know how to teach. However, the participants’ responses showed their understandings of the significance of professional development and their willingness to be engaged in opportunities that would help them improve both their language proficiency and their teaching efficiency as student-teachers after graduation. They realize that technological advancements, curriculum changes and improvements, and emergence of new theories and teaching methods create the need to update their knowledge, i.e., professional development (Richards & Farrell, 2005).

Thus, the program should provide the student-teachers with opportunities that would help them understand their language and teaching needs and how to meet those
needs through engagement in professional development opportunities after graduation. Some of the areas in which teachers need to follow their advancements and be up-to-date are in second language acquisition research, composition research, assessment development, and technology development (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Since self-observation and critical reflections, alone, will not help teachers’ professional growth, teachers are encouraged to explore advancements in the previously mentioned areas (1) to be able to make decisions that would help their learners, (2) to be able to theorize their own language teaching, (3) to vary their teaching styles and classroom activities, and (4) to be able to provide technology enhanced instruction that is appropriate to their students’ needs. In addition, teacher-educators can outline a number of questions as the basis for Professional Development Needs Assessment (Farrell, 2006) to help student-teachers consider what they should do after graduation. The questions may include:

(1) what does teacher development mean to you,
(2) what do you think is the best way to keep informed about developments in English language teaching,
(3) where can you get ideas about teaching methods and techniques,
(4) where can you get information about language,
(5) where can you learn about teaching,
(6) how can you improve your teaching skills, and
(7) which areas do you think you need to develop in your teaching? (Farrell, 2006, p. 138).

Teacher-educators can also provide learners with the answers Farrell provided to help them compare Farrell’s answers with theirs (Farrell, 2006).
As future teachers, student-teachers should consider their subject-matter knowledge, pedagogical expertise, self-awareness, knowledge of learners, understanding of curriculum and materials, and career advancements while exploring their own professional development (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Recently, language teachers were encouraged to consider reflective practices and to “look into something concrete within their teaching and their students’ learning, with the overall goal of changing for the purpose of becoming more effective teachers” (Farrell, 2006, p. 142). Farrell (2004) believes that teachers practice reflection when they answer the following questions: (1) what are they doing in the classroom (method) ?, (2) why are they doing this (reason) ?, (3) what was the result ?, and (4) will they change anything based on the information gathered from answering the first two questions (justification)? In other words, teachers learn to question and critically analyze their own teaching and learning beliefs through reflection, which can help them be more responsible about their classroom actions and practices (Farrell, 2004).

Finally, the program should encourage student-teachers to become teacher-researchers. Since some of the student-teachers and graduates acknowledged not knowing the purpose of including the graduation project as one of the requirements, it is the teacher-educators’ responsibility to explain that its aim is to prepare them to become teacher-researchers. They should offer a number of methods courses to help them become more reflective practitioners by introducing them to action research, critical incident analysis, journals (diary writing), observation tasks (self, peer), and teacher development groups (Farrell, 2006). In action research, teachers recognize a problem that needs to be investigated and decide to study it by looking at the available literature, as well as
seeking other teachers’ views about the problem, plans for how to collect data, information for how to collect data, and finally how to analyze the data and reflect on it to make “data-driven decision[s] to take some action” (Farrell, 2006, p. 144). In this way, teachers become more responsible and learn to make “informed decisions” (Farrell, 2006, p. 144). In critical incident analysis, teachers reflect on critical incidents in a “formal manner” to discover new understandings about the process of teaching and learning (Farrell, 2006, p. 144). Additionally, teachers are encouraged to write journals after classes or after any event of significance to “promote reflective teaching” (Farrell, 2006, p. 145). In these diaries, teachers “record criticisms, doubts, frustrations, questions, the joys of teaching, the results of experiments, and just about anything else” (Farrell, 2006, p. 145). Moreover, classroom observation is another way to look at teachers’ classroom practices, where an individual teacher, pairs, or group of teachers observe classes with the aim of discussing “teaching in the form of critical friendships” (Farrell, 2006, p. 147). Finally, teacher development groups are group discussions in which teachers reflect on their teaching practices together (Farrell, 2004). This group discussion not only improves their understandings of their teaching, but also provides them with moral and emotional support, especially for first-year teachers.

*Partnerships between the Faculty of Education and some schools abroad.* One of the suggestions that student-teachers and graduates put forward was having partnerships between the Faculty of Education and some schools abroad. Student-teachers and graduates thought that the opportunity of being sent to schools abroad would help them to not only improve their language skills, but would also help them to observe how English is taught in those schools. Additionally, student-teachers and graduates
thought that the opportunity of being sent to schools abroad would help teachers learn how to deal with classrooms filled with multilingual and multidialectal learners.

Educational partnerships with foreign institutions could increase the quality of TESOL teacher education and ELT in Libyan schools. Maintaining and building linkages with successful schools and institutions from around the world can provide novice teachers with a “continuing flow of new knowledge, deepened exposure, and new research scholarship” (Wiley & Root, 2003, p. 7), which could lead to improving the current dominant ELT practices in the Libyan context.

**Enforcing policies and providing essential resources to ensure program efficiency.** The findings revealed that all of the participants were dissatisfied with the program’s lack of stringent policies, lack of the necessary curriculum and teaching materials, the unavailability of resources and facilities, the program’s shortage of teacher-educators, and the lack of clear, quality assurance procedures. Even though these two studies were conducted decades ago, this study’s findings confirm Hawana’s (1981) and Elhensheri’s (2004) findings on the deficiency of program policies, resources and facilities, and the nonexistence of maintenance services. Unfortunately, there has been no progress with regard to policies and resources, in spite of both studies’ participants’ recommendations. There is a need to consider what the participants reported and suggested for effective program reform.

**Enforcing program policies.** All the participants were dissatisfied with the program for not having what they described as “strict” policies for admission and academic standing requirements. However, the university already has admission and academic standing requirements (Aldoukalee, 2013). They might have used the term
“strict” because they know that admission and academic standing requirements are not being followed because Qaddafi used to interfere by allowing students with low GPAs\textsuperscript{31} to be admitted to programs that require higher ones. Qaddafi and his proponent deans used to interfere by stopping some faculties from getting students expelled because of their low GPAs.

Admission and academic standing requirements are designed to foster excellence and should be followed. Only student-teachers who possess those requirements should be admitted. The participants, therefore, recommended enforcing stringent policies that would improve the program’s effectiveness in preparing efficient teachers and would lead to achieving program goals. This will eliminate admitting student-teachers with low language proficiency and having student-teachers with low language proficiency in the advanced levels.

**Teaching and learning materials and resources.** Participants’ responses showed that they were all aware of the significance of teaching materials and resources for effective ESOL teacher preparation. Materials and resources are “fundamental to language learning and teaching” (Garton & Graves, 2014, p. 11). Materials are “anything used by teachers or learners to facilitate the learning of a language” (Ramirez, 2004, p. 2). Brinton (1991) defined materials as “the media” and divided materials into two types: nontechnical and technical media (p. 455). Nontechnical media includes whiteboards, magnet-boards, flash cards, posters, pictures, and other materials. Technical media includes audio and video recordings and their players, different types of projectors, computer software/hardware, labs, and other materials.

\textsuperscript{31} Grade point average.
TESOL teacher education programs need two types of teaching materials, which include teacher-made teaching materials and commercially prepared materials (Rahimi, 2008). Teacher-made materials are “pamphlets or handouts” that include “summaries of important points”, whereas commercially prepared materials include ready-made nontechnical and technical media (Rahimi, 2008). With such an understanding, when the participants were asked about their perceptions for program reform, all respondents recommended equipping the program with the essential needs that will help in preparing effective English language teachers. This meant providing all the classrooms with whiteboards, having a number of computer labs instead of just one, installing PowerPoint projectors and their screens into all the classrooms, providing journals and essential library references, and providing Internet access to student-teachers, which are essential moves that can help facilitate teaching and learning and effective ESOL teacher preparation.

The most significant recommendation is having a learning management system by which students can keep their privacy, eliminate publishing names and grades on Facebook, and save their time. One of the student-teachers asked about the reasons for not being able to check their grades online, like they could previously. Even though the respondents focused just on checking grades and their privacy, as a Libyan teacher-educator who was impressed with Canvas as a learning management system, I can add that having a learning management system not only helps in providing quick access to grades, but it also provides teachers and students continuous access to the shared class materials and announcements, facilitates student enrollment, facilitates checking
absences, helps teacher-educators to manage tests and assignments, and can be used as a class discussion board.

**Hiring qualified teacher-educators.** The respondents urged Oya University and the Faculty of Education administrators to hire qualified teacher-educators so as to help eliminate the program’s dependence on unqualified part-time teacher-educators. Given the vital role teacher-educators play in preparing effective ESOL teachers, hiring qualified teacher-educators is of significance.

Since TESOL teacher education programs’ roles have changed, teacher-educators’ roles have changed from providing student-teachers with ready-made techniques to exploring the broader historical, social, cultural, and political factors that are shaping and affecting student-teachers’ thinking (Kumaravadivelu, 2012). Being educators in a war-torn context, teacher-educators’ roles have also changed to becoming transformative intellectuals and agents of social justice and peace. Therefore, they have become agents for positive change in the profession of teaching (Margolin, 2011).

The investigated Libyan TESOL teacher education program needs to hire qualified teacher-educators. The program also needs to provide the existing and new teacher-educators with opportunities that would help them understand their new roles and how to help their student-teachers become agents of positive change in a war-torn country using TESOL.

**Setting clear quality assurance procedures.** Document analysis and teacher-educators’ responses have shown that the program lacks “real” quality assurance procedures. The program’s teacher-educators indicated that the program does not follow specific standards and does not implement any specific process for quality assurance,
which helps to monitor the standards of teaching and assessment. Program evaluation is a necessary stage to determine the program’s effectiveness, to assess whether its goals and objectives were achieved, and to assess students’ accomplishments and curriculum implementation (Brown, 1995; Richards, 2001). One way to evaluate the program’s effectiveness is by using the questions Richards (2001) provided for formative, illuminative, and summative evaluation. Following Richards’ (2001) questions for program evaluation will help in collecting information that leads to a deeper understanding and will help to identify what to improve in the program. The program can also use Stufflebeam’s (2001) categories that include pseudo-evaluations, questions / methods oriented, improvement / accountability, and social agenda / advocacy to design a specific procedure for evaluation. The program also is advised to understand Oya University’s program evaluation procedures and to consider them with Richards’ (2001) questions and Stufflebeam’s (2001) categories to create unique criteria that would help in improving program effectiveness in preparing efficient English language teachers.

**Implications of the Study**

In light of the findings from the present study, it is important to highlight the following implications, which suggest a need for curriculum reform at Oya University’s TESOL teacher education program:

- Even though document analysis of the program showed that the courses in the program cover all the categories of teacher education knowledge base, there is a focus on the subject matter of the categories on the expense of teacher preparation and training opportunities. The program needs to balance
between theory and practice while improving student-teachers’ language proficiency.

- There is a need to pay attention to the quality and content of the courses that represent the program requirements. The findings revealed that there is a reliance on the program’s courses’ quantity over quality and their effectiveness in preparing the student teachers.

- The program is designed to prepare student-teachers for three educational levels. Thus, there is a need to redesign the program and a need to reconsider its objectives. It is suggested that the program becomes two programs that aim for preparing elementary teachers and secondary teachers.

- The program is advised to implement student-centered approaches and alternative assessment forms that foster student-teachers’ independent learning.

- There is a need to implement approaches that promote student-teachers’ criticality and a need to spread awareness of peace, social justice, and humane issues.

- The TESOL teacher education program should raise student-teachers’ awareness of the significance of professional development by explaining the purpose of including the graduation project as one of the program requirements and designing other opportunities for professional development for student-teachers while in the program and after graduation.
The investigated program is located in a context that is considered a conflict zone. Since research on TESOL teacher preparation in conflict zones is really limited, there is a need to focus on the role of TESOL teacher preparation in conflict zones.

**Future Research Directions**

The findings of this study serve as a guide for further research opportunities in the field of TESOL teacher education and program evaluation in the Libyan context and TESOL programs around the world. For researchers who would like to replicate this study, I would suggest conducting interviews that I was not able to conduct due to the social and political challenges in my context. I would also recommend designing a mixed-methods approach to include quantitative perspectives so that the researcher can investigate the percentages of teacher-educators’, student-teachers’, and graduates’ satisfaction of the program. In addition, if this study is going to be replicated, I would suggest using a larger number of participants.

As the findings of the question that investigated the participants’ views on which English to teach and its position in the Libyan context, further research should investigate Libyan teacher-educators’, student-teachers’, and graduates’ perceptions of which English to teach and its position in the Libyan context. The study might include a larger sample of participants from different cities around Libya. The findings might provide Libyan educational decision makers with information that helps them transform TESOL in Libya.

In this study, the participants thought that critical language teacher education would be an effective approach for program reform. A number of studies could explore the feasibility of implementing the approach in the Libyan context. Libyan researchers
can also investigate how Libyan teacher education programs foster critical discussions and critical approaches in the Libyan context.

This study explored one of the Libyan TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints as perceived by the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates. Further research could investigate a number of Libyan TESOL teacher education programs’ affordances and constraints. The findings of this study would help in improving TESOL teacher education in the Libyan context. Further, a comparative study could be conducted to investigate how effective a number of TESOL teacher education programs around Libya are in preparing and training Libyan student-teachers to become efficient TESOL teachers.

Further research can also explore the content of the courses that aim for preparing and training student-teachers to learn how to teach English, such as the ELT Methods course and the Strategies courses. Researchers can investigate the content of the courses, the student-teachers’ perceptions, and efficacy of those courses in preparing student-teachers to teach. Finally, since the main aim of this study was to identify one of the Libyan TESOL teacher education program’s affordances and constraints, a study might investigate the type of textbooks that are used in the program, how they are chosen, and/or the teacher-educators’ and student-teachers’ perceptions on the chosen textbooks.

As mentioned earlier, research on the role of TESOL teacher education programs in conflict zones and the preparation of transformative teachers that are agents of positive change in societies is considered to be limited. Further research is needed to explore the role of TESOL teacher education programs in conflict and post-conflict zones. Research
also needed to investigate how student-teachers are being prepared to become transformative ESOL teachers who are agents of positive change in their societies. 

**Potential research questions**

The following research questions are suggested for further research:

- How do Libyan public school administrators perceive the preparedness of the graduates of the Libyan TESOL teacher educations programs?
- What kind of support do Libyan novice teachers receive in making their transition from their TESOL teacher education programs to being full-time school teachers?
- How are Libyan student-teachers taught to manage their independent language learning?
- How are Libyan in-service teachers supported when attempting to improve their language and professional skills?
- What kind of professional development opportunities are provided to Libyan in-service teachers?
EPILOGUE

One of the reasons for conducting this study was my own experiences as a TESOL teacher education program graduate, an ESOL teacher, an ESOL teacher-educator, and a TESOL teacher education program developer. Being involved in program design and development without being prepared or having prior knowledge of designing TESOL teacher education programs has always made me question my decisions on what or what not to include in a curriculum when designing an effective TESOL teacher education program. Most importantly, the ongoing sociopolitical changes that occurred in Libya and the program’s need for reform to help our student-teachers meet the new challenges “ignited my passion for the study” (Richards, 2013, p. 207).

The main goal of this study was to investigate the affordances and constraints of Oya University’s TESOL teacher education program, as reported by its teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates, who are in-service teachers. Another goal of this study was to explore the views of the program’s teacher-educators, student-teachers, and graduates on critical language teacher education as an approach for program reform. I began my dissertation with a Prologue, in which I used Park’s (2012) narrative snapshots to describe specific academic and professional experiences with the aim of helping my readers visualize the situation in Libya as lived and experienced by me.

This Epilogue seems necessary, as I feel it is important to provide and discuss more narrative snapshots that highlight some of the struggles and experiences that I encountered while conducting my study and writing my dissertation. I begin by explaining my experiences as being a Libyan educator who is in and out of the conflict zone and what I think the Libyan ministry should do to help Libyan teachers and learners.
The Epilogue then highlights my specific experiences, which include discussing my challenges while conducting my study in a conflict zone, which include insights on how the Libyan and Western Higher Education can empower researchers doing research in conflict zones, my experiences in completing the GCCCU Faculty Portfolio Program, and my experiences at TESOL 2016, which helped me to construct my teacher-scholar identity. I discuss the situation in Libya as a Libyan who is in and out of the conflict zone. Then, I briefly discuss my feelings toward the travel ban that included Libya and how the country empowered me through its education discriminates against me. As one of the US universities graduate students, I was empowered by what my IUP professors provided through the assigned readings, class discussions, and written assignments that encouraged critical thinking and developed my teacher-scholar identity. Thus, I became a strong believer in the role of TESOL in conflict zones. However, when the ban on Muslims from seven countries among which was my country was announced, I felt that I was discriminated by the country that gave me power and voice. Within this Epilogue, I also provide some insights based on my experiences in being among some successful ESL educators. I conclude this Epilogue with my final remarks. It is worth mentioning here that my discussion of my struggles and experiences is not merely for acknowledging them, but also to call for actions, for a change that would make the Libyan academic culture more teacher-scholar friendly.

**Being In and Out of the Conflict Zone**

As I mentioned earlier, war on Qaddafi, the armed fights between different parties and militias, and other social and economic conflicts, have put Libyan learners, teachers, and educators in dangerous situations, which lead to critical consequences. Even though I
was physically outside the conflict zone, my mind and heart were in Libya. I lived the Libyan people’s struggles and fears. Each time I called and one of my parents, siblings, or in-laws asked me not to go back; I realized that the situation was worse than before and that it was unbearable. Some of my Libyan friends joked on Facebook that they needed some kind of psychological help; this made me believe in the necessity of implementing conflict-peace strategies to help Libyans process trauma, eliminate injustice, and promote peace.

As a Libyan TESOL educator who is in and out of Libya as a conflict zone, I believe that the Libyan Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research need to address the complexity of the situation in Libya and admit the country’s need for a revolutionary change instead of the current armed solutions. The quick changes that have been made in Libya’s national curriculum do not meet the needs of Libyan teachers and learners, as citizens living in a conflict zone. Just omitting the courses that were devoted to Qaddafi’s ideology and some of the course content from the other courses is not the right solution. Considering “classes as safe havens and productive spaces for students” while teachers and students are processing trauma and trying to survive in a conflict zone is not helpful (Nelson & Appleby, 2015, p. 322). There is a need to redesign the Libyan national curriculum by considering what is going on in Libya as a conflict zone and by taking conflict-peace studies into account. There is also a need to prepare in-service teachers and student-teachers “to have the know-how to support” their learners as conflict survivors (Nelson & Appleby, 2015, p. 310).
Doing Research in a Conflict Zone

Even though conducting research was not new to me since I had a previous experience in my MA thesis, I felt like a novice researcher who was unable to make crucial decisions without her committee’s help. This was because I was conducting research in a conflict zone while not being prepared for the challenges of research in conflict zones and how to make appropriate decisions when confronting challenges.

On my dissertation defense, I felt that I was accused of dropping the interviews on purpose with no convincing reasons, which showed me that I needed to clarify this in my revisions. In reality, as my interviewees decided not to respond to my messages, I was forced by them to rely on their questionnaire responses and the documents analysis. The consequences of not conducting interviews were that I found difficulty in playing the role of the outsider and relied on my own understandings of some of my participants’ expressions as an insider. I was not prepared as a researcher, who is conducting her study in her country that is a conflict zone, to challenge the western ideologies on research. I was doing my best to keep myself away while I was deeply attached to the context and the data.

Wright (2010) encouraged researchers to conduct research in less documented contexts. However, what he did not know is the reality of conducting research in conflict zones. Deep inside, I was in a struggle, how can I challenge the western research ideologies as a beginning researcher who was taught to follow the western research methods. On top of that, I found researching in a conflict zone while being an insider is challenging as it put me through emotional and methodological challenges. Another challenge was in being mindful of my methodological representation and in complicating
transparency. This is because, as a novice researcher, I learned that “[h]ow [I] produce transparency, then, contributes to how [I] understand qualitative research as a field and how [I] continue to push its boundaries” (Bridges-Rhodges, Cleave, & Hughes, 2016, p. 548). Thus, I believe that programs that provide courses to prepare graduate students for research should take into account the challenges that might encounter novice researchers and how to achieve transparency. I also believe that they should design courses that would help novice researchers predict the challenges of conducting research in conflict zones and how to overcome such challenges.

As I explained in Chapter 3, among the challenges I faced as an insider that affected the data generated in this study is the difficulty of locating the objectives of ELT in Libya and the reasons behind adopting the communicative approach. Accordingly, I urge the Libyan Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, along with the Libyan universities’ administrators, to work on creating a database that includes all studies that are archived somewhere in the country. I believe that effective educational reform needs research results and a reliable database to provide sources and information whenever and wherever needed.

Another type of challenge I faced as an insider was while analyzing the documents I gathered from the investigated program. The emotional experiences I faced while analyzing the program’s documents gave me the courage to question our program’s and faculty’s policies; it pushed me to call for a reform, especially since some of my participants mentioned policy reform. I recommend that the program and the faculty administrators develop and enforce authorship and program development policies to keep program developers’ and reviewers’ rights. I argue that words and expressions, such as
“designed by”, “developed by”, “suggested by”, “approved by”, “reviewed by”, and others should only be used to help eliminate the chances of attributing someone’s work to others. I am aware of the complexity of text ownership in the Libyan culture, and I am not trying to impose the Western ideology with regard to ownership of text and textual borrowing. However, I believe that there is a need to establish a cultural understanding of “the notion of authorship and originality” and the significance of accrediting someone’s work, especially in Libyan academic contexts (Pennycook, 1996, p. 211).

My Experience in Completing the GCCCU Faculty Portfolio Program

When my former boss, Mackenzie Holland, at Miami University Middletown’s ELC, sent an email that provided information about professional development opportunities offered to part-time faculty, I became so interested and followed the provided link in her email in order to read more. One of those great opportunities was the Teaching Portfolio Program, which was offered by the Greater Cincinnati Consortium of Colleges and University (GCCCU). As soon as I understood all the requirements for the Teaching Portfolio Program, I got in touch with someone who got me in contact with Ruth Benander, my mentor. As I felt that I had missed the opportunity of working as a Teaching Assistant (TA) at IUP and being mentored by one of my IUP professors, I thought that the Teaching Portfolio Program was an opportunity for professional improvement. Even though I was busy teaching, grading, working on my data analysis and dissertation, and fulfilling my role as a mother, I was determined to take on the opportunity.

In the GCCCU Faculty Portfolio Program, the university faculty demonstrated their competencies through a portfolio, in which they “document[ed] their professional
development activities related to teaching and learning” (GCCCU, 2014, para. 1). As a participant in this program, I was required to “compile a portfolio to demonstrate professional development in several areas” (GCCCU, 2014, para. 2). The GCCCU Faculty Portfolio Program components included knowledge of the institution, assessment, classroom management, instructional technology and resources, instructional strategies and learning engagement, course design/development, and developing observable/measurable student learning outcomes (GCCCU, 2014).

One might wonder about this experience in relation to my study. My answer is that it is about the Teaching Portfolio. The first time I came across portfolio assessment was when I was required to submit a Qualifying Portfolio in order to gain doctoral candidacy in my Composition and TESOL program at IUP. In the portfolio, I was required to follow the portfolio instructions and compile “samples of [my] academic writing”, which included a publishable manuscript, two courses papers, and other academic requirements (C&T Program Handbook, 2012, p. 10). A committee then evaluated my “ability to successfully complete the program” and determined my ability to complete my study in the program (C&T Program Handbook, 2012, p. 10). After a while, I found out about writing portfolios when I attended Ann Amicucci’s 32 presentation and heard Maha Alawdat’s 33 talk about her dissertation topic. The experience of compiling my own portfolio to complete the GCCCU Faculty Portfolio Program helped me later in creating my own teaching portfolio as a requirement for job interviews. The latter teaching portfolio is a compilation of documents that showcases an experience.

32 Ann Amicucci was a doctoral candidate in my Composition and TESOL program at IUP.
33 Maha Alawdat was a doctoral candidate in my Composition and TESOL program at IUP.
instructor’s teaching philosophy, teaching practices, strengths as a teacher, and teaching achievements. These examples of portfolio assessment encouraged me to read about portfolio assessment in teacher education. Thus, I was more interested in how to integrate the teaching portfolio in our TESOL teacher education program in Libya, especially since some of my participants mentioned the necessity of implementing independent learning practices.

This experience strengthened my belief that teaching portfolios can help our Libyan student-teachers in gaining critical perspectives about teaching, especially about their teaching practices. My experience with portfolios made me believe that we should consider them in the program’s future reform.

**My Experiences at TESOL 2016**

As I mentioned in the Prologue, I have always thought about how Libyan ELT teachers could contribute to making a positive change in Libyan learners’ lives. I looked for ways that ELT teachers could help learners process trauma, eliminate injustice, and promote peace. I was so fascinated when reading articles about how educators from different places around the world helped their students process trauma and survive. The most influential and encouraging experiences were presented by Aziz Abu Sarah in his keynote speech at the TESOL 2016 convention. It was my first time attending and presenting at the TESOL conference, and it was one of my most memorable experiences. What I learned from Abu Sarah’s presentation opened my eyes and raised my belief that I, a TESOL teacher-educator, could help eliminate the fear and hatred that were attached to the war against Qaddafi and his regime. Bringing barriers down seemed possible because Abu Sarah was able to make a change in a conflict zone in his own way. In his
presentation, he explained that we could revolutionize education by stepping out of our comfort zones, learning about the other, challenging the stereotypes, and engaging learners in experiential education.

The Country that Empowered Me Discriminates Me!

I grew up under Qaddafi’s dictatorship. I was forced to follow ideologies and orders, not to critique, not to think critically, and to just accept his ideologies as facts that cannot be argued. When I began my journey as a graduate student, I felt that my English language gave me the power that was stolen from me for years. I felt that I was strong, even when I could not speak because Qaddafi’s regime stole my voice.

As I discussed in the Prologue, my study at IUP has empowered me in many ways that lead me to believe in the role of TESOL in conflict zones. My exceptional IUP professors gave me the chance to read, to explore different ideas, to discuss ideas without any kind of constraints, and helped me to see the light at the end of the dark tunnel. Like many Libyans, I believe that my stay in the US not only helped me receive education, but also helped me gain my freedom. My US education empowered me that I became a strong peace activist that calls for the need for an educational revolution in Libya that implements peace, social justice, and humane education. My US education made me a strong believer in the role of TESOL in reconciliation in conflict zones.

However, when the ban was announced, I felt heartbroken; the country that empowered me discriminates me because I am Muslim and I am Libyan. I was shocked when I saw the news that spread the ban on Muslims from seven countries, among which was my beloved country, Libya. Fear of being attacked by any hater made me stay at home for days. I was depressed and thinking of what my fellow Libyans will say when
they read what I was proposing about the role of TESOL in conflict zones that I wrote the following on my Facebook page:

It feels weird that in my dissertation I’m highlighting the role of TESOL in achieving peace and social justice in conflict zones, whereas the government of the country, where the TESOL association is located, considers me and other Muslim TESOLers as threats that should be banned from entering USA.

The reaction of many of my fellow American TESOLers, IUP professors, and my American friends and neighbors gave me hope of humanity. The supporting messages and words helped me overcome that fear of being hated and the discomfort of being discriminated. Even though the ban made me feel hurt and discriminated because of my religion and where I come from, I still believe in the role of TESOL in conflict zones.

**My Insights**

Living and working in the US has given me the chance to come across specific information, which encouraged me to think about the possibility and applicability of implementing similar procedures to help Libyan TESOL teachers improve their language and teaching skills. The three ideas that I propose to be considered in the Libyan educational culture for TESOL teachers’ professional development are designing induction programs, creating recertification programs, and establishing a council for TESOL teachers.

**Induction Programs**

Induction programs have always captured my attention since I came to the US as a student and then worked as a part-time faculty member. US language programs, university programs, and teacher excellence programs organize induction programs to
help provide specific information that would help students and/or faculty. Induction programs have different purposes and are a week or longer. All US language programs and universities organize induction programs so that new students are introduced to the US system, to the language/university requirements and policies, to the facilities, and to other useful information. Induction programs are created to help newcomers settle and cope with their new environment. Induction programs are also organized for new teachers; these programs help introduce new teachers to their school’s expectations and policies and to their responsibilities and duties.

Induction programs are specifically necessary for Libyan first-year in-service teachers. Induction programs play a great role in helping novice teachers’ transition from being student-teachers in training to effective in-service teachers. Induction is “a comprehensive, coherent, and sustained professional development” process that is “organized by a school district” with the aim of training, supporting, and retaining new teachers to help “seamlessly progresses them into a lifelong learning program” (Wong, 2004, p. 42). It is the process that helps student-teachers “adapt to and learn about their roles as teachers” (Schwille, Dembele, & Schubert, 2007, p. 89). This process helps in the transition of student-teachers in becoming professional in-service teachers through specifically designed activities and support. The essential components of effective induction programs are specified by Wong (2004) and include the following:

- [Beginning] with an initial 4 or 5 days of induction before school starts;
- Offer[ing] a continuum of professional development through systematic training over a period of 2 or 3 years;
• Providing study groups in which new teachers can network and build support, commitment, and leadership in a learning community;

• [Incorporating] a strong sense of administrative support;

• Integrating a mentoring component into the induction process;

• [Presenting] a structure for modeling effective teaching during in-services and mentoring; and

• [Providing] opportunities for inductees to visit demonstration classrooms. (p. 48)

Ingersoll and Strong (2011) reviewed a number of empirical studies about induction and found that “mentoring programs have a positive impact” (p. 225). As shown in Figure 12, the success of induction programs relies on the role of mentors who “must be part of an induction process aligned to the district’s vision, mission, and structure” (Wong, 2004, p. 42).

Figure 12. Mentoring, induction, and professional development relationship (Wong, 2004, p. 42).
Mentoring. Since the mid-1980s in the US, new teachers were assigned to mentors. Mentoring is a kind of support system where “a knowledgeable person aids a less knowledgeable person” with the aim of assisting novice teachers (Eisenman & Thornton, 1999, p. 81). Mentors are usually experienced or experts from the same school, so they can help novice teachers become aware of school philosophies, cultural values, and expected behaviors (Little, 1990).

Since mentors may not be as clear about their mentoring roles and responsibilities, they might “become so intuitive they find it difficult to articulate what in fact they are doing” (Tomlinson, 1995, p. 18). Also, they might find difficulty in explaining the ways they applied a certain type of knowledge in their classrooms (Maynard & Furlong, 1995). Malderez and Bodoczky (1999) presented five mentors’ roles, in which mentors are involved in all five roles in (1) being models and demonstrators to inspire novice teachers, (2) in being acculturators, (3) in being sponsors who introduce the “right people” to their mentees, (4) in being supporters whenever their mentees need them, and (5) in being educators who provide novice teachers opportunities to accomplish professional learning objectives through the articulation of ideas (p. 21). Like their fellow TESOL teachers, Libyan TESOL teachers have to “negotiate their pedagogic roles with demotivated students, unsupportive parents, critical mass media and educational authorities” (Gao, 2011, p. 495). Along with that, Libyan teachers face other social and political issues in a conflict zone context. Mentoring could provide them with a chance to negotiate “these pressures and demands” (Mann & Tang, 2012, p. 473).
The Recertification Program

The first time I heard about this program was from Jennifer Edwards, a former colleague at ELC, when she told me that teachers in the US are required to meet some requirements in order to be able to teach. First, I was in shock, but then the more I read about this policy’s benefits, the more I thought that we should consider ideas, like this, to help our TESOL graduates to improve themselves as language users and as professionals.

In Libya, there are no professional development requirements for in-service teachers, which should be changed by considering programs that would engage in-service teachers in professional development opportunities. In the US, in-service teachers’ commitments to their professional development are a necessity. License holders go through a process, known as licensure renewal, where they are responsible for updating their knowledge and skills (Virginia Department of Education, 2016). Each state has its licensure renewal manual, which is developed by the state’s division of teacher education and licensure. For instance, in Virginia, requirements for licensure renewal include the following:

1. 180 professional development points;
2. Child Abuse and Neglect Recognition and Intervention Training;
3. Technology Standards for Instructional Personnel;
4. Emergency First Aid, CPR, and use of AEDs certification and training;
5. Virginia history/state and local government tutorial;
6. Application for license renewal; and a
7. Nonrefundable application fee. (Virginia Department of Education, 2016, pp. 4-6)
In Virginia, state teachers choose from eight renewal options “to document the accrual of 180 professional development points to renew their license” (Virginia Department of Education, 2016, p. 7). These eight options include receiving college credit, attending a professional conference, developing a curriculum, publishing an article, publishing a book, and engaging in professional development activities (Virginia Department of Education, 2016). As can be seen, unlike Libyan in-service teachers, who are not required to engage in any professional development activities, Virginia teachers are required to engage in activities that aim for renewing their teaching license.

I am not suggesting imitating such a process and applying it as it is. What I am suggesting is investigating such an idea and evaluating its appropriateness in the Libyan educational culture. I believe we need to consider the possibility of implementing similar renewal programs that would improve the efficacy of Libyan TESOL in-service teachers.

**The Libyan Association of TESOL**

I was so excited when I received a message from Ashour Abdulaziz, asking for my TESOL membership number, because they were preparing for a Libyan TESOL association. In 2014, I was honored to be a member of a group of Libyan TESOLers, lead by Dr. Al Tiyb Al Khaiyali, who established a TESOL’s affiliate in Libya, Libya TESOL. As an association that aims to provide Libyan TESOL teachers, educators, and researchers opportunities for professional development and networking, the program’s teacher-educators have the responsibility of informing their student-teachers about Libya TESOL and encouraging them to join their fellow in-service teachers and their educators for their current and future professional development. The association of TESOL teachers will hopefully unite Libyan educators and teachers and provide its members with various
sources, publication opportunities, and workshops; hopefully, it will also help organize conferences that will help to improve ELT in the Libyan context. I also believe that the Libyan TESOL association can promote peace and social justice in the Libyan academic and social societies.

**Final Remarks**

I still remember one of my professor’s words when she advised me to be careful and decide wisely on what to include and what not to include in my dissertation since I am representing my culture here in the US, as well as in my dissertation. I thought about that every day and every minute I spent writing and revising my dissertation. I had some kind of a struggle deep inside. The other Entisar inside of me that felt oppressed and hopeful for a better Libya after the revolution has always been rebellious. She always questioned me: are we not supposed to tackle the constraints? How can we tackle them if we are not going to expose them with the aim of showing a brighter side of the country? Is not Libya going through this painful and stressful situation because of our silence when we should have spoken? Is not Libya going through what the media calls a “civil war” because of not confronting ourselves and others that what Libya needs is not an armed fight, but peaceful revolutionary educational changes?

I confronted my fears, my own beliefs, and I decided to speak. Many times, I feared that I would be accused of being an enemy and that I would be persecuted for my American education. However, I believe that we need to use TESOL to “construct a pedagogy that is sensitive to [our] local needs, wants, and situations” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, p. 545). TESOL can play a great role in bringing critical thinking, social justice,
and peace to the Libyan culture by using the English language on our “own terms according to [our] own values and visions” (Kumaravadivelu, 2003b, p. 545).

Now that the head of the investigated program that gave me permission and encouraged me to pursue this topic is no longer in the program, I am not sure if the program will be willing to hear about my results. I am not sure if they are willing to follow my participants’ suggestions for program reform. However, deep inside, I still hear my inner voice, and it is telling me that I have done my part and that I should not think or worry about the others’ responsibilities.

I did not fail my country. I did my best, even when I was hurt and struggled because of my finances and my country’s social and political problems. I still believe that education is our “most powerful weapon” and that we should “use [it] to change the world” (Nelson Mandela Foundation, 2015). We, as TESOL teacher-educators and curriculum developers, need to think seriously about our department’s role in bringing peace and empowering others through social justice. We need to use the English language as an empowerment tool in order to facilitate critical thinking and encourage educational practices that will help in communicating with all the Libyan groups while reconnecting to rebuild our beloved country.

The fact that my findings were similar to a study that was conducted three decades ago (Hawana, 1981), and another that was conducted a decade ago (Elhensheri, 2004), is shocking. My participants’ suggestions were similar to what both of the studies recommended. This made me wonder about the reasons behind not taking these research results into account when designing and reforming programs. Even though I am not sure about whether my findings will be taken into consideration because the head of the
department who supported my study is no longer in the program, I promised myself to make a change and to present my results even if I cannot go back to my position in the program. We need to open new windows and consider research results if we plan to prepare effective TESOL teachers who not only teach English, but also empower their learners to create positive change. I hope that I managed to open that window to my fellow Libyan teacher-educators and program developers. My work in this study is considered finished; however, my contribution to change in Libyan social, academic, and educational culture has just begun.
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Dear prospective participants,

My name is Entisar Elsherif. I am a doctoral student in the Composition & TESOL program. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements of the Composition & TESOL PhD program. The study is about how you perceive and understand the affordances and constraints of the existing English language teacher education curriculum. I would like to invite you to participate to gain your insights, experiences, and understanding.

I am seeking participants who are between the ages of 19 – 55 years old, who are teacher-educators, student-teachers, or graduates/in-service teachers of the English language teacher education program of the Faculty of Education at Oya University. If you decide to participate, you will answer a questionnaire, meet with me for an interview via Skype/Viper, and document some journal entries on your experiences during the program. The interview will be audio-taped and then transcribed. Should you feel uncomfortable answering some of the questions, I assure you that you do not have to answer any questions that you do not wish to. All the results will be shared with you as my participant, and I hope that your voice and opinion will be heard and will contribute in the reform of the existing program.

Participation is confidential. The results of the study may be published or presented at professional meetings, and participation is anonymous, which means that no one will know your identity.

Thank you for your consideration. If you would like to participate, please email me at your earliest convenience to e.elsherif66@yahoo.com.

With kind regards,
Entisar Elsherif
724-541-8143
e.elsherif66@yahoo.com
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I volunteer to participate in a research project conducted by Entisar Elsherif, a doctoral student at Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I understand that the project is designed to gather information through departmental documents, questionnaires, interviews, and reflective journals about how teacher-educators, student-teachers, and in-service teachers perceive and understand the existing English language teacher education program in one of the Libyan universities.

1. My participation in this project is voluntary. I understand that I will not be paid for my participation. I may withdraw and discontinue participation at any time without penalty. If I decline to participate or withdraw from the study, I shall notify the interviewer. If I withdraw, all data pertaining to the interview will be destroyed.
2. I understand that I should find the questionnaire interesting and thought-provoking. If, however, I feel uncomfortable in any way, I have the right to decline to answer any question.
3. I understand that I should find the interview discussion interesting and thought-provoking. If, however, I feel uncomfortable in any way during the interview sessions, I have the right to decline to answer any question or to end the interview.
4. I understand that I will write reflective journals about my teaching experience and how I perceive and understand the existing EFL teacher education program. If, however, I feel uncomfortable in any way, I have the right to decline to participate.
5. Participation involves completing a questionnaire, being interviewed by the researcher, and writing reflective journals. The interview sessions will last approximately 60 minutes each. Notes will be written during the interview. An audio/video tape of the interview and subsequent dialogue will be made. If I don't want to be taped, I will not be able to participate in the study.
4. I understand that the researcher will not identify me by name in any reports using information obtained from this interview, and that my confidentiality as a participant in this study will remain secure. Subsequent uses of records and data will be subject to standard data use policies, which protect the anonymity of individuals and institutions. Video and audio files/tapes will be edited digitally to protect my identity.
5. I understand that this research study has been reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Studies Involving Human Subjects: Indiana University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Rights. For research problems or questions regarding subjects, the Institutional Review Board may be contacted through phone: 724-357-7730.
VOLUNTARY CONSENT FORM:

I have read and understand the information on the form and I consent to volunteer to be a subject in this study. I understand that my responses are completely confidential and that I have the right to withdraw at any time. I have received an unsigned copy of this Informed Consent Form to keep in my possession.
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Entisar Elsherif
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Appendix E
Teacher-Educators’ Questionnaire Protocol

Background information: Please check or complete as appropriate:

- Nationality: ____________________
- Your native language: __________
- Degree: Doctorate _____ Master: ____ Other_______
- Specialization
  TESOL _____ Applied Linguistics _____ Linguistics _____ Literature ____
  Other _____ Please specify __________________________________________________________________
- Years of university teaching experience:
  1 year ___ 2 – 5 years ___ More than 5 years ___
- Your Position: ______________________________________
- Years of teaching experience elsewhere and please specify where (if any):
  ______________
- Did you take any courses about curriculum development? Yes _____ No _____
  If yes, please specify _______________________________________________________________________
- Did you participate in the process of the current curriculum’s development?
  Yes __ No __
  What was your role/responsibility? (Please specify when) ___________________________________________________________________

A. Which English? Which Expression?

1. In your opinion, which English should be taught in the department?
   - British English
   - American English
   - British & other varieties
   - American & other varieties
   Please specify why you chose that: ___________________________________________________________

2. In your opinion, which of the following expressions should be used in the Libyan context
   - Teaching English as a Second Language _____
   - Teaching English as a Foreign Language _____
   - Teaching English as an International Language _____
Please specify why you chose that:
________________________________________________________________________________

**B. Views about English language teacher education programs**

3. How do you define English language teacher education programs’ roles and responsibilities?
4. What are the crucial elements to include in the English language teacher education program curriculum?

**C. Views about the existing English language teacher education program’s affordances and constraints**

5. Do you think your English language teacher education program meets the expectations of the Libyan Ministry of Education? Why?

6. What courses in the existing curriculum do you think are not relevant to teacher education purposes? Why?

7. In your opinion, what are your program’s strengths?

8. In your opinion, what are your program’s limitations?

9. Are there any limitations related to types of courses, teaching staff availability, teaching resources availability, student number, etc.? If yes, what?

**D. Suggestions for the existing English language teacher education program’s reform**

10. How can the curriculum of the English language teacher education program meet the objectives/expectations of the Libyan Ministry of Education?

11. How do you think your English language teacher preparation can balance between theory and practice in the curriculum?

12. How can the methodology course fully prepare student-teachers for their future teaching in Libyan schools?

13. How can the program’s curriculum help students predict real classroom teaching challenges and be prepared to overcome any challenges?
14. How can a teacher education program and teacher-educators inform/teach student-teachers about ways of professional improvement after graduation?

15. If you were given the chance to improve the English language teacher education program, what changes would you make?

E. Views on critical language teacher education

16. In your opinion, what is critical language teacher education?

17. How do you think critical language teacher education is relevant to your context?

18. What do you think of critical language teacher education as an approach for program/curriculum reform?

19. What do you think of the following statements?
   - The curriculum should include courses that raise student-teachers’ awareness to peace education.
   - The curriculum should include courses that raise student-teachers’ awareness to social justice education.
   - The curriculum should include courses that raise students’ awareness to place and environmental issues.

Interview

Will you be interested in having an interview to talk about your English language teacher education program in more detail?

Yes _____ No ______

If you have answered the previous question with yes, please provide the following information:

Name:                           Email:
Appendix F

Student-Teachers’ Questionnaire Protocol

Background information: Please check or complete as appropriate:

• Level: 3rd year student _____ 4th year student _____

• Which of the following courses did you take?
  o Methods of Teaching _____
  o Strategies 1 _____
  o Strategies 2 _____
  o Computer Assisted Language Learning _____
  o Teaching English to Young Learners _____
  o Teaching English Skills _____
  o Other teacher preparation courses ______________________

• What would you like to become?
  o A primary school teacher _____
  o A preparatory school teacher _____
  o A secondary school teacher ________

• Did you participate in teaching practice at schools? Yes _____ No _____
  If yes, which school did you go to?
  o Primary school teacher _____
  o Preparatory school teacher _____
  o Secondary school teacher _____

A. Which English? Which Expression?

1. In your opinion, which English should be taught in the department?
  • British English
  • American English
  • British & other varieties
  • American & other varieties

  Please specify why you chose that: _____________________________________
2. In your opinion, which of the following expressions should be used in the Libyan context?

- Teaching English as a Second Language _____
- Teaching English as a Foreign Language _____
- Teaching English as an International Language _____

Please specify why you chose that:

_______________________________________________

B. Views about English language teacher education programs

3. How do you define English language teacher education programs’ roles and responsibilities?

4. What are the crucial elements to include in the English language teacher education program curriculum?

C. Views about the existing English language teacher education program’s affordances and constraints

5. Do you think your English language teacher education program meets the expectations of the Libyan Ministry of Education? Why?

6. What courses in the existing curriculum do you think are not relevant to teacher education purposes? Why?

7. In your opinion, what are your program’s strengths?

8. In your opinion, what are your program’s limitations?

9. Are there any limitations related to types of courses, teaching staff availability, teaching resources availability, student number, etc.? If yes, what?

D. Suggestions for the existing English language teacher education program’s reform

10. How can the curriculum of the English language teacher education program meet the objectives/expectations of the Libyan Ministry of Education?

11. How do you think your English language teacher preparation can balance between theory and practice in the curriculum?
12. How can the methodology course fully prepare student-teachers for their future teaching in Libyan schools?

13. How can the program’s curriculum help students predict real classroom teaching challenges and be prepared to overcome any challenges?

14. How can a teacher education program and teacher-educators inform/teach student-teachers about ways of professional improvement after graduation?

15. If you were given the chance to improve the English language teacher education program, what changes would you make?

E. Views on critical language teacher education

16. In your opinion, what is critical language teacher education?

17. How do you think critical language teacher education is relevant to your context?

18. What do you think of critical language teacher education as an approach for program/curriculum reform?

19. What do you think of the following statements?
   • The curriculum should include courses that raise student-teachers’ awareness to peace education.
   • The curriculum should include courses that raise student-teachers’ awareness to social justice education.
   • The curriculum should include courses that raise students’ awareness to place and environmental issues.

Interview
Will you be interested in having an interview to talk about your English language teacher education program in more detail?
Yes ______ No ______
If you have answered the previous question with yes, please provide the following information:
   Name:                                          Email:
Appendix G

Graduates’ Questionnaire Protocol

Background information: Please check or complete as appropriate:

- Years of experience:
  2 years ____  3 – 5 years ____  more than 5 years ____

- I am a __________________________
  o Primary school teacher. _____
  o Preparatory school teacher. _____
  o Secondary school teacher. _____

- What level are you teaching now? ________________

- When you were a student, did you participate in teaching practice at schools?
  Yes ____  No ______

- Which school did you go to?
  o Primary school teacher _____
  o Preparatory school teacher _____
  o Secondary school teacher _____

A. Which English? Which Expression?

1. In your opinion, which English should be taught in the department?
   - British English
   - American English
   - British & other varieties
   - American & other varieties

   Please specify why you chose that: _________________________________

2. In your opinion, which of the following expressions should be used in the Libyan context?
   - Teaching English as a Second Language _____
   - Teaching English as a Foreign Language _____
   - Teaching English as an International Language _____

   Please specify why you chose that:

   ____________________________________________
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B. Views about English language teacher education programs

3. How do you define English language teacher education programs’ roles and responsibilities?

4. What are the crucial elements to include in the English language teacher education program curriculum?

C. Views about the existing English language teacher education program’s affordances and constraints

5. Do you think your English language teacher education program meets the expectations of the Libyan Ministry of Education? Why?

6. What courses in the existing curriculum do you think are not relevant to teacher education purposes? Why?

7. In your opinion, what are your program’s strengths?

8. In your opinion, what are your program’s limitations?

9. Are there any limitations related to types of courses, teaching staff availability, teaching resources availability, student number, etc.? If yes, what?

D. Suggestions for the existing English language teacher education program’s reform

10. How can the curriculum of the English language teacher education program meet the objectives/expectations of the Libyan Ministry of Education?

11. How do you think your English language teacher preparation can balance between theory and practice in the curriculum?

12. How can the methodology course fully prepare student-teachers for their future teaching in Libyan schools?

13. How can the program’s curriculum help students predict real classroom teaching challenges and be prepared to overcome any challenges?

14. How can a teacher education program and teacher-educators inform/teach student-teachers about ways of professional improvement after graduation?
15. If you were given the chance to improve the English language teacher education program, what changes would you make?

**E. Critical language teacher education**

16. In your opinion, what is critical language teacher education?

17. How do you think critical language teacher education is relevant to your context?

18. What do you think of critical language teacher education as an approach for program/curriculum reform?

19. What do you think of the following statements?
   - The curriculum should include courses that raise student-teachers’ awareness to peace education.
   - The curriculum should include courses that raise student-teachers’ awareness to social justice education.
   - The curriculum should include courses that raise students’ awareness to place and environmental issues.

**Interview**
Will you be interested in having an interview to talk about your English language teacher education program in more detail?
Yes ______ No ______
If you have answered the previous question with yes, please provide the following information:
   Name: __________________________ Email: __________________________
Appendix H

Teacher-Educators’ Interview Protocol

Q1 Can you tell me about your teaching experience as a teacher-educator? Please provide any information related to the English language teacher education program, particular views about pedagogy courses, teachers’ course instructions, and possible role models established at the time.

Q2 Tell me about your teacher education program. The approaches and methods emphasized, courses taken, amount of time, your impression about the program and the student-teachers, and the program’s strengths and weaknesses.

Q3 What do you think students have learned in teacher preparation courses and practicum? What do you think about their preparedness to teach?

Q4 In Q#? of the questionnaire you answered (), please talk about your response in more detail.

Q5 Looking at the curriculum and some of the reports, I noticed that there were some courses that were changed from being among the compulsory courses to elective ones. Please specify why.

Q6 What do you think of critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform?
Appendix I

Student-Teacher Interview Protocol

Q1 Tell me about your pre-service training?

Q2 Can you tell me about your teaching experience during teaching practice and micro-teaching?

Q3 Tell me about your teacher education program. The approaches and methods emphasized, courses taken, amount of time, your impression about the program and the teacher educators, and program’s strengths and weaknesses.

Q4 What do you think you have learned in teacher preparation courses and practicum? What do you think about your preparedness to teach?

Q5 In Q#? of the questionnaire you answered (), please talk about your response in more detail.

Q6 What do you think of critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform?
Appendix J

Graduates’ Interview Protocol

Q1 Tell me about your pre-service training as an English language teacher.

Q2 After years of teaching, what do you think of your teacher education program? The approaches and methods emphasized, courses taken, amount of time, your impression about the program and the teacher-educators, and program’s strengths and weaknesses.

Q3 What do you think you have learned in teacher preparation courses and practicum? What do you think about how you were prepared to teach?

Q4 In Q#? of the questionnaire you answered (), please talk about your response in more detail.

Q5 What do you think of critical language teacher education as an approach for curriculum reform?
### University Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>رمز المقرر</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arabic Language 1</td>
<td>لا ع 103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arabic Language 2</td>
<td>لا ع 104</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arabic Language 3</td>
<td>لا ع 105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Arabic Language 4</td>
<td>لا ع 106</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quranic Studies 1</td>
<td>لا ع 101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Quranic Studies 2</td>
<td>لا ع 102</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Computer Science 1</td>
<td>حاسب 1 Cs100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Computer Science 2</td>
<td>حاسب 2 Cs101</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Principles of Statistics</td>
<td>ح س 400 مبادئ الإحصاء</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix L

**Faculty Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>رمز المقرر</th>
<th>اسم المقرر</th>
<th>عدد الوحدات</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ت ن 100</td>
<td>علم النفس العام</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ت ن 101</td>
<td>اصول التربية</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>ت ن 200</td>
<td>علم النفس التربوى</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>ت ن 201</td>
<td>طرق تدريس عامة</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>ت ن 202</td>
<td>اساس مناهج</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ت ن 203</td>
<td>علم النفس الارتقائي</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ت ن 301</td>
<td>طرق بحث</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>ت ن 302</td>
<td>التقويم و القياس</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>ت ن 303</td>
<td>الوسائل التعليمية</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ت ن 401</td>
<td>الصحة النفسية</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>ت ن 402</td>
<td>التربية العملية</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total of credits**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مجموع الوحدات الكلي</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### English Department’s Compulsory Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eng102</td>
<td>English Grammar 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng103</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng104</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng105</td>
<td>Writing 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng106</td>
<td>Phonetics 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng107</td>
<td>English Grammar 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng108</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng109</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng110</td>
<td>Writing 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng111</td>
<td>Phonetics 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng212</td>
<td>English Grammar 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng213</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng214</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng215</td>
<td>Writing 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng217</td>
<td>Linguistics 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng218</td>
<td>English Grammar 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng219</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng220</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng327</td>
<td>Creative Writing 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng223</td>
<td>Theoretical Linguistics 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng222</td>
<td>English Literature 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng326</td>
<td>Advanced Listening &amp; Speaking 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng324</td>
<td>Grammatical Structures 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng325</td>
<td>Advanced Reading 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng328</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng440</td>
<td>Academic Writing 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng334</td>
<td>Methods of Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng322</td>
<td>Grammatical Structures 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng336</td>
<td>Strategies 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng446</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng340</td>
<td>Computer Assisted Language Learning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng422</td>
<td>Strategies 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng342</td>
<td>English Literature 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng343</td>
<td>Research Methods in English Language Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng402</td>
<td>Teaching Practice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng448</td>
<td>Graduation Project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total of Credits:** 94
## Appendix N

**English Department’s Elective Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Psycholinguistics</td>
<td>Eng329</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advanced Reading 2</td>
<td>Eng331</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advanced Listening &amp; Speaking 2</td>
<td>Eng332</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Creative Writing 2</td>
<td>Eng333</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Applied Linguistics 2</td>
<td>Eng335</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Grammatical Structures 3</td>
<td>Eng337</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching English Language Skills</td>
<td>Eng341</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vocabulary Development</td>
<td>Eng344</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching English to Young Learners</td>
<td>Eng345</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advanced Reading 3</td>
<td>Eng348</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Advanced Listening &amp; Speaking 3</td>
<td>Eng349</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Academic Writing 2</td>
<td>Eng445</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Vocabulary Development</td>
<td>Eng344</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>History and Varieties of English</td>
<td>Eng447</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching English Language Skills</td>
<td>Eng341</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of Credits</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix O

**TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum (1st Year)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Crse #</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Prereq.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Crse #</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Prereq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eng102</td>
<td>English Grammar 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eng107</td>
<td>English Grammar 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng103</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng103</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Comprehension 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eng104</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eng104</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng105</td>
<td>Writing 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng105</td>
<td>Writing 2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eng106</td>
<td>Phonetics 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eng106</td>
<td>Phonetics 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ل ع 103</td>
<td>Arabic Language 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>ل ع 104</td>
<td>Arabic Language 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>ت ن 100</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>ل ع 101</td>
<td>Quranic Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total of Credits**: 22

---
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# Appendix P

## TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum (2nd Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Crse #</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Prereq.</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Crse #</th>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Prereq.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eng212</td>
<td>English Grammar 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eng218</td>
<td>English Grammar 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Comprehension 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Comprehension 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng213</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng109</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eng220</td>
<td>Listening &amp; Speaking 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng215</td>
<td>Writing 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng110</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng327</td>
<td>Creative Writing 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eng217</td>
<td>Linguistics 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eng223</td>
<td>Linguistics 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eng218</td>
<td>English Grammar 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reading Comprehension 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cs101</td>
<td>Computer 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cs100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Eng327</td>
<td>Creative Writing 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eng223</td>
<td>Linguistics 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total of Credits** 24

**Total of Credits** 22
### Appendix Q

**TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum (3rd Year)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>5th Semester</th>
<th>6th Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng324</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grammatical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structures1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eng325</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced Reading1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eng328</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applied Linguistics1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Eng334</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Methods of Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Basis of Curricula</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total of Credits</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Appendix R

**TESOL Teacher Education Curriculum (4th Year)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7th Semester</th>
<th>8th Semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td><strong>Crse #</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Eng442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Eng342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Eng343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ت ن 401</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total of Credits | 10 | Total of Credits | 6 |
### Appendix S

**Academic Supervisor’s Teaching Practice Assessment Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; visit</th>
<th>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; visit</th>
<th>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; visit</th>
<th>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; visit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson Planning (12 marks)</strong></td>
<td>Prepares clear and organized lesson plan (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has clear lesson aims and objectives (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awareness of teaching methods and techniques (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well thought of and aimed lesson procedures (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepares model examples to best illustrate language (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepares suitable activities and exercises (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson Delivery (20 marks)</strong></td>
<td>Arrives on time (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives warm up or introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has clear voice (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manages class time efficiently</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presents material well in a variety of techniques (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illustrates with sufficient examples</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives enough activities and exercises (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Checks students’ understanding (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives and checks homework (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Linguistic Competence (30 marks)</strong></td>
<td>Uses acceptable pronunciation and intonation (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses language accurately (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaks fluently (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spells correctly (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Displays good range of vocabulary (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gives clear instructions (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom Management (20 marks)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicates clearly and easily (3)</td>
<td>Displays knowledge of material content (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimizes use of L1 (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses body language and eye contact (2)</td>
<td>Moves around class (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains students’ attention throughout (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizes individual, pair, or group as needed (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls students’ undesirable behavior e.g., noise (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gives positive reinforcement as appropriate (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivates students to practice/interact (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourages students to ask questions (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pays attention to weak students (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapts well to unexpected situations (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>**Teaching Aids 8 marks)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses whiteboard effectively (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses audio material e.g., CDs when appropriate (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses visual aids (DVD, pictures, flashcards, etc.) (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses other technology e.g., Internet, data show (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Observation, Self-reflection and Development (10 marks)</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of observation skills and items to observe (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-reflects effectively on own practice (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts and acts upon feedback (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offers effective feedback to peers (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Able to utilize various resources and develop own teaching profession (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total assessment marks of each visit:**

**Final assessment (average of last three visits):**
Appendix T

Educational Supervisor’s Teaching Practice Assessment Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESSON PLANNING NOTEBOOK</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prepares lesson plans regularly</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lesson plans included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>The general objective of the lesson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Clear procedural objectives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Teaching procedure appropriate to lesson objectives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Activities connect previous knowledge with new ones</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Appropriate teaching materials</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Appropriate means of evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LESSON IMPLEMENTATION &amp; LEARNING ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prepares learners using a variety of methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Provokes students' background knowledge before engaging in the lesson</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Connects the new lesson with the previous lessons</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Uses up-to-date, appropriate sources and teaching materials</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Uses appropriate and varied teaching methods and approaches</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides opportunities to encourage research, experiment, and proposing solutions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Uses open-ended questions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gives students enough time to think and to find answers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Gives appropriate feedback</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensures a friendly teacher-student/student-teacher relationship and encouraging atmosphere</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Welcomes students' questions and provides convincing answers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Enhances learners' answers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Addresses learners' negative behaviors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Proper use of class time</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Correctness of subject matter</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Lesson is introduced sequentially and coherently</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Talks in the class with a clear, loud voice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Capable of the subject matter/proficient</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Covers all the subject's points/areas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Effective use of the textbook</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Uses the board effectively</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATING STUDENTS' LEARNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Chooses the appropriate ways to evaluate students' learning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assigns students activities and tasks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assigns students activities and tasks that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Related to the lesson</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Appropriate for students' levels of proficiency</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Includes various cognitive, emotional, and behavioral levels</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Encourages different modes of thinking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WEEKLY MEETINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Commitment to weekly meetings' attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discusses ideas and gives opinions that indicates the students</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Presents student-teachers' creative work</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accepts advice and guidance, discusses the ideas, and works on implementing them</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Takes notes of the supervisor's ideas/notes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total of grades**

100
Appendix U

School Principal’s Teaching Practice Assessment Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student-teachers’ commitment to their daily attendance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Participation in the school's different activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Student-teachers’ commitment to going into and out of class on the assigned time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Student-teachers’ cooperation with the school's administration and teachers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Student-teachers’ commitment to daily attendance of morning and recess line-up</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total of grades</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>