SELF-PERCEIVED (NON) NATIVENESS AND COLOMBIAN PROSPECTIVE ENGLISH TEACHERS IN TELECOLLABORATION

by

JOHN JAIRO VIÁFARA GONZÁLEZ

_____

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

GRADUATE INTERDISCIPLINARY DOCTORAL PROGRAM IN SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION AND TEACHING

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2015

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
GRADUATE COLLEGE

As members of the Dissertation Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by John Jairo Viáfara González, titled Self-Perceived (non) Nativeness and Colombian Prospective English Teachers in Telecollaboration and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

_____Date: 1/7/2015
Robert Ariew

_____Date: 1/7/2015
Beatrice Dupuy

_____Date: 1/7/2015
Grace Fielder

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copies of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

_____Date:1/7/2015
Dissertation Director: Robert Ariew

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that an accurate acknowledgement of the source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whose or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: John Jairo Viáfara González

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This new achievement in my career was only possible because of the various forms of support that I received from several people. Quiero agradecer y expresar mi afecto a cada una de ellas. I firstly would like to thank Dr. Ariew, head of the SLAT interdisciplinary program, the chair of my committee y un gran amigo. I was lucky to be a recipient of Robert's commitment, wisdom, humor and encouraging guidance. The first words and last words he wrote to provide me feedback will always live in my mind because they drove me to strive towards my goal. Through Robert, I benefited from SLAT´s solid structure to support my studies at the University of Arizona. I also appreciate Dr. Dupuy and Dr. Fielder´s suggestions and availability to enrich my research work. I certainly incorporated their recommendations into my project as I conducted my study. Another person, I sincerely thank is Dr. Linda Waugh. Her invitation to join the program and her kindness and trust will never be forgotten.

In Colombia, my mom, Rosmary, siblings, niece and nephew have once again done what they do best and continuously inspired me: believing in my character and potential. Even though they were far away, my family's affection has sheltered me and that is invaluable. "Los quiero y agradezco a la vida que estén bien." Aleida Ariza has been my unconditional friend through the years, and despite her own challenges, she took care of my issues back home while I was in the program. I am forever grateful to this strong, clever and sincere woman who I love and deeply admire and respect. "Este es un logro de los dos pequeña."

Besides my Ph. D degree, there is a treasure I encountered in this second visit to the U.S.; I had the fortune to find love from Sean Seeba. Sean has shared with me every day the satisfaction and hardships this process has meant and his wise and clear judgment as a reader of

my articles is priceless. I can write today the concluding remarks in this dissertation because he was the "wind beneath my wings." "Te quiero y espero que los años próximos nos traigan aún más satisfaciones."

José Aldemar Alvarez, his wife Mirta, and two kids' affection and concern for me was invaluable throughout these years. I am so grateful they have opened their home's door for me when I was on my own in Tucson. They are family to me and I will always owe them a great deal. "José, te admiro y desde que he tenido la fortuna de conocerte has sido un ejemplo para mí." My dear friend and brother, Norberto Rodriguez, always made my concerns his and not only accompanied me throughout this journey, but he assisted my family in Colombia with whatever they needed. After twenty-eight years of knowing each other, I cannot say how lucky I have been to count him as such a friend. "Betico gracias por ser incondicional como siempre." María Imperio Arenas has always offered her support and has been available throughout these years. I appreciate her kindness and solidarity. María and Cesar Romero gave me their vote of confidence and that was an honor for me. "El apoyo que ustedes me dieron solo lo dan los grandes amigos, muchas gracias." I have made a lifelong friend in Kristen Michelson who was always concerned for my health and emotional wellbeing. By offering her sincere and kind friendship, she made this journey more enjoyable and productive. "Eres una superwoman y un modelo a seguir."

I am eternally obliged to María Eugenia López. Her dedication in organizing the telecollaboration experience in her Colombian university made a difference in the study. Trudie McEvoy contributed with her patience and dedication to the success of the telecollaboration with Colombian students. A big part of what this dissertation has come to be is owed to John Rabuck. With his clear judgment and vast knowledge, he tutored me in writing and then his impressive experience enlightened my dissertation work. John has won my admiration and gratitude

because of his professionalism and kindness. “Eres un amigo que siempre estará en mi corazón.”

Finally, I sincerely acknowledge the financial support of Fulbright and Colciencias. The scholarship I was granted was an important contribution for my studies and I have grown a lot because of this unique opportunity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES 10
ABSTRACT 11
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 13
Overarching Research Design 17
Conceptual Framework 23
Overview of the Three Articles 33
CHAPTER 2: "I FEEL LIKE I'M MISSING SOMETHING": SELF-PERCEIVED (NON) NATIVENESS IN COLOMBIAN PROSPECTIVE ENGLISH TEACHERS 36
Introduction 36
Language Ideologies and the Current Status of Spanish and English 39
Critical Applied Linguistics and the Myth of the Native Speaker 41
Research on Non-native English Speaker Teachers' Self-perceptions 43
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 46
Context of the Study 47
Participants 49
Data Collection and Instruments 51
Data Analysis 52
FINDINGS 54
"Of course, I Regard Myself as a Native Spanish Speaker" 55
"Despite Our Being Native Speakers, We Certainly Have Limitations" 58
"I Feel like I'm Missing Something" 61
"I Am Increasing My Abilities and Opportunities" 65
"NNESTs Can Have Very Good Language Mastery, but that's Not the Ideal" 67
"It Is Good to Give NESTs and NNESTs a Chance to Teach as Far as They Are Prepared" 71
DISCUSSION 76
Ideologies Shaping Participants´ Self-perceptions of (non) Nativeness as Speakers 76
From Nonnative English Speakers to Prospective NNESTs: From Myth to Fallacy 87
CONCLUSIONS 94
IMPLICATIONS 95
Implications for Policy Makers 96
Implications for University Officials 97
Implications for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Pre-service teachers 99
Implications for Further Research 101
CHAPTER 3: PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS IN TELECOLLABORATION: MEANING MAKING ABILITY AND THE MYTH OF THE NATIVE SPEAKER 103
Introduction 103
Literature Review 105
Nativespeakerism and associated micro-language ideologies 105
Non-native english speaker teachers' self-perceptions: reviewing the research 109
Telecollaboration 110
Heritage spanish learners 112
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 114
Setting 115
The Telecollaboration 116

Participants ... 117
Data Collection Instruments ... 119
Data Analysis ... 121
FINDINGS ... 122
Native Spanish Speakers in Telecollaboration: Their focus on Meaning Making and Modeling Language Ability ... 122
English Language Ability and Pursuit of Native-like Standards in ICFLE ... 131
Telecollaboration and Confidence in Language Ability: Reinforcing Prior Self-perceptions as Prospective NNESTs ... 142
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS ... 146
Confidence in Meaning Making Abilities and Evolving Self-perceptions of (non) nativeness in Telecollaboration ... 147
Resembling and Modeling Native-Like Language Ability: Purism, Contradictions and Critical Incidents ... 153
Favorable Self-perception of Language Ability: Positive Images as Future Teachers ... 163
CONCLUSIONS ... 167
PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS ... 168
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH ... 171
CHAPTER 4: THE IMPACT OF ICFLE AFFECTIVE AND KNOWELEDGE-BASED RESOURCES ON SELF-PERCEPTION OF (NON) NATIVENESS ... 174
Introduction ... 174
Nativespeakerism: The Myth of the Native Speaker and Associated Ideologies ... 176
Telecollaboration ... 178
Telecollaboration and sociocultural theory ... 178
Telecollaboration and the intercultural speaker ... 180
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY ... 181
Setting ... 182
Telecollaboration Design and Implementation ... 184
Participants ... 185
Data Collection Instruments ... 187
Data Analysis ... 189
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION ... 189
Affective Dynamics of Shared Identification as (non) Native Speakers ... 190
Mutual encouragement ... 191
Tolerance ... 195
Sharing their concerns ... 196
Internet resources, affect and portrayed images of (non)nativeness ... 198
Affect and nonnativeness in ICFLE and self-perceptions as prospective NNESTs ... 202
Information and Experiences: from Interaction to Personal Reflection ... 203
Personal histories and beliefs ... 204
Awareness of language use ... 210
Awareness of native speakers as culturally nuanced ... 211
CONCLUSIONS ... 215
IMPLICATIONS ... 217
Pedagogical Implications ... 217
Suggestions for Further Research ... 220

CHAPER 5: CONCLUDING REMARKS 222
APPENDIX A: PRE-TELECOLLABORATION SURVEY 226
APPENDIX B: PROTOCOL INTERVIEW I 237
APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONS FOR TELECOLLABORATORS 240
APPENDIX D: WEEKLY TOPICS AND PREPARATION TASKS 241
APPENDIX E: FACEBOOK TELECOLLABORATION GROUP 246
APPENDIX F: AFTER TELECOLLABORATION SURVEY 247
APPENDIX G: PROTOCOL INTERVIEW II 257
APPENDIX H: INSTRUCTIONS FOR REFLECTION LOGS 259
APPENDIX I: INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE FACEBOOK FORUM 261
REFERENCES 262

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 2

Table 1.Participants' Self-ranking of their Overall Spanish Language Ability 56
Table 2. Participants' Self-ranking of their Specific Spanish Language Ability 57
Table 3. Participants' Comparing themselves to Other Colombian Spanish Speakers 57
Table 4. Participants' Self-Ranking of Their Overall Linguistic Ability in English 63
Table 5. Average of Participants' Self-Evaluation of Language Abilities and Knowledge 64
Table 6. Participants' Opinions Regarding What NNESTS Can Offer and Are Missing 69
Table 7. Participants' Opinions Regarding Nests Can Offer and Are Missing 69
Table 8. Participants' Advice about Hiring Someone as an English Teacher 70
Table 9. Participants' Views on Who They Would Hire to Work in a Language Institute 72
Table 10. Levels of Concern Regarding Language Limitations and Future Teaching Job 76
Table 11. References to Native Speaker Standards in English Courses at University B 78

ABSTRACT

Previous studies on nonnative English speaker teachers (NNESTs) (Reyes & Medgyes, 1994; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Llurda, 2008; Rajagopalan, 2005) and publications in World Englishes (WEs), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and English as an international language (EIL), have analyzed and documented how prevailing ideologies rooted in "the myth of the native speaker" (Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah, 1999; Kramsch, 2000), "the native speaker fallacy" (Phillipson, 1992) and associated ideologies generate discrimination and affect students and teachers' sense of self-worth.

By making use of telecollaboration to determine how L1 Spanish speaking Colombian EFL pre-service teachers' interactions with U.S. heritage Spanish speakers (HSSs) influence the Colombian future teachers' self-perceptions as (non) native speakers and future teachers, this study responds to scholars' concerns to diversify the scope of explorations on NNESTs (Samimy & Kurihara, 2008; Llurda, 2008). Examining the ideological side of the native vs. non-native speaker dichotomy in telecollaboration, this research seeks to reverse the tendency to study interactants' exchanges mainly as a language feedback process through which "native speakers" support those who are not native speakers.

Under an overarching qualitative phenomenological case study research design, the first article's pre-assessment of participants' self-perceptions of (non) nativeness found that the myth of the native speaker, the native speaker fallacy and associated ideologies permeated participants' self-images as language speakers and prospective teachers. Nevertheless, their ongoing education and the perceived benefits of becoming skillful language users contrasted with the harmful effects of these ideologies.

Based on findings in the first article, the second study determined that in adopting meaning making abilities as their center of interest in telecollaboration, most participants focused less on the achievement of idealized native speaker abilities. Their interaction with U.S. peers

generated confidence in their use of English, self-criticism of their skills in Spanish and a tendency to embrace the idea that they could succeed as English teachers.

The intercultural and sociocultural nature of telecollaboration as a potential resource to leverage Colombian prospective teachers' self-perceptions constitutes the core of the last manuscript. Cooperative relationships with U.S. peers provided participants affective and knowledge-based resources to build more favorable views of themselves, attitudes to confront the detrimental effects of nativespeakership ideologies, and informed judgments to dismantle them. The pedagogical implications section discusses the need to revise the current EFL perspective providing the framework for English language teaching and learning in Colombia, avenues for strengthening students' ideological literacy through telecollaborative tasks and the potential integration of telecollaboration in the language teacher education curriculum as a means to increase participants' linguistic, intercultural and pedagogical abilities, and to cultivate more favorable self-images.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Since the emergence of Paikeday's (1985) seminal work "The Native Speaker is Dead", a robust number of publications have campaigned against the mythical figure of the native speaker as an ideal model for language performance. More recently another publication, "The Native Speaker is Alive and Kicking" (Mukherjee, 2005), not only illustrates the permanent controversy surrounding this mythical character, but signals the pervasiveness of nativespeakerism. This ideology promotes an idealized native speaker-like language proficiency, which is unlikely to be attained, and justifies social sanctions for those individuals with no native-like credentials.

This study joins in the decades long efforts of scholars to increase awareness of, challenge and dismantle the ubiquitous belief in the native speaker as the goal that students in the foreign language education field need to accomplish. Foreign language education has been constructed under the premise that learners' instruction should enable them to interact primarily with native speakers (Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Modiano, 2001; Jenkins, 2006; Cook, 2007). Traditionally, the materials, syllabi and standards for evaluation are based upon guidelines that adopt native speaker norms as a benchmark (Alptekin, 2002; Mc Kay, 2002; Cook, 2007; Ziaei, 2002; Baleghizadeh & Motahed, 2010).

Because the native speaker standard does not account for the actual variability of speakers at various levels, it is an inconsistent and biased linguistic construct and its use as a measure of language ability exposes learners to inescapable failure (Rajagopalan, 1999; Kramsch, 2002; Cook, 2007). Furthermore, it disenfranchises them from expressing their culture and identity (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001; Cook, 2007). In the end, the native speaker is more a social notion that indexes race, class and national origin, among other variables (Kramsch & Lam, 1999; Canagarajah, 1999; Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001) and accredits a few

individuals considered the owners of the language (Widowson, 1994) while it discredits others as "renters."

The growing global number and increasingly varied geographic distribution of those traditionally considered (non) native English speakers (Crystal, 2008) has been highlighted by fields such as world Englishes (WEs), English as an international language (EIL), and English as a lingua franca (ELF). This new scenario alters the global communicative dynamics among English speakers, for whom currently it is far easier than ever before to come into contact with one another; non-native English speakers are more likely to communicate with other non-native speakers than they are to communicate with native speakers (Smith, 1976). This global communicative dynamic change has become a strong argument against, not only imposing native-like standards (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy 2001; Gradol, 2003), but more importantly attributing the ownership of English to an elite group of speakers.

Teachers begin their foreign language education as learners and in that capacity they are likely to face the consequences of not reaching socially-sanctioned native-like speakers' standards like the ones discussed above. However, the negative impact teachers endure of not reaching these standards goes even beyond this. In countries around the world, scholars have studied the nature and conditions of nonnative English speaker teachers (Reyes & Medgyes, 1994; Braine, 1999; Mahboob, 2003; Llurda 2004; Moussu, 2006) and their research has led them to denounce the prejudice and the inequities that nonnative English speaker teachers (NNESTs), or those perceived as such, suffered despite their qualifications as proficient speakers (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Mahboob, 2003; Moussu, 2006; Clark & Paran, 2007). As a result NNESTs oftentimes develop feelings of inferiority which compromises their chances for personal growth in their roles as teachers.

As a contribution to this struggle, this research study focused on Colombian prospective[1] teachers´ self-perceptions of their (non) nativeness in telecollaboration with U.S. heritage Spanish learners. These teachers in this study were enrolled in undergraduate EFL teacher education programs at two public universities. The exploration of their self –perceptions of (non) nativeness, before and after the exchange, involved an examination of the influence that major ideologies, such as the myth of the native speaker (Pennycook, 1994; Rajagopalan, 1997; Canagarajah, 1999; Kramsch, 2000) and the native speaker fallacy (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999), and intrinsically connected to these beliefs, native speaker standard language (Train, 2007, 2011), "non-accent" (Lippi-Green, 1997) and monolingualism (Kachru, 1994; Davis, 2004 ;Train, 2011), exerted on their self-image as learners and prospective teachers.

A telecollaboration, or internet mediated intercultural foreign language education (ICFLE) experience (Belz, 2003; Thorne, 2005; Guth & Helm, 2010; Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012), was integrated into this study to provide an opportunity for participants to interact with those they regarded as native speakers of English. Taking into consideration an ideological perspective of the relationship between native and non-native speakers, this study sought to expand the scope of analysis in telecollaboration experiences which usually focuses on participants' language ability and knowledge (Belz, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002; Belz & Vyatkina, 2005), and intercultural learning (Liaw & Bunn-Le Master, 2010; Ware, 2005; Ware & Kramsch, 2005; Schenker, 2012; Belz & Müller-Hartman, 2003; O'Dowd, 2003). The focus of studies on telecollaborators, characterized as native or nonnative speakers, is usually on the

[1] Throughout this document, participants will be described as "prospective teachers" or "pre-service teachers." The two terms will be used interchangeably to mean that participants were enrolled in undergraduate teacher education programs in universities seeking to earn teaching degrees. They did not have any experience in relation to teaching.

linguistic gains that the former provide to the latter (Dussias, 2006; Tudini, 2003; Lee, 2002, 2004).

Despite recommendations for more critical frameworks in ICFLE (Guth & Helm, 2010; Train, 2005; Ware & Kramsch, 2005), few studies have emerged to fill this gap. Ware and Kramsch's (2005) work is the only published research that delves into the native speakership ideologies associated with these partnerships. Their study exposes, among other factors, the role that cultural stereotypes play in participants' misunderstandings. The telecollaborators, English and German learners, held preconceived views regarding the attitudes that native speakers of the languages they were studying should exhibit. In the end, their cultural stereotypes of native speakers contributed to misunderstandings when their real-life peers did not match these preconceptions.

This study shares a common objective with previous research on NNESTs in that it examined their self-perceived strengths and weaknesses at the level of their language abilities, pedagogical strategies, and self-confidence (Reyes & Medgyes, 1994; Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 2001; Rajagopalan, 1995; Braine, 1999; Llurda, 2008; Butler, 2007; Llurda & Huguet, 2003). However, targeting participants who are prospective teachers with no teaching experience in a Latino American country contributes to the diversification of the population usually involved in studies; previous studies focused on inner and outer circle nations and in-service or graduate pre-service teachers. In addition, this study considers a historical perspective which looks at participants' self-perceptions and analyzes their interactions with native speakers as a potential factor influencing their self-perceptions. Only studies by Llurda (2008) and Wang (2014), in the context of study abroad, have examined NNESTs' self-perceptions of (non) nativeness as the result of their contact with native speakers. However, the study abroad context is different from the online context involved in this study.

Considering that this study sought to examine participant's self-perceptions as users of Spanish and English, the biculturalism and bilingualism, and in some circumstances multiculturalism and multilingualism of U.S. peers, was an asset. U.S. Heritage Spanish speakers represent the mixture and resulting variation of language and cultures existing in countries, such as the U.S., England and Australia, which have been traditionally perceived as native speaker homelands. The complexity of Colombian peers' sociocultural background and their context had the potential to challenge nativespeakership ideologies, which reject language admixtures and instead impose purism and prescriptivism.

Overarching Research Design

The examination of the effect that Colombian EFL pre-service teachers' telecollaboration with U.S. Heritage Spanish learners have on their self-perceived (non) nativeness involved two data collection cycles. The first cycle took place during two weeks prior to participants' initial engagement with their U.S. peers in the telecollaboration and it sought to pre-assess participants' self-perceptions. The second cycle commenced with the telecollaboration and ended with the administration of the second questionnaire and interview two at the end of the exchanges. The research designs in each cycle exhibited several differences and as a consequence, the methodology employed in article one varies in comparison to the methodology used for articles two and three.

Though the dominant research paradigm throughout the study was qualitative, the first article also employed quantitative techniques, namely descriptive statistics. In this sense, the first study employed mixed-methods research (Creswell & Plano, 2010). It included qualitative data from a questionnaire and an interview as well as quantitative data from the questionnaire. The purpose of this combination was to enrich the detail and description of qualitative data with information regarding general tendencies in participants' self-perceptions.

The qualitative nature of this study is founded in research principles which scholars recurrently highlight (Patton, 2002; Glesne, 2006; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Creswell, 2007; Miles, Hubberman & Saldaña, 2014). The study adopted a holistic perspective to look at participants by considering the natural settings where they usually live and the array of complex factors influencing their ratiocinations. The researcher became the main instrument and maintained an emic perspective to collect and analyze data. Participants' perspectives became the driving force to work with the data, identify patterns in their self-perceptions and build interpretations to answer the research questions. Though data collection instruments were designed prior to the study, it was possible to make changes in these tools to adapt them to the researcher's evolving understanding of research questions and emerging answers.

Within the qualitative tradition, this study aligns itself with the constructivist, phenomenological and case study approaches. From a constructivist perspective (Patton, 2002; Creswell, 2007; Glesene, 2006), participants were regarded as builders of multiple world perceptions through their interaction with others. Under these circumstances, the creation of perceptions is a historical process shaped by their cultural milieu. The adoption of a constructivist approach encompassed a nuanced explanation of participants' self-perceptions concerning their (non) nativeness. This endeavor took into consideration the past and current condition of their beliefs, the multifaceted nature of those ratiocinations and the influence of social and cultural dynamics in their construction.

Based on Van Manen (1990), Cresswell (2007) and Groenewald's (2004) discussions of phenomenological research principles, the following lines explain how this study adhered to this approach. To begin with, the researcher's interest was focused on building an interpretation of the meaning that for these future teachers had to look at themselves as (non) native speakers and of the impact of their perceptions on their self-images. The research design sought to examine

the complex nature of the phenomenon of interest, the participants' self-perception of (non) nativeness. Phenomenological interviews (Seidman, 2006), which were in-depth and semi-structured, used in an informal manner contributed to the examination of participants' life experiences. The spontaneous nature of the interviews was also intended to allow pre-service teachers to bring about issues of importance for them in relation to the phenomenon being studied.

A case study, understood "not as a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied" has been essential to the study's configuration (Stake, 2005, p. 443). In the first study, a group of students was regarded as a case. In studies two and three, each of the eight participating students became a case. Given that in each of the three dissertation studies there was more than a case, they are classified as collective case studies. The existence of several cases in the same study not only favored an analysis of findings which establish commonalties, but also emphasized differences that could bring potential understanding to the current exploration or further studies.

Participants in this study were two groups of Colombian undergraduate EFL prospective teachers in two universities. The first site was the Modern Languages program at University A in a small Colombian city of 145,000 inhabitants, characterized by a semirural environment in one of the neighboring "Departamentos" (states) to the capital city, Bogotá. University A offers a five-year- B.Ed. in education (EFL and Spanish as a mother tongue). Twenty-one 3rd-year student-teachers, 13 women and 8 men, enrolled in the course, Intermediate English I, participated in the study at University A. Their ages ranged from 18 to 28 years, and most of them, 15 students, were between 18 to 21 years of age. Ten of them were born in the city in which University A was located and 7 in the surrounding small towns. The remaining 4 student-teachers were also originally from small towns, but in neighboring "Departamentos" (states). It

is in these towns that a significant number of participants attended primary and secondary schools and where they grew up living on farms. It is common that when moving from towns to the city in order to start their university education, students bring with them many of the features characterizing rural life.

Twenty-one 3rd-year student-teachers, 13 women and 8 men, enrolled in the course, Intermediate English I, participated in the study at University A. Their ages ranged from 18 to 28 years, and most of them, 15 students, were between 18 to 21 years of age. Seventeen of them were born in the city in which University A was located or the surrounding small towns. The remaining 4 student-teachers were also originally from small towns, but in neighboring "Departamentos" (states). The majority of students, 12, started to learn English while in primary school, whereas 2 began in pre-school and 8 began by secondary school. Five prospective teachers had taken additional English courses in institutions outside the official school system prior to their enrollment in the program. None of them had traveled to an English speaking country. Sixteen of them had been in contact with native speakers, and in 11 of these cases, those native speakers were assistants who had temporarily studied at the university as part of international exchange programs.

It is relevant to mention that traditionally the linguistic educational policy in Colombia has favored those Colombians who lived in urban areas, especially major cities. In a recent study, conducted by Medina and Arcila (2013), the participants, Colombian teachers in rural areas, describe the disadvantages that rural students have when compared to their urban counterparts. In addition to higher quality of and broader access to technology, "big cities offer more and better conditions to learn a foreign language, for various reasons such as a higher need to use the second language to talk to foreigners, more opportunities to participate in cultural activities, and more chances to listen to their favorite bands" (p. 30). The disadvantageous

conditions rural teachers face makes it difficult to keep abreast of the profession and to update their language knowledge.

The second site was the Foreign Languages program at University B in Bogotá. Bogotá, a megalopolis, is the capital of Colombia with approximately 7 million inhabitants. University B, offers a 4-year B. Ed. in education (EFL). Instructional time is concentrated in only one language, English. Two teacher's assistants, generally from the U.S. or England, spend a year in the program supporting non-native instructors' lessons.

Twelve female and 8 male 2nd year student-teachers registered in the course, Oral Communication III, and agreed to participate in the study. Their ages range from 16 to 29, and most of them, 16 students, were between the ages of 17 to 20. Whereas 14 participants were originally from Bogotá, the remaining 6 were born in other major cities. Twelve participants started to learn English in primary school whilst 5 began during pre-school and the remaining 3 started in secondary school. Five prospective teachers had studied English in courses independent from University B before enrolling in the program. Only one student had visited an English speaking country. Out of 16 students who had had contact with native speakers, 11 made that contact with people other than assistants in the program.

One of the characteristics of the cosmopolitan context where these participants lived is the high regard for the variety of Spanish spoken there. As it is the case in other South American capital cities, the variety spoken in the Bogotá, is considered the most desirable one in the country. Colombian Spanish and in particular, the variety spoken in Bogotá, enjoys a high reputation nationally and internationally. In her exploration of perceptions and attitudes towards varieties of Spanish, Slebus (2012) found that participants from various countries (Mexico, Argentina, Spain and Colombia) favored the Colombian variety as the most "beautiful", specifically the Spanish spoken in Bogotá.

Colombian Participants telecollaborated with U.S. peers. These U.S. students were distributed in three classes, 67, students enrolled in the Spanish heritage language learning program at a Southwestern U.S. university. The primary investigator was the instructor in the U.S. heritage Spanish course. Because the U.S. University is located in a city very close to the border with México, the city and the University are heavily influenced by Hispanic culture. The Spanish program in the university is the biggest of its kind in the country. The 16 U.S. students who interacted with Colombian participants in the telecollaboration were born in the U.S. but they also have roots in Hispanic culture. Their grandparents or parents were born in Mexico, other Latin-American countries, or in Spain. They heard and often spoke Spanish in their childhood at home; Spanish was even the first language for many of them. A vast array of complex circumstances totally or partially constrained their use of Spanish generally as they started their elementary education. They viewed their listening comprehension ability as their highest skill and their speaking as their lowest ability. They did not feel confident speaking in Spanish. In fact, it was common to hear their stories about relatives who spoke the language fluently and laughed at them when they spoke. Scholars have also identified multiple language ideologies in the U.S. context in connection with the unfavorable image that heritage Spanish speakers hold of their Spanish language abilities (Valdés, González, García & Márquez, 2003; García, 2005). These beliefs include "English as a national language", "bilingualism as a problem", "monolingualism as an ideal", "Latin American and Spanish born individuals as ideal native speakers" and "standard varieties from Latin America and Spain as the models to follow."

Despite the fact that heritage Spanish speakers (learners) in this study felt more comfortable speaking in English, they exhibited a strong connection with the Hispanic culture. Most of them identified themselves as Mexican Americans, Mexican or Hispanic. Though most of them did not constantly engage in nonacademic activities to practice their Spanish outside the

classroom, a few watched some television in Spanish and approximately half of them listened to Latina music at least one hour a week. Their reasons to register in the course had more to do with their desire to regain the confidence and ability to communicate with their Spanish speaking family members, to expand their knowledge of the Hispanic culture, to increase professional opportunities rather than the mere need to fulfill a requirement to complete their program.

Conceptual Framework

This section presents and discusses the main constructs informing this study. Before elaborating on conceptualizations of the various language ideologies which are this dissertation's focus, the section starts by defining the concept of "language ideologies." Subsequently there is a discussion of "nativespeakersim", "the myth of the native speaker" and "the native speaker fallacy" and associated ideologies, namely "non-accent'', "monolingualism" and "native speaker standard language." The section closes with an elaboration on constructs in connection with "telecollaboration": "sociocultural theory" and "intercultural learning".

The field of language ideologies was born within the linguistic anthropology tradition, but it has grown to such an extent that now scholars regard it as its own discipline (Bloomaert, 2006). From its origins with the pioneering work of Silverstein (1979), this field has sought to reframe speakers as active agents in shaping the continually changing structure of languages through their judgments about those languages. In connection with this founding interest in the field, this study looks at the effects of participants' views about language on their self-perceived (non) nativeness.

Kroskrity (2008, p. 497), conceptualizes language ideologies as a "more ubiquitous set of diverse beliefs, however implicit or explicit they may be, used by speakers of all types as models for constructing linguistic evaluations and engaging in communicative activity." In accordance with the previous scholar, in this study language ideology refers to how and what speakers think

about language. This basic notion provides two dimensions: firstly, the concept refers to a language user's ratiocinations in the form of beliefs, feelings, and views or, as in the particular case of this study, perceptions regarding language or issues about that language, e.g. its speakers, uses or contexts of use.

Secondly, language ideologies entails the evaluative use that speakers make of their ratiocination about languages, positioning themselves, those languages and their various communicative categories, speakers, contexts and functions within sociocultural and political settings. Speakers' judgments of a language, its users and contexts of use are not neutral. Oftentimes, directly or indirectly, they imply negative or positive views to constructing languages in terms of superiority or inferiority (Kroskrity, 2004). In comparison to the first dimension, this perspective entails a notion of ideology which focuses on social, cultural and political perspectives.

By adopting the previous view on language ideologies, this study favors a research agenda which seeks to expose participants' perceptions regarding nativespeakersism and increase their awareness about these myths. In addition, because this awareness can encourage various ways of individuals' contestation and agency towards the inequalities promoted by some of these ideologies (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994), this study shows how participants can eventually reexamine their rationalizations of (non) nativeness and construct more positive images of themselves as language users. The following paragraph defines the various language ideologies which are the focus of this dissertation.

Nativespeakerism is a term originally coined by Holliday (2006, p. 1) to denote "the belief that 'native-speaker' teachers represent a 'Western culture' from which springs the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology." This ideology is intrinsically connected with two other well-established myths in the field of language teaching

and learning: the myth of the native speaker (Ramptom, 1990; Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah, 1999; Kramsch, 1999) and the native speaker fallacy (Phillipson, 1992; Canagarajah, 1999). This myth and fallacy show a similar ideology from two interrelated perspectives. The myth promotes the belief that those who are regarded as native speakers are ideal language models. The fallacy refers in particular to teachers and predicates that teachers who have been granted native speaker credentials are better teachers than those whose nativeness does not correspond to the native speaker ideal.

Though on the surface this ideology seems to be mainly focused on the evaluation that speakers make of others based on their language use, it transpires that multiple sociocultural and political considerations come to bear when speakers are granted or denied nativeness. Native speaker credentials are granted to those who, for example, are identified as being born in certain western nations (e.g. in the case of English, England, the U.S. and Australia; in the case of Spanish, Spain and South American countries) and reveal particular values, ethnic and racial characteristics associated with privileged classes in these countries.

From a linguistic perspective, this myth aligns with theoretical constructs which are used to describe ideal speakers as producers of "perfect" utterances. Chomsky emphasizes a monolingual ideal speaker-listener possessing a unitary and decontextualized competence which is to a great extent genetically acquired. In this theory, the native speaker possesses natural intuition to produce and make accurate judgments about language. This conceptualization has been identified as an influential academic precursor of the myth of the native speaker (Paikeday, 1985; Rajagopalan, 1997; Cook, 1999; Kramsch, 2002; Canagarajah, 1999; Davies, 2004; Mahboob, 2005). Implications deriving from Chomsky's linguistic theory in the ideological construction of the native speaker are summarized by Rampton (1990, p. 97) who remarks that a "particular language is inherited, either through genetic endowment or through birth into the

social group stereotypically associated with it." Thus, because native speakers are those who have inherited the language, it is believed that they produce it and understand it appropriately, whereas the opposite applies for those who are not native speakers. Another implication emerges from the binary idea that "people are or are not native/mother-tongue speakers." If Individuals lack nativespeakership credentials, they are not relevant. Thus, there is the danger that they are made "invisible." Finally, Rampton posits that "just as people are usually citizens of one country, people are native speakers of one mother tongue." Consequently, only the group of individuals who enjoy the privilege of being citizens are counted as native speakers.

The conceptualization of the native speaker as an ideal model for language performance has been mainly problematized because it ignores the natural variability of language in sociocultural contexts. Other scholars such as Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (2001, p. 102) convincingly argue that "socially constructed notions" prevail over "linguistic categories" in the accreditation of users as native or non-native speakers. In addition, subjective opinions as for instance, how someone looks and how her/his speech sounds might play a role in this judgment. Another complicated issue is an individual's perceived degree of nativeness, which hints at the possibility that a non-native speaker could become a native speaker (Mahboob, 2005; White & Genesee, 1996). In the educational field, for instance, it has become commonplace to depict individuals' abilities or expected competence as native-like or near native.

Coupled with these approaches, applied linguists in the fields of WEs, ELF and EIL bring to bear the effect of the changing global scenario on how native and non-native English speakers position themselves and are positioned as proficient users of language. The progressive expansion of speakers of English as a second language that is predicted to surpass native speakers during the next 50 years, questions the imposition of native speaker norms on non-native speakers (Gradol, 2003). In a like manner, Train (2010) problematizes the ideologies of

national identity underpinning the concept of nativespeakership. The connotation of "nation state", historically packed with ethnolinguistic prejudices (Bonfiglio, 2010), grants legitimate ownership of the language to those born in specific nations (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001). In addition, the nation state is regarded as the natural environment for acquisition, which as the previous authors emphasized, "ties the concept to a static model of language acquisition" (p.104). Under the premises of EIL and ELF, nonnative English speakers communicate with nonnative and native speakers (Smith, 1976) and the ownership of English extends to a wider array of users. Nativespeakership is a myth that excludes the increasing multiculturalism and diversity in contemporary societies (Davies, 2004, p. 68) where, as Kramsch & Lam (1999, p. 368) posits, "from the perspective of linguistic travel… and migration everyone is a non-native."

Monolingualism as an associated ideology to the myth of the native speaker is known as the "monolingual" bias (Kachru, 1996; Cook, 1997; Belz, 2002; Mahboob, 2010), "monolingual nativism" (Train, 2011) or "monolingual fallacy" (Phillson as cited in Canagarajah, 1999). This ideology is also rooted in Chomsky's linguistic program (Chomsky, 1986). The idealized native speaker is placed within an idealized context for its study and that context is monolingual. Examples of the pervasiveness of this ideology include the traditional focus in second language acquisition research on monolingual speakers ignoring the bilingual nature of a learners' endeavor (Firth &Wagner, 1997; Cook, 1997), the negative stigma place upon the use of L1 in L2 classrooms (Cook, 1999; Belz, 2002) and upon the mixture of languages (Otheguy & Stern, 2011; Sayer, 2008).

Native Speaker Standard Language (Train, 2005, 2007, 2011) emphasizes the connection between two well-established ideologies: nativespeakerism and standardization. For this author standardization emanates from the language variety associated with native speakers. In this vein, it is the variety of a privileged group, "codified in grammars and dictionaries, thus forming the

basis of the universalizing national and global language of the kingdom and, later, the empire and the nation-state." However, it is relevant to clarify that the group supposed to be the model for the standard does not include all those considered native speakers on the grounds of birth. Only the educated native speakers exhibit the standard.

As other language ideologies, standardization is founded on a myth. In this case, this ideology promotes and imposes the idea of uniformity in language. Speakers evaluate others' language ability based on their adherence to the standard. This is related to Milroy's, (2001) conceptualization of standardization as a culture in which speakers hold strong beliefs in the existence of a standard. These speakers contribute to the social sanction of what should be accepted as correct, prestigious and careful, among other values attributed to standards. In a like manner, they propagate the belief that if the standard is not maintained the language will degenerate. The ideology of standardization is seen as the locus of the prescriptivism and purism which "frames variability and diversity as a supposed problem" (Train, 2007). It promotes discrimination because it privileges certain language varieties while others are misrepresented as lower, inappropriate, defective and undesirable.

The myth of *"Non-accent"* is another ideology inextricably connected with standardization (Lippin-Green, 1997). This ideology is rooted in the belief that standard language speakers do not exhibit an accent. Nonetheless, all speakers have an accent because accents reveal the normal variation in language according to various sociocultural variables. Regarding, second language learners, a wide spread belief is that language learners' L1 accent, when transferred into L2, deems their L2 speech incomprehensible. Though it is undeniable that a different pronunciation of specific sounds or intonation patterns from those more commonly used by some speakers can cause some difficulty in understanding words or speech fragments, Lippin-Green (1997, p. 50), supported by the work of sociolinguists, concludes that "accent has

little to do with communicative competence or the ability to use and interpret language in a wide variety of contexts effectively."

Despite the unnecessary connection between accent and intelligibility, it is not uncommon to find L2 learners and even L1 speakers who feel uncomfortable because of their accents. To a large extent, these negative feelings hinged upon the social stigmatization of certain accents. An ideology of "non-accent" promotes prejudice and injustice since it attempts to invisibilize and undermine diversity in speakers. In one of her Studies on ESL students' accents, Derwing (2003), one of the most prominent scholars in this field, concludes that her participants believed that accent played a role in their chances to be accepted and respected by those they regarded as native speakers. They did not seem to be invested in preserving their accent as a hint of their identity. In fact, losing their accent was not regarded as detrimental for their identity.

Articles two and three in this dissertation explore participants' self-perceived non-nativeness as they engage in telecollaboration with U.S. peers. *Telecollaboration* is also known as internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education (ICFLE) (Thorne, 2005) or defined more broadly, online FL interaction and exchange (Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012). Telecollaboration is a pedagogical design for foreign language learning framed within collaborating educational institutions. The design facilitates the interaction of participants in locations distant from each other relying on the use of internet-mediated communication. Because oftentimes participants' origin and cultural backgrounds differ, ICFLE's objectives include not only participants' language learning, but also their intercultural development. In addition, the broad emphasis on "foreign language education" suggests that in conjunction with the development of intercultural and language abilities (Belz, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002; O'Dowd & Ware, 2009; Ware & Kramsch, 2005), ICFLE can support students' advancement in areas including multiliteracies

(Guth & Helm, 2012) and critical perspectives. (Helm, Guth & Farrah, 2012; Fuchs, Hauck & Müller-Hartmann, 2012; Train, 2005).

Though scholars such as Thorne (2010, p. 140) view ICFLE, telecollaboration and tandem as three "contemporary approaches to L2 learning that espouse a philosophy of education with long antecedents to such practices as pen-pal communication and the dialogue-based model of education", in this study the terms ICFLE and telecollaboration are used interchangeably. Inasmuch as ICFLE is regarded as a broader concept which describes the multiple approaches employing internet applications to facilitate language learning and telecollaboration is a specific ICFLE design, this dissertation adopts both terms. What differentiates telecollaboration from other ICFLE designs is, firstly, its institutionalized nature. Classes of students, who are enrolled in educational institutions, commit to work together. Secondly, telecollaboration usually includes well-crafted pedagogical designs. Project work and task-based methodologies contribute to building opportunities for learning.

This study aligns with a *sociocultural* perspective in telecollaboration (Thorne, 2008; Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012; Kinginger & Belz, 2005; Warschauer, 2005; Kern, 2006). Warschauer's (2005) overarching conceptualization of sociocultural theory for CALL presents the core principles for this approach. Rooted in the Vygotskian tradition, this scholar refers to "mediation", "social learning", and "genetic analysis" as relevant tenets to observe the implementation of sociocultural approaches. Mediation originates from individuals' actions and social exchanges with others in "cultural, institutional and historical settings" (Wertsch, 1994) and it requires learning how to use cultural tools (symbols and signs), for instance, oral and written language. Vygotsky determined that mediation triggered the transformation of elementary psychological functions into superiorly intellectual and voluntary higher functions which become internalized. In this dissertation, language is conceived as a mediator in

participants' sociocultural interactions creating opportunities for their construction and reconstruction of self-perceptions and subjectivity. Being immersed in interactions with others is a necessary condition in a sociocultural learning perspective. The learning which starts in social interactions moves into a new stage of evolution: the "intrapsychological" level (Vygotsky, 1981, p.163). The intrapersonal stage is expected to lead learners into the development of skills and knowledge, which are eventually internalized. The last principle, genetic analysis, as explained by Vera and Holbrook (1996), refers to a specific research approach which can be used to examine the historical transformation of learning while it occurs. The use of genetic analysis requires explorations to begin at the origin of the phenomenon being studied and to follow the phenomenon until it expires. Conducting this sort of exploration demands proper consideration to the multiplicity of relations among the processes involved in learning. Though this dissertation does not incorporate this specific paradigm, it does consider a historical examination of participants' self-perceptions. The design of the study looks at participants' self-perceptions prior to the telecollaboration and while the exchange takes place.

Foreign language learners´ development of *intercultural competence or intercultural communicative competence* has been established as a central goal of telecollaboration (Belz, 2007; Belz & Thorn, 2005; Helm & Guth, 2012). Belz (2007, p. 128) justifies this goal based on "the demands of our multilingual and globalized world", "the widely held belief that language and culture are inextricably bound together" and "the humanistic assumption that intercultural understanding is of moral and ethical value." By engaging in telecollaboration, students encounter favorable and unfavorable circumstances, for instance, opportunities for interaction with international peers, pedagogical frameworks and even possible conflicts that enhance their growth as intercultural speakers; thereby, telecollaboration can potentially, but not necessarily enhance intercultural development.

The concept of the intercultural speaker in ICFLE is usually associated with Byram's (1997) work. Despite recent criticism, much of which derives from its original connection to the field of study abroad (Belz, 2007; Risager, 2007), this scholar's intercultural communicative model continues to be embraced by this nascent field. When compared to other models, Byram's model appears to capture more of the essence of the relationship between the development of a "communicative competence" and an "intercultural competence" as essential goals of foreign language education.

Byram defines intercultural competence (IC) as attitudes in relation to "readiness to suspend disbelief and judgment with respect to others' meanings, beliefs and behaviors and a willingness to suspend belief in one's own meanings and behaviors, and to analyze them from the viewpoint of the others with whom one is engaging" (1997, p. 34). At the center of his conceptualization, Byram places the intercultural speaker who is expected to develop him/herself at various levels to communicate and relate effectively with his/her interlocutors. Intercultural speakers enter the communicative scene with previously acquired knowledge and attitudes which they continue developing in their interactions. This knowledge encompasses not only aspects about themselves and others, but also the manner in which interactions take place. The ideal intercultural attitude emerges through the relativization of beliefs, behaviors and meanings which in turn lead to valuing others' cultural expressions. In Byram's model, knowledge and attitudes aggregate to the procedural perspective of skills.

Intercultural speakers need to be able, on one hand, to interpret cultural practices and make connections between cultural meanings in different contexts. On the other hand, they are expected to discover those meanings, which often times occur through interaction. The development of reflective attitudes encourages intercultural growth and can be enhanced by participating in educational experiences.

Overview of the Three Articles

Each one of the three articles in this dissertation answers one of the three interrelated questions that guide this study. By determining and exploring Colombian participants' self-perceptions as (non) native speakers and future NNESTs before their telecollaboration with U.S. peers, the first article sets the groundwork for the subsequent articles. The first research study makes use of a mixed method approach combining qualitative research techniques with descriptive statistics. Forty-one prospective teachers from the two participating Colombian universities provided data for this study. All of them answered questionnaires and 18 accepted invitations for semi-structured interviews.

Findings in the first article show that participants' self-perceptions were aligned with myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies, namely "non-accent", native speaker standard language and monolingualism, among others. These ideologies have existed in participants' academic and social context since their childhood. As Spanish and English speakers, participants revealed the two sides of the influence that these ideologies could exert on them: they perceived themselves as over empowered in their being native speakers of Spanish, and disempowered as non-native speakers of English. Self-perceptions as English speakers affected their views as future teachers, in such a way that, though they saw advantages in their accumulated experience as language learners and possibilities of education, they suffered obstacles while striving to reach native-like ability.

The second article establishes how the participants' pre-telecollaboration-identified self-perceptions evolve as they engaged in ICFLE with their U.S. peers. In order to build an understanding of self-perceived (non) nativeness from those initial findings, this study, conceived as qualitative phenomenological and constructivist, examines the case of eight Colombian prospective teachers from the two target universities. Though a small number of

participants might have limited variation in responses, it contributed to data quality because the eight participants provided complete in depth data which revealed a progressive unfolding of their telecollaboration process. Questionnaire, interviews and reflection logs documented participants' self-perceptions in connection with their interactions recorded in Facebook chats and Skype video or audiocalls.

This second article concluded that participants' telecollaborations with U.S. peers influenced their adherence to or distance from native-like language ability models which contributed to the shaping of their self-perceptions as language speakers. The telecollaboration was one of the manifold factors affecting prospective Colombian teachers' self-perceptions. The need to become meaning makers, who could function communicatively in their exchanges with culturally diverse peers, displaced native-like aspirations as their main language ability. Gaining or not gaining a favorable perception of their skills to succeed in communication and increasing or decreasing their confidence in those skills shaped their self-images. Their rejection of or adherence to the native speaker fallacy, established in the first study when looking at their self-perceptions as future teachers, varied depending upon the very same factors mentioned above.

The last article examined in depth the telecollaborative resources that (dis) allow participants' reconstruction of self-perceptions as (non) native speakers and future teachers. Its research design is similar to the second study. The telecollaboration experience was analyzed taking into consideration the theoretical principles of sociocultural theory founded upon Vygotsky's work and the intercultural speaker construct as conceptualized by Byram (1997), Kramsch (1996) and Risager (2007). In this study, as in the second one, telecollaborations were conducted for 8 weeks. The mismatch between participating universities' schedules did not allow for a longer exchange and this is a factor that should be further explored. Findings suggested that the nature of ICFLE bolstered participants' cooperative and intercultural

relationships with their telecollaboration partners. Their interaction, based on their collaborative attitude, generated affective dimensions which enhanced their understanding of their potential as learners and comfort level with their self-perceived status as nonnative speakers. Their exchange also provided them knowledge about language and culture which in turn encouraged a reexamination of self-perceptions. Colombian prospective teachers' personal reflections showed that they made connections between the affective and knowledge-based dimensions generated in telecollaboration, and their self-perceptions as prospective NNESTs.

CHAPTER 2: "I FEEL LIKE I'M MISSING SOMETHING": SELF-PERCEIVED (NON) NATIVENESS IN COLOMBIAN PROSPECTIVE ENGLISH TEACHERS

Introduction

Nativespeakerism, the set of beliefs about native speakers and how closely they adhere to the ideal model of an L1 in its linguistic, sociocultural, pedagogical and psychological implications (Holliday, 2006; Pennycook, 1994; Kramsch, 2003; Canagarajah, 1999; Mahboob, 2005), constitutes probably the most influential language ideology in EFL/ESL today. Not only has this language ideology been examined from the perspective of its effects on learners, but it has generated a robust interest in teacher education (Reyes & Medgyes, 1994; Braine, 1999; Mahboob, 2003; Llurda 2004; Moussu, 2006). English learners and teachers' perceptions of themselves as native or non-native speakers, as monolingual, bilingual or multilingual individuals or as users of a mother tongue in contrast to an L2 contribute not only to their development of language abilities, intercultural skills and identity construction, but also to the formation of the macro-ideologies shaping English as a second language (ESL), English as a foreign language (EFL), English as an international language (EIL), and English as a lingua franca (ELF).

Drawing from the broader fields of language ideology and critical applied linguistics, this study examines two groups of EFL undergraduate pre-service teachers' self-perceptions regarding their (non) nativespeakerism at two Colombian public universities. Research studies on non-native speaking English teachers (NNESTs) have generally centered on participants' self-perceptions concerning their English language abilities and teaching skills (Braine, 2005; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). However, prior to examining their self-images in connection to English, this study analyzes participants' self-perceptions regarding their L1, Spanish. In doing so, this article addresses the influence that pervasive (non) native language ideologies associated

to their self-image as Spanish speakers in the Colombian context might exert on their self-images regarding English.

By targeting undergraduate pre-service teachers, most of them with no experience in teaching, this study seeks to contribute to the diversification of the field's scope. Traditionally NNEST research has focused on in-service teachers and pre-service teachers as students in graduate and post graduate programs (Braine, 2005; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Pre-service teaching constitutes a fundamental pillar in the teacher education aimed at supporting their development of, not only disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge, but also socio-cultural sensitivity, personality, and identity; as such the study of influential ideologies as nativespeakerism at this stage of their education becomes relevant.

Since the 90's, research within the field of NNESTs has been conducted primarily in the U.S., Australia, Canada and the U.K., or inner circle countries[2]. In these nations, scholars have denounced the prejudice and the inequities that NNESTs, or those perceived as such, suffered despite their qualifications, (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Mahboob, 2003; Moussu, 2006; Clark & Paran, 2007). In expanding circle countries, such as Thailand, Taiwan and China, where NNESTs constitute a majority, research shows that educational linguistic policies adopted by those governments are stimulating, sometimes dramatically the employment of "imported" native English teachers (NETs) who might even be unqualified with respect to their professional preparation (Ling & Braine, 2007; Ke, 2009; Şimşek, 2012).

In expanding circle countries located in Latin-American, including Colombia, there exists scant research on NNESTs. Nonetheless, research on language policies evidences that

---

[2] Kachru (1990) classifies nations based on three concentric circles. Inner circle countries are those where English is the 1st dominant language, the outer circle includes former inner circle country colonies where English has an institutionalized role, and expanding circle nations are those in which English is used for specific purposes and other language(s) constitute the main means of communication.

governments in the region are implementing ambitious programs for the teaching of English which usually favor native speakers' status and knowledge over the local non-native Colombians (Guerrero, 2008; Usma, 2009; Valencia, 2013). The situation discussed above requires, as Gonzalez (2010, p. 346) explains, more critical applied linguistic approaches in a field, like EFL, that is not "neutral and depoliticized."

Gonzalez, among others, highlights the importance of integrating critical awareness of language ideologies in the applied linguistics field and the education of prospective and in-service teachers. This emerges as a desirable goal because discriminatory practices that favor native speakers and native speaker teachers over those who do not hold the nativespeakership status exerts a negative impact on NNESTs' employment options, future profession, and consequently motivation and self-esteem (Rajagopalan, 2005). In addition, the sustained criticism of the imperialistic spread of English and its negative effects (Pennycook, 1994; Phillipson, 1992) also highlights NNESTs' unintended contributions in this expansion (Rajagopalan, 2005; Llurda, 2004). The tension that learning and embracing a new language and its culture can trigger in students and teachers, especially regarding their identities, is another reason why a critical perspective is needed (Llurda, 2004).

A final issue emphasized by Silverstein (1979 in Kroskrity, 2010) underlines the importance of "discursive consciousness" since by gaining awareness and reflecting upon the form and function of language, speakers start contributing to its transformation. This argument resonates in the current case of English, where the traditional ownership of the language, historically ascribed to native speakers of American and British English, is being challenged, and new norms for its uses and forms are emerging. Critical awareness paradigms in teacher education can guide teachers to move beyond the uncritical contemplation of challenges at the professional, ethical, and psychological levels. Thus, they can become better informed, prepared

and eventually dismantle the harmful nativespeakerism ideology which frees them to work for equality and social change (Kumaravadivelu, 1994; Train, 2007; Llurda, 2004).

The following section reviews the literature regarding nativespeakerism and associated language ideologies in connection with the spread of English and Spanish in the world. This section concludes with a summary of research studies on NNESTs' self- perceptions.

Language Ideologies and the Current Status of Spanish and English

When looking at the status of two major languages, English and Spanish, on the current geopolitical stage, more commonalities than divergences appear. The historical expansion of both these languages is often associated with colonization and colonialism, migration (Pennycook, 2007; Train, 2007; Mar-Molinero, 2000), and more recently, in the particular case of English, with individuals' own agency in the context of international communication (Brutt-Gliffer, 2001).

Although the globalization of communications seems to favor "the acceleration of the volume of exchange" (Paffey, 2007) in the case of Spanish, it is undeniable that English has benefitted more from this global tendency, becoming not only the most used language in electronic media, but also the language of science, technology, diplomacy, and business (Graddol, 2003; Crystal, 2008). Though Spanish and English are both major international languages, their statuses are different considering that English has become the global language.

In attempting to understand how Spanish and English consolidate and maintain their power and status, and the consequences of their spread, researchers have explored related language ideologies which are ubiquitous in many language learning and teaching contexts around the world. Standardization, extensively analyzed by Train (2007, p. 213) among others, emanates from the native standard language as the discourse of a privileged group, "codified in

grammars and dictionaries, thus forming the basis of the universalizing national and global language of the kingdom and, later, the empire and the nation-state."

The ideology of standardization is seen as the locus of the prescriptivism and purism which "frames variability and diversity as a supposed problem" (Train, 2007). It privileges certain varieties of English and Spanish while others are misrepresented as lower, inappropriate, defective and undesirable. In addition, the status of standard Spanish in Central and South America has been granted to those varieties spoken in capital cities used by the middle class (Mar-Molinero, 2004). These varieties mirror the benchmarks dictated by the *Real Academia de la Lengua Española* (RAE), the supreme guarantor of Spanish "purity." In a like manner, upper middle class varieties of American and British English hold the status of standard (Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Modiano, 2001; Tollefson, 2007).

The selection of privileged varieties to function as standards is also bound up with ideologies that confer to native speakers of the standards, "ownership of language" (Widowson, 1994). In this vein, native speakers of the standard maintain the role of legitimate authority and quality control over the language whereas other speakers, whose English is deemed inaccurate, inappropriate and strange, in other words, non-standard, should look to as models. This ideology disregards the power of a growing number of speakers of WEs, EIL and ELF who are and will continue affecting the form and function of this language.

Another ideology inextricably connected with standardization is the myth of "non-accent" (Lippin-Green, 1997). This ideology is rooted in the belief that language learners' L1 accent, when transferred into L2, deems their L2 speech incomprehensible. Lippin-Green (1997, p. 50), supported by the work of sociolinguists, concludes that "accent has little to do with communicative competence or the ability to use and interpret language in a wide variety of contexts effectively." Accent, as related to speakers' identity in connection with their language

background, indexes sociocultural categories, e.g. origin, race, ethnicity, social class and gender. An ideology of "non-accent" then promotes prejudice and injustice since it attempts to invisibilize and undermine diversity in speakers.

In educational settings, not only does language ideology contribute to the configuration of policies (Ricento, 2000), but also policy works in the advancement of ideologies (Tollefson, 2000). Currently a specific group of ideologies being employed in countries around the world to carry out plans for the education of English learners is rooted in the belief that learning English brings multiple benefits. Not only actual economic capital, but the improvement of people as human capital vis-à-vis education and social status constitute some of the promised gains. Tollefson (2007) cites García's (1995) research which determined that the relationship between English learning and benefits is not straightforward. The benefits of English might be just a myth because what provides a real account of the gains learners can enjoy by learning English should be determined by a critical analysis of contexts.

Critical Applied Linguistics and the Myth of the Native Speaker

Though the previous section included a brief discussion of pervasive language ideologies contributing to the construction of English, Spanish and their users' statuses, nowadays, that review is incomplete without one pivotal ideology; nativespeakerism. This ideology buttresses the economic and politic power of ELT in the world (Rampton, 1990; Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994) and deems invisible the characteristics, conditions and rights of English speakers in today´s world (Kramsch, 2003; Modiano, 1999; Graddol, 2003; Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001).

From a theoretical linguistics perspective, scholars associate the term "native speaker" with other notions namely, "mother tongue", "monolingualism" and "ideal speaker-hearer." The previous concepts are situated in Chomsky's linguistic program. Consequently scholars have

identified his theory as a precursor of nativespeakerism (Paikeday, 1985; Cook, 1999; Kramsch, 2003; Canagarajah, 1999; Davies, 2003; Mahboob, 2005). Chomsky emphasizes a monolingual ideal speaker-listener possessing a unitary and decontextualized competence which is to a great extent genetically acquired. In this theory, the native speaker possesses natural intuition to produce and make accurate judgments about language. In problematizing the native speaker, arguments point to the ambiguity and inconsistency of the concept.

Implications deriving from Chomsky's linguistic theory in the ideological construction of the native speaker are summarized by Rampton (1990, p. 79) who uses Irvin and Gal's (2000) framework based on three semiotic processes: "recursivity", "erasure" and "iconization". Rampton emphasizes that stereotypically native speakers are those who have inherited the language, genetically or by birth, thus it is believed that they produce it and understand it appropriately. Those individuals lacking nativespeakership credentials are deemed "invisible" and the group of individuals who enjoy the privilege of being citizens are counted as native speakers.

Approaches to the study of language with strong social and anthropological foundations have questioned the diverse constructs which support the native speaker ideology. Answering the question who is a native speaker and by default, who is not, continues to be a struggle since as Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (2001, p. 102) convincingly argue "socially constructed notions" prevail over "linguistic categories" in the accreditation of users as native or non-native speakers. In addition, subjective judgments as for instance, how someone looks and how her/his speech sounds might play a role in this judgment. Another complicated issue is an individual's perceived degree of nativeness, which hints at the possibility that a non-native speaker could eventually become a native speaker (Mahboob, 2005; White & Genesee, 1996). In the

educational field, for instance, it has become commonplace to depict individuals' abilities or expected competence as native-like or near native.

Coupled with these approaches, applied linguists in the fields of WEs, ELF and EIL bring to bear the effect of the changing global scenario on how native and non-native English speakers position themselves and are positioned as proficient users of this language. The progressive expansion of speakers of English as a second language that is predicted to surpass native speakers during the next 50 years, questions the imposition of native speaker norms on non-native speakers (Gradol, 2003). In a like manner, Train (2010) problematizes the ideologies of national identity underpinning the concept of nativespeakership. The connotation of "nation state", historically packed with ethnolinguistic prejudices (Bonfiglio, 2010), grants legitimate ownership of the language to those borne in specific nations (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001). In addition, the nation state is regarded as the natural environment for acquisition, which as the previous authors emphasized, "ties the concept to a static model of language acquisition" (p.104).

Under the premises of EIL and ELF, nonnative English speakers communicate with nonnative and native speakers (Smith, 1976) and the ownership of English extends to a wider array of users. Nativespeakership is a myth that excludes the increasing multiculturalism and diversity in contemporary societies (Davies, 2004, p. 68) where, as Kramsch & Lam (1999, p. 368) posits, "from the perspective of linguistic travel… and migration everyone is a non-native."

Research on Non-native English Speaker Teachers' Self-perceptions

The critical perspective on nativespeakerism, with its far-reaching negative implications and effects, has encouraged development of a robust body of research on non-native English speaker teachers (NNESTs). To a great extent, this research agenda has focused on probing the bias of the "native speaker fallacy" (Phillipson, 1992) which is the idea that native speaker

teachers are superior to non-native educators. At a macro level, the NNEST research contributes to the struggle against the monolingual bias supporting the fields of SLA, TESOL, applied linguistics, and both ESL and EFL teacher education. Mahboob (2010) posits that this bias privileges native speaker norms and stereotypes NNESTs as imperfect users of the language. He advocates for new paradigms based on a functional view of language, which essentialises a speaker's skill in using language in real contexts. Such a perspective could lead to the reduction of prejudice against NNESTs and the adoption of more valid, objective criteria, namely, experience and education used to judge their teaching ability.

Examining teachers' self-perception in regards to their being or not being native speakers of the language they teach is without a doubt a trend in the field. Findings in Reyes and Medgyes' study revealed that most of the participants identify themselves as non-native speakers (NNSs) of English. The majority, 68%, considered that native and NNSTs' performances differ. This was corroborated by Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) who in addition revealed that their participants did not favor any of the two categories of teachers as better than the other.

Subsequent studies by Llurda and Huguet (2003), who examined the self-perceptions of 101 NNESTs in primary and secondary education in Spain, and Butler's (2007) who involved Japanese primary and secondary teachers, contradicted these findings. Primary school teachers in their examinations believed that native English speaker teachers (NESTs) were better than NNESTs. The last study exhibits a correlation between primary NNESTs' perception of themselves as having limited language competence and their adherence to the native speaker fallacy. Nonetheless, in Llurdas and Huguet's study, secondary school teachers had more confidence in their language skills and suggested that the native speaker was not necessarily the ideal in the profession.

Reyes and Medgyes' (1994) study determined that most NNESTs participants acknowledge that they faced limitations in regards to their knowledge and skills related to vocabulary, speaking, pronunciation and listening. In addition, they thought those limitations did not have negative effects on their performance. Samimy and Brutt-Griffler's (1999) participants did not mention the use of the language to characterize themselves in relation to NESTs, but they did portray NESTs as fluent, accurate and communicative-based users of the language. This perception of NESTs seem to relate to NNES teacher educators in Dogancay-Aktuna's study who considered their colloquial and conversational knowledge and skills as needing further development (Llurda, 2008). Other studies such as Butler's (2007) found that participants self-perceived themselves as being stronger in their reading and writing competences than in their speaking ability. Similarly in Llurdas and Huguet's study, elementary school teachers considered their reading ability and grammar knowledge favorably.

NNESTs in Samimy and Brutt-Griffler's (1999) also believed that NESTs used a wide variety of teaching strategies and provided encouraging feedback to students. NNESTs were described as employing their L1 more in teaching, paying more attention to psychological and emotional factors, being more book and test oriented in their teaching, and having more knowledge in regards to who their students were. Akin to the last finding, Dogancay-Aktuna (as cited in Llurda, 2008) determined that respondents felt their comprehension of contextual issues was higher because they were NNESTs instructors in an EFL setting.

Research has identified self-confidence issues in NNESTs' perception of themselves. NNESTs' self-perception as lacking the language ability that NESTs have (Kim's, 2011) or their permanent acknowledgement of their language difficulties could lead them to a negative self-perception with a related decline in language ability and an impression of inferiority (Reyes & Medgyes, 1994). In Bernat's (2008) research, NNESTs lacked experience and had language

difficulties which generated a feeling of inferiority compared to NESTs. Rajagopalan (2005) found that a group of NNESTs in Brazil thought they were not fully prepared to do their job, underestimated as teachers, limited in their options to grow and pursuing an unreachable ideal. Furthermore, their contact with native speakers triggered their anxiety. This study pointed out an interesting correlation: less experienced participants exhibited less concern in regards to their lack of native speakership credentials.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Three interrelated research questions guide the exploration of participants' self-perception of (non) nativeness:

a. What are participants' self-perceptions as non-native speakers of English?
b. What are participants' self-perceptions as native speakers of Spanish?
c. What are participants' self-perceptions as prospective non-native English speaking teachers?

This study employed a mixed methods approach. Quantitative and qualitative data was simultaneously gathered and the two sets of findings were combined to answer research questions (Creswell and Plano, 2010). The mixture of two data types enriched each other and favored a more substantial comprehension of participants' self-perceptions. This combination also contributed to corroborate findings. Quantitative data was gathered by means of a questionnaire and analyzed through descriptive statistics (Dörnyei, 2003).

Regarding the qualitative approach (Patton, 2002; Glesne, 2006; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Creswell, 2007), this study considered participants while in their natural settings in order to examine holistically their self-perceptions of (non) nativeness. In addition, a phenomenological perspective was adopted and contributed to the exploration of participants' multifaceted meanings regarding the target phenomenon and their self-perceptions of (non)

nativeness (Van Manen, 1990; Schwandt, 2001; Creswell, 2007). A case study, understood "not as a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied", namely, a group of students regarded as a unit, (Stake, 2005, p. 443) has been essential to the study's configuration.

Context of the Study

In theory, Colombia is a multilingual country with 98% of the population speaking Spanish (García & García, 2012) and the remaining 2% speaking a myriad of indigenous languages as their first language. However, in practical terms, the majority of the country is monolingual (Ordoñez, 2011). Dialectal variations of Spanish are spoken according to geographical regions, but the variety spoken in the capital city, Bogotá, is considered the most desirable one. Colombian Spanish and in particular, the variety spoken in Bogotá, enjoys a high reputation nationally and internationally. In her exploration of perceptions and attitudes towards varieties of Spanish (Argentinian, Mexican, Peninsular and Colombian), Slebus (2012) found that participants from various countries favored the Colombian variety as the most "beautiful", specifically the one in Bogotá.

This myth is also socially supported through Colombian media as a recent headline, on the webpage of one of the most popular newscasters in the country announced that, "Good Spanish is spoken in Colombia, says RAE." In addition, the current government's campaign to promote Spanish as a foreign language is also based on the "myth" that Colombian Spanish is "one of the best in the world." In contrast to this supportive attitude toward the official language, the government has recently focused its efforts and resources on promoting the learning of English as the language of opportunities (Guerrero, 2010; Valencia, 2013).

Over the course of Colombia's history, English and its speakers have steadily elevated their status in the country (Velez-Rendón, 2003; De Mejia, 2005; González, 2010; Usma, 2009). Though American English has traditionally enjoyed the highest prestige in the country, British

English is the second most popular variety (González, 2010). These preferences are related to the influence of the U.S. culture promoted through mass media and the current economic and political role the U.S. plays in the world. The British Council markets the use of British English through their perpetual and focused involvement in Colombia's foreign language educational policy and planning. In addition, as González, (2010, p. 337) remarks, "there seems to be little knowledge about outer circle varieties of English, which are commonly believed to be of lower prestige and linguistically impure." Textbooks, used in the country's institutions of higher learning including the two universities in this study, are published in the U.S. and England (Velez-Rendon, 2003) reflecting the preference for these varieties of English.

Several English teacher job ads, found on the internet, evidenced the high status of native speakers in the country through their limited education requirements (Velez-Rondón, 2003; González, 2010). They are usually preferred over national non-native teachers who may have more education than their native speaker counterparts. The following assertion by Velez-Rondón (2003, p. 197) summarizes the general social tendency in the country "to rely on models imported from abroad that emphasize conformity to the standard and norms of an idealized English native speaker as the ultimate goal of language competence."

The studies that various scholars have conducted, regarding the current educational language policy for Spanish and English, shed some light on the ideologies overtly and covertly being promoted by the government. Globalization and neoliberalism are two overarching ideologies which support the "high instrumentalization of English" (Usma, 2009, 2014). Thus, English is portrayed as an instrument needed to gain access to numerous benefits (Guerrero, 2008, 2010; Valencia, 2013). The British Council's role as experts and quality controllers of the government policy and the dismissal of local knowledge which validates native speakers as legitimate owners of the language (Guerrero, 2008; Usma 2014). Furthermore, the adoption of

standards by the government based on the Common European Framework implies a belief in standardization as a solution to the language variability "problem." Guerrero (2008) and Valencia (2013) also remark that the policy promotes the idea of being bilingual as the acquisition of an equivalent command of both English and Spanish.

To close, it is relevant to mention that traditionally the linguistic educational policy in Colombia has favored those Colombians who lived in urban areas, especially major cities. In a recent study, conducted by Medina and Arcila (2013), the participants, Colombian teachers in rural areas, describe the disadvantages that rural students have when compared to their urban counterparts. In addition to higher quality of and broader access to technology, "big cities offer more and better conditions to learn a foreign language, for various reasons such as a higher need to use the second language to talk to foreigners, more opportunities to participate in cultural activities, and more chances to listen to their favorite bands (p. 30). The disadvantageous conditions rural teachers face makes it difficult to keep abreast of the profession and to update their language knowledge.

Participants

Two groups of students from two public universities constitute the study's participants and setting. The first site was the Modern Languages program at University A in a small Colombian city of 145,000 inhabitants, characterized by a semirural environment in one of the neighboring "Departamentos" (states) to the capital city, Bogotá. University A offers a five-year- B.Ed. in education (EFL and Spanish as a mother tongue). Every year, the program welcomes two or three teacher assistants who support English classes. Usually they are U.S., England or Jamaican born and work with non-native instructors in their classes.

Twenty-one 3rd-year student-teachers, 13 women and 8 men, enrolled in the course, Intermediate English I, participated in the study at University A. Their ages ranged from 18 to

28 years, and most of them, 15 students, were between 18 to 21 years of age. Seventeen of them were born in the city in which University A was located or the surrounding small towns. The remaining 4 student-teachers were also originally from small towns, but in neighboring "Departamentos" (states). The majority of students, 12, started to learn English while in primary school, whereas 2 began in pre-school and 8 began by secondary school. Five prospective teachers had taken additional English courses in institutions outside the official school system prior to their enrollment in the program. None of them had traveled to an English speaking country. Sixteen of them had been in contact with native speakers, and in 11 of these cases, those native speakers were assistants who had temporarily studied at the university as part of international exchange programs.

The second site was the Foreign Languages program at University B in Bogotá. Bogotá, a megalopolis, is the capital of Colombia with approximately 7 million inhabitants. University B, offers a 4-year B. Ed. in education (EFL). Instructional time is concentrated in only one language, English. Two teacher's assistants, generally from the U.S. or England, spend a year in the program supporting non-native instructors' lessons.

Twelve female and 8 male 2nd year student-teachers registered in the course, Oral Communication III, and agreed to participate in the study. Their ages range from 16 to 29, and most of them, 16 students, were between the ages of 17 to 20. Whereas 14 participants were originally from Bogotá, the remaining 6 were born in other major cities. Twelve participants started to learn English in primary school whilst 5 began during pre-school and the remaining 3 started in secondary school. Five prospective teachers had studied English in courses independent from University B before enrolling in the program. Only one student had visited an English speaking country. Out of 16 students who had had contact with native speakers, 11 made that contact with people other than assistants in the program.

Data Collection and Instruments

Data collection started with a questionnaire (See Appendix A). This instrument provided information regarding pre-service teachers' demographics and background, self-perceptions as speakers of Spanish and English, and self-perceptions as prospective (non) native speaker EFL teachers. Items in the questionnaire were taken and/or adapted from existing instruments (Medgyes, 1999; Rajagopalan, 2005; Llurda, 2008) to ensure their validity. A combination of 56 closed-ended and opened-ended questions elicited qualitative and quantitative data. The use of Qualtrics Survey Software, an application available through the University of Arizona, allowed Colombian pre-service teachers in the two universities to provide their answers electronically. They had access to surveys for two weeks and 41 questionnaires were answered, which resulted in a 100% return rate.

Phenomenological (Seidman, 2006) semi-structured (Leech, 2002; Merriam, 2009) interviews were the second type of instrument for data collection (See Appendix B). Considering the dynamics of phenomenological design, the first interviews focused on pre-service teachers' past experiences in connection with their self-perceptions of (non) nativeness. In this vein, the instrument provided data about their history as English and Spanish learners and it helped to expand upon participants' answers in questionnaires. The interviews were conducted the second week after Colombian students started classes in the spring semester.

Colombian prospective teachers in the two target universities received invitations to participate in the interview through an internet application which allowed them to schedule a time for the meeting. They were required to answer the questionnaire prior to the interview. Nine students from University A and 9 from University B participated in the interview via Skype. Prospective teachers decided if they felt more comfortable employing audiocall or

videocall. Each interview lasted approximately 1 hour and was recorded by means of an application called "Skype autorecorder" and a virtual recorder tablet application.

The last source of data emerged from documents. The curriculum of the two programs, the syllabi of courses students had taken in the past or those of the courses in which they were currently enrolled, and the web-pages of the two universities provided information used to understand the educational milieu in which the study took place. In addition to these university documents, the study made use of information from newspapers, job ads posted on the internet, official documents explaining the language and language educational policy promoted by the national government, and publications by national scholars disseminating the results of research on language and related policy in the country. These documents became data to identify omnipresent language ideologies in the setting.

Data Analysis

An initial stage of data analysis ran parallel to data collection. As soon as participants answered questionnaires, responses were studied, so that follow-up interviews could incorporate emerging significant key issues or emphasize some of those already being considered. Towards the end of the interview cycle, the second and main stage of data analysis started. Firstly, questionnaires were grouped according to participants' affiliation to either University A or University B, so that specific tendencies in each institution were captured. By using descriptive statistics, namely percentages, the quantitative data in the questions was summarized (Dörnyei, 2003, p. 114).

In general, the qualitative data analysis adheres to three distinct, but interrelated processes. The initial descriptive reading of data exposed participants' factual rationalizations, an analytical stage contributed to establishing connections between patterns and finally, an interpretative stance moved the process further into determining what the data meant (Wolcott,

1994, pp. 10-11). The study of the data was contingent on inductive analysis and contextual sensitivity, which are outstanding principles from the qualitative paradigm.

Nvivo 10 research software for qualitative data supported the organization, exploration, coding and visualization of data. A chart containing prospective teachers' qualitative answers for each university, the transcription of 7 interviews provided by University B students and 6 by University A students and the recordings of the remaining interviews, were imported into the software.

At the onset of the process, two coding cycles took place (Miles, Hubberman & Saldaña, 2014). While the first one incorporated descriptive and in vivo techniques to support the identification of initial patterns within relevant data, the second cycle involved the grouping of similar patterns into themes displayed in a tree-shaped fashion by means of the software.

The study of patterns allowed the construction of categories and subcategories (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 2009): using analytic memos to record the ongoing reflection process and clustering to compare and explore relationships among patterns, categories and sub-categories were established. Constant testing and verification of data in multiple revisions of initial categories and subcategories produced the final version of findings included in this manuscript.

Considering that this study sought to provide a " a thick description" of participants' self-perceptions, validity in the research process was regarded as "holistic" and based on "prolonged engagement", "descriptive data", and "triangulation" (Cho & Trent, 2006). Methodological triangulation was based upon the interrelations of interviews, questionnaires, and documents (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Miles, Hubberman & Saldaña, 2014).

FINDINGS

The description of prospective teachers' self-perceptions of (non) nativeness begins by establishing how they identified themselves with the traditional categorization of "native" or "non-native speaker." Subsequently, this section presents a description of findings concerning participants' self-perception of their (non) nativeness; first as Spanish speakers, then as English speakers and finally as prospective Colombian English teachers.

In their questionnaire responses, all 43 participants indicated that they considered themselves to be native speakers of Spanish and non-native speakers of English. Of the 43 participants, 9 University A and 9 University B prospective teachers were interviewed and they elaborated upon their understanding of what a "native speaker" was. Similar answers in both groups conferred nativespeakership status based on birth, prolonged immersion in the language and culture, and the ability to use the language in various settings. The only interview answer that diverged from these criteria for granting someone nativespeakership status was provided by a University A prospective teacher: "Un hablante nativo, según el marco común europeo estaría en el nivel más alto para inglés y es el C2" (UniA-S3-INT-February, 21, 2014)[3]. [A native speaker according to the Common European Framework (CEF) would be in the highest level, C2.] When asked about the origin of their notions to define a "native speaker", they mentioned university courses, and their reflections upon others' and their own language learning experiences.

---

[3] Throughout this article, abbreviations are used to identify quoted answers from participants: "UniA" and "UniB" refers to the university where they studied. "S" followed by a number is used to identify students. As for the instruments from where a piece of evidence was taken, Q. stands for questionnaire and INT. for interview. The primary investigator provides participants' original testimonies in Spanish and subsequently in parentheses, he includes his translation of the quotations into English keeping faithful to participants´original ideas.

Two overarching tendencies characterize pre-service teachers' responses regarding their self-perception of nativeness as Spanish speakers: most participants exhibited a high level of confidence in their language abilities and some them saw themselves as Spanish speakers in need of improvement.

"Of course, I Regard Myself as a Native Spanish Speaker"

"Por supuesto, yo me considero un hablante nativo de español" (UniA-S21-Q-March, 18, 2014), [Of course, I regard myself as a native Spanish speaker], were the words used by a participant in a survey when answering if she compared herself to native speakers of Spanish in Colombia. Her answer captures the essence of a substantial number of participants' replies to questions regarding their self-image as Spanish language users. The majority saw themselves as highly competent users of Spanish. Fifty-five percent of University B and 86% of University A prospective teachers self-evaluated their proficiency as a 4, the second best, on a scale from 1 to 5 and there was a group of participants who thought their level was the highest possible, 5, (see Table 1, below), though percentages were lower, 40% of University B and 14% of University A prospective teachers.

Table 1

Participants' Self-ranking of their Overall Spanish Language Ability

	Scores				
University	1 (Lowest)	2	3	4	5 (Highest)
UniA				86%	14%
UniB			5%	55%	40%

Participants considered listening comprehension, speaking and pronunciation as their strongest skills (See Table 2, below). In a like manner, when asked about their Spanish language

limitations in the survey, 12 University B and 6 University A pre-service teachers did not answer the question. Not providing an answer might covertly imply that they did not acknowledge any limitations. Conversely 1 University B and 5 University A prospective teachers directly expressed that they did not have any difficulties.

Table 2

Participants' Self-ranking of their Specific Spanish Language Ability

	University1		University2	
Abilities	Total Responses	Mean	Total Responses	Mean
Listening Comprehension	20	4.55	20	4.75
Pronunciation	20	4.60	20	4.65
Speaking	20	4.25	20	4.55
Knowledge of Vocabulary	20	4.15	20	4.35
Grammar in Use	20	4.10	20	4.50
Grammar Rules	20	4.05	20	4.10
Reading Comprehension	19	4.05	20	3.95
Writing Composition	20	3.85	20	4.20

As Table 3 shows, in relation to their comparison to other Colombian Spanish speakers, 57% of University A and 50% of University B prospective teachers either compare or do not compare themselves to other native speakers because their nativeness buttresses or makes their language expertise irrefutable.

Table 3

Participants Comparing Themselves to Other Colombian Spanish Speakers

	University	
Answers	UniA	UniB
Do not compare themselves to other native speakers because they are native speakers.	24%	20%
Compare themselves to other native speakers because of their high competence.	33%	30%
Compare themselves to other native speakers in order to learn.	43%	50%

For 8 pre-service teachers (5 from University A and 3 from University B), it was not just being native speakers that explained their advanced knowledge and skills in Spanish, but also their studies. In the interviews, they mentioned that learning their native language had been a lifelong experience. University A participants, in particular, emphasized the time they had spent in courses at the university: "Siempre he tenido como en un buen nivel, o sea en cuanto a otros porque bueno, somos nativos pero...yo ya estudie cinco semestres de la lengua materna…" (UniA-S3-INT-February, 21, 2014). [I have always had, like, a good level, I mean in relation to others (Spanish speakers) because, well, we are native speakers but I have already taken courses about my mother tongue for 5 semesters.]

"Of course, I regard myself as a native Spanish speaker" also connotes a sense of pride and appreciation for Spanish, as evidenced by qualitative data from surveys and interviews. Nine University A and 7 University B prospective teachers referenced reasons to appreciate their L1. They mentioned that Spanish was an expression of their culture and identity (4 University A and 1 University B participants): "Identidad, porque fue con la lengua que yo crecí, o sea, para

mí es, la lengua materna si se puede decir, entonces eso me, me identifica" (UniA-S9-INT-February, 23, 2014). [Identity, because it was the language (Spanish) I grew up with, I mean, for me, it is my mother tongue, I would say, so that identifies me.]

In addition, participants were satisfied with their knowledge of various aspects of the language (2 University A and 1 University B pre-service teachers) and they valued the language as a key to "opening doors" in the world (2 participants in each university): "Mi lengua nativa es una de las más habladas en el mundo y me siento orgullosa por ello, pues es una gran ventaja" (UniB-S5-Q-February, 25, 2014). [My native language is one of the most spoken in the world and this makes me proud because it represents a big advantage.]

"Despite Our Being Native Speakers, We Certainly Have Limitations"

Even though they expressed high confidence in their language knowledge and abilities as native speakers, some participants sensed that there were aspects of their language ability that could be enhanced. This perception of language ability varied among pre-service teachers. For some, there were "little problems", aspects to polish or to become more specialized in (12 University A and 8 University B participants in qualitative data from surveys and interviews). In this regard, a student teacher commented: "Mis problemas son con algunas conjugaciones de verbos, pero muy mínimas" (UniA-S7-Q-February, 20, 2014). [I have trouble with some verbal conjugations, but that is a minimal problem.]

Other pre-service teachers viewed the learning of Spanish as a continuous endeavor due to the complexity and vastness of the language. There were language skills which they lacked and associated limitations they felt very concerned about (6 University A and 7 University B participants in qualitative data from surveys and interviews). The following extract illustrates these views, "a pesar de ser hablante nativo, existen vacios en el conocimiento estructural de la lengua; pero con lo aprendido en la Universidad, he mejorado en la expresión oral y en el

conocimiento gramatical y sintáctico del español" (UniB-S12-Q-February, 25, 2014). [Though I am a native speaker, there are aspects I do not know about the structural part of the language, but because of what I have learnt in the university, I have improved about my oral expression, grammar knowledge and syntax.]

Participants' answers to a survey question, regarding comparing themselves to other Colombian Spanish speakers (see Table 3), show that 43% of University A and 50% of University B pre-service teachers made such a comparison in order to learn from others. Specifically, they related their comparison to their continuous disposition towards expanding their knowledge and abilities (8 University A and 3 University B pre-service teachers), using the language accurately (5 University A and 5 University B pre-service teachers), self-evaluating their knowledge (2 University A and 1 University B pre-service teachers), or acquiring more specialized knowledge (2 University A and 1 University B pre-service teachers).

Pre-service teachers expected to learn from educated or prestigious Spanish speakers; often times, these speakers were socially legitimized authorities in language usage who exhibit accurate and acceptable linguistic conventions. A pre-service teacher commented,

> pues yo trato a veces de mirar, el, lo de *la Real Academia Española* y ver como las nuevas reglas…y hay como cosas que no estoy de acuerdo, pero si las hacen así, son personas que han estudiado y tienen como su razón de ser…(UniB-S2-INT-March, 2, 2014). [I try to pay attention to what RAE says and look at the new rules…and there are things I don´t agree with, but if they say it should be that way, well, these are people who have studied and so, it kind of makes sense]

Prospective teachers in both universities felt that "knowledge of grammar rules", "reading", and "writing" were the most problematic in their learning (See Table 2). Specifically academic reading and writing proved challenging for participants, and regarding the latter ability, they also

mentioned difficulties in spelling and punctuation. Regarding grammar rules, concerns involved knowledge in relation to complex verb tenses.

Though speaking skills were not ranked among the lowest abilities in the survey, qualitative data evidenced that 8 University A and 6 University B prospective teachers were also concerned about their oral expression skills. Their concerns involved mostly psychological issues, such as nervousness and insecurity while speaking publicly in academic settings. Additionally, three students (2 University B and 1 University A) perceived that their regional varieties of Spanish were deemed undesirable in the Capital cities where they lived. One of them commented:

> Tengo bastantes problemas, bastantes problemas en cuanto al español, porque, hay muchos, pues precisamente porque no soy de Bogotá hay muchos regionalismos que uno tiene (ajá) entonces que por lo menos uno llega a Bogotá y a uno no le entienden (UniB-S8-INT-February, 27, 2014). [I have many problems, many problems in relation to Spanish, because I am not from Bogotá and there are many regional uses in my Spanish then you arrived to Bogotá and people don´t understand you].

"I Feel like I'm Missing Something"

Regarding their self-perception as non-native speakers of English, participants brought to bear their partial mastery of the language. Their language limitations become a central topic in their description of their self-image, associated with their support of the myth of the native speaker and their self-encouragement to continue learning English. The essence of prospective teachers' self-perception as non-native speakers of English can be illustrated in the following excerpt: "Algunas veces me cuesta escuchar hablar y siento que me hace falta un poco de fluidez para lograr un acento correcto" (UniA-S2-INT-February, 21, 2014). [Sometimes I listen to myself speaking and I feel like I'm missing something, like a bit of fluency to achieve the right accent].

When answering survey questions, prospective-teachers repeatedly mentioned they were lacking knowledge and skills necessary to achieve their envisaged goals in the use of English. For some, these goals gravitated primarily towards their acquiring sufficient skills to be able to maintain communications with other English speakers (13 University A and 8 University B prospective teachers), whereas for others the aim was to achieve native-like proficiency and mimic a native speaker's communicative performance (8 University A and 15 University B prospective teachers). The following two excerpts demonstrate these contrasting views: "cuando los hablantes nativos de inglés vienen acá ellos, o sea, hablan en español con su acento gringo, y o sea, no, eso no importa, lo importante es que uno hable bien, o sea que pronuncie bien" (UniA-S10-INT-February, 22, 2014). [When native English speakers come here, they speak in Spanish with their gringo accent, I mean, that (accent) is not important, what is important is to talk well, to pronounce well.];

> yo creo que todos los no-nativos, nos gustaría llegar a eso, a que uno esté en un país nativo, y como que no se le note que es de otro lado, o sea, por lo menos que no se note

> tanto la variante latina que uno tiene al hablar. Pues, eso sería, ese sería el ideal, la meta (UniB-S8-INT- February, 27, 2014). [Well, I think that we, nonnative speakers, we would like to achieve that, I mean, that when you are in a native country they don't notice that you come from somewhere else, I mean that the Latin variant is not so evident, that would be the goal, the ideal.]

Questionnaires indicated that when asked to self-evaluate language ability in English, 80% of University A participants graded their ability to use the language as a 3 on a scale from 1 to 5 while 10% saw themselves as having a lower ability, grading themselves with 2, and the remaining 10% thought their ability was higher, giving themselves a 4. On the whole University B students revealed that they had a higher self-perception of their language skills than the University A prospective teachers'. Sixty percent of University B participants scored themselves with 3, 25% with 4, and 15 % with 2 (See Table 4).

Table 4

Participants' Self-Ranking of Their Overall Linguistic Ability in English

		Scores			
University	1 (Lowest)	2	3	4	5 (Highest)
UniA		10%	80%	10%	
UniB		15%	60%	25%	

Pre-service teachers' in both universities considered "grammar rules", "grammar in use" and "reading comprehension" as their best skills whereas "oral communication" was given the lowest score (See Table 5). These results also point out that University B students exhibited a higher regard for their abilities than University A students.

Table 5

Average of Participants' Self-Evaluation of Language Abilities and Knowledge

	University1		University2	
Specific Abilities	Total Responses	Mean	Total Responses	Mean
Grammar rules	21	3.43	20	3.80
Grammar in use	21	3.24	19	3.58
Reading comprehension	20	3.15	19	3.58
Writing composition	21	3.14	19	3.26
Pronunciation	21	3.14	20	3.37
Knowledge of vocabulary	21	2.86	19	3.45
Listening comprehension	21	2.86	19	3.42
Oral communication	21	2.81	19	3.26

The perception of themselves as lacking ability and knowledge caused participants (12University A and 9 University B prospective teachers) frustration, fear, and insecurity. Specifically, one of these prospective teachers expressed:

> Cuando estaba en primer semestre en alguna ocasión me llegue a frustrar porque veía a un compañero que había hecho un semestre de idiomas en Bucaramanga y pues el se podía comunicar perfectamente con la asistente y pues eso si como que me lleno un poco de frustración y aveces cuando yo hablaba con ellos no les entendia (UniA-S2-INT-February, 21, 2014). [When I was in 1st semester, I got kind of frustrated, there was a peer who had studied a semester in another university and he could communicate perfectly with the assistant (native speaker), it was frustrating and when I tried to talk with them (the assistants) I did not understand them.]

As in the case of this participant, these unfavorable feelings seem to proliferate at the prospect of communicating with native speakers. There was usually the impression that native speakers would act as judges of their performance.

Fifty-two percent of University A and 80% of University B prospective teachers compared themselves to native speakers since they are regarded as the ideal. Thus, these models

become the point of reference used to evaluate their own abilities, correct their mistakes, and improve imitating them. Those prospective teachers who expressed that they did not compare themselves to native speakers explained that currently their language abilities were too limited to attempt to make a comparison (5 University A and 2 University B pre-service teachers). A smaller group, 3 University A and 1 University B pre-service teachers, believed it is very unlikely that they would reach the level of skill native speakers have. One pre-service teacher from University B commented that not all native speakers had a good command of the language and he might in fact have a better command of English.

Participants' feelings regarding having a foreign accent when speaking in English, also reveals their self-perception of themselves as "missing something." Ninety percent of University A and 95% of University B prospective teachers felt concerned about their accent in English. Their preoccupation was mainly anchored in the belief that they would not be understood if they did not have a suitable accent (8 University B and 14 University A pre-service teachers). Another reason was that they wanted to sound more natural, polished, and "beautiful" resembling a native speaker and without any trace of L1 accent (8 University B and 3 University A pre-service teachers).

The accents, University A and University B pre-service teachers felt most attracted to, were the British and the American varieties. One student commented, "pues es muy agradable que quiera aprender acento británico si, como que todo el mundo se va por el acento americano, entonces como que uno quiere aprender acento británico" (UniB-S17-INT-March, 2, 2014). [It is really nice to prefer a British accent, like everybody goes for the American and it's like, one wants to learn British accent.] One of his peers said, "no sé si es por vanidad de uno como estudiante, pero uno siempre quiere como que aprender más que todo británico que americano. Entonces, es bastante común, por lo menos en la clase en la que estoy" (UniB-S8-INT- February,

27, 2014). [I don't, not if it is vanity that one has a student, but one always wants to learn more the British variety than the American. This is very common, at least in my class.]

Another English variety mentioned by two students at University A was Jamaican, however, these participants made it clear that Jamaican English was not their favorite variety: "Sinceramente, vi una película no recuerdo cómo se llamaba, era como unos juegos olímpicos de unos jamaiquinos, y no sé me parecía muy gracioso como ellos hablaban, no la verdad no me gustó mucho" (UniA-S2-INT-February, 21, 2014). [Honestly, I watched a movie, I don't remember how it was called, it involved some Jamaicans in the Olympic Games, and I don't know, it was funny how they talked, I didn't like it much.] A second pre-service teacher commented: "el acento se me hace un poquitico difícil de entender, además habían ciertas palabra que eran como cortadas, entonces, como que quedaba yo, 'uy pero qué me trato de decir', jejeje..." (UniA-S4-INT-February, 22, 2014). [The accent (Jamaican) it seems a bit hard to understand, and also there were some words that were like broken, so, I was like 'what were they trying to tell me? he, he…']

Those few students who were not preoccupied with their accent, expressed that their English proficiency was good and that they could acquire an accent during their learning process. One of them said that having an accent was not even an issue when speaking the language.

"I Am Increasing My Abilities and Opportunities"

Despite thinking of themselves as "missing something", as not fully possessing the desired level and performance when using English, extracts from 15 University B and 14 University A prospective teachers' surveys and interviews showed that they felt encouraged because they still had time ahead of them as learners to shape their language skills into what they expected. A participant commented:

Me encanta el inglés y cada día aprendo algo nuevo sin importar si estoy en un ambiente

> académico. Aprendo de los programas de televisión, de los libros e incluso de las canciones. He aprendido muchas cosas que desconocía y han sido de gran ayuda para mi formación académica (UniB-S9-Q-February, 25, 2014). [Every day I learn something new regardless of my being in an academic context or not, I learn from television shows, from books, from songs. I have learned a lot of things I did not know and this has been a great help for my academic preparation.]

They deemed their accomplishments valuable since oftentimes, especially during previous levels of their education, they had iteratively faced challenges related to unsuitable conditions in schools, lack of resources and poor teaching:

> Yo entré con un nivel muy, muy, muy básico de inglés a este programa, desde el colegio. Creo que he mejorado mis habilidades tanto de escucha, creo que mejoré en pronunciación, en gramática, yo creo que he mejorado. Algunos de mis compañeros probablemente hablan y, mucho mejor el inglés que yo, pero yo estoy mejorando, estoy mejorando (UniA-S9-INT-February, 23, 2014). [Starting this program my English level was really basic, it was that way since I was in secondary school but I have improved in my listening, pronunciation and grammar. I think I have improved. Some of my peers probably speak much better than me but I am improving, I am improving.]

Participants also maintain their drive to learn English by focusing on the perceived benefits of learning the global language, its culture and the skills necessary to teach it (4 University A and 5 University B pre-service teachers). "Pues yo creo que como hablante no nativa de inglés, la oportunidad de aprender inglés como segunda lengua, porque obviamente el inglés es como el idioma más importante y el más hablado" (INT-S2-UniB-March, 2, 2014). [I think that as a non-native speaker of English I have the opportunity to learn a second language like English which is obviously the most important and most spoken language.]

"NNESTs Can Have a Very Good Language Mastery but That's Not the Ideal"

As prospective NNESTs, participants exhibited two interrelated images of themselves. These images constitute a perpetuation of the self-perceptions described above concerning their being non-native speakers of English. On the one hand, they viewed NNESTs as lacking the ability to attain the level of language expertise and cultural knowledge that they believe NESTs possess. On the other hand, they saw themselves as prospective teachers who possess advantageous conditions associated with nonnative speaker status and with the capacity to acquire the necessary preparation to succeed in their future jobs.

Regarding language proficiency, participants considered NNESTs to be at a disadvantage when compared to NESTs. Table 6 shows that 40% of University B pre-service teachers identify various aspects of language abilities (spoken language 25% and fluency 15%, added together), as what NNESTs are missing in regards to support for their students. Language ability is only surpassed by the lack of cultural knowledge at 45%. Similarly 23% of University A participants ranked language abilities second to cultural knowledge at 43%. In contrast, Table 7 reveals that participants in both universities ranked cultural knowledge and language abilities first and second respectively, when considering what NESTs could offer their students. Participants' answers regarding who they would advise to become a relative's English teacher also favors NESTs over NNESTs. Table 8 indicates that 62% of University A and 55% of University B pre-service teachers would recommend a Native Speaker while 33% of University A and 40% of University B would recommend a NNEST.

Table 6

Participants' Opinions Regarding What NNESTS Can Offer and Are Missing

	University A	University B

Teachers' Qualifications	NNESTs can offer	NNESTs are missing	NNESTs can offer	NNESTs are missing
More help in understanding and adapting to the L2 language and its culture	38%		35%	
More techniques to address learning difficulties	14%			
More knowledge of learning strategies for language learning	14%		35%	
A good model	5		15%	
Higher awareness of students' sociocultural background	10%			
Others	23%		15%	
More accuracy in spoken language		10%		25%
More accuracy in written language		5%		
Fluency		10%		15%
A better knowledge of the cultures associated to English		43%		45%
Others		32%		15%

Table 7
Participants' Opinions Regarding Nests Can Offer and Are Missing

	University A		University B	
Teachers' Qualifications	NESTs can offer	NESTs are missing	NESTs Can offer	NESTs are missing
A more active and innovative methodology	10%	14%	5%	5%
A more real and authentic atmosphere in class	24%		50%	
More cultural knowledge	24%		15%	
Broader vocabulary knowledge	10%			

Acquisition of better pronunciation	14%		10%	
Others	18%		20%	
Knowledge of the teaching environment and context		14%		20%
Preparation in linguistics and knowledge of grammar rules		10%		15%
Knowledge of EFL learning processes and strategies		29%		25%
Capacity to mediate between the target and the learners' culture		19%		25%
Others		24%		15%

Table 8

Participants' Advice about Hiring Someone as an English Teacher

	University A	University B
Teachers' Qualifications		
A native speaker from another country who could speak Spanish	5%	5%
An English native speaker who could speak Spanish	62%	45%
A non-native English speaker from Colombia	33%	40%
An English native speaker who could not speak Spanish		10%

Additionally, 10 University A and 11 University B prospective teachers explained in surveys and interviews that it is possible for NNESTs to achieve proficiency in the use of the language. Nonetheless, they considered it impossible to become the ideal; the native speaker. NNESTs were considered better prepared to explain the grammatical structure of the language,

its formal and basic aspects[4], and as such are more suitable to teach initial instructional levels. Conversely NESTs are more qualified to teach advanced levels. As an example of these opinions a participant expressed:

> La debilidad para el hablante no nativo, sería, pues que domina la lengua pero, pues, no la va a dominar al cien por ciento, o sea, tiene, puede tener un muy buen dominio pero pues no lo domina cien por ciento, digamos puede acercarse, pero no es ideal de todas maneras (INT-S7-UniB-February, 27, 2014). [The non-native speaker teacher's weakness is that he/she can master the language but he/she cannot do it a 100%, I mean he/she can be close to having a very good mastery of the language, but that's not the ideal any way.]

Participants recalled that several of their primary and secondary school teachers did not exhibit acceptable oral skills. They expressed concerns that what they perceived as prospective NNESTs' limitations can be transmitted from their primary and secondary school teachers through them to their future students. One of them commented:

> Las personas no nativas adquieren, digamos, mañas o pronuncian las palabras de una forma no apropiada, entonces, y eso que ellos dicen, se lo enseñan a sus estudiantes, o sea, los estudiantes adquieren esas, esos malos hábitos, o sea, sí como que no les enseñan bien cómo se debe pronunciar las palabras…(INT-S9-UniB-February, 28, 2014). [Non-native people acquire, we could call them "bad habits" or they pronounce words inappropriately and then they teach that to their students, this means that students acquire these "bad habits", so they do not teach the right way to pronounce words...]

---

[4] This perception matches the self-evaluation they made of themselves concerning their abilities in the use and knowledge of the language. It can be seen in Table 5.

As findings reported in the next section will show, the majority of participants perceived that there were advantages and opportunities that became avenues to build themselves as competent NNESTs teachers in the future. However, a few of them, 2 University A prospective teachers, feared that they might not be hired if they had to compete with a native speaker and 1 University A prospective teacher thought she could be a victim of harassment from her students if she did not exhibit a native-like English.

"It Is Good to Give NESTs and NNESTs a Chance to Teach as Far as They Are Prepared"

When thinking about their future performance as teachers, most participants in both universities, 67% of University A participants and 75% of University B, did not show concerns about not being regarded as a NEST. Another survey question, asking participants who they would hire to work in a language institute, showed that in both universities, 90% of University B and 81% of University A prospective teachers, would hire an even number of NNESTs and NESTs (See Table 9). In this vein, they do not see themselves in a disadvantageous position in comparison with NESTs. In fact, while 57% of University A students think NNESTs are more successful than NESTs, 43% think the opposite. Similarly 83% of University B students believe that NNESTs are more successful than their counterparts.

Table 9

Participants' Views on Who They Would Hire to Work in a Language Institute

Participants' opinion regarding who they would hire	University1	University2
More native speakers than nonnative speakers	5%	5%
The same number of native speakers than nonnative speakers	81%	90%
More nonnative speakers than native speakers	14%	5%

The role models that participants identify for their future teaching jobs attest to their overarching perception of themselves as having a significant chance of becoming competent English teachers despite their non-nativeness. Through data from interviews, it was established that all prospective teachers (18) who were interviewed, designated a Colombian NNEST as their role model. Despite the fact that most of them had not been taught by NESTs, only two of those pre-service teachers who were interviewed had ever had NESTs, the reasons they put forward to explain their preference for NNESTs as role models corroborate their positive opinion regarding these educators as stated in surveys.

Their NNEST role models were admired because they spoke clearly in English, thus facilitating students' understanding. A couple of students commented that they prefer teachers who did not try to imitate native speakers' accents because that imitation might complicate their comprehension. Moreover, they appreciated teachers who excelled in their use of engaging methodologies, which again made it easier to understand topics. Finally, a positive encouraging attitude towards students' learning process, being kind but demanding, and facilitating a cordial relationship with students, constituted pivotal characteristics of the role models they chose. On the whole, prospective teachers highlighted qualities in their role models that confirm their view of NNESTs as potentially competent since they promote suitable learning environments and implement successful pedagogical frameworks. Related findings are presented below:

> Me gustaba porque él era muy social con los estudiantes, le gustaba la misma música que a mí y podíamos hablar y nos ponía a leer. Ciertamente el te llenaba de el conocimiento que tenía y cuando cometíamos errores, el no era de decirte 'lo hiciste mal' (su tono es fuerte)…El decía, 'hay que ver lo positivo de esto' y de esta forma se aprende, la corrección debe ser poco a poco (UniA-S14-INT-Febrero, 23, 2014). [I like how he (his role model) socialized with students, he liked the music that I liked and we talked and he

> got you involved in reading. He really filled you with knowledge and if you made mistakes he was not telling you 'this is wrong' (he uses a scolding voice)…He would say, 'let's see the positive side of this' and that's how you learn, when you're corrected little by little.]

The first of two dimensions to explain pre-service teachers' self-characterization as competent prospective teachers involves their belief that their experience learning English in Colombia has equipped them with knowledge to buttress their future students' language education. In this regard, 38% of University A and 35% of University B pre-service teachers answered in the survey that NNESTs' were particularly skilled at helping their students understand and adapt to the foreign language. Five percent of University A and 15% of University B pre-service teachers considered NNESTs to be "good models" to follow and 10% of University A students highlighted "their awareness of their students' sociocultural background" (See Table 6).

Qualitative data from surveys and interviews revealed that 14 University B and 12 University A students underscored NNESTs' language learning background as a key element of their future job performance. Participants believed that NNESTs are acutely aware and understand their students' difficulties and needs. Moreover, they are skilled at identifying factors affecting the teaching-learning process. NNESTs' experiences as learners inform their pedagogical judgment, which in turn leads to sound choices when adapting, adopting or creating curricular elements. The next excerpt exemplifies the previous perspective: "Yo me siento mucho más cómoda con un profesor no nativo, siente uno más confianza, porque sabe pues que están hablando de lo mismo, pues han vivido y compartido la misma cultura, el mismo contexto" (UniA- S10-INT-February, 22, 2014). [I feel much more comfortable with a NNEST, I am talking about myself, I am a student and I feel more comfortable, more confident because you know you are talking about the same things, you know you have lived and share the same

culture, the same context.]

Regarding the second dimension of their self-perception as competent prospective non-native teachers, several participants thought that their education would grant them the required qualifications to teach. Forty percent of University B pre-service teachers chose the two lowest levels of concern, while 20% selected the highest one when asked if they thought that the difficulties they perceived in their English would be a problem in their future teaching job. In the case of University A pre-service teachers, 24% selected the two lowest levels of concern whereas 29% selected the two highest ones (See Table 10, below). In general, those students who showed the least concern explained that, by the end of their undergraduate program, their language limitations would probably be reduced because of their studies.

Data from interviews provided by 6 University B and 5 University A pre-service teachers, revealed that despite their perception of NNESTs as not being the ideal in terms of their language ability, participants believed that NNESTs could succeed in their teaching jobs. Education was regarded by several participants as the most relevant criteria used to judge how qualified a teacher was. Not only undergraduate education but continuous education after graduation would make a NNEST competent. In this regard, a participant commented:

> Pienso que, en mí, en lo que estoy estudiando voy a aprender las herramientas necesarias para, para ser una buena profesora… o sea, no creo que tenga un mal, bajo nivel de enseñanza, entonces, no sé, yo creo que no va a ser ningún impedimento que no sea hablante nativa (UniB-S9-INT-February 28, 2014). [I think that what I am studying in the university will help me to learn about the tools I need to be a good teacher… so I don't think my teaching will be deficient, I don't know, I don't think that not being a native speaker will be a barrier.]

Table 10

Levels of Concern Regarding Language Limitations and Future Teaching Job

Rank	University A	University B
1 (Lowest level of concern)	5%	10%
2	24%	30%
3	48%	40%
4	10%	10%
5 (highest level of concern)	14%	10%

DISCUSSION

The analysis of participants' self-perceptions of their interrelated role as Spanish and English speakers has shown their tendency to support the myth of the native speaker. Nonetheless, in those two roles, participants' views of themselves also challenged that myth by acknowledging that despite their (non) nativeness, they had limitations in the case of Spanish and they were encouraged to develop their language competence through their university education in the case of English.

Ideologies Shaping Participants´ Self-perceptions of (non) Nativeness as Speakers

As Spanish speakers, all participants self-subscribe to the category native speaker which most of them primarily define in terms of being born, growing up in the country, and possessing a diversified competence in the use of the language. They were born and grew up in Colombia a Spanish speaking country and therefore they are native speakers of that language. Because they are native speakers, most participants take for granted that they have a high competence in the use of Spanish; their knowledge and performance is close to the ideal or is the ideal. In the case of Spanish, as in the case of English described below, the rationalizations the participants used to describe their (non) nativeness in both languages buttress the main ideological premises concerning the myth of the native speaker (Ramptom, 1990; Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah, 1999; Kramsch, 1999).

Regarding English they do not fulfill any of the three conditions they revealed to define what a native speaker is and they identify themselves as non-native speakers. They regard themselves as possessing an insufficient level of competence in English, which is not the ideal. Though for some the aim to achieve a high level of communication when using English, most of them aspire to speak like a native speaker because as one participant puts it, "la idea de hablar otro idioma es hacerlo muy parecido a un hablante native" (UniA-S5-Q-February, 22, 2014).

[The idea of speaking another language (second/foreign) is to do it very much akin to the way a native speaker does it.]

Participants' tendency to adhere to the myth of the native speaker is not isolated from the ideological make up of their context. Participants' expectations to achieve native-like command of the language parallels the wording of objectives found in the three syllabi of the English courses in which University B participants had been enrolled. Examples of these objectives can be seen in table 11:

Table 11

References to Native Speaker Standards in English Courses at University B

Course	**Language Skill**	**Syllabi Fragments**
Comunicación Oral II	Listening Comprehension	"Comprensión de conversaciones entre hablantes nativos." [Understand conversations between native speakers]. "Comprende el discurso articulado de un hablante nativo en canciones y películas apoyándose en los guiones o scripts." [Understands the articulated discourse of a native speaker in songs and movies with the help of scripts.] (Comunicación Oral II [Course Syllabus].2014).
Comunicación Oral III	Speaking	"Participa en la conversación con un grado de fluidez y espontaneidad que hace posible la interacción habitual con hablantes nativos sin producir tensión en ninguno de los interlocutores." [Participates in conversation exhibiting such a degree of fluency and spontaneity that they can interact without native speakers without generating tensions for any of the interlocutors.] (Comunicación Oral II [Course Syllabus].2014).
	Listening	"El estudiante podrá comprender las ideas principales y especificas- aun cuando no en todo detalle- de una manifestacion oral

	Comprehension	hecha por un hablante nativo o texto auténtico." [Students will be able to understand main and specific ideas-even though this might not be possible in full detail-of an oral utterance performed by a native speaker or authentic text.] (Comunicación Oral III [Course Syllabus].2014).

In addition to setting the superior native speaker as the preferred model of language competence, the last objective included in table 11 for the "Comunicación Oral II course" uses language that presents participants as non-native speakers likely to fail on the basis of their poor language ability.

In Colombia, English native speakers are regarded as the ideal model for language learning (Velez-Rondón, 2003; González, 2010). In fact, they are usually hired to teach without teaching credentials and they are hired as experts by the government to develop the guidelines of educational policies for English teaching and learning (Guerrero, 2008; Usma, 2014).

Pre-service teachers' self-perceptions support other ideological pillars regarding the myth of the native speaker. In relation to the idea of the native speaker as one who exhibits a "natural", spontaneous and intuitive mastery of the language (Norton & Tang, 1997; Brutt-Griffler, & Samimy, 2001; Timmis, 2002; Davis, 2003), participants perceived those skills associated with "natural and effortless performance" (speaking and listening), as their most well-developed Spanish language abilities. In fact, they scored their performance in these abilities close to the ideal. In English, where they see themselves as non-native speakers, participants do not regard their oral language skills as their strengths.

Concerning the characterization of the ideal native speaker as a monolingual individual (Cook, 1999; Davis, 2004), also known as "monolingual bias" (Kachru, 1996; Belz, 2002; Mahboob, 2010), even though participants have been studying English and expected to reach the

necessary level of mastery to make it their profession, they never expected that they could achieve native-like proficiency. This suggests that they believe that they can only possibly be native speakers of one language, Spanish.

Coupled with the myth of the native speaker, pre-service teachers' self- perceptions exhibited an ideology of "native speaker standard language" (Train, 2007, 2011). The varieties of Spanish, spoken in the capital cities where the two universities are located, enjoy the status of "standard". Whereas the Spanish spoken in certain areas of Bogotá is considered a national standard and enjoys high prestige, the variety spoken, in the city in which University A is located, plays a similar role for the region. A substantial number of participants, who had travelled from other regions to attend the two target universities in these capital cities, exhibited those dialectal features in their Spanish.

Four of these participants perceived their use of Spanish as not good enough since it reflects regional uses of the language, thus adhering to the social convention by which, as Train (2007, 2011) puts it, "standardness frames variability and diversity as a supposed problem." Inasmuch as most participants also perceived that their ideal models of Spanish speakers correspond to educated individuals, the native speaker standard language intersects with the educated native speaker (Paikeday, 1985; Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Modiano, 2001).

A very good example of this intersection is provided by a University B student teacher who is quoted in the findings section saying that even if she disagrees with *la Real Academia Española* (RAE)'s rules on the use of Spanish in Colombia, she follows them because that institution is composed of highly educated people. In this regard, Train (2007, p. 214) posits that "the standard language comes to be naturalized as the putative native language of the educated members of society." The participants' history and the educational system, especially during

primary and secondary school, also contributed greatly to the naturalization of the Spanish standard in their language use.

In interviews, pre-service teachers described how by means of prescriptive teaching techniques such as the repetition of misspelled words over and over, they learned the "correct" way to write words, namely, the "standard." The quote below illustrates the role of education in this student's language standardization process and how despite that education, he does not seem to be satisfied with his performance in Spanish. In this case, the socially constructed power of standardization overrules education to index region and class (South west Bogotá is composed of working class neighborhoods) leading the participant to judge his ability in Spanish as undeserving:

> …Ese acercamiento a la lectura y también el gusto por la materia de español en el colegio, me, me ayudó bastante, para la expresión oral y como para el conocimiento de una forma de hablar entre comillas "correcta" y, todavía como hay mucha influencia de, de la forma que tiene uno de hablar aquí uno, pues digamos en el suroccidente de Bogotá, o pues por, por pertenecer a esta área de, eh, pues no es tan técnico, no es tan sofisticado, digamos entre comillas, el español que yo manejo (INT-S7-UniB-February, 27, 2014).
>
> […So my being close to reading and my pleasure to take the Spanish class at secondary school helped me a lot in my oral expression and in my knowledge of what in quotations I would call the right way to speak…but there is still a lot of influence from the way one has to speak here, I mean being from the southwest of Bogotá, because I come from this area, the Spanish I use is not that technical, it is not that sophisticated.]

Considering participants' self-perceptions as speakers of English, the native speaker standard language ideology was contingent on their aim to resemble those they regarded as native speakers. However, not all those who were born and grew up in English speaking countries

constituted a legitimate model to emulate; pre-service teachers favored American and British varieties. Likewise, the standards for English adopted by the government and based on the Common European Framework (CEF) seem to influence participants' perception of nativeness. Findings reveal that students' conceptualization of nativeness intersects with their awareness of the current educational language policy for English in the country.

The previously mentioned varieties of English globally enjoyed the prestige of standard (Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Modiano, 2001; Tollefson, 2007. At the local level, Colombia has long-standing economic, political and cultural relations with the United States and England. However the educational language policy has been influenced mainly by the British Council. The standards for English adopted by the educational system come from Europe and are promoted by the British Council. The influence of these British and American English varieties can be associated with the textbooks used by the pre-service teachers in is this study. The series "Cutting Edge", "New Cutting Edge" and "New Interchange" are some of the textbooks included in the syllabi of courses at University B and University A. These textbooks' publishers are U.K. and U.S.-based. In the curricula of the two universities, the literature courses focus almost exclusively on U.S. and British authors. By the same token, the two institutions usually host foreign teacher assistants from the U.S. and England. The University A adds assistants from Jamaica, but they do not turn out to be the most popular as revealed in the findings section.

Another ideology participants embraced regarding their self-perception of nativespeakership was that of "non-accent." Lippi-Green (1997, p. 44) relates this ideology with standardization since in both cases experts in the field of linguistics consider them "abstractions" or "myths." Almost all participants feared that their not having the right accent, namely an accent without Spanish influence and ideally resembling American or British English, would negatively affect their chances of being understood by others, especially native speakers.

Echoing Lippi-Green's previous remark that the sole definition of what accent entails is problematic, prospective teachers usually equated "accent" with "pronunciation", "intonation", and "fluency." Although clarity regarding the meaning of "accent" was elusive for participants, what they were certain about was the consequences of displaying one that was not acceptable. Having a Spanish "accent" made their English incomprehensible, inappropriate, ugly, nonstandard and a far cry from the native-like competence they sought to achieve.

With regard to Spanish, although some participants made negative evaluations of their overall regional variety of Spanish in comparison to the standard, they did not refer to their accent in particular. One participant from University A did, however, share a story involving her peers' perception of her accent when she entered university:

> …Mis compañeros me decían que mi acento sonaba raro. Claro yo viví en un pueblito. Sin embargo con el tiempo las cosas cambiaron, cuando interactuas con la gente que vive en la ciudad y los de la universidad te cambia (UniA-S19-INT-February, 20, 2014). […My classmates used to tell me that my accent was weird. Of course because I lived in a small town, but later that changed a little, to interact with people in the city and university makes you change.]

This quote exemplifies the kind of peer pressure the participant experienced since her Spanish was heard as a variation of the standard socially favored in the city in which university A was located.

Pre-service teachers' self-perceptions of (non) nativeness in both languages indicate that their embrace of the aforementioned ideologies affected their subjectivity. As native speakers of Spanish they felt proud and highly confident with their competence in the language and most of them regarded their limitations as a regular part of the learning process. They were in a comfortable position since their education, which oftentimes during primary and secondary

school was grounded in prescriptivism that emphasized purism and correctness, entitled them to be socially regarded as owners and safeguards of the language. Conversely these nativespeakership ideologies can lead participants to construct themselves as inadequate Spanish speakers when their dialectal uses deviate from the privileged standard.

As non-native speakers of English, pre-service teachers had not yet achieved their desired command of the language, both communicatively and aesthetically, which for a substantial number of them, 8 University A and 15 University B participants, was based on native speaker norms of correctness. The result of their "inability" to attain their goal is made explicit by the following participant's comment:

> Me gusta mucho aprender sobre la cultura y la lengua de los países en que se habla el inglés pero algunas veces siento algo de desaliento por que yo creo que no alcancaré a la pronunciación de un habalante nativo (UniB-S2-INT-March, 2, 2014). [Learning the language and the culture of English speaking countries is something I like a lot. However I have felt somewhat disappointed because I think I won't be able to acquire a native speaker's pronunciation].

Despite their feelings of encouragement and optimism based on the perceived gains learning English could bring them, pre-service teachers mentioned that the prospect of being regarded as incompetent and being discriminated against when, for instance, looking for jobs or traveling abroad, triggered their anxiety.

Feelings like fear, insecurity and frustration constitute an expected outcome when students' learning goals are grounded in the standards of the ideal native speaker. On one hand, these models do not conform to the common language variability and partial language command found in the real world (Cook, 1999; Ramptom, 1990; Mahboob, 2010), "the majority of communication in English does not involve native speakers", and "learning a second language

makes people different from monolingual native speakers" (Cook, 2007, p. 240). On the other hand, even if one sounds like a native speaker, one might not be granted the credentials unless an array of elusive socially-established requirements related to race, nationality and class, among others, are met. Brutt-Griffler and Samimy (2001, p. 104) posit that "the socially constructed category of the native speaker is fixed and immutable. The native speaker is conceived as a permanent language learner. They cannot aspire to any socially recognized authority in the language."

Making the native speaker the target for language learning might not only be "silly" as Cook (2007, p. 240) exhorts, but painful. Far-reaching consequences of pursuing this ideal can directly affect learners' identity, as in the case of the following participant who explains why she does not want to sound like a foreigner while speaking in English:

> …Es decir, yo creo que uno no debe pasar el acento que lo caracteriza a uno a esa otra lengua, por ejemplo cuando uno escucha a otras personas, digamos mejicanas o argentinas que hablan se nota un acento marcado y no se siente bien y si solamente por esa razón ellos pueden decir que eres un extranjero, por eso podrías sentirte intranquilo, es algo así (UniB-S4-INT-February, 25, 2014). […What I mean is that you should not transfer the characteristic accent of your language to that other language (English), when you listen to others, say, Mexican or Argentinian speaking in English there is a marked accent and that's not really comfortable and that just because of that, they can see that you are a foreigner, that can make you uncomfortable or something like that.]

The participants' desire to mask their identity subsumes issues of human dignity, justice, and prejudice generated by what Cook (2007, p. 240) explains: "The denial of the right to L2 speakers to sound as if they come from a particular place reeks of power; native speakers are not treated in the same way." Unfortunately, despite the fact that for the most part, native speaker

norms are deemed unrealistic and inappropriate by many scholars in the language learning field, for students who expect to interact with native speakers and for those who do not, to approximate a native-like ability remains a main goal (Timmis, 2002).

The myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies influenced pre-service teachers by encouraging them to perceive themselves as over empowered as native speakers of Spanish, and disempowered as non-native speakers of English. Their substantially different roles socially constructed under the ideological premises of (non) nativespeakership put them at the opposite extremes of the power relationship scale. As educated Spanish native speakers, they could assume the role of judges:

> No sé de pronto si tengo de pronto un poco de ego, pero si a medida de que voy aprendiendo de esas presiones me he comparado un poco con la gente, con mis vecinos, con mis amigos fuera de la universidad y pues a veces digamos los corrijo de que no se expresen así no digan esto, esto está mal dicho (UniA-S2-INT-February, 21, 2014). [I don´t know maybe my ego is a bit high but yes, as I learn new expressions I compare myself with other people, my neighbors, my Friends who don´t attend the university and well, l sometimes, I correct them, 'don´t express yourself like that, don´t say it that way, you said it in the wrong way'.]

As English speakers, they had granted the omnipresent and usually abstract idealized native speaker all the authority to judge them:

> …Pero sin duda siempre está ese miedo hablar con ellos, por ejemplo cuando llegan se presentan y dicen 'Do you have any question about me?' y uno queda como bueno si tengo preguntas pero no quiero hacerlas por miedo a equivocarme y que usted me corrija, por lo general es así y uno siente eso mucho no solo con migo pienso yo sino también mis

> compañeros sienten el miedo a equivocarse frente a un nativo (UniA-S6-INT-February, 19, 2014). […With no doubt, there is always that fear to talk with them (foreign assistants), for example, when they arrived and introduce themselves and they say 'do you have any question about me?' And you think for yourself, 'well I do have questions but I don't want to make them because I am afraid I will make mistakes and you will correct me', this is the way it is. It is not only me, my peers also are afraid to make mistakes when they face a native speaker.]

Prospective teachers revealed a dichotomy concerning the effect of nativespeakership ideologies on their self-perceived subjectivity. As Belz (2002, p. 60) puts it when referring to L2 learners:

> In many cases, he or she (the L2 learner) has emerged rather gauntly as a bundle of dichotomous variables (e.g., +/– motivated) or, perhaps even more anaemically, as a 'deficient communicator struggling to overcome underdeveloped L2 competence, striving to reach the "target" [L2] competence of an idealized native speaker.'

It was not just disappointment and lack of confidence that they felt as English learners, being in an undergraduate program, they also and perhaps counter intuitively saw themselves as surrounded by opportunities to reach their learning goals through their studies. Likewise, there was a desire to learn a language that in their context was believed to grant them substantial social, cultural and economic capital. Interestingly, more prospective teachers (4 University A and 5 University B) held this perspective concerning English than Spanish, (2 students from each university). The government's language educational policy has robustly campaigned to promote English as the language of opportunities and that discourse has been socially replicated (Usma, 2009, 2014; Guerrero, 2008, 2010; Valencia, 2013).

English, when considered a purveyor of future opportunities, encouraged participants to identify with it. In the case of both languages, Spanish and English, Colombian prospective

teachers manifested their desire to perceive themselves as being part of those languages and their associated cultures. Concerning English, a participant commented: "Aprender una lengua es aprender igualmente una cultura, un nuevo mundo lleno de experiencias. Ha sido muy emocionante para mi crecimiento personal y, a largo plazo, profesional" (UniB-S5-Q-February, 25, 2014). [To learn a language is simultaneously to learn its culture, a new world full of experiences. This has been exciting in relation to my personal and in the long run professional growth.] Regarding Spanish, a student teacher said: "Amo mi lenguaje nativo (español) y mi cultura, considero que los lenguajes representan la cultura de sus hablantes" (UniB-S13-Q-February, 25, 2014). [I love my native language (Spanish) and my culture. I think that languages represent their speakers' culture.] Bearing in mind the inequalities that undergird prevailing nativespeakership ideologies, an emerging question in relation to Colombian prospective teachers' identification and perceived opportunities, especially in the case of English, points to a concern about the extent to which they can aspire to make that language and culture theirs (Widdowson, 1994; Norton, 1997; Rajagopalan, 1999, Jenkins, 2006).

Given that their ability and knowledge in using English will constitute one of the pillars in their teaching knowledge base, it is not surprising that participants' self-perception of being non-native speakers of English exerts a substantial influence on their self-image as prospective English teachers. Their ideologically charged self-perception of "missing something", the "something" being language ability, transcends their role as English learners to infiltrate and muddle their self-perception as future teachers. The following pages discuss how the myth of the native speaker and affiliated ideologies, participants' expectations, and perceived advantages underpin their images as future teachers.

From Nonnative English Speakers to Prospective NNESTs: From Myth to Fallacy

This study results agree with various other studies in which NNESTs believed that they

lacked the ability to attain NESTs' idealized language expertise and cultural knowledge. Using conceptual metaphor analysis, Bernat (2008) determined that her participants, some of them prospective teachers, partially define NNESTs' identity on the grounds of their language problems. In regards to overall language ability, in Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999), Árva and Medgyes (2000), Norton and Tang's (1997) studies, NESTs' were considered more competent than NNESTs. More specifically, Colombian pre-service teachers' pointed mainly to oral language abilities as the most concerning aspect in NNESTs' profiles, corroborating findings in Şimşek (2012), Reyes and Medgyes (1994), and Dogancay-Aktun's (as cited in Llurda, 2008) studies.

The Colombian participants' views depicting NNESTs' knowledge of the English language culture as limited was shared by NNESTs' in Moussu (2006) and Reyes and Medgyes' (1994) studies. Those same Colombian participants, however, perceived NNESTs to be more skillful in writing, reading and grammar, which aligns with conclusions presented in Llurda and Huguet (2003) and Butler's (2007) studies.

Fed mostly by participants' concerns regarding language ability, the myth of the native speaker translates into the native speaker fallacy. This concurs with Llurda (2009, p. 41) when he chronicles the decline of the myth that the native speaker is the highest standard in the profession: "The native teacher as the ideal teacher was equivalent to the monolingual native speaker as the ideal speaker." The axiomatic power of the native speaker fallacy influences NNESTs as much as prospective teachers who transfer their ideologically charged self-perceptions from their role as learners to their prospective role as teachers.

As a result of their self-perceived insufficient skills as speakers of English, 12 University A and 9 University B pre-service teachers experienced frustration, lack of confidence and were afraid to engage in interactions, especially with native speakers. Interestingly when sharing their

self-perceptions concerning their future as English teachers, only 2 University A and 1 University B pre-service teachers reported these affective states. Possible explanations for this decrease in concern might be related to prospective teachers' confidence for their future as explained in the upcoming pages, and their distance from possible job-related prejudice based on their lack of teaching experience.

The three prospective teachers mentioned above felt anxious at the prospect of being denied job opportunities if their language competence was not judged to be native-like or of being subjected to aggravation from their students because of the same reason. One of them commented:

> El "bulling" de ahora está en todas partes, los profesores también pueden ser perseguidos y acosados por los estudiantes. Yo conozco muchos casos. Entonces eso es como un miedo, la forma en que yo me enfrento con mis estudiantes. ¿Qué tanto respeto me tenga a mí mis estudiantes porque yo no soy nativa? Porque en medio de todo esa es una figura de superioridad (UniA-S12-INT-Febrero, 22, 2014). [Bullying is now everywhere and teachers can also be harassed by students, I know of many cases. That's one of my fears, the way I will face students; how much respect I will get from students because I am a non-native speaker, because that after all is a symbol of power.]

Anxiety in NNESTs due to lack of language ability and leading to feelings of inferiority has been widely reported in studies (Kim, 2011; Reyes & Medgyes, 1994; Bernat, 2008; Rajagopalan, 2005). Árva and Medgyes' (2000) study, which in addition to examining NNESTs' self-perceptions included observing them while teaching, shows that participants' views of their English as inaccurate was far from the actual dexterity they exhibited during researchers' observation of their classes.

Though only a reduced number of Colombian participating prospective teachers, who

were in their second and third year of studies and had not even enrolled in teaching practicum experiences, reported anxiety related issues, their testimonies underscore the impact of perceived future prejudice on their self-perceptions. In this vein, reviewing the history of the field, Llurda (2009, p. 41) remarks that the discrimination that NNESTs suffer has often been determined to be a pivotal factor in the development of their professional self-esteem.

Even though participants' unfavorable self-perception of their language abilities in comparison to native speakers revealed their adherence to the native speaker fallacy, other aspects of their self-perception challenged this ideology. They believed that as prospective NNESTs they brought meaningful and distinct culture-bound experiential knowledge that they could use in their teaching. By the same token, they considered that NNESTs are more knowledgeable about their students socio-cultural context which concurs with findings in studies conducted by Dogancay-Aktuna (as cited in Llurda, 2008), Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) and Árva and Medgyes (2000), among others. In a like manner, participants' reports in Şimşek's (2012), Inbar-Lourie, (2005) and Árva, and Medgyes (2000) were similar to those of Colombian prospective teachers' remarks about NNESTs' ability to facilitate their students' English language comprehension. They considered that NNESTs speak clearly, can use L1 as a communication strategy, and employ supporting methodologies. These findings reveal the complexity and dichotomy of participants' self-perceptions as prospective NNESTs. While their current or future self-perceived lack of native-like language ability caused them frustration and fear, their previous knowledge, background and potential pedagogical abilities led them to feel confident about their future.

Pre-service teachers regarded NNESTs as able to understand students' needs and difficulties which encourages their adaptation to the language. This finding has also been reported by Norton and Tang, (1997), Árva, and Medgyes (2000), Dogancay-Aktuna (as cited in

Llurda, 2008) and Şimşek (2012). In agreement with Inbar-Lourie's (2005) inquiry, in which NNESTs perceived themselves as having better relationships with their students, participants indicated that by being kind, but also demanding, NNESTs can display a constructive attitude in classrooms. Pre-service teachers characterized NNESTs as exhibiting a helpful attitude that motivates them to continue learning and as being models for students, which is supported by Moussu's (2006) research study. By and large, the essence of participants' views concerning NNESTs´ advantageous pedagogical skills is embodied in the following quote:

> El hablante no nativo trabaja como un puente de interconexión, pues cuenta con el conocimiento, tanto de su propia cultura como la de la lengua que ha adquirido. De esta manera, puede explicar y realizar las respectivas comparaciones de acuerdo a como él/ella las ha llegado a comprender (UniB-S7-Q-February, 25, 2014). [The non-native speaker works as an interconnection bridge because she/he has the knowledge of both, his/her own culture and the language she/he has acquired. Thus, she/he can explain and make the corresponding comparisons according to the understanding that he/she has gained.]

In her review of research on NNESTs, Kamhi-Stein (2005, p. 77) discusses the change in the NNEST's classroom role from initially being deemed problematic and undesirable to more recently being regarded as an asset. She goes on to explain, citing Seidlhofer (1999), that possessing knowledge of the two cultures and languages allows NNESTs to mediate between them which is beneficial to students.

Another participants' view, that confronts the native speaker fallacy partially engrained in participants' self-perceptions of themselves, emanates from their confidence in their future teaching performance. Similarly, Bernat (2008, p. 6) reported, regarding her participants, that they "at times felt overwhelmed by what they were undertaking in their career, (but) they also

saw a possibility of success." In the particular case of the target student teacher population, findings indicate that their ongoing preparation process contributes to their confidence in their prospective achievements and their construction of positive self-images, despite pervasive nativespeakership ideologies.

Colombian pre-service teachers perceived that their education during their undergraduate program and throughout their career will help them fight possible prejudice:

> Pues yo creo que la preocupación siempre está, pero a la larga yo pienso que uno se preparó para eso cierto, uno estudio su carrera, uno pues me imagino ya después va a hacer sus especializaciones, su pregrado si, entonces yo creo que a la larga eso son prejuicios de la gente, si, o sea, que yo me pongo a pensar, si yo estudie en la universidad, estoy teniendo una preparación idónea para ser docente de inglés, por qué tendría que preocuparme de que los otros me percibieran como que no soy si, hablante no nativa (UniB-S2-INT-March, 2, 2014). [Well, I believe that you are always concerned (about not being a NEST), but you study your program and well, I imagine that later on you will enroll in specialization programs, yes, then, at the end, people prejudice, I mean, I think if I studied a university program to get professional preparation to be an English teacher, why should I have to worry about others looking at me as a NNEST?]

These findings align with a vast number of scholars' views that the criteria to judge NNESTs' teaching performance should not be based on nativespeakership credentials, but on overall qualification and experience (Ramptom, 1990; Llurda, 2009; Mahboob, 2010). Both NNESTs and NESTs can fulfill those conditions through education and practice.

Overall Colombian prospective teachers rejected the native speaker fallacy. Sixty-seven percent of University A and 75% of University B participants were not preoccupied with their non-nativespeakership status because they did not consider it a determining factor in the quality

of their future teaching. When asked if they thought that their perceived weaknesses would represent a problem in their future teaching jobs, the percentage of the two lowest levels of concern (40% University B and 29% University A participants) were higher than the combined percentage of the two highest levels (20% University B and 24% University A participants (See Table 11). This tendency to disregard their nonnative speaker status when pondering their future teaching career might be related to findings in Rajagopalan's (2005, p. 209) study: "…those [his participants] with less teaching experience (and presumably from a younger generation) were less worried about their being non-natives than those who have been in the profession for upwards of 10 years."

Though Colombian prospective teachers reflected a balanced image of both NESTs and NNESTs by acknowledging favorable and unfavorable characteristics of both, they (57% of University A and 83% of University B prospective teachers) regard NNESTs as more successful. Participants' responses in other studies align with these Colombian pre-service teachers' views. Ninety percent of pre-service teachers in Şimşek's (2012) study rejected the fallacy and in Samimy and Brutt-Griffler's (1999) study, neither category (NESTs or NNESTs) was regarded as superior than the other. Secondary school teachers in Llurdas and Huguet (2003) expressed that NESTs were not necessarily more skillful than NNESTs and 67% of NNESTs in Moussu (2006) agreed that NNESTs perform as effectively as NESTs in teaching.

Despite the clear tendency in the majority of participants' responses to challenge the overarching assumption behind the native speaker fallacy, when asked whom they would suggest others to hire as an English teacher, 62 % of University A and 55% of University B pre-service teachers chose NESTs. This finding makes apparent the prevalent ambivalence in participants' perceptions. NNESTs can be successful in their jobs, but they do not possess the ideal language ability that native NESTs do. Though they are undergraduate prospective teachers who have

never had a teaching job, their conflicting views seem to echo Llurda's (2009, p. 42). Llurda posits that despite the fact that NNESTs are affected by the ideology of discrimination which favors native speakers, they uphold the ideology favoring native speakers. It seems that even before their debut as teachers, participants' self-images have been affected by ideologies that encourage a view of themselves as inferior to NESTs.

CONCLUSIONS

Grounded in the fields of language ideologies, critical applied linguistics and NNESTs, this study sought to determine how two groups of Colombian students from two public universities perceive their (non) nativeness as English and Spanish speakers, and their prospects of becoming English teachers. Findings revealed that in both universities, the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies permeated participants' self-images. Being part of a socio-cultural and educational context in which nativespeakership and associated ideologies had historically circulated, most participants were aware of and supported the social demands that these ideologies imposed upon them.

The majority of participants aspire to resemble the educated native speaker by acquiring the corresponding ideal competence in their language abilities. Regarding Spanish, this expectation translated into confidence and pride since they perceived themselves to possess high level language abilities. Even when acknowledging the need to improve their Spanish, on the whole, they did not characterize themselves as deficient. Though most participants report a sense of self-assurance when using Spanish, a small number of prospective teachers, who migrated to capital cities from small cities or towns, differed from this pattern by concurring with native speaker standard ideologies and constructing their language variability as a problem (Train, 2011).

Whether as speakers or future teachers of English, the majority of prospective teachers

feared disadvantages that not achieving native-like abilities could bring into their lives and their future profession. Being the target of future social sanctions, whether regarded as incompetent or "too Spanish-like", constituted an important element of their self-images. However, their self-perceptions were also imbued with a sense of confidence concerning their future. Because they viewed themselves as part of a teacher education program, they relied on their education process to achieve, not only their language goals, but also to equip themselves with pedagogical tools. In addition, they perceive themselves as in an advantageous position because they possess practical experience as English learners in Colombia. They believe that this background could be useful in their future careers. Finally, they indicated that learning English, the global language, can bring them an array of social, cultural and economic benefits.

IMPLICATIONS

Findings in this study concur with research conducted in other countries which seek to call attention to the detrimental effects of nativespeakership ideologies on teachers' self-images. Alternative approaches to traditional ESL and EFL, namely WEs, EIL and ELF, have mushroomed recently in reaction to the global expansion of English. In a like manner, research on NNESTs has been produced during the last three decades and its emergence parallels the advent of critical approaches in applied linguistics, socio-linguistics, and education. All these fields have placed nativespeakership ideologies at the top of their study agendas and scholars have started to produce a substantial body of knowledge to expose the inconsistencies and the inadequacy of such myths.

In Colombia, the analysis of nativespeakership and associated ideologies and of their effect on NNESTs' lives and careers has been practically non-existent. This study seeks to fill that gap. The following section discusses recommendations for the formulation of language educational policy, the implementation of university programs and the betterment of educators'

pedagogical practice. Scholars, working in the field of NNESTs, have concentrated on graduate pre-service teachers in outer and inner circle nations. That specificity of most available research should be considered a caveat for the suggestions presented in this section.

Implications for Policy Makers

Bearing in mind that policies shape and are simultaneously shaped by ideologies (Ricento, 2000; Tollefson, 2000), and that policies translate into specific plans which influence the various stakeholders in the education system, decisions made regarding policy implementation need to reflect an ideology that values and privileges Colombians as English users in "the global village." Unfortunately nativespeakership ideologies, which exert a detrimental influence on participants in this study, have historically been a strong ideology entrenched in the official foreign language educational policy.

In order to initiate transformation processes in the ideological foundations of ELT policies, government officials need to invite and involve Colombian non-native English speaker experts as their main advisers. The opposite, the invitation of native speakers, has become the norm in Colombia whenever new policies are configured (Gonzalez, 2007; Usma, 2009; Guerrero, 2008). Local experts' specialized knowledge can guide policy makers in issues concerning critical applied linguistics, sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology, thus they gain the necessary awareness to identify and eventually contribute to dismantling nativespeakership ideologies. Most importantly, by inviting Colombian experts to be consultants in English language policy, not only can they be empowered, but a counter nativespeakership ideology is de facto promoted. Wnen non-native speakers are granted the authority to make decisions regarding English; they become the owners of that language as well.

Implications for University Officials

Findings showed that nativespeakership and associated ideologies became a part of students' lives through their Spanish learning experiences at a young age. This hints at the role that these language ideologies play in their perception and use of Spanish. Likewise, this early exposure to these myths provides fertile ground for the emergence of similar ideologies as speakers of English. Because of the symbiotic relationship between the two languages, university officials leading undergraduate teacher education programs need to provide for opportunities for the integration of courses of courses taught in English and Spanish into the same curriculum. Integration allows for the critical ideology analysis of the learning and teaching processes of both languages. Options can include the implementation of duals programs and the introduction of Spanish courses, namely sociolinguistics and applied linguistics, in the ELT undergraduate program.

In this study, University A pre-service teachers' undergraduate program was a dual language curriculum that included an applied linguistic course in the third year of studies while the University B program included a sociolinguistic course in the second year. Analysis of curriculum documents did not show any evidence of specific strategies being promoted at University A to make students' aware of language ideologies in Spanish and of the relationships between those ideologies in the two languages. The University A program includes an applied linguistics course in the third year, however, university officials should consider teaching of this course at an early stage. The effect that sociolinguistics course in University B exerts on participants will be further commented upon in the next chapter.

Bearing in mind participants' self-perceived language needs, especially concerning speaking skills which constitute most of the pre-service teachers' concerns, programs should make sure that they provide prospective teachers plenty of opportunities to gain the necessary

language ability expertise. This recommendation matches those put forward by scholars in the NNEST field (Samimy & Kurihara, 2006; Moussu & Llurda, 2008). Although participants implicitly trust they will develop sufficient competence in English through their studies, their programs can adapt their content and include methodologies to ensure that their individual needs are met.

Programs should also seek alternatives to help prospective teachers cope with constrains generated by the specific conditions of the Colombian context regarding scarce opportunities to practice the language. Prospective teachers' answers in questionnaires revealed that they did not practice English often with peers outside the classroom. While 55% of University B prospective teachers interacted "sometimes" with peers outside the classroom, 30% did it "rarely". Regarding other possibilities for practice, they mentioned that 50% had sought opportunities with international peers via the Internet, but in most cases, that had been sporadic. In the case of University A participants, whilst 57% "sometimes" engaged in speaking with peers outside the classroom, 33% did it "rarely". Twenty-five percent had sought opportunities to interact with international peers, but this has not been constant. Students argued that using the language outside the classroom with other Colombians seemed artificial, without a real purpose, thus they oftentimes did not feel encouraged to do it.

By taking advantage of the array of possibilities created by electronic communication, universities can telecollaborate with international institutions thereby granting prospective teachers access to more structured practices that might provide chances of success with higher quality than those randomly encountered on the web. In addition, these exchanges can incorporate pedagogical frameworks to guide participants' exploration and confrontation with nativespeakership ideologies.

Finally, university officials should broaden the spectrum of countries from where language experts, namely, assistants, come from. In the two participating universities, U.S. and British assistants were usually preferred. This could generate changes towards a tolerant an inclusive view of English varieties and the understanding that qualified English speakers exist in inner, outer and expanding circle nations.

Implications for Teacher Educators, Teachers and Pre-service teachers

A focus on prospective teachers' self-perceptions has allowed this study to expose their rationalizations regarding language and its teaching as intertwined with subjectivity categories, namely, affect, personality, identity and motivation. These are issues that have slowly started to be taken into consideration as part of the conceptualization and agenda of teacher education programs. Emerging experiences in other countries can be considered as instances proposed as contextualized alternatives. Consequently, Colombian scholars can learn from international initiatives, but local programs need to suit the characteristics of Colombian pre-service teachers in specific regions. That being said, Wu, Liang, and Csepelyi (2010, p. 205) propose an interesting example of strategies integrated in teacher education courses. The strategies address subjectivity issues in teachers' lives and careers since they "aim at helping NNESTs combat negative emotions, such as fear, anxiety, lack of self-worth, and any sense of isolation, through restructuring their self-efficacy beliefs and redefining their self-identity as professional language educators."

Due to the ubiquity of nativespeakership ideologies across universities' curricula, this study concurs with scholars in fields as EIL, ELF, WEs who warn us about the necessity to revise our traditional commitment to EFL and ESL as overarching approaches to English learning and teaching, especially in expanding circle nations as Colombia. In this vein, Kachru and Nelson (1996, p. 79) within the WEs framework posit that:

> The concept of English in its Inner, Outer and Expanding Circles is only superficially equivalent to native, ESL and EFL. In thinking of a country as ESL country [or EFL for that matter] or of a person as an ESL speaker, for example, we perpetuate the dichotomy of native versus nonnative, 'us versus them.'

Concerning EIL, Modiano, (2001, p. 169) remarks that "EFL speakers should be provided with a space where they can attempt to be culturally, politically, and socially neutral. EIL, as a strategy for inter-cultural communication, potentially provides such a space."

EIL, ELF, WEs become examples for teacher educators, teachers and pre-service teachers, so that they can explore alternatives to the current EFL conceptualization undergirding pedagogical practices. The EFL perspective based on the premise that individuals in countries as Colombia, learn English mainly to interact with native speakers is currently inadequate since as Kramsch and Sullivan (1996, p. 211) put it "appropriate pedagogy should prepare learners to be both global and local speakers of English and to feel at home in both international and national cultures."

The critical analysis of nativespeakership ideologies in the ELT curriculum conducted by various scholars can buttress the development of awareness regarding these myths and the design of favorable pedagogical proposals. Analysis has targeted influential teaching approaches as Communicative Language Teaching (Alptekin, 2002; Mc Kay, 2002), the formulation of learning objectives (Cook, 2007) and the materials selected for teaching (Ziaei, 2002; Baleghizadeh & Motahed, 2010).

Due to the pervasive power of nativespeakership ideologies, a crucial task that educators face is to enhance their students' development of what Modiano (2010, p. 165) calls ideological literacy: "…to demonstrate awareness of the cultural beliefs and values underpinning the speech communities which are presumed to be in possession of the prestige varieties…" In order to

trigger language awareness and eventually guide students and teachers in the development of ideological competence, strategies rooted in diverse approaches such as critical discourse analysis, critical pedagogy, critical applied linguistics and critical language awareness can be employed in teacher education programs, undergraduate programs or even at the school level with English learners. In their study about strategies to train teachers under an ELF perspective, Snow, Kamhi-Stein, and Brinton (2006) showcase several avenues proposed by scholars to raise students awareness in relation to ELT ideologies, among them, the use of materials to enhance students' contact with diverse English varieties, the use of research to look at NNESTs' advantages and the analysis of teachers' roles as "intercultural speakers." In her "Strategies to prepare teachers equally for equity", Barrat (2010) highlights raising awareness regarding NNESTs and NESTs' language ability, cultural values and segregation issues.

Implications for Further Research

By selecting two different universities in diverse settings in Colombia, this study sought to trace the impact that particular prospective teachers' characteristics associated with their context exerted on their self-perceptions. Although findings seem to provide some initial leverage to build claims regarding this contrast, further research is needed to give weight to emerging patterns revealed in this study. A major difference between the two programs was that the University A program was a dual one, Spanish-English, whereas the one at University B was single, English. Some findings seem to indicate that University A prospective teachers acknowledge more their limitations as Spanish speakers than University B students. However, the numerical difference was not substantial and the tendency was not constant across all the questions related to this issue. If this difference was more marked, it could convey that University A prospective teachers' constant academic learning of Spanish leads them to regard themselves as native speakers who are not ideal. That would contradict the myth of the native

speaker. Consequently, that finding would support the idea of a dual program as a better option for pre-service teachers' construction of "healthier ideologies as native speakers."

Secondly, University A pre-service teachers self- perceived their abilities in English as being in a lower level compared to what University B students thought of their skills. Simultaneously some data indicated that a higher number of University A students, in comparison to University B students, tend not to support the myth of the native speaker. If the latter data were more ample, this could show that pre-service teachers with a lower level tend to support less the ideology. The hypothesis behind this parallel would be that University B students are more confident of themselves in relation to being able to achieve comprehension and sustain interaction. That "basic" level would have been surpassed thus they started aiming at what they probably regarded as perfecting their skills, "to acquire native like ability." This goal would be a more challenging endeavor. University A students seemed to be coping with more basic stages, therefore they would not be so concerned about reaching the native speaker ideal.

Finally, regarding the native speaker fallacy, University A students, the ones with the self-perceived lower language ability, seemed to support more the native speaker fallacy. However, data is not sufficient to claim a conclusive finding concerning the latter issue. If this tendency were corroborated, it would buttress Llurda and Huguet's (2003) study which showed that teachers with a lower self-perception of their language skills tended to support more the fallacy in question than those with a higher self-perception.

CHAPTER 3: PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS IN TELECOLLABORATION: MEANING MAKING ABILITY AND THE MYTH OF THE NATIVE SPEAKER

Introduction

In Colombia, as in most expanding circle nations, the teaching and learning of English has traditionally been shaped by an EFL perspective (Velez-Rendón, 2003; González, 2010; Macias, 2010). Among the core ideologies embedded in such an approach, scholars have highlighted the tendency to educate learners as if they were to use the language to communicate mainly with those regarded as native speakers (Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Modiano, 2001; Jenkins, 2006). This belief, which is becoming every day more obsolete as the composition of English speakers in the world diversifies, reveals the pervasiveness of the myth of the native speaker in ELT.

The detrimental effects of the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies, namely the native speaker fallacy, the native speaker standard language, and the monolingual fallacy, among others, on learners and teachers has not only attracted the interest of scholars in established fields such as critical applied linguistics and language ideologies, but has also generated research that addresses nonnative English speaking teachers (NNESTs) (Reyes & Medgyes, 1994; Braine, 1999, 2005; Mahboob, 2003, 2010; Llurda 2004; Moussu, 2006; Moussu & Llurda, 2008).

In particular, for several decades, this research has focused on revealing how teachers themselves, their students, and employers perceive NNESTs' limitations, advantages, and differences compared to native speaker teachers (NESTs). The research examining the performance of NNESTs has also shown how their characteristics generate discriminatory attitudes and practices against them and which avenues favor the successful education of this population.

This study seeks to diversify the scope of research concerning the effects of the myth of the native speaker fallacy and associated ideologies on learners and teachers. In this regard, (Llurda, 2008; Bernat, 2008; Samimy & Kurihara, 2006) stress the need to expand research on NNESTs so that, for instance, more contexts, teachers' individual characteristics, and their exposure to their L1, L2 languages and cultures become new foci of exploration. In this vein, this article examines how a group of prospective Colombian English teachers perceived themselves as (non) native Spanish and English speakers, and as future teachers while they telecollaborate with U.S. English speakers who are also heritage Spanish learners.

The particularities of participants in the current study, namely, the EFL context, Colombia, where they reside and their inexperience as pre-service teachers in undergraduate programs associated with their self-perception of (non) nativeness have not been previously targeted for examination. Another innovating aspect is Colombian participants' exposure to U.S. English speakers in a telecollaboration experience. Only Llurda (2008) and Wang (2014), in study abroad contexts, examine the influence that contact with the L2 language and culture exerts on NNESTs' self-perceptions of their (non) nativeness. The historical nature of this research project, in this case examining Colombian participants' self-perceptions prior to the telecollaboration and after the experience, also becomes a fresh approach to study this population.

Colombian pre-service teachers' U.S. partners' Spanish heritage background is a key factor in this research study. The complex characteristics of Spanish heritage speakers of English, including their bilingualism and biculturalism problematize well-established and pervasive language ideologies in connection with (non) nativeness, as for instance, monolingualism. Consequently Colombian participants' interactions with their U.S. partners can

generate critical opportunities leading them to revisit their rationalizations concerning the two languages, their learning, speakers, contexts of use, and social evaluation, among others.

Exploring the ideological side of the native vs. non-native speaker dichotomy, this research seeks to reverse the tendency of studies in applied linguistics to explore telecollaboration experiences mainly as sites for feedback processes through which native speakers support those who are not native speakers (Dussias, 2006; Tudini, 2003; Lee, 2002, 2004). The study proposed here joins the efforts of the few scholars who have pushed for an examination of more critical issues in telecollaboration, focusing on participants' identities and subjectivities (Guth & Helm, 2010; Train, 2005; Ware & Kramsch, 2005).

Literature Review

The next section starts by discussing the main tenets underpinning scholars´ analysis of the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies, and the research conducted on the field of NNESTs. Subsequently, this review summarizes basic notions concerning telecollaboration and pertinent research in the field. A brief section characterizing Spanish heritage learners will close this review.

Nativespeakerism and associated micro-language ideologies. The historical expansion of English and Spanish is often associated with colonization and colonialism, migration (Pennycook, 2007; Train, 2007; Mar-Molinero, 2000), and more recently, in the particular case of English, with individuals' own agency in the context of international communication (Brutt-Gliffer, 2002). Although the globalization of communications seems to favor "the acceleration of the volume of exchange" (Paffey, 2007) in the case of Spanish, it is undeniable that English has benefitted more from this global tendency, becoming not only the most used language in electronic media, but also the language of science, technology, diplomacy, and business (Graddol, 2003; Crystal, 2008). Though Spanish and English are both major international

languages, English has also become the global language. In attempting to understand how Spanish and English consolidate and maintain their power and status, and the consequences of their spread, scholars have delved into related language ideologies which are ubiquitous in many language learning and teaching contexts around the world.

Nativespeakerism, a term originally coined by Holliday (2006, p. 1) to denote "the belief that 'native-speaker' teachers represent a 'Western culture' from which spring the ideals both of the English language and of English language teaching methodology", can be regarded as a macro-language ideology. Multiple micro-ideologies, namely, they myth of the native speaker, the native speaker fallacy, the native speaker standard language, and the monolingual fallacy among others, make of nativespeakerism the most influential language ideology in ELT today (Rampton, 1990; Phillipson, 1992; Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah, 1999; Kramsch, 2003; Train 2011; Mahboob, 2005)

Nativespeakersism is considered a language ideology because it basically refers to what and how speakers think about language. More precisely Kroskrity (2008, p. 497) conceptualizes language ideologies as a "more ubiquitous set of diverse beliefs, however implicit or explicit they may be, used by speakers of all types as models for constructing linguistic evaluations and engaging in communicative activity." In this vein, nativespeakerism fulfills certain conditions to be regarded as an ideology. Firstly, speakers' ideas, beliefs, or perceptions regarding what is considered to be the native language, its speakers, uses, or contexts of use, are culture-bound and commonsensical (Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994), and "multiple, and necessarily constructed from their sociocultural experience" (Kroskrity, 2008, p. 496). Secondly, this ideology entails overtly or covertly the negative or positive evaluation that speakers make of the (non) native language, advantageously or disadvantageously positioning themselves and others, those language varieties

and their various communicative categories, contexts and functions within sociocultural and political settings (Kroskrity, 2008).

From a theoretical linguistics perspective, Chomsky's linguistic program has been identified as a precursor of nativespeakerism (Paikeday, 1985; Cook, 1999; Kramsch, 2003; Canagarajah, 1999; Davies, 2003; Mahboob, 2005). Chomsky emphasizes a monolingual ideal speaker-listener possessing a unitary and decontextualized competence which is to a great extent natural, genetically acquired, based on intuition and allow him/her to produce and make accurate judgments about language.

Social and anthropological approaches to the study of language have questioned the ambiguity and inconsistency of the native speaker ideology. Determining who is a native speaker and by default, who is not, becomes a struggle since "socially constructed notions", including for instance how someone looks and how her/his speech sounds, prevail over "linguistic categories" in this judgment (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001, p. 102). Another complicating issue is an individual's perceived degree of nativeness which hints at the possibility that a non-native speaker could become a native speaker (Mahboob, 2005; White & Genesee, 1996). In the educational field, for instance, it has become commonplace to depict individuals' abilities or expected competence as native-like or near native.

Nascent fields in applied linguists such as world Englishes, (WEs), English as an international language (EIL), English as a lingua franca (ELF) bring to bear the effect of the changing global milieu where non-native English speakers communicative with non-native and native speakers (Smith, 1976), and they position themselves or are positioned by others as (non) proficient users of this language. The progressive expansion of speakers of English as a second language that is predicted to surpass native speakers during the next 50 years, challenges the imposition of native speaker norms on non-native speakers (Gradol, 2003). In a like manner,

Train (2010) problematizes the ideologies of national identity underpinning the concept of nativespeakership. The connotation of "nation-state", historically packed with ethnolinguistic prejudices (Bonfiglio, 2010) and regarded as the natural environment for acquisition, not only grants legitimate ownership of the language to those born in specific nations, but also "ties the concept to a static model of language acquisition" (Brutt-Griffler and Samimy, 2001, p. 104).

The ideology of standardization or "native standard language" emanates as the discourse of a privileged group, "codified in grammars and dictionaries, thus forming the basis of the universalizing national and global language of the kingdom and, later, the empire and the nation-state (Train, 2007, p. 213)." Standardization positions the varieties of Spanish spoken in capital cities of Central and South American countries by the middle class and which mirror the benchmarks dictated by the *Real Academia de la Lengua Española* (RAE) as the standard (Mar-Molinero, 2000, 2004). In a like manner, upper middle class varieties of American and British English hold the status of standard (Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Modiano, 2001; Tollefson, 2007). This ideology is seen as the locus of the prescriptivism and purism which "frames variability and diversity as a supposed problem" (Train, 2007), misrepresenting language varieties as lower, inappropriate, defective and undesirable. Selecting privileged varieties as standards is also bound up with ideologies that confer native speakers of the standards "the ownership of language" (Widdowson, 1994) and therefore, the role of legitimate authority and quality controllers over it.

Another ideology inextricably connected with standardization is the myth of "non-accent" (Lippi-Green, 1997). This ideology is rooted in the belief that language learners' L1 accent, when transferred into L2, deems their L2 speech incomprehensible. Lippi-Green (1997, p. 50), supported by the work of sociolinguists, concludes that "accent has little to do with communicative competence or the ability to use and interpret language in a wide variety of

contexts effectively". Accent, as related to speakers' identity in connection with their language background, indexes sociocultural categories, e.g. origin, race, ethnicity, social class and gender. An ideology of "non-accent" attempts to invisibilize and undermine diversity in speakers.

Non-native English speaker teachers' self-perceptions: reviewing the research. Research on non-native English speaker teachers (NNESTs) was born out of a reaction to the far-reaching negative implications and effects of nativespeakerism (Holliday, 2006), the "native speaker fallacy" (Phillipson, 1992) and associated ideologies. Mahboob (2010) posits that these biases privilege native speaker norms and stereotypes NNESTs as imperfect users of the language. This in turn positions native English speaker teachers (NESTs) into a superior position in relation to non-native educators. He advocates for new paradigms based on a functional view of language, which essentialises a speaker's skill in using language in real contexts and opens the ground to more valid criteria, namely, experience and education to judge their teaching.

Concerning teachers' self-perception of their (non) nativeness, findings in Reyes and Medgyes (1994) showed that 68% of their participants considered that native and NNSTs' performances differ. Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) concurred with these findings, adding that their participants did not favor any of the two categories of teachers as better than the other. Llurda and Huguet's (2003), study with primary and secondary NNESTs in Spain, and Butler's (2007) with the same population in Japan, contradicted these findings since primary school teachers believed that NESTs are better than NNESTs. Llurda and Huguet (2003) suggest a correlation between NNESTs' perception of themselves as having limited language competence and their adherence to the native speaker fallacy.

Research has examined NNESTs' self-perceptions of their weaknesses and strengths. While NESTs were characterized as users of a wide variety of teaching strategies and the

provision of encouraging feedback to students, NNESTs were described as employing more their L1 in teaching, paying more attention to psychological and emotional factors, being more book and test oriented in their teaching, and having more background knowledge of their students (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler,1999). The last finding concurs with Dogancay-Aktuna's study (as cited in Llurda, 2008). Reyes and Medgyes' (1994) study determined that most NNESTs regarded vocabulary, speaking, pronunciation, and listening as their salient limitation in using English, however, they thought those limitations did not have a negative effect on their performance. NNESTs tendency to see themselves in a disadvantageous position in relation to NESTs concerning their use of oral language is supported by Samimy and Brutt-Griffler (1999) and Dogancay-Aktuna's (as cited in Llurda, 2008) studies. In other studies, such as Butler (2007) and Llurda and Huguet (2003), NNESTs considered their reading, writing, and grammar knowledge and abilities superior than their speaking ability.

NNESTs' self-perceptions of themselves, as lacking the language ability that NESTs have (Kim, 2011) or their permanent acknowledgement of their language difficulties, oftentimes leads them to a negative self-perception with a related decline in language ability and an impression of inferiority (Reyes & Medgyes, 1994; Bernat, 2008). Rajagopalan (2005) found that a group of NNESTs in Brazil thought they were not fully prepared to do their job, were underestimated as teachers, limited in their options to grow and were lost, pursuing an unreachable ideal. Furthermore, their contact with native speakers triggered their anxiety. This study pointed out an interesting correlation: less experienced participants exhibited less concern in regards to their lack of native speakership credentials.

Telecollaboration. In this study, Colombian pre-service teachers and their U.S. partners participated in a telecollaboration, also known as internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education (ICFLE) (Thorne, 2005) or defined more broadly, online FL interaction and

exchange (Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012). Publications by Belz and Thorne (2005), Guth and Helm (2010), Dooly and O'Dowd (2012) serve as a review of the main features of ICFLE experiences. Telecollaboration is a pedagogical design for foreign language learning framed within collaborating educational institutions. The design facilitates the interaction of participants in locations distant from each other relying on the use of internet-mediated communication. Because oftentimes participants' origin and cultural backgrounds differ, ICFLE's objectives include not only participants' language learning, but also their intercultural development.

This study subscribes to a sociocultural perspective in telecollaboration (Thorne, 2008; Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012; Kinginger & Belz, 2005; Kern, 2006). Rooted in the Vygotskian tradition, language becomes the tool for mediation in the exchange enabling its own learning within the dialogic dynamics of encounters between participants (O'Dowd, 2012). Simultaneously language is a mediator in participants' sociocultural interactions creating opportunities for their development of self-perceptions and subjectivity.

This study focuses on participants understanding of themselves as (non) native speakers. Consequently, as Train (2005, p. 250) explains, their potential "engagement with individual and collective practices and ideologies" of language and their awareness of their peers' and their own sociocultural and political circumstances in being L1 or L2 language users becomes an opportunity for their critical engagement in the telecollaboration. Train goes on to say that the intercultural agenda in telecollaboration brings together speakers from diverse contexts and linguistic backgrounds. This milieu potentially sets the groundwork for the emergence of established ideologies permeating the field, such as nativespeakerism and associated ideologies, which might find an ideal terrain to mushroom in the ICFLE.

The examination of participants' language ability and knowledge has emerged as one of the most common areas of research in telecollaboration (Belz, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002;

Belz & Vyatkina, 2005). A specific trend within this area of research has considered the dichotomy between native and non-native speakers (Dussias, 2006; Tudini, 2003; Lee 2002, 2004; Darhower, 2008). Unfortunately these studies delve solely into the effect that native speakers' feedback (linguistic affordances) have on non-native speaker's language learning. By Exploring the ideological side of the native vs. non-native speaker dichotomy, this research seeks to reverse this tendency, so that a critical perspective on this issue gradually becomes more apparent.

Intercultural learning, currently the other noticeable pillar in telecollaboration research (Liaw & Bunn-Le Master, 2010; Ware, 2005; Ware & Kramsch, 2005; Schenker, 2012; Belz & Müller-Hartman, 2003; O'Dowd, 2003) is yet to become a focus in the examination of participants' construction and deconstruction of language ideologies. A closer look at intercultural studies in relation to the main issue undertaken by the current proposal indicates that Ware and Kramsch's (2005) work is the only research that targets, albeit timidly, participants' ideology concerning "the identity of the native speaker." Ware and Kramsch (2005) aimed to describe misunderstandings between U.S. students learning German and German students learning English. Their analysis revealed that participants' cultural stereotyping of their peers, as "typical" native speakers in their countries of origin, became a precursor of misunderstandings. The fact that "this individual [actual peer in telecollaboration] does not resemble the 'standard' native speaker presented in language textbooks" (p. 199) challenged his/her partner´s ideology.

Heritage Spanish learners. Colombian participants in this study telecollaborated with U.S. university students attending a Spanish for heritage learners' course. In the U.S. the term heritage language denotes any of the multiple languages, other than English, that immigrants have brought with them. Though these languages coexist with English at certain levels and oftentimes are almost exclusively used at home with family and friends, they do not enjoy the

social prestige granted to English, the language of education, science, government and business. Within this context, a heritage speaker or learner can broadly been defined as "an individual that has a personal or familial connection to a non-majority language" (Fishman in Beaudrie & Fairclough, 2001, p. 7).

In addition to the heritage language, community and the culture are defining elements of heritage speakers (Carreira, 2004). Other scholars address the issue of proficiency in their conceptualizations. Valdés (1995), for instance, highlights that heritage learners exhibit dissimilar levels of bilingualism where it is more common to find advanced comprehension skills than to find advanced speaking skills. The persistent challenge of scholars to agree on a definition of what being a heritage learner entails is the result of the vast array of characteristics in relation to Spanish and its culture that influence these speakers.

Some Spanish heritage learners in this study, for instance, might have been born in Mexico, but educated in U.S. during their infancy, thus their first language became their second language. Others might be second, third or fourth generation U.S. born living in homes where the spectrum of Spanish use might have varied from no use to full employment of the language. Also, family members decide if their children will have additional education in Spanish or if English will be the only language encountered at schools. Because of the circumstances described above, which can constrain their development of the language, heritage Spanish learners, like those in this study, enroll in university programs to study the language. Most of these students hold negative perceptions of their language knowledge and abilities. Even if that is not the case, their lack of familiarity with the language, and the social pressure and judgment from family members, friends or even from teachers strongly contribute to their feelings of inadequacy.

Diverse language ideologies shape the teaching and learning of Spanish as a heritage language in U.S. society and many universities. Nationalism promotes the belief in "one language, one nation" as Valdés, González, García and Márquez, (2003, p. 24) discuss. In this vein, it is believed that a uniform language for the country helps to create the idea of nation. While English may be embraced and exalted as the national language, other languages that coexist with it, for instance, the languages of immigrants, are looked upon with disdain, belittled, constrained and even forbidden. They are suspicious and regarded as a threat. Nationalism aligns with monolingualism, English only, and problematizes bilingualism. García (2005, p. 605) posits that "in the United States, we have gone from the two solitudes of our two languages in bilingualism, to our sole solitude in English, with whispers in other languages."

The belief that native speakers are the ideal language model has a symbiotic relationship with monolingualism. In the U.S., this belief not only comprises the high value placed on those who have been granted nativespeakership credentials as English speakers of the national language, but it extends to those that, as in the case of faculty in heritage Spanish language university programs, are regarded as native speakers of Spanish. They are individuals who were born in Latin America or Spain, countries where Spanish is regarded as the native language. Native speakers exhibit the language variety of prestige, the standard to which heritage speakers and learners in the U.S. are being held to. In foreign language departments, ideologies promoting the myth of the native speaker and standardization are "protecting the language from contamination from the English that surrounds them and to providing a model of a standard target language free of vulgar colloquialisms and popular jargon" (Valdés et al., 2003, p. 7).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

After examining Spanish speaking Colombian prospective teachers' of English self-perceptions of (non) nativeness in a previous article, this paper addresses the influence of the

telecollaboration experience with English speaking U.S. Spanish heritage learners on Colombian prospective teachers' initially identified self-perceptions. Specifically, the study seeks to determine how a group of prospective Colombian English teachers perceived themselves as (non) native Spanish and English speakers, and as future teachers while they telecollaborated with U.S. English speakers who were also heritage Spanish learners. By addressing these concerns, the study looks at participants' pre-telecollaboration self-perceptions of (non) nativeness in relation to those rationalizations they exhibited at the end of the exchange and it identifies the interconnected language ideologies associated with nativespeakerism that become the fabric of participants' self-images.

This study integrates overlapping principles rooted in social constructivism (Schwandt, 2001; Patton, 2002; Guba & Lincoln, 2005) and phenomenology (Van Manen, 1990; Schwandt, 2001; Creswell, 2007). By acknowledging the role of the "other" in someone's actions and ideas, and presenting a historical viewpoint used to understand the possible transformation of thinking, social constructivism and phenomenology are adopted as a framework for this study's sociocultural perspective examining the participants' self-perception of language ideologies in telecollaboration. Within the qualitative research tradition (Patton, 2002; Glesne, 2006; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Creswell, 2007), these approaches considered participants in their natural environment while telecollaborating, encourage a holistically examination of their self-perceptions concerning (non) nativeness, and emphasize the understanding and the revelation that the multifaceted meanings of concepts convey for individuals.

Setting

Participants in this study were selected from two groups of prospective Colombian English teachers at two Colombian universities. One of the universities was a public institution located in Bogotá, Colombia´s capital city, and the second was also a public entity in a small city

which is the capital of a neighboring "state." Twenty pre-service students in the first university and 22 in the second took part in a telecollaboration experience with three classes, 67, students enrolled in the Spanish heritage language learning program in the Southwestern U.S. university involved in this study. The primary investigator was the instructor in the U.S. heritage Spanish course and was a former colleague of the two professors in the Colombian universities courses associated with the experience.

Because the U.S. university is located in a city very close to the border with México, the city and the university are heavily influenced by Hispanic culture. The Spanish program in the university is the biggest of its kind in the country. The 16 U.S. students who interacted with Colombian participants in the telecollaboration were born in the U.S. but they also have roots in Hispanic culture. Their grandparents or parents were born in Mexico, other Latin-American countries, or in Spain. They heard and often spoke Spanish in their childhood at home; Spanish was even the first language many of them spoke. A vast array of complex circumstances totally or partially constrained their use of Spanish generally as they started their elementary education. Despite the fact that the heritage Spanish speakers (learners) in this study felt more comfortable speaking in English, they exhibited a strong connection with the Hispanic culture. In fact, most of them identified as Mexican Americans or Hispanic. Their reasons to register in the course more frequently had more to do with their desire to regain the confidence and ability to communicate with their Spanish speaking family members, to expand their knowledge of the Hispanic culture, to increase professional opportunities rather than the mere need to fulfill a requirement to complete their program.

The Telecollaboration

Colombian prospective English teachers and U.S. SHLs participated in an 8 week telecollaboration experience during the 2014 spring semester. At the beginning, students were

provided with the instructions for participating in the exchange (See Appendix C). Based on these guidelines, exchanges occurred weekly and required students to interact for no less than 45 minutes each time. Since the number of U.S. participants was higher, some Colombian participants worked with two U.S. peers, whereas others interacted only with one. Peers were matched based upon their availability.

The primary investigator started a private Facebook group as the site for the exchange (See Appendix D). In addition to serving as a virtual meeting place, the group page helped provide the necessary information to guide the participants through the exchange: logistics, use of Internet tools, and a weekly forum for Colombian prospective teachers. On average, 5 out of the 8 weekly online exchanges employed the Facebook synchronous chat interaction. The remaining three interactions were conducted via Skype audio or video calls that were recorded by the students.

The telecollaboration was integrated into the regular course curriculum of the U.S. and the two Colombian universities. Students' conversations were guided by a weekly schedule provided at the beginning of the course (see Appendix C). The schedule included the topics to be addressed each week, a set of questions (prompts) for each topic, instructions for developing a preparation activity for each exchange and the logistics for that particular exchange. Topics involved different aspects of participants' lives, for instance family, favorite music, their universities, and specific issues concerning language learning, Spanglish, bilingualism and, their history as language learners, among others. These topics were negotiated among the various instructors involved so that they were integrated into their course syllabi.

Participants

Though data was collected from all the Colombian students involved in the telecollaboration, only a few became participants in the study based on certain criteria. Firstly,

students with the most exposure to U.S. peers, i.e. those with two peers, were chosen. From this group, the primary researcher selected those who had fully completed interviews, questionnaires and weekly reflective logs (data collection instruments). Finally, based on twenty questions that were repeated in the two questionnaires, one prior to the telecollaboration and the other after the experience, the principal investigator designed a matrix to track how student answers changed. This criterion was applied to select participants because the study sought to determine participants' self-perceptions during their telecollaboration, but in relation to their self-perceptions prior to the exchange. Prospective students who changed their answers to at least 6 of the 20 questions became participants in the study. As a result of these criteria, 3 University B and 5 University A prospective English teachers qualified as participants.

Malena, Carolina, Anabel, Graciela and Ivan were attending the Intermediate English I course when they participated in the study. This was a course in the Modern Languages program (EFL and Spanish as a mother tongue) at University A in a small city of 145,000 inhabitants, characterized by a semirural environment. Carolina, Anabel, Graciela and Ivan's ages were between 18 and 20. Malena was 25 years old. Carolina and Malena were born in small rural towns while the other 3 participants were born in a larger city, where the university was located. They all started their education in English by the end of their elementary school and, similarly to University B participants, they had not travelled to any country where English was the language spoken by the majority of inhabitants. Their contact with native speakers of English had been through teaching assistants from England, the U.S., and Jamaica who were in their English classes. They all enrolled the program seeking to become language teachers.

The three University B participants[5], Nancy, Duban and Renata, were attending the third English course in a sequence of six in a B.Ed. in Education (EFL) program when they engaged in the telecollaboration experience. In this program, instructional time focuses on the English language. Nancy and Duban were 18 years of age and born in Bogotá. Renata was 25 years old, born in the capital city of a northern state and as an adult moved to Bogotá. The three of them started their education in English when they were in pre-school or early elementary education. While Renata joined the program drawn by her desire to become a teacher, Duban enrolled because he liked the language, and Nancy wanted to find opportunities to expand her knowledge of English by interacting with native speakers. Nancy had had contact with native speakers during her pre-school education in a bilingual school. In the case of Duban, starting the previous year, virtual chats became the means for him to practice English with native speakers. Two teachers' assistants from the U.S. and England, who supported instructors' classes, were Renata's only contact with native speakers and they also interacted with Duban and Nancy.

Data Collection Instruments

This study employed primary and secondary data collection instruments. In the first category, two questionnaires, one prior to the exchange and one after provided information regarding prospective teachers' self-perceptions as speakers of Spanish and English, and self-perceptions as prospective (non) native speaker EFL teachers (See Appendix A & E). In addition, the first one elicited demographic and background data while the second one gathered participants' self-perceptions of their interactions with their U.S. peers. Questionnaires were mainly taken and/or adapted from existing instruments (Medgyes, 1999; Rajagopalan, 2005;

[5] In compliance with IRB procedures, participants signed consent forms to be part of the study and their real names have not been provided to keep their identity anonymous.

Llurda, 2008) to ensure their validity. Questions elicited qualitative and quantitative data. The use of Qualtrics Survey Software, an application available through the University of Arizona, allowed Colombian prospective teachers in the two universities to provide their answers electronically. They had access to surveys for two weeks prior and two weeks after the telecollaboration.

Phenomenological (Seidman, 2006) semi-structured (Leech, 2002; Merriam, 2009) interviews were the second main instrument for data collection (See Appendix B & F). Because of the dynamics of phenomenological design, the first interviews focused on prospective teachers' past experiences in connection with their self-perceptions of (non) nativeness. The second interviews explored prospective teachers' self-perceptions associated with their telecollaboration experience and the meaning they constructed from the exchange. Participants were required to answer the questionnaires prior to the interviews. Because the primary investigator was not in the same country as the interviewees, pre-service teachers decided if they felt more comfortable employing Skype audiocall or videocall for the virtual conversation. The first interviews lasted approximately 50 minutes to an hour and second interviews required at least one hour, but no more than one hour and fifteen minutes. Data was recorded by means of two applications: "Skype autorecorder" and a virtual recorder for android tablets.

A third source of data emerged from the transcripts of participants' synchronous exchanges with their U.S. partners when using chat and Skype audio or video call. This data included the critical aspects in exchanges which become the source of participants' self-reflections. Consequently, these transcripts were tied to surveys and interviews in a mutually complementary relation (Ware & Rivas, 2012, p. 116).

Secondary data collection instruments encompassed participants' eight weekly reflection logs concerning their telecollaboration experience (See Appendix H). These logs were based on

anecdotal data from telecollaboration events and required pre-service teachers to select from a pool of fixed questions guiding their analysis. They sent the primary investigator the logs via email at the end of every week. In addition, prospective teachers engaged in eight weekly forums to discuss topics in connection with language ideologies and the telecollaboration experience (See Appendix I). The researcher assigned the topics and participants were expected to provide one original post and two reactions to peers' posts. Logs and forums were curricular activities for Colombian pre-service teachers and their professors graded them based solely on their completion. The last source of data emerged from documents including, the two programs' curricula, course syllabi students had taken and were currently studying, and the web-pages of the two universities provided information to understand the educational milieu in which the study took place.

Data Analysis

This study employed thematic analysis, "a process that involves coding and then segregating the data by codes into data lumps" (Glesne, 2006, p. 147). Subsequently, the use of clustering, added to reflective memos, supported the study of codes to construct and revise the category construction (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 2009).

Given that in the previous article, the research established categories to explain participants' self-reflection upon their being (non) native speakers and prospective teachers prior to their participation in telecollaboration with their U.S. peers, this second article took into consideration those findings from the first article to examine prospective Colombian teachers' variations in their self-perceptions under the influence of telecollaboration. In general, the three overarching principles that Wolcott (1994, pp. 10-11) discusses, namely, description, analysis and interpretation, guided the inclusion of new data in the existing categories and the configuration of new ones when needed. A software application for qualitative data analysis,

Nvivo10 was used in the analysis. The software facilitated the organization, exploration, visualization and codification of data. Finally, the principle of "triangulation" guided data collection and analysis, so that multiple sources of information contributed to the findings confirmation (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 2009; Miles, Hubberman & Saldaña, 2014).

FINDINGS

Aiming to describe the findings of this study, the following pages include three sections focused on prospective teachers' self-perception in connection with their (non) nativeness as Spanish speakers, as English speakers, and as future English teachers. Each of the three sections starts by presenting findings concerning participants' self-perception prior to their telecollaboration with U.S. partners and subsequently describes prospective teachers' self-images at the end of the exchange.

Native Spanish Speakers in Telecollaboration: Their focus on Meaning Making and Modeling Language Ability

Prior to her engagement in the telecollaboration, Graciela, a participant at University A, perceived that as a Spanish speaker, she was a very competent user of the language and exhibited confidence in her skills and knowledge. In her initial survey, based on a scale from 1 to 5, she selected 4 to grade herself concerning her overall ability in Spanish and rated specific languages abilities either 4 or 5. Although in the survey she did not register any answer when asked what her limitations in the language were, in the interview she expressed that "pues el español, digamos que ha sido pues mi lengua materna y la conozco y la domino, entonces, pues en ese sentido no...no veo digamos como dificultades" (UNIA-PTINT-February, 20, 2014[6]). [Well,

[6] Throughout this article, abbreviations are used to identify quoted answers from participants: "UNIB" and "UNIA" refers to the university where they studied. PT indicates that a data collection instrument was used prior to the telecollaboration and AT, after the exchange. As for the instruments themselves, Q. stands for questionnaire, INT.

Spanish, let's say, has been my mother tongue and…and I know it and master it, then, in that sense, no…I don't think I have any difficulties.] Graciela, who defined being a native speaker as "haber nacido en un context donde se habla español…" (UNIA-PTQ-February, 22, 2014). [Being born in a Spanish speaking context…] considered her nativeness the main reason for her ability and also credited her university education for contributing to her mastery of Spanish. Her program at University A was dual, EFL and Spanish as L1. Malena and Carolina from University A and Nancy from University B exhibited similar self-perceptions to the ones voiced by Graciela.

Renata attended University B. Her self-image as a Spanish speaker was imbued with the type of confidence displayed by Graciela. She concurred with the University A prospective teacher in how she graded her ability and in the role that her nativeness played in her language proficiency. In addition, Renata stated that she was proud of being a native speaker of Spanish,

> …Tal vez son prejuicios míos también porque yo me pongo a mirar el inglés y el español y a mí el español se me hace sumamente complicado…yo en cierta forma siento que soy afortunada de tener una lengua como el español como lengua materna (UNIB-PTINT-March, 2, 2014). […Maybe it is my prejudice but when I look at English and Spanish, Spanish is much more difficult in comparison to English…and somehow I feel fortunate to have a language like Spanish as my mother tongue.]

Likewise, other students, namely Malena felt proud of her Spanish because of the opportunities it would provide her, and Carolina has learned to value Spanish through her university studies at University A.

---

for interview, TCH. for telecollaboration chats, TSR. For telecollaboration skype recordings, WRL. for weekly reflective logs and FBF. For Facebook forum.

Despite their similarities, the most critical contrast between Graciela and Renata's self-perceptions of their Spanish before the telecollaboration was that the latter acknowledged her Spanish had limitations, a perception that Duban from University B, and Ivan and Anabel from University A shared concerning their own performance in the language. Renata stated that: "Me siento satisfecha con el español, me encanta el idioma. Sin embargo, siento que hay mucho que mejorar…" (UniB-PTQ-February, 24, 2014). [I feel satisfied with my Spanish. I love the language. However, I feel there is a lot I need to improve.] In particular, she mentioned that "Algunos problemas de pronunciación…y hablo muy rápido, uso muchas muletillas, a veces no vocalizo bien" (UniB-PTQ-February, 24, 2014). [I have some pronunciation problems…and I speak too fast, sometimes I do not enunciate sounds properly]. Duban, Ivan and Anabel were concerned about their nervousness when speaking in public or their need for specialized skills or knowledge.

When surveyed and interviewed again after they telecollaborated for several months with their U.S. peers, the eight Colombian pre-service teachers either kept or increased their evaluation of their language abilities in Spanish. Malena, for instance, increased her self-evaluation from 4 to 5 and explained:

> En los momentos en que me comuniqué con mis compañeras en Español, pocas veces que tuve que repetirles algo, lo que me da a entender que fui clara, que no usé el idioma de tal forma que llevara a mis compañeras a confusiones o algo parecido, por lo tanto me siento muy complacida con el aprendizaje y uso de mis español (UniA-ATQ-May, 6, 2014). […when I communicated with my peers in Spanish a few times I did not have to repeat any words, this means that I was clear, that I didn't use the language in a way that it could create misunderstandings or something like that, that's why I feel pleased about my learning and use of Spanish]

Her self-perception of expertise as a native speaker was intertwined with her awareness and effort to cooperate with her peer in achieving understanding. In a like manner, by the end of the telecollaboration, all the other participants' self-perceptions as native Speakers of Spanish suggested there were aspects of their Spanish they needed to pay attention in order to, improve the quality of their communication with peers: increasing specialized vocabulary (e.g. to talk about culture), expanding flexibility to use different registers, and discovering other ways to express ideas. Carolina's comment below serves to illustrate these self-perceived needs:

> A pesar de hablante nativo del español, también tengo que entender losc onceptos, un ejemplo fue un instante cuando estaba hablando con Alex y el me hizo una pregunta, que qué palabra you utilizaba para caracterizar mi enicidad. Yo creía que ese término se usaba para los indigenas y no lo sabía. Me confundió y después lo busqué y supe que se relacionaba con la nacionalidad de la gente (UniA-ATINT-May, 18, 2014). [Although I am a native speaker of Spanish, I need to know concepts, for example there was a moment in the telecollaboration when Alex [one of her telecollaboration peers] asked me which word I'd use to describe my 'ethnicity' I thought that word was about indigenous people and I didn't know, it was confusing and then I looked it up and I learn it was related to nationality.]

However, in addition to the perception that they needed to work on aspects like the ones mentioned above, Nancy, Ivan, Anabel, Renata and Duban were invested in becoming ideal language models for their peers. For them, as Duban commented, this was expected since native speakers are not likely to make mistakes and should exhibit mastery of the language of educated people:

> He tratado de hablar lo más correctamente posible para darles una buena visión de cómo es la forma "correcta" de hablar el español. Evitar el uso de colonialismos o expresiones

que hagan parte de la idiosincrasia de mi cultura…(UniB-WRL-Abril, 6, 2014). [I have tried to speak as much accurately as possible trying to give a good perspective of what the 'correct' way to speak Spanish is. I have avoided the use of colloquialisms and expressions which are part of my cultural idiosyncrasy.]

In the following excerpt, the same participant asked her peer her opinion regarding one of the most controversial issues in the exchange, Spanglish, which was introduced because of their U.S. partners' background:

D: What do you think about Spanglish?

P: For me it is easy, just a moment ago I was talking in Spanglish. (Laughs)

D: Do you think it is good? Or, you learn English or you learn Spanish. But Spanglish…like...

P: I think it's OK because all of those who know how to speak English and Spanish it comes easy to them. I don't know so this is for them to speak in both…I don't know I think it's OK, it is a good thing.

D:…It sounds kind of funny for me, it is like somebody is talking about…for example people in Spanish tend to say something like, 'Bueno voy a guarder esto en el freezer'[Well, I am going to put this thing in the freezer]."

P: [laughs]…o yeah...

D: Why don't you just end the sentence in Spanish as you start it? I don't I mean,… it's good, but sometimes it is like an excuse for some people not to learn the complete err language, I mean.

P: Hmm…

D: I mean, it's not correct. (UniB-TSR) (Originally in English)

While using Spanglish was common practice for his peer due to the contact between the two

languages on the borders between Mexico and the U.S., for Duban and four of his other peers, in Colombia, it was used as a joke and it showed lack of knowledge and laziness. It was inappropriate to mix Spanish and English. Similarly, in one of her Skype interactions, Renata's peer asked her if she thinks there are some kinds of Spanish which are better than others:

> R: I don't know but I have listened to other kind of Spanish like ere Spanish from Spain for instance or Spanish from Peru or Spanish from Ecuador and Spanish from Mexico, yes?
>
> P: OK.
>
> R: And I think there are some Spanish that sound better than others, for instance, I don't like Spanish from Salvador or Spanish from Puerto Rico, for instance, because they are pretty different to Latin American Spanish, yes?
>
> P: Yes
>
> R: But on the other hand, I really like Spanish from Spain, that accent, you know, Spanish from Spain sounds amazing. Actually I would dare to say that Spanish from Spain is the equivalent to English from England, like that that reputation they have, you know. But for instance if you listen to the English from India that sounds pretty different from the English from England. (UniB-TSR). (Originally in English)

Renata presents herself as a native speaker of Spanish whose judgment of what is more acceptable concerning varieties aligns with the one enjoying the highest prestige in the Hispanic world, Spanish from Spain.

This prospective teacher was invested in being the ideal model as a Spanish native speaker, she, as other participants, suggested that the telecollaboration had made them realize they needed much more knowledge of grammar rules, spelling and the use of accents, so that their peers would not be at risk of learning what was inaccurate. These participants' anxiety in

portraying themselves as perfect models led them to become very self-demanding when they interacted with peers. In an anecdote of her first chat with one of her U.S. peers, Renata mentions that:

> Francamente, fue un esfuerzo gigante tratar de escribir "con todas las de la ley" en una conversación informal, aplicar todas esas reglas que conozco en cierta medida, pero que nunca les vi una real importancia a la hora de usarlas en un espacio como FB…Lo más complicado del asunto fue, que una vez terminada la conversación con Erika, revisé el historial de lo escrito y encontré que había cometido varios errores en español (UniB-WRL-MARCH, 7, 2014). [Honestly, it was a monumental effort to try to write 'by the book' in an informal conversation, to apply all the rules I know and which I never thought were really useful on Facebook…the hardest part was that when I finished and checked the history of what I had written I realized I had made several mistakes in Spanish…]

Interestingly, in her final interview, she questioned the need to portray herself as a perfect model of a native speaker to her peers:

> Como hablante nativa, creo que definitivamente puedo cambiar el concepto que yo tenía, que por ser hablante nativa, definitivamente tenía que ser un modelo perfecto, casi perfecto, en lo que es, eh, el uso del español, porque igual yo luego cuando revisaba digamos como los chats y eso, me daba cuenta que a veces ellas escribían Im, digamos I am, y lo escribían I'm, pero lo escribían con minúsculas, sin la comilla y la m y eso en primer semestre, yo me acuerdo que nos decían que eso jamás se inglés, que eso de los peores errores que podía cometer en inglés… a uno también en la universidad le meten como mucho terror y a lo largo un hablante nativo hace esas cosas (UniB-ATINT-May, 19, 2014). [As a native

> speaker, I think I can definitively change that concept I had that because I was a native speaker I had to be a perfect model, almost perfect, in the use of Spanish because when I revised like the chats and that, I realized that sometimes they [her U.S. peers] wrote 'im' meaning 'I'm' but they wrote it in lower case letters without the apostrophe and all that and when I was in my first semester here professors told us that you should never write that in English…that's a lot of terror they put into you in the university and at the end a native speaker does those things.]

Being appreciative of one's status as a native speaker of Spanish resurfaced as another pattern at the end of the telecollaboration. Malena's previous motivation for appreciating Spanish was based on the opportunities she thought Spanish could bring her. Through the telecollaboration, however, the scope of her appreciation expanded to include the idea that the language led to a "que fortalece y enriquece profundamente [su] actitud, conocimiento y valor de su] propia cultura" (UniA-WRL-May, 5, 2014). [Strengthening and enriching [her] attitude, knowledge and value of [her] own culture.] The previous quote was Malena's final entry in a log where she narrated how one of her peers told her that many Hispanics in the U.S. refused to learn English and refused to leave their Spanish behind. Malena connected this with a text of Richard Rodríguez called "Fear of losing a culture."

In the case of Renata, before the telecollaboration, she felt proud about being a native speaker of a language she considered to be very difficult to learn. By the end of the experience her satisfaction was buttressed by what she learned concerning Spanish in the U.S. through her peers: "Es interesante ver que en otras partes del mundo nuestro idioma resulta una opción atractiva de formación" (UniB-WRL-March, 30, 2014). [It's interesting to see that in other parts of the world our language is an attractive option for education.]

Another student whose self-perception as a native speaker of Spanish was associated with his satisfaction was Ivan. He wrote in his final survey "…me senti muy cómodo, ya que mis compañeros me comentaban sobre la fuerza del español en los Estados Unidos y lo dificil que era para ellos aprenderlo" (UniA-ATQ-May, 7, 2014). […I felt very comfortable because my peers told me about how strong Spanish was in the U.S. and how difficult it was for them to learn it.] In addition to appreciating Spanish because he felt part of a language that is spreading in an influential country like the U.S., Ivan felt empowered believing that he was a native speaker of a language that is hard for others to learn.

In the case of Ivan and Renata, their appreciation for Spanish reached a more complex level converging with cultural and intercultural realms. As he elaborated further on his perception of the complexity of Spanish, Ivan answered in his final interview: "Entonces, eh, como que empieza uno a pensar de que ellos no son más que nosotros, de que nosotros podemos hacer parte de, de una cultura americana y de que ellos pueden estar en una cultura colombiana" (UniB-ATINT-May, 18, 2014). [Then, er…, it is like one starts thinking that they [U.S. people] are not more than us, that we can be part of the American culture and that they can also be in the Colombian culture.] He struggled all his life to learn English, and now he realizes that others also have a hard time learning Spanish; it seems a more balanced picture for him. In one of her Skype conversations with a U.S. peer Renata commented in English:

> I used to believe that people from the U.S. was focused just in their own culture and their own language, now I realized that you guys are also interested in learning Spanish; for instance, I never thought that Spanish was an attractive issue for you, I just thought that it was just for native speakers, now I am more convinced that we tend to judge mostly based on prejudice. (UniB-TSR) (Original in English).

English Language Ability and Pursuit of Native-like Standards in ICFLE

A question included in the questionnaire prior to the telecollaboration asked participants if they had ever been concerned about their accent when speaking in English and why. Malena´s answer illustrates not only hers, but all participants´ recurrent language learning objectives associated with their self-perception of (non) nativeness concerning English. The University A prospective teacher indicated that she was concerned about her accent because "esper[a] hablar el Inglés de la mejor forma posible, que sea un Inglés fluido, casi natural, pulido; que se entienda y escuche bien" (UniA-PTQ-February, 19, 2014). [She expects to speak English the best she could, being fluent and using polished and natural English, thus her English can be understood and sounds good.] When asked to elaborate on her answer in the interview, she expanded, "…tal vez no podré aspirer a hablar inglés de una forma natural, pero puede ser lo más natural que se pueda, sé que no será como el de un native, pero algo que se acerque" (UniA-PTINT-February, 21, 2014). [Probably I cannot aspire to speak natural English, but it could be as natural as possible, I know that it won't be a native speaker's, but something closer.] Her replies reflect two aims which for her and most of the other participants seemed to be intertwined: being able to communicate using English, and sounding closer to a native speaker of that language.

Before the exchange, at the core of participants' self-image as speakers of English was their perception that they were lacking language ability to resemble a native speaker. It is important to clarify that it was not the variety of all those who were born in English speaking countries that participants judged as native ones; they referred to American or British English. Malena, for instance, graded her overall skills in the language as 3 out of 5, a pattern followed by all participants in the two universities.

All of them reported that their listening and speaking skills connected with pronunciation, intonation, accent, fluency and vocabulary retrieval were not strong enough. In this vein,

frustration, fear, and insecurity were feelings participants started experiencing back in their elementary and secondary education, and though they were not that prominent in their university education, to some extent, they persisted. At the beginning of his university studies, Ivan recalls that,

> Era muy frustrante escucharlo a él y no entenderle ni papa, agarrar una o dos frases o una o dos palabras y no entender más y preguntarle a alguien qué fue lo que dijo el profesor o e qué se trata el tema o qué es lo que hay que hacer era demasiado frustrante (UniA-PTINT-Februay, 21, 2014). [It was frustrating to listen to him [a teacher] and not being able to understand anything, getting one or two words and no more and having to ask someone what the professor said or what the topic was or what it was we needed to do, that was too frustrating.]

The prospect of having new learning opportunities in the program improved prospective teachers' confidence about their future improvement of their language abilities. Ivan's testimony illustrates this self-perception:

> En primer semester me era muy difícil comenzar y como le comente antes…debíamos trabajar en las cuatro habilidades…pero se pierde el temor con el recorrido atráves del programa y se aprende más vocabulario, pero también yo sé que me es necesario aprende mucho porque el inglés es un idioma muy extensor (UniA-PTINT-February, 21, 2014). [When I was in my 1st semester it was hard to start and as I told you…we need to work in four skills…but one loses fear as one advances through the program and you learn more vocabulary, though anyway I still need to learn a lot because it (English) is a broad language.]

Another incentive contributing to their willingness to continue building their skills, despite their self-perceived limitations, was their view of English as the language of opportunities. The same

participant suggested: “En mundo tan globalizado se hace más que esencial el aprender nuevos idiomas, pero más allá de esto es el trabajo personal el que nos impulsa a aprenderlo” (UniA-PTQ-FEBRUARY, 19, 2014). [In relation to the English learning process, in a globalized world as ours, it is more than essential to learn new languages and beyond this, it is our personal work what encourages us to learn it.]

Though some of the participants in this study had interacted with native speakers prior to their telecollaboration with their U.S. peers in this project, none of them had sustained such a long, habitual and peer-like interaction with them. Colombian pre-service teachers had formed their self-perceptions of their non-nativeness distant, for the most part, from those they regarded as native speakers. Participants’ acquaintances, and in some cases friendship, with their U.S. peers in the telecollaboration created what they depicted as a “real communication context.” Within this context, prospective teachers´ pre-telecollaboration self-perceptions were apparently partially influenced by their international online exchange with U.S. peers.

As a part of his questionnaire answer concerning self-perception of English language abilities prior to the exchange, Duban, an University B student, responded, “en el habla siento dificultad para expresarme rápidamente en una conversación casual. Tampoco soy muy bueno comprendiendo lo que dice un hablante nativo al 100 %” (UniB-PTQ-February, 26, 2014). [About my speaking, it is difficult for me to speak fast in a casual conversation. I am not very good either at understanding 100% of what a native speaker says.] As all the other participants did, he felt his ability was insufficient, especially when interacting with those he regarded as his ideal reference, native speakers. By the end of the exchange, Duban was more comfortable with his skills and knowledge of English.

The overall performance grade he gave himself at the end of the exchange when compared to the beginning grade and the various answers he provided in several instruments,

attest to his perception that he improved but also that his self-confidence in his language skills had increased. He raised his overall self-grading from 3 to 4 and in relation to that commented in the interview:

> Estoy hablando en términos de una evolución, porque en las primeras interacciones, digámoslo que tenía como los mismos problemas que tenía con interacciones pasadas, previas, …yo cuando hablaba, hablaba con, con un nativo pues tenía problemas con, tenía problemas como de digámoslo como de seguridad, como que me preocupaba mucho por hablar perfectamente…entonces digámoslo que yo creo que con el proyecto de Arizona fui ganando más y más un poco en eso, en seguridad, como en frescura, digámoslo a la hora de hablar (UniB-ATINT'May, 14, 2014). […talking in terms of evolution, in the first interactions, I had, let's say the same problems I had in previous interactions…when I spoke with a native speaker I was insecure, It was like I was focused on speaking perfectly…and let's say that with this project [telecollaboration] I gained more confidence, like to feel relaxed, let's say when talking.]

Whereas Malena, Ivan, and Graciela also increased the overall grades they assigned to their skills in English, Carolina, Anabel, and Renata increased their marks for specific skills, especially concerning speaking and listening. Though Nancy was the only participant who did not increase any of her marks, what she had in common with all the others participants was her comments about her self-perceived improvement. For instance, she expressed that "It was an interesting experience because I feel that every day I learned something new, interacting with them helped my fluency, interaction, and I gained a lot in terms of confidence and assurance (UNIB-ATQ)."

These participants' confidence was also highly influenced by their peers' praise for their language ability:

> Y, digamos, ambos me dijeron que eh, me dijeron que yo pues, hablaba muy bien el

> inglés, que, y digamos, Ariana me dijo que ella se dio cuenta que yo desde el primer día, tuve como una mejoría como en la fluidez y la manera de expresarme. Entonces, eso para mí fue, pues, muy gratificante. Escucharlo de ellos, pues, porque son hablantes nativos de allá (UniB, ATINT-May, 22, 2014). […and both told me that, er…, that well, that I spoke English very well, that, Ariana [her U.S. peer] told me that she had realized I had improved since the first day…so that for me was very gratifying, hearing that from them, because you know they are native speakers from there…]

Although all participants' exhibited self-perceived gains in their language ability and confidence, a group of participants including, Graciela, Carolina and Anabel emphasized their struggle to keep skype conversations flowing with their peers. Carolina mentioned that:

> Hablar siempre ha sido algo complicado para mí. Hablar con ellos fue, quiero decir, por lo menos chateando fue algo fácil por que nisquiera vee a la persona y esto te dan más tiempo para pensar en grmática y esas cosas pero en la otra forma, cuando usas Skype, si claro, ese format fue difícil, fue mi reto mayor cuando intentaba mantener la conversación en inglés (UniA-ATINT-May, 18, 2014). [The speaking ability has always been difficult for me, talking with them, I mean, I mean chatting was easier, you don't even see them, and you have more time to think of grammar and everything, but the other way when you have to Skype, yes, that was difficult, that was my biggest challenge to try to keep a conversation in English].

They described how excessive time spent structuring ideas, lack of lexicon, grammar and cultural knowledge, and their preconceptions concerning their U.S. peers among others, often caused breakdowns, misunderstandings and ultimately frustration in audio or videocalls.

In conjunction with their increasing confidence in language ability, prospective teachers self-perceived that they had gained awareness of factors pertaining to the sociocultural milieu

influencing their interaction with U.S. peers. Prior to the telecollaboration, Anabel had been part of a students' association in which some members voiced their strong opinion against the role of the U.S. in the world. At the end of the exchange, she explained:

> Pues yo en realidad estaba como, muy cerrada a la banda, pues, de tratar con personas de Estados Unidos, yo me limité mucho en un principio. Pero no, en general la experiencia fue, súper, muy chévere, fue muy bacana, saber que tenía la oportunidad de entablar un diálogo, pues, muchas veces tan bien fue algo cómico (UniA-ATINT-May, 20, 2014).
>
> [At the beginning I was stonewalled to interact with U.S. people, well I limited myself at the beginning, but no, in general the experience was awesome, having the opportunity to dialogue meaningfully with my peer and sometimes it was even fun.]

When asked why she had that attitude, she went on,

> …En el entorno en el que estoy, en la universidad, uno escucha 'ay no Estados Unidos que el país del imperio, que no sé qué'. Entonces uno como que inconscientemente se indispone con ellos… pero pues al interactuar con ellos me di cuenta que, tal vez, en algún punto, llegan a pensar lo mismo de, pues, referente a la situación que vivimos acá como a la que ellos tienen allá, entonces fue muy chévere. Entonces, ya me abrí totalmente… (UniA-ATINT-May, 20, 2014).
>
> […well, because one, well, in the environment where I am in the university, one often hears 'oh, no U.S., the imperialistic nation' and so on, so one unconsciously develops some distaste for them, …but after I interacted with them… at certain point I realized that they might think the same thing about…, well, about the situation we have here, as we think about the situation there, then it was cool and I opened up completely.]

Social, political and cultural issues shaping the images of those participants regarded as native

speakers influenced participants' communicative exchanges with peers. Self-perceptions concerning awareness about the connection between language and culture were mostly expressed by Duban, Malena, Renata and Carolina. Carolina, for instance, related this event:

> En la segunda tele colaboración con mi compañero Samuel Santana, estábamos hablando de las cosas que tenía la UNIA y él me preguntó que si acá había clubs y no supe a que se refería porque en Colombia los clubs son lugares donde se hacen eventos y se pueden hacer diferentes cosas para divertirse. Creo que lo que sucedió me muestra como alguien que habla el inglés como una segunda lengua ya que fue por falta de conocimiento de la cultura Americana que me sentí confundida y no respondí nada hasta no estar segura a que se refería él con clubs (UniB-WRL-February, 28, 2014). [In the second telecollaboration with my partner, we were talking about the kind of things people could find in my university and he asked me if here we had 'clubs' and I didn't know what he was talking about because here in Colombia, we call 'clubs' to the places where we organize events and you can do various activities to have fun…what happened shows me how someone who speaks English as a second language, like me, can get confused because of the lack of knowledge of American culture and in my case, I did not answer anything until I was sure about what he meant by clubs.]

While the goal of resembling native speakers' language ability did not diminish in importance and even became more relevant for some participants, for others its pertinence began or continued to wane. Duban, Renata, and Nancy, who attended University B, and Malena, who attended University A, did not perceive themselves as invested in exhibiting a native-like competence as they were before the telecollaboration. Several reasons may account for these participants' evolution. Regarding the issue of accent, Malena answered in the final survey:

> Uno se va dando cuenta que el acento es más como cuestión de forma, como de vanidad,

> lo realmente importante es lo que tengo para decir y cómo lo digo y… Me preocupa menos ahora el acento y si alguna vez llegase a tal fluidez como para tenerlo tenerlo, pues bienvenido sea, pero claramente ya no me afecta tant (Unib-ATQ-May, 6, 2014). [You start realizing that having an accent is more an issue regarding form, like vanity, what really matters is what I have to say and how I say it…I am less concerned now about accent and if I ever have the fluidity to have one it will be welcomed, but that clearly does not affect me so much now.]

Likewise, in her first weekly reflective log, she remarked that, when her peer in the exchange spoke in Spanish, she noticed her peer did it calmly, thus her ideas were clear because she had sufficient time to organize them. On the contrary, Malena thought that she and most nonnative speakers, when speaking English, try to do it fast believing that it portrays them as efficient speakers. On her part, Nancy stated:

> …Después de la experiencia, yo siento que no es necesario eh, uno, …como desear tanto imitar al nativo. Sino como ser uno mismo y hablar el inglés de una manera apropiada. Si, o sea, digamos, yo creo que si uno se preocupa por lo que las otras personas, o sea digamos, como imitar, yo creo que antes como que se le va a dificultar más como aprender el inglés y hablarlo de una forma natural (UniB-ATINT-May, 22, 2014). […after the experience, I feel it is not necessary, eh, one…like to wish too much to imitate native speakers. But to be yourself and to speak in English appropriately... I mean, if you become concerned about what other people, I mean, like to imitate, I believe it would become more difficult to learn English and speak in a natural way.]

As in Malena's case, the other three participants mentioned above had not completely turned their backs on their longstanding dream of sounding like native speakers, but they became less focused on it. Mainly, they mentioned that communicating effectively with peers was their

priority. Another point they highlighted was, as Nancy suggested above, that focusing on imitating their peers made them overly aware of their limitations and they tended to make more mistakes and lose spontaneity. Another factor associated with their focus on native-like abilities was the difficulty they thought imitating entailed: "El acento no es algo que se modifique notoriamente en un par de semanas. Además, como hablante no nativa del inglés, SIEMPRE se me sentirá un poco de acento, aunque trate de disimularlo o lo que sea" (UniB-ATQ-May, 18, 2014). [Accent is not something you can substantially modify in couple of weeks. Moreover, as a non-native speaker of English, people will ALWAYS notice some of my accent, even if I try to hide it.] Renata explained that she realized this when her U.S. peer told her that her mom, who was born in Uruguay but has lived in the U.S. since she was about seven years old, still had an accent.

Two final points brought up by Duban were that University B students were taking two courses, Phonetics and Phonology, and Sociolinguistics. For him:

> …me han enseñado como a abrirme más a diferentes culturas y pues me han enseñado pues que no es el hecho de, de como de querer imitar un acento, de querer aprender sólo una cultura del inglés…entonces, por ende, pues a mí me sigue gustando la cultura británica, pero pues por ejemplo yo, sí, yo antes sólo buscaba personas nativas era porque pues quería imitarlas, (si) pero pues me di cuenta que pues no es cuestión de buscar un modelo a seguir, porque es que uno es uno y uno tiene su identidad colombiana, latinoamericana (UniB-ATINT-May, 14, 2014). […taught me to open more to different cultures and understand that imitating an accent is not what is relevant or to try to learn only from one culture of English… then, I keep liking British culture, but, for instance, yes, before I only looked for native speakers to imitate them but I realized that the idea is not to have a model because one, one has its own identity as a Colombian, as a

Latin American.]

Finally, he stated that after the telecollaboration he was not that concerned about having an accent because "…este tipo de interacción me dan más habilidades en cuanto a la confianza que se tiene a la hora de hablar…" (UniB-ATQ-May, 20, 2014). […this type of interaction [telecollaboration] increases my abilities and I can speak with more confidence…]

All University A prospective teachers except Malena either maintained or increased their focus on achieving native-like language ability. This tendency originated from participants' understanding of their interaction with their U.S. peers as an opportunity to get a closer, real life, view of these native speakers, who were the language models they wanted to resemble. In describing the meaning of the experience, Anabel remarked:

> Ya existe un referente más claro y más tangible de cuál es la forma ideal de pronunciación. Me siento más preocupada en este aspecto porque ya puedo identificar cuáles son mis problemas al pronunciar y también ya tengo un horizonte para llegar con esto (UniA-ATQ-May, 5, 2014). [Now there is a clearer and tangible reference to know what the ideal way of pronunciation is [her peers' pronunciation]. I feel more concerned because now I can identify which my pronunciation problems are and I also have the means to get there.]

While Anabel's determination to pursue the native speaker standard was mainly anchored in her self-evaluation vis-a-vis her constant comparison with her U.S. peers, another decisive factor that attracted other participants to that model is revealed in the following excerpt:

> Cuando ellos me dijeron que tenía acento, como que en parte mi mundo del inglés se cayó, por yo jamás había pensado de que en realidad tenía un acento marcado, por lo mismo de que aquí no puede hablar así con un nativo americano o con un nativo…Mi compañero me contaba que en Estados Unidos había personas que tenían un acento muy

> marcado y que eso como que, como que ellos lo tenían muy en cuenta. Entonces, como que me preocupo un poquito más acerca de eso, y de cómo puedo llegar a pulir mi acento… (UniA-ATINT-May, 18, 2014). [when they [U.S. peers] told me that I had an accent, it was like part of my English world collapsed, I had never thought I had a marked accent and it makes sense since I had never had such kind of interaction with a native American speaker or with a native speaker…my peer told me that in the U.S. there were people with marked accents and that, that was given a lot of importance. So now I am a little more concerned about that, and how I can polish my accent.]

In Ivan's case, his peers' own perceptions regarding accent in the telecollaboration reinforced his self-awareness about lacking the native speaker accent he sought to achieve and his determination to work towards minimizing his accent.

Finally, Graciela's increasing concern about resembling native speakers' speaking performance intersected with her self-perception of what the aesthetics of English might be. She remarked, "Algo importante cuando uno está, pues hablando otro idioma, entonces tiene, no solamente que hablar como cambiando las palabras del inglés al español, sino ponerle ese acento y esa musicalidad que tiene el inglés" (UniA-ATINT-May, 21, 2014). [Accent is something important, when one is speaking another language you have to, not only speak like changing the words from Spanish to English but also to put in it like, like that accent, that music that English has.] When asked if she thought that her accent might have caused misunderstandings in her interaction with U.S. peers or if they had expressed or shown negative attitudes regarding how her English sounded, Graciela said that misunderstandings occurred because of her mispronunciation of words, and not because of her accent.

Telecollaboration and Confidence in Language Ability: Reinforcing Prior Self-perceptions as Prospective NNESTs

Participants´ concerns, when revealing their self-perceptions as non-native speakers of English before the telecollaboration, constituted the core of their self-images as future teachers. Their uneasiness concerning their language abilities, under the watchful eye of the native speaker, appear again in relation to teaching. While at the same time though, their uniqueness as non-native speaker teachers and the possibility of continuing their education encourages them to see themselves as potentially successful English teachers.

On a scale from 1 to 5 Nancy, Duban, Ivan, Anabel, and Renata, marked their levels of concern as a 3 while Carolina marked 4, in pre-telecollaboration questionnaires concerning the extent to which they anticipated that their limitations in English would represent a problem in their future jobs. Nancy, for instance, described some of her limitations in English like:

> Algunas debilidades es que si de pronto me toca hablar en público a mí se me olvidan las cosas, porque me dan como nervios, pero también pienso que las debilidades es que no sé de suficiente vocabulario como para entenderme o sea con una persona nativa que ya obviamente sabe mucho más (UniB-PTINT-February, 29, 2014). [Some of my weaknesses are that if I need to speak in public, I forget what to say, I become nervous, but I also think that another difficulty is not to have enough vocabulary to understand a native speaker who obviously knows much more.]

Nancy along with Graciela and Renata considered that nonnative English speaker teachers (NNESTs) lacked the language ability to do their jobs when compared to native English speaker teachers (NESTs). Specifically, she mentioned that they "les falta ser más precisos al momento de hablar" (UniB-PTQ-February, 25, 2014). [Lack precision when using spoken language.] Likewise, Carolina, Anabel, and Renata pointed to NESTs as those who could offer more

support to their students concerning language skills development. Nancy also chose a native speaker to be the type of teacher she would suggest a relative to hire. Malena, Carolina and Graciela concurred with these opinions. Though Nancy would hire equal numbers of NNESTs and NESTs if she ran a language institute, she, along with Graciela and Renata, thought NNESTs should work in basic or initial levels, since higher levels would be reserved for NESTs, whose language abilities and real use of language would be an asset.

Despite acknowledging limitations in her English language ability, Nancy stated that "si suplo esas dificultades en el transcurso de, de estos años que estoy estudiando, creo que ya no, no van a ser un impedimento para nada, pues yo creo que antes, eh, con razón es que me estoy formando" (UniB-PTINT-February, 28, 2014). [Well if, I beat these limitations along these years of study, I think they won't be an obstacle at all, I think that before, hmmm, that's why I am getting education.] This perception was shared among all the participants. In addition to education, four participants Renata, Nancy, Graciela, and Anabel perceived, as suggested by their answers in a survey question, that an NNEST's background as an EFL learner was an advantage.

In this vein, Malena believed that NNESTs can be a great support for students because "Ellos te comprende major pues pasaron pore se proceso de aprendizaje para educarse, entonces pueden brindar más ayuda y otra cosa es que comparten la misma cultural con sus estudiantes" (UniAPTC-PTINT-February, 21, 2014). [They can understand you better, they were also in that learning process to educate themselves so they can help more and also there is the fact that they share the culture with students.] Other qualities associated with NNESTs in questionnaires included, but were not limited to, their help to understand and adapt to the L2 culture (Nancy), their being good models (Duban), their knowledge of more techniques to face language learning difficulties (Ivan), and their knowledge of grammar (Graciela and Carolina).

Considering NNESTs' previously described characteristics, most participants regarded them as potentially more successful than NESTs. Graciela's opinion diverged because she believed that native speakers had more expertise in the language. On the whole, all prospective teachers, except Anabel, who thought she could be the victim of bullying, and Renata, who was afraid of students' noticing she would make mistakes, were not concerned about being regarded as non-native speakers in their future jobs. What is more, only Anabel, Malena and Graciela selected American and British English as the varieties they would like their students to speak. These selections were chosen over an option for English as an international language, which implies that these three students, out of the eight participants, favored more native speaker models.

After the telecollaboration, participants' answers supporting their self-perceptions as future English teachers did not change substantially from those prior to the exchange. Only in the case of particular prospective teachers did changes occur. Malena was one of the three students who graded her ability as 3 before the telecollaboration, but after the exchange increased to 4. As discussed elsewhere for various participants, confidence was at the core of this positive self-perception:

> Uno se va dando cuenta, por las mismas respuestas que las compañeras muestran hacia ti, de que sí te entienden, de que el mensaje sí está siendo entendido. Te das cuenta de que 'ah, bueno, no fue como tan, es como más cuestión de desconfianza' Entonces, a través del proceso, ortalecí ese aspecto, como tener más confianza en mis capacidades (UniA-ATINT-May, 18, 2014). […one realizes, because of peers' answers to you, that they understand you, that the message is being understood. You realized that 'oh, good, it is more about confidence'… I became stronger in that aspect, like to be more confident regarding my abilities.]

What is noteworthy is that American English stopped being the variety Malena would like her future students to learn, and that she embraced English as an international language instead. Her answer regarding whom she would suggest as an English teacher to a relative changed from a native speaker to a non-native speaker from Colombia. By the same token, she modified her response from "no" to "yes" when asked in the questionnaire if she thought that NNESTs background as EFL learners would be to their advantage when working in their jobs.

The three University B participants and Malena, all of whom self-evaluated their English language ability as 4 at the end of the telecollaboration, concurred with their questionnaire answers regarding NNESTs. These responses totally aligned after, Renata and David modified their responses from "no" to "yes" in a question asking if they considered that NNESTs' backgrounds as EFL learners would be advantageous for their teaching. Renata also changed her answer from "yes' to "no" when asked if she was concerned about being regarded as a non-native speaker of the language she would teach. This aligns with her peers responses to that question. These small variations in some participants' questionnaire answers reinforced their pre-telecollaboration self-perceptions depicting NNESTs as potentially successful teachers, who are more suitable for the Colombian setting and are equipped with experience and knowledge of their contexts.

The remaining University A students, except Ivan, gave a 3 to their English language abilities at the end of the telecollaboration. Ivan and Anabel's answers, to survey questions concerning perceptions of NNESTs, differed in just one answer to those of the group discussed above. Before the telecollaboration, Ivan responded that he had never been preoccupied about being a non-native speaker of the language he was going to teach. After the exchange, he answered that he was concerned and he selected as a "not being able to advance in one's career." Graciela and Anabel shared Ivan´s preoccupation regarding their status as NNESTs. Graciela´s

concern was “No utilizar la lengua como la usa un hablante nativo y enseñar mal” (UniA-ATQ-May, 10, 2014). [Not to use the language as a native speaker and to teach poorly.] whereas Anabela kept the same answer she provided for prior to the exchange; she feared to be caught making mistakes.

The last two University A participants, Carolina and Graciela, provided survey answers regarding their perceptions of NNESTs that were in stark contrast with the other six pre-service teachers. They both responded that American English would be the variety they would like their students to learn. While Carolina kept her initial answer to the question, Graciela modified it to English for international purposes. Carolina also kept her opinion that an NNEST’s background as EFL learner was not an advantage in his or her future teaching. Graciela held to her belief that the native speaker would be the most successful type of teacher and this would be the kind of teacher she would suggest her relatives to hire. Though some of their answers aligned with the rest of participants’ perceptions of NNESTs as able to be potentially qualified and successful in their jobs, Carolina and Graciela’s answers suggest they were the participants with the most opposition to this perception.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Colombian undergraduate prospective teachers exhibited two overarching interests as English and Spanish speakers at the end of their international exchange with their U.S. peers: their meaning making skills in interactions and their adopting and becoming native speaker models. These concerns have influenced their self-perceptions of nativeness in these two languages and as future teachers. The next pages discuss the findings in this study using the aforementioned issues as guidelines for examining participants’ self-perceptions of (non) nativeness: as speakers of Spanish, speakers of English, and prospective English teachers.

Confidence in Meaning Making Abilities and Evolving Self-perceptions of (non) nativeness in Telecollaboration

Being skillful Spanish and English speakers was at the core of participants' self-images regarding their (non) nativeness. In the case of both Spanish and English, it was specifically their confidence in their language abilities to understand and being understood that shaped their self-perceptions. Prior to the telecollaboration participants perceived themselves as highly skillful Spanish speakers. Their confidence in their knowledge and abilities was bolstered by their nativeness. For them, being born in a Spanish speaking country, complemented by their study of the language, was sufficient leverage to claim language expertise. In many cases, there was not even room to think of limitations. Their self-perceptions of nativeness agreed with the ideological premises of what scholars have called the myth of native speaker (Ramptom, 1990; Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah, 1999; Kramsch, 1999).

Concerning English, their self-perceptions embodied the same myth. In stark contrast to the case of Spanish, participants exhibited insecurity about their English language abilities in particular, when confronted with interaction with those regarded as native speakers. Participants considered it improbable that they would acquire the language ability that someone born in the U.S. or England could achieve.

Colombian prospective teachers' self-perception of (non) nativeness as Spanish and English speakers was influenced by their participation in telecollaboration with their U.S. peers. When considering the two languages together, their concern regarding their meaning making abilities while interacting with their international partners became prominent. A functional perspective of their use of English and Spanish, meaning that "successful use of language in context determines the proficiency of the speaker (Mahboob, 2010, p. 1)" seemed to prevail as a

result of participants' realizations about what their communication with U.S. peers required of them.

The kind of concerns and challenges faced by participants because of misunderstandings, are not foreign to telecollaboration experiences. In their classification of potential sources for misunderstandings, O'Dowd and Ritter (2006) underlined the effect of differences between participants' behavior and communication style which are related, not only to their disparities in language abilities, but also their intercultural skills. Ivan's forum participation illustrates this perception:

> A través del proceso que se ha estado llevando a cabo podemos observar que ciertos estereotipos pierden sus bases y que sin duda se juzga a veces sin conocer realmente los hechos. Para este caso, el punto del "hablante ideal" ya no radicaría en hacer o no hacer un uso correcto de las 4 habilidades mas allá de esto radica en hacerse realmente entender con nuestro compañero de la U de Arizona (UniA- FBF5-Abril, 4, 2014). [This process [telecollaboration] shows that some stereotypes lose ground, sometimes there is judgment without knowing the facts. Being an 'ideal speaker' would not be based anymore on using the 4 skills appropriately but beyond that, what should be important is to make oneself understood by one's peers from the U of A].

Prospective teachers' preoccupations with not being able to make themselves understood or to understand their peers challenged their self-perceived expertise they believed they enjoyed as Spanish speakers. They questioned their infallibility when faced with instances in which they were not understood by their U.S. peers; they realized they did not know it all, and they found themselves at odds with trying to resolve the challenges they faced during exchanges. This realization matches scholars' assertions that the mere commodity of holding nativespeakership

credentials does not guarantee expertise in language ability (Kramsch, 1996; Cook, 1999; Rajagopalan, 1997).

Participants perceived these challenging circumstances as a call for improvement on their part. In the case of Spanish, difficulties did not affect their confidence in their abilities as native speakers; on the contrary, given that they usually sorted these challenges out while facilitating communication, their self-assurance was reinforced. For Graciela, as for several of her peers, avoiding misunderstandings and explaining cultural meanings were complications they often encountered, but later overcame:

> Retos como por parte mia como hablante del español,como poderme dar a entender de manera que lo que yo estaba hablando no fuera malentendido ese fue el reto más grande y también otro reto grande fue como dar a entende mi cultura, eeee, en inglés porque hay cosas que yo no podia expresar en inglés…pero al final yo lograba que me entendieran, yo tenia que usar cosas como fotos, videos o páginas para darme a entender…(UniA-ATINT-May, 21, 2014) [The challenges, on my side, as a native speaker of Spanish, well, to make myself understood so what I was saying was not going to be misunderstood, that was the biggest challenge, and also, another big challenge was to make my own culture understood, hmmm, let's say in English, there were things of my culture I could not express in English…but at the end I managed to make my peer understand…I used photos, videos or different pages to be clear…]

Anxiety at the prospect of not achieving understanding, when interacting with those they regarded as native speakers of English, was a salient preoccupation for participants before the telecollaboration. Nevertheless, when the actual exchange unfolded, prospective teachers often managed to communicate with their U.S. peers employing what Firth and Wagner (1997) describe as myriad of conversational strategies for foreign language speakers. Despite their self-

perceived limitations, they generally succeeded as meaning makers in interactions which boosted their confidence in their English. Other studies have reported students' increase in their self-confidence as a result of their involvement in telecollaboration. In Chen, Pedersen, Eslami and Chen's, (2007) study on telecollaboration, 53% of their participants felt more capable in their communication with foreigners and 63% of those same participants felt more confident. Guth and Helm (2012) also determined that their Italian participants perceived they had improved in their speaking skills and in their confidence while involved in FL interaction and exchange.

Ivan summarizes this journey of students facing native speakers through the telecollaboration by means of a metaphor:

> Nos creamos el ideal de ese monstruo nativo… Entonces, me creé el imaginario de "monstruo" de un obstáculo que tenía que enfrentar solo, y ya después de la conversación, con el compartir nuestras culturas, las experiencias, ya hablando un poquito más lingüísticamente, tendríamos que compartirla, tendríamos que hablar y hacerme entender. Entonces ese monstruo se fue haciendo un poquito más pequeño porque, no sé, uno está entre amigos. Entonces, la fluidez es mejor, uno trabaja muchísimo mejor, eh, incluso, se podría decir que habla como que el monstruo ese grande que yo había imaginado en un principio, se vuelve un poquito más pequeño y es algo con lo que yo puedo lidiar (UniA-ATINT-May, 18, 2014). […We create the native speaker monster as an ideal…I created the idea of the monster, an obstacle I had to face on my own, and after our conversations, our sharing our cultures and experiences, at the level of language, we shared language, we had to speak and made ourselves understood …Then that monster became smaller, it was like being among friends and then my fluency was better and I could work better and could even say I spoke better. It was like

> that big monster that I imagined became smaller and now it was something I could cope with…]

For him, the native speaker embodied a serious challenge that would test his abilities in the language; it was the idealization of the highest standard possible and he had the chance to face that monster in the telecollaboration.

Data suggest that those participants who expressed substantial confidence in their language abilities to sustain interactions, perceived themselves as less invested in native-like models of performance at the end of the telecollaboration. Nevertheless, confidence was not the only factor influencing their tendency to distance themselves from their interest in native-like models. Prospective teachers' own peers' examples as native speakers, who were not infallible, along with the knowledge acquired from university classes, seemed to contribute to this shift. In addition, they gained awareness of the difficulty of achieving this standard and that their excessive attention to that objective led them to lose focus on efficient communication. These are struggles described by Byram and Zarate (1996, p. 240) when they discuss the effects that pursuing native speaker models can exert on foreign language learners:

> …the constraints of real time performance began to make evident the problems of imitating the native speaker, first with respect to manipulation of the grammatical system, and then more recently with respect to understanding of the cultural contexts in which a language is used by native speakers.

Confidence as a pivotal factor affecting self-perceptions was part of a complex ecology in the telecollaboration. Scholars in computer mediated communication fields have underlined the interrelation of technology and "the broader ecological context that affects language learning and use in today's society, both inside and outside the classroom (Warschauer, 1998)." Findings in this study point to the relation between participants, their diverse self-perceptions of (non)

nativeness, and their environment. The ecological perspective, which has resonated in recent decades to explain second language acquisition and language education in general (Leather & Van Dam, 2003; Van Lier, 2004), contributes to the understanding of the intricacies of Colombian prospective teachers' evolving language ideologies in telecollaboration.

Theoretically, participants' self-perceptions as meaning makers and their corresponding decrease in aspiration to the native speaker ideal can be related to Risager's (2007), Kramsch (1996), and Byram and Zarate's (1996) elaboration on the concept of intercultural speaker in opposition to that of (non) native speaker. Risager (2007, pp. 222-223) explains that "it [the concept of intercultural speaker] directs attention to the role of negotiator and mediator that the language learner can cultivate through practice and conscious work on the negotiation of meaning: the forming of meaning in interaction." Either as Spanish or English speakers, the telecollaboration led participants to gain awareness that their cooperation with their peers to achieve mutual understanding was their priority in the exchanges. Renata commented:

> Eh, pues sí, creo que de cierta forma me sentí un poco, aliviada, porque, o sea, en cierta forma sentía que bueno ella al menos entendía lo que le quería decir, entendía si, como no sólo el mensaje, sino que también los sentimientos que le querría transmitir…obviamente el acento es algo que me ha estado como torturando desde hace tiempo, pero finalmente ya, si o sea, ya me he dado cuenta que uno, uno siempre va a tener el acento (UniB-ATINT-May,19, 2014). [Hmm, well, I felt relief because, I mean, at least she understood what I wanted to say, she understood, not only the message, but also the feelings I wanted to transmit…obviously having an accent has been torturing me for a long time, but finally, I have realized I will always have it.]

As illustrated in the previous excerpt, mimicking (non) native speakers' abilities became less of a focus for prospective teachers. Their cooperation with U.S. peers to achieve mutual

understanding, in addition to the mediation and negotiation previously mentioned, also subsumes "establishing relationships and managing dysfunctions (Byram, 1997, p. 39)."

Resembling and Modeling Native-Like Ability: Purism, Contradictions and Critical Incidents

Though interacting with U.S. peers in telecollaboration led participants to focus more on their meaning making abilities and, in the case of various prospective teachers, to question their interest in achieving native-like language use, the myth of the native speaker persisted. As Spanish speakers, most of them believed that their nativeness required them to be models for their U.S. peers. They were born in Colombia, a Spanish speaking country with a strong sense of pride regarding the prestige of the variety of Spanish spoken there.[7] Their telecollaboration peers, heritage Spanish speakers (HSSs), have most likely been in contact with ideologies granting native speakership to individuals born in Latin America or Spain; thus, HSSs in the U.S. needed to aspire to those varieties as standards (Valdés & et. al., 2003).

Some Colombian prospective teachers´ peers possessed remarkable Spanish language abilities, had connections with Latin American culture, and used Spanish as their main language for various years during childhood. Despite these characteristics, most Colombian prospective teachers denied them native speaker credentials because they were born in the U.S. and they were learners. This hints at their self-perception as owners of the language and therefore its guardians, which Widdowson (1994) discusses in the case of English, but lends itself ideally to the case of Spanish in this study.

---

[7] A research study conducted by Slebus (2012) found that participants from various countries in Latino America (Argetina, Mexico, Colombia & Spain) favored the Colombian variety as the most "beautiful", specifically the one in Bogotá. This myth is also socially supported through Colombian media as a recent headline, on the webpage of one of the most popular newscasters in the country announced that: "Good Spanish is spoken in Colombia, says RAE." The current government campaign to promote Spanish as a foreign language is also based on the "myth" that Colombian Spanish is "one of the best in the world".

Graciela and Anabela were the exceptions to the majority of participants in this study, in that both of them considered one of their peers as native speakers of both languages. When asked if she thought her peer could be a native speaker of two languages, Graciela answered: "Humm, si, yo creo que sí, porque de acuerdo con el término "native" pues es como relacionado a nacer and pues y ella nació con los dos, con los dos contextos, entonces yo creería que si" UniA-ATINT-May, 21, 2014). [hmm, yes, I think so, yes, because according to the term 'native' that is like related to be born, then she [her U.S. peer] well, she was born with the two of them, with the two contexts, hum, of language and then yes.]

Despite her attachment to one of the most unwarranted arguments to grant someone nativeness, birth, Graciela challenges the myth of the native speaker in one of its main foundations, monolingualism (Cook, 1999; Davis 2004; Kachru, 1994). Within the premises of nativespeakerism, Graciela's peer was supposed to have only one native language. This was her language of birth and which she spoke "perfectly" (English). Nonetheless, for Graciela her peer was exposed to two languages since she was born (English and Spanish) and that meant she was a native speaker of two languages. Graciela's answer, which simultaneously appears to adhere to and reject the myth, illustrates the common discrepancies participants inevitably fell into whenever they tried to elaborate on defining nativeness. This is not a surprise considering that the arguments underpinning nativeness are in themselves ambiguous and inconsistent (Rajagopalan, 1997; Kramsch, 2000; Davies, 2003).

Perceiving themselves as models involved accepting ideologies connected with purism, prescriptivism and standard language. Participants have adopted these ideologies from the education system, institutions in charge of safeguarding the prestige of the language, as the *Real Academia de la Lengua Española* and the society in which they live. They have worked hard at

modeling what they considered a polished Spanish and rejected those language expressions which were not prestigious or standard.

Colombian prospective teachers held well-entrenched beliefs about the use of Spanglish. For most of them, it was used in a joking manner and it merely revealed one´s ignorance concerning the language, laziness or lack of mental ability as Anabela expressed when talking with her peer: "Many times persons who use Spanglish sounds as stupid persons" (Original in English). They had been educated to avoid it at all costs as Renata explains: "en la universidad digamos que el inglés, eh se habla inglés totalmente y el español se habla español e habla español y no se mezclan ¿sí?, es lo que digo, era como una especie de prohibición oculta" [at the University, well, English, er, we speak English completely and when in Spanish you speak Spanish and you do not mix them. Right? That´s what I am saying, it was a kind of hidden prohibition.] Prospective teachers were careful to avoid Spanglish, so that they could earn membership in the academic community of skillful language users (Modiano, 2001).

Colombian prospective teachers' perceptions of Spanglish concurred with ideologies often found in the U.S. education system and privileged classes. In these U.S. spheres, Spanglish is associated with a deficit perspective; the mixture of English and Spanish is not only a deformity of those languages, but most importantly links Latinos to semilingualism (Sayer, 2008) and "deprives the North American Latino community of a major resource in this globalized world: mastery of a world language (Otheguy, & Stern, 2011).''

For most HSSs in the exchange, Spanglish was welcomed, it was part of their tradition, it was useful for communication, and it indicated people were skillful in two languages. Meeting their U.S. HSS peers, for whom Spanglish has been very common in their families and around their neighborhoods where they grew up, opened a new cultural meaning for Spanglish. In exchanges, Colombian prospective teachers appreciated the opportunity to learn about the

sociocultural meaning of Spanglish from their peers and some of them acknowledged that they had actually used Spanglish during the exchange, however, their view of this language practice as a problem prevailed. Malena, was the only participant whose opinions revealed a substantial change in her perception. The following extract from a chat with one of her peers attests to this:

> M: Si total, nosotros hacemos lo mismo, como dices son frases coloquiales.
>
> Además hay algo, y es que uno también usa intencionalmente dentro del idioma de uno, palabras en inglés por ejemplo ya sea para dar énfasis a lo que estás diciendo, o para ser gracioso (UniA-TCH-April, 10, 2014). [M: But think about it, the fact that we use certain words from our mother tongue because we don't know them in English, does not make us less competent?
>
> P: Right. For instance, there are words or phrases in English that my friends and I use which don't have the same context in Spanish because they are more colloquial
>
> M: Yes, we do the same, as you say they are colloquial expressions. There is something else, one uses within one's own language English words, for instance, to emphasize what one is saying or to be funny.]

In conjunction with the previous stigmatization of Spanglish, as not real Spanish or English for that matter, participants exhibited two other ideologies in their self-perceptions as ideal Spanish language models. Firstly, their promotion of prestigious varieties of Spanish, namely, Spanish from Spain, whereas other varieties, like Spanish spoken on islands, on the coasts of countries or in Central America, were deemed undesirable. Secondly, they tried to make the language more "standard" by cleaning it up. For example prospective teachers tried to modify their Spanish by eliminating lexicon or structures that peers might not understand because they were typical of Colombian Spanish.

Colombian prospective teachers embraced the native speakership and associated ideologies mentioned above and this bore consequences for themselves and their peers. For the Colombians, pursuing the ideal native speaker model by attempting to correct all their peers' speech or writing, by using all possible grammar rules was an exhausting task, often proved to be futile. In the case of their peers, after prospective teachers pronounced their judgment concerning Spanglish, several of their U.S. HSSs changed their mind about the favorable regard they held for this language practice.

This was the case of Duban and one of his peers. Duban's peer told him, in a Skype communication:

> I think it [Spanglish] is OK because all of those who know how to speak English and Spanish, it comes easy to them. I don't know, so this is for them to speak in both…I don't know I think it's OK, it is a good thing. (UniB-TSR) (Original in English).

After that, a fragment of Duban's answer to his peer was:

> Why don't you [people in general] just end the sentence in Spanish as you start it? I don't…, I mean, it's good, but sometimes it is like an excuse for some people not to learn the complete er..er..er language, I mean… I mean, it's not correct. (UniB-TSR)

In her final reflection for her university Heritage Spanish class, Duban's peer wrote about her conversation with Duban:

> Tuvimos diferentes opiniones de la situación, él dijo que Spanglish tiene aspectos negativos y yo pensé que tenía aspectos positivos. Ya que cada uno hablo de sus opiniones, realice que su opinión tenia mas sentido. Dijo que el Spanglish esta usada para la gente perezoso o que no quiere aprender la idioma bien. Creo que lo que dijo de esta situación es verdad. (We had different opinions about the situation [Spanglish], he said that Spanglish had negative aspects and I thought it was positive. After each one

> provided their opinions, I realized his opinion made more sense. He said Spanglish was used by lazy people or the ones who did not want to speak the language well. I think what he said about this is true).
>
> In this instance, Duban´s ideologies, undergirding his self-perception as a native speaker of Spanish rooted in purism and prescriptivism, managed to lead his HSS peer to believe that Spanglish, a cultural expression bounded to her bilingualism and biculturalism, was inappropriate. This attests to Train´s (2007) discussion of how the power of the aforementioned language ideologies can construct, or as in this case reconstruct, peoples' "realities of language, community, and identity (p. 209)" so that variability, which is regarded as a complication, is erased not only from language, but also from culture and identity.

As mentioned previously, prospective teachers with more confidence in and a favorable self-perception of their English language abilities seemed to reduce their support for the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies at the end of the telecollaboration. Nevertheless, this tendency was not invariable; participants exhibited contradictions. In her interview Nancy mentioned:

> Pues, digamos, después de la experiencia, yo siento que no es necesario…(xxxx) como desear tanto imitar al nativo. Sino como ser uno mismo y hablar el inglés de una manera apropiada…. Porque uno ya no va a hablarlo de una forma natural, sino como imitando un estereotipo (UniA-ATINT-May, 22, 2014). [Well, let's say that after the experience [telecollaboration] I feel that it's not necessary …like to wish to imitate native speakers but to be oneself and speak English appropriately…because then you are not going to speak naturally but like imitating a stereotype.]

However, in her survey, she wrote, “Creo que lo más valioso es usar un acento apropiado, (no siguiendo ningún estereotipo de "americano" o "británico") evitando que suene como "spanglish" para así poder ser entendido por cualquier hablante nativo” (UniA-ATQ-May, 21, 2014). [I believe the most valuable is to use a suitable accent, (without following American or British stereotype) avoiding sounding as ‘Spanglish’ so that you are understood by a native speaker.] Nancy’s rationale for avoiding a resemblance to native-like language ability is challenged by her own rejection of possible Spanish features in her English and her desire for approval regarding what should be intelligible from native speakers.

Discrepancies also appeared between attitudes towards the two languages. On one hand regarding Spanish, some participants were inclined to be native speaker models for their U.S. peers, which subsumed ideologies of prescriptivism and standardization, among others. On the other hand regarding English, there were some prospective teachers who sought to leave by the wayside the pursuit of native-like language ability. These two tendencies, their support of Spanish language native speaker norms and their distancing themselves from those norms, in the case of English, portrayed participants as less flexible when in the Spanish speaker role. This increasing rigid attitude can be related to their self-perceived ownership and role as language guardians of their “native” Spanish. Renata remarks in a forum: La cuestión del respeto hacia dicha lengua que no nos pertenece es fundamental, así como nosotros procuramos hacer buen uso de nuestra lengua materna, tratando en la medida de lo posible de no ‘maltratarla’” (UniA-FBF-March, 7, 2014). [The question of respect towards that language [English] which does not belong to us is fundamental; in the same way as we make an effort to use our mother language appropriately, trying as much as possible not to ‘mistreat…]

University A participants answers, except Malena’s, by the end of the telecollaboration suggest a connection between their self-perceived language ability, insufficiencies and

insecurities and their inclination to support the native speaker myth. This pattern diverges from the one exhibited by University B students and therefore is worthy of consideration. One explanation for this divergence could be found in the contrasting characteristics of the two university contexts. Prospective teachers at University B, which is a university located in the capital of the country, attend a program focused mainly on English. University A participants attend a university located in a city characterized by a semirural environment and the instructional time in their program is divided between Spanish and English. The educational policy in Colombia has traditionally favored those Colombians who live in urban areas, especially major cities. In a recent study by Medina and Arcila (2013), when comparing their education conditions to those in major cities, Colombian teachers in rural areas indicated that they encounter environments that are less conducive to their learning. They reported issues with the quantity and quality of available technological resources, their reduced need to use English to talk with foreigners and fewer opportunities to engage in cultural activities.

From the start, University A prospective teachers regarded the telecollaboration as an opportunity to experience the authentic model used to improve their abilities and their perception did not vary substantially by the exchange's end. In her final interview, Graciela responded: "De ves en cuando comparé mi forma de como me expreso con mis compañeros. Lo hacía pues quería como un modelo de como usar inglés, algo como inicial para mejorar mi forma de hablar, algo real" (UniA-ATINT-May, 21, 2014). [Sometimes I compared my way to express myself to my peers [from the U.S.] I did it to have like an English language model, a starting point to improve my way of speaking, a real point.] Similarly to the ideology cited elsewhere from Train (2007), in the case of Spanish, Graciela's attachment to native speaker models is based on her belief that there is "real" English, what her U.S. born peers speak, and "no real" English, what she has learned as a foreign language and is a faulty version of the "original." Train (2007, p.

207) specifically defines this ideology as being "legitimated and invested with authority and authenticity with respect to the Native Standard Language, a constellation of hegemonic ideologies of language, (non)standardness, and (non)nativeness." Graciela and Carolina were the only two students who after the telecollaboration experience remained attached to their choice of U.S. English as the variety they would prefer their students to speak because of its prestige. Graciela's ideologies align with those adopted at various levels in Colombia. In this country, native speakers, especially from the U.S. and England, are regarded as the ideal model for language learning (Velez-Rondón, 2003; González, 2010). In fact, they are usually hired to teach without even being trained to do the job and they are also hired as experts by the government to formulate the guidelines of educational policies in English (Guerrero, 2008; Usma, 2009).

Ivan was the only participant whose focus on achieving native-like abilities in English was more noticeable at the end of the telecollaboration than before the exchange. Interestingly, he did not enter the telecollaboration with an unfavorable self-image of himself as a user of the language. On the contrary, he self-evaluated his abilities to be the same as those participants who were less invested in that objective. Ivan's case illustrates that participants' U.S. peers were not blank slates regarding ideologies. They adopted language ideologies rooted in the myth of the native speaker as their Colombian peers did. Ivan's self-perception of language use suffered a major downturn when his peer told him he had a marked accent in English. In the next fragment, Ivan had asked his peer for an opinion about his English:

> P: I think that yours, for example is good, it is good but you have an accent because you are from Colombia.
>
> I: It is the same as yours, how can I improve that? I would like to make it more native. Maybe some advice, how can I improve my accent?

> P: Hmm, that's a difficult question. To improve I recommend a trip to the U.S. Spend time with people in the U.S. and your accent will disappear. (Origianl in English)

His peer's comment about his accent was not taken as an insult. In fact, Ivan and his peer had developed what appeared to be a sincere friendship and he started by praising his English as "good". Nevertheless, someone he regarded as the ideal model, a native speaker, had an objection; "he had an accent". For Ivan "it was like part of [his] English world collapsed (UniA-AT-INT)." His rationalization concerning accent which was shared by his peer matched a widespread ideology of "non-accent'', extensively discussed by Lippi-Green (1997). In Ivan's Colombian society and academic setting, accent was undesirable especially in interaction with native speakers, the quality controllers. He had expressed in his pre-telecollaboration interview that one of his teachers advised him and his peers to work on eliminating their accents to the point where if they made phone calls to the U.S., nobody could tell they were Hispanics. Ivan's concern about accent was further reinforced:

> "My peer told me that in the U.S. there were people with marked accents and that, that was given a lot of importance (UNIA-AT-INT)." In addition, he shared that por ejemplo, estaba viendo una serie, y me di cuenta que las personas con acento son más como, discriminadas, no discriminadas, sino que se burlan un poco de las personas que tienen acento en Estados Unidos, y yo me preocupaba un poco sobre eso, de que si mi acento era fuerte, de que ellos se pudieran burlar de mí (UniA-ATINT-May, 18, 2014). (I was watching a series and I realized that people who have an accent are more like, to be discriminated, not discriminated but people laugh at them in the U.S., I was concerned about that, that if my accent was strong they could laugh at me)

This critical incident led Ivan to channel more his efforts into achieving native-like skills. His preoccupation went beyond intelligibility and into issues concerning speakers' identity, which connect with their language background and index sociocultural categories like origin, race, ethnicity, social class and gender (Lippi-Green, 2007).

Favorable Self-perception of Language Ability: Positive Images as Future Teacher

Based on pre-telecollaboration data, this study established that participants' self-perceptions as future teachers of English supported the native speaker fallacy regarding NNESTs' language ability. This intersects with their concerns regarding their language ability and their adherence to the myth of the native speaker as discussed before. Nonetheless, participants believed that their current and future education would prepare them appropriately to do their jobs. In addition, their self-perceptions did not buttress the native speaker fallacy when considering other relevant realms of NNESTs qualifications and over all, NNESTs were considered more suitable for the Colombian context.

Taking into consideration the three levels of prospective teachers' self-perceptions that this study examines, their self-images as future teachers is at the level where there was less variation in relation to what participants revealed before their telecollaboration with U.S. peers. Participants' answers showed a similar pattern to the one identified before the exchange. In general, as participants' self-perceptions of their English skills and most importantly their confidence in those abilities increased, their self-perceptions as future English teachers were less supportive of the native speaker fallacy. The small changes in self-perception that are evident in participants' surveys, interviews, and other data collection instruments after the telecollaboration showed this tendency. Malena, for instance, expressed the following at the end of the telecollaboration:

> Al comienzo, como en cualquier situación nueva, intranquilidad por pensar en que mis compañeras no me entendieran, que tuviera un nivel de inglés tal como para que mis compañeras simplemente decidieran no continuar. Luego sentimientos de satisfacción por darme cuenta que no solamente mis compañeras sí me entendían, sino que uno va adquiriendo confianza y uno se va arriesgando, aunque poco en mi caso, a ser más espontánea (UniA-ATQ-May, 18, 2014). [At the beginning [of the telecollaboration] as in any new situation, I felt uneasy thinking that my peers might not understand me, that my English level was so poor so they might decide to give up interacting with me. Then, I felt satisfied, I realized that they not only understood me but that one acquired confidence and took risks, though a little in my case, to be more spontaneous.]

Her confidence in her performance using English became more robust and simultaneously her answers suggesting her rejection of the native speaker fallacy as well. She changed three of her answers in the questionnaire characterizing NNESTs as well qualified to do their jobs and that they were better options as teachers for the Colombian context. When justifying why she thought NNESTs could be more successful than NESTs she explained: Puede tener más éxito el hablante no nativo porque, él o ella al ya haber pasado por el mismo proceso de prendizaje…por ende se puede llevar al desarrollo de estrategias y medios que sean más apropiados y eficaces para la enseñanza del idioma (UniA-ATQ-May, 18, 2014). [The nonnative speaker can be more successful because he or she has gone through a similar learning process students have… and then, this can help him or her to design suitable and more efficient strategies to teach the language.]

Interestingly, she was already making connections between her own experience as a learner in the telecollaboration and her future as an English teacher. In one of her weekly reflection logs, she explains how to describe the structure of a Colombian university to her peer

was a challenge. She felt uneasy thinking her peer could not understand what she said. Then she comments:

> Estos momentos han sido muy interesantes porque me han permitido pensar y reflexionar mucho sobre mi futura labor, ponen a prueba mis habilidades y en esa medida trato de encontrar los medios, las formas más adecuadas con el fin no solo de hacerme entender, sino también de entender a la otra persona, su punto de vista, lo que trata realmente de significar para llegar a un conocimiento mutuo más profundo y significativo… (UniA-WRL-February, 28, 2014). [These moments [telecollaboration exchanges] have been very interesting because they have allowed me to think and reflect about my future jobs, they test my abilities and in that sense I try to find the means, the most suitable ways to not only make myself understood but understand my peers' point of way, what they really try to mean so there is deeper and meaningful mutual knowledge.]

Two of the three students, who assigned the lowest self-evaluations to their language abilities at the end of the exchange and whose answer suggested they were less self-assured about their use of English, remained firm in their adherence to the native speaker fallacy. When asked to explain why, after the telecollaboration, she had responded in her survey that she was concerned about being regarded as a non-native speaker teacher in the future, Graciela explained:

> Well, hmm, I think that, hmm, I could see the importance of being a native speaker and being clear about the importance of having clarity in what you are saying, in your ideas when you teach, sometimes it is hard to be understood as a non-native speaker…the exchange made me worry because I need to improve. (UniA-INT)

Findings in this study concur with Llurda's (2008) study on the effects of study abroad on a group of teachers' self-perceptions. Though, Llurda's study's context is a study abroad situation, its focus on teachers' contact with those traditionally called native speakers making it relevant to

the study being discussed in this article. Llurda (2008, p. 111) suggests that "the role of self-confidence in language teaching by NNESTs seems to be important." In his study, the longer teachers stayed abroad, the higher their self-perception of confidence in their language abilities. Wang's (2014) study conducted, in a study abroad experience, yielded similar results. The case of Colombian prospective teachers interacting with U.S. peers can be regarded as aligned with these findings. Their self-perceptions of language ability showed they were more confident after the exchange and those participants with higher self-perceived confidence held a more favorable view of NNESTs' qualifications and their future performance as NNESTs. Another finding in Llurda and Wang's studies reveals a correlation between teachers' longer periods of contact with native speakers and their openness towards "issues relating to the choice of the target language model and cultural values" (2014, p. 74). Their finding can be related to the results in this article. After the telecollaboration, the number of participants who selected English as an international language over British or U.S. English as the variety they would like their students to speak if they were already teachers increased by two. Three others had already selected that choice.

This study's findings concerning the connection between Colombian prospective teachers' robust self-confidence in language ability and their views on NNESTs' qualifications to do their jobs also matches Llurda and Huguet's (2003, p. 230) study with primary and secondary teachers. These scholars posit that, while secondary school teachers were more appreciative of their English language ability and held a "stronger critical awareness of their condition as NNS teachers involved in the teaching of English as an international language", primary school teachers were more insecure about their proficiency and "appear strongly attached to the myth of the NS as the ideal teacher."

Pre-telecollaboration data suggested that most participants began the telecollaboration with highly favorable views concerning NNESTs' qualifications to perform as teachers. Overall, they tended to reject the native speaker fallacy from the start. Because of the paucity of studies with non-experienced pre-service teachers, this study relates its findings to those studies addressing in-service teachers. Nevertheless, a piece of research which can shed some light on Colombian prospective teachers' initial self-perceptions prior to the telecollaboration is Rajagopalan's (2005) study. His findings revealed that less experienced teachers were less concerned about not being native speakers than those who had been working for more than ten years.

CONCLUSIONS

Data collected, prior to prospective teachers´ engagement in telecollaboration with U.S. peers and at the end of the exchange, has informed this study concerning participants' evolving self-perceptions as (non) native speakers of Spanish, (non) native speakers of English and future English teachers. Overall participants' self-perceptions exhibited tendencies to adhere or distance themselves from native-like language ability models.

In telecollaboration, attitudes corresponding to intercultural speakers become a priority favoring Colombian prospective teachers' inclination to lessen their focus on native-like proficiency. Concerning Spanish, when confronted with challenging communicative situations, requiring more than mythical nativespeakership credentials, participants gained awareness of their vulnerability as native speakers and identified aspects needing improvement. In the case of English, participants' success in their communication with peers buttressed their self-perceived confidence in language ability. Participants who were more self-assured in their English skills expressed less concern about not resembling a native speakers. Not only the telecollaboration but also an array of additional factors in connection with participants and their peers, subjectivities,

background, academic settings, and sociocultural contexts, among others, intertwined to favor their evolving ideologies concerning nativeness.

Participants' self-perceptions of (non) nativeness were not completely unattached from the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies at the end of the exchange. Their participation in telecollaboration encouraged their self-images as ideal native speakers whose expectation was to support their peers' language learning. Thus, they exhibited ideologies of standard language purism and prescriptivism. These ideologies have the potential to generate doubt about their language practices and related culture as in the case of Duban and his peer exposed above. Duban's negative view of Spanglish, rooted in purism and standardization, led his peer to change her favorable cultural-based view of Spanglish, to the negative perspective he presented to her. As English speakers, while less confident participants were those who appeared to remain constant to in wanting to achieve native-like abilities, critical incidents seemed to increase their focus on these expectations. Contradictions were not absent from those prospective teachers' who were more confident. In their self-perceptions, they distanced themselves from some of the various nativespeakership ideologies while they believed others or they were not as invested in those ideologies as English Speakers, as they were about Spanish.

This study aligned with previous research which suggested that NNESTs who held an unfavorable regard of their language abilities had tended to adhere to the native speaker fallacy and vice versa, meaning that they adhered to the idea that NESTs are more qualified than NNESTs. In their pre-telecollaboration answers, most Colombian participants rejected the fallacy, a pattern also observed at the end of the exchange. Small changes towards supporting the fallacy appeared in the surveys and questionnaires answers from those prospective teachers who perceived their ability as insufficient and were more insecure of their skills.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Telecollaboration studies have traditionally focused on "native speakers" and "non-native speakers" with the purpose of determining the language gains that the former group can bring to the second. Unfortunately, few intercultural perspectives on telecollaboration delve into the examination of other intra and inter subjective levels of how these characterizations affect participants. Native and non-native speakers are rarely seen for what they primarily are, embodiments of nuanced socially constructed ideologies. Train (2005, p. 264) reminds us that "ICFLE must engage and contest the nativist focus on competence as formal accuracy and communicative appropriateness that is associated with an idealized NS and NSL along with its concerned for communicative efficiency."

This study suggests that telecollaboration has the potential to guide participants, who are the two sides of the myth-native and nonnative speakers, to focus on intercultural concerns rather than on the discouraging, ephemeral and oppressive (non) native roles as language users. Participants in this study gained awareness about their role as language experts whose ability was what they contributed to build mutual understanding. They also strengthened their favorable self-perception of abilities distancing themselves from their initial interest in native-like models as learners and future teachers.

Nevertheless, there were instances during the telecollaboration in which pervasive detrimental (non) nativeness ideologies that influenced participants' self-perceptions remained unmodified or even became stronger. This calls for a revision of telecollaboration design, so that it contributes as much as possible to students' development of ideological literacy (Modiano, 2001) and to "… articulate a frame in which concepts of linguistic and cultural authenticity can be resignified into a notion of agency, expertise, and identity that are not bound to the acquisition of the authorized NSL [native speaker language] practices as the sole means of empowering

speakers..." (Train, 2005, p. 263). In this particular study, there were elements in the telecollaboration which proved to favor participants' critical awareness of their nativespeakership ideologies. The biculturalism and bilingualism of heritage Spanish learners generated an array of opportunities for Colombian prospective teachers´ reflection upon their telecollaborators' background in connection with their (non) nativeness. Introducing logs and forums as weekly reflection tasks allowed participants to go back to those points they identified as relevant in their English and Spanish education and to delve more deeply into their beliefs. Consequently these two activities which were added to their participation in surveys and interviews increased their awareness of their and others' language ideologies.

The robust conceptualization that scholars in ICFLE have put forward in relation to task design can be used successfully in fields like critical language awareness, EIL, and ELF, to inform the construction of suitable frameworks that incorporate students' ideological literacy development as a key objective. In this vein, the telecollaboration design for this study, which included specific tasks with the main purpose of exploring their self-perceptions of the target language ideologies, could be more focused and sequenced. Considering, Belz (2002), Müller–Hartmann (2007) and O'Dowd and Ware's (2009) proposals, the introductory phase of the exchange should encourage students to obtain background information about their peers and share their languageculture identities including their attitudes towards their (non) nativeness. Comparison tasks could, for instance lead participants to analyze attitudes towards language diversity or (non) native speakers in different settings, and in collaborative tasks, students could share their views and self-perceptions that emerged from the previous activities. Ethnography and corpus linguistics in ICFLE lend themselves to the exploration of language variation as a natural condition in language favoring the three categories of issues put forward by Clark, Fairclough, Ivanič, and Martin-Jones (1991, pp. 48-49) "social awareness of discourse", "critical

awareness of diversity" and "consciousness and practice for change". Designing and sequencing tasks, so that critical issues reappear several times throughout the process, would confront participants with their ideologies at various points during the exchange. Such dynamics can create multiple opportunities for students to revise these ideologies which are usually difficult to modify as this study has revealed.

Telecollaboration projects can be incorporated into the teacher education curriculum for several purposes. In a context like the Colombian one, where face-to-face contact with international speakers of English, especially in small cities and towns is limited, ICFLE becomes an additional pedagogical resource seeking to increase not only language participant's ability, but their self-confidence in those skills. In the case of NNESTs, a pivotal issue is to contribute in ways that they feel confidence about their language ability; those favorable unique qualities pertaining to their NNEST background are less likely to be overshadowed by (non) nativespeakership ideologies so that they can work on their empowerment (Medgyes, 1999; Llurda, 2008).

Several prospective teachers mentioned the influence of university courses, namely, sociolinguistics and applied linguistics in their reconstruction of language ideologies. The integration of telecollaboration projects with teacher education courses as the ones previously mentioned is an attractive avenue to bolster their learning. In general, the theoretical perspectives studied in these courses regarding language varieties, languages contact, language attitudes or speech communities among others, can be enriched when participants are actively engaged in actual language practices with international peers.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The vast array of factors influencing participants' self-perceptions of (non) nativeness in telecollaboration expose the "ecological" nature of these exchanges. Providing that language

ideologies are nourished from sociocultural contexts, individuals' cognition and affect issues, an ecological perspective for research on individuals' self-perceptions would likely inform the interconnections among these various factors. The situatedness of ecological research to explore relationships in contexts influenced by time and place and its openness to examine transformations in connection with interventions (Van Lier, 2004), make this research approach an option to better understand the types of self-perception this study addresses in an educational setting.

Another potential line to continue this research emerges from the differences perceived between University B students who reside in a megalopolis and University A participants whose origin and residence is linked to rural and semirural environments in Colombia. Though a clear factor in their tendencies to support the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies is their self-perceived language ability and their confidence in their skills, further research could identify other relevant influences. As suggested by the current study, the origins of ideologies shaping participants' self-perceptions emanate from diverse sources. This type of data can guide language policy and teacher education initiatives in the respective countries.

This study did not integrate a telecollaboration experience that include a highly sophisticated level of design. That is an avenue that might be useful in future studies. Bringing to the fore theoretical perspectives from fields as critical language awareness or language attitudes among others, a further research study can involve ICFLE participants in the development of tasks specially crafted for their examination of self-perception of language ideologies. In this case, an action research paradigm, would lend itself to the continuous observation, implementation and improvement of pedagogical practices.

The mismatch between academic calendars of universities in different countries is a well-known constrain in ICFLE and in this study was not the exception. Participants could only

interact for eight weeks. In order to ameliorate this factor, this study selected those participants who interacted with two peers throughout the exchange, so their contact with international peers was more intensive. Nonetheless, in the case of examining participants' changes in self-perceptions of (non) nativeness, a further study might benefit from a longer telecollaboration, for instance two consecutive academic terms.

CHAPTER 4: THE IMPACT OF ICFLE AFFECTIVE AND KNOWELEDGE-BASED RESOURCES ON SELF-PERCEPTION OF (NON) NATIVENESS

Introduction

The (non) nativeness of telecollaboration participants has traditionally emphasized their language expertise or lack of it. Studies, for instance, explore the benefits that nonnative speakers can obtain when interacting with those regarded as native speakers. Unfortunately, though critical perspectives looking at the (non) nativeness of telecollaborators beyond their socially expected expertise have been suggested (Train, 2005; Guth & Helm, 2010), they have hardly materialized. This paucity of critical views of (non) nativeness in telecollaboration is a surprise considering that in these exchanges participants' profiles emerged in conjunction with their national origin, cultural background and language abilities, all of which are often mythologized and become cornerstones in the ideological construction and pervasiveness of nativespeakerism.

Because one of the multifarious goals of telecollaboration is precisely to encourage participants to develop critical language awareness (Helm & Guth, 210), one would expect that this field contributed in exposing and dismantling harmful beliefs such as the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies. Scholars in applied linguistics, language ideologies, World Englishes (WEs), English as a Lingua Franca (ELF) and English as an international language (EIL) have discussed, analyzed and documented how these ideologies generate discrimination and affect people's sense of self-worth (Pennycook, 1994; Kramsch, 2003; Canagarajah, 1999; Kachru & Nelson, 1996; Brutt-Griffler & Samimy, 2001). These serious consequences resonate when much of the literature on telecollaboration promotes this type of exchange as an opportunity for learners to interact with native speakers without including a critical agenda in guiding theses encounters.

Telecollaboration is a pedagogical design in which speakers vested with multiple identities encounter others who differ from them in multiple ways. This technology requires from them the adoption of moderating and cooperative attitudes to achieve success in their interactions with international peers. It is at this point that participants socially and ideologically constructed as native and nonnative speakers can potentially redefine, not only their language ability but their identities as intercultural speakers (Byram & Zarate, 1996; Byram, 1997).

This study adheres to a sociocultural approach in the Vygotskian tradition to characterize telecollaboration dynamics and resources as vehicles for participants' learning through social and contextualized relationships and the mediation of language employed in online environments (Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012). These tenets leverage an examination of how telecollaboration resources and dynamics can potentially favor or not participants' transition from mythical native and nonnative speakers to intercultural speakers (Byram & Zarate, 1996; Kramsch, 1997). What that transformation can entail is described in Risager (2007, pp. 222-223): "the concept of intercultural speaker directs attention to the role of negotiator and mediator that the language learner can cultivate through practice and conscious work on the negotiation of meaning: the forming of meaning in interaction."

Using principles rooted in qualitative and phenomenological research design, this study specifically examines how the nature of the telecollaboration between Colombian prospective English teachers and U.S. English speaking heritage Spanish learners functions to (dis) allow participants' apparent reconstruction of their self-perceptions of (non) nativeness as speakers and future teachers. In what follows, the article contextualizes the study within the existing literature on the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies and internet intercultural mediated foreign language education.

Nativespeakerism: The Myth of the Native Speaker and Associated Ideologies

In the last decades, some scholars in the field of applied linguistics have adopted a more critical stance towards the study of language teaching and learning. Critical applied linguistics has emerged as a branch of applied linguistics with a focus on issues related to "access, power, disparity, desire, difference and resistance" (Pennycock, 2001, p.6) and the purpose of "dismantling the ideological assumptions and professional doxa involved in applied linguistic practices" (Kabel, 2009, p. 3). In this spirit, nativespeakerism became one of the first concerns which initially encouraged the adoption of a critical perspective in applied linguistics in the 90s.

Generally scholars in applied linguistics associate the term nativespeakerism (Holliday, 2006) with a myriad of language ideologies among them, monolingualism, native standard language, "real language", purism and non-accent (Kachru, 1994; Lippi-Green, 1997; Cook, 1999; Train, 2007). These various ideologies position those vested with native speaker credentials as idealized language models, owners of the language and therefore its guardians and quality controllers (Widowson, 1994); by contrast, nonnative speakers are constructed as deficient communicators (Belz, 2002), perpetual learners, and thus with little or no authority on issues pertaining to the form and function of the foreign language. The previous beliefs parallel the myth of the native speaker (Rajagopalan, 1997; Kramsch, 2000; Davies, 2003) which translates into the native speaker fallacy (Phillipson, 1992) referring to the belief that native speaker teachers are more qualified than nonnative ones.

Inasmuch as the cornerstone concepts in nativespeakerism such as monolingualism and mother tongue are situated in Chomsky's linguistic program, scholars have identified his theory as a precursor of this ideology (Cook, 1999; Kramsch, 2002; Canagarajah, 1999; Davies, 2004; Mahboob, 2005). Chomsky emphasizes a monolingual ideal speaker-listener possessing a

unitary and decontextualized competence which is to a great extent natural, genetically acquired and based on intuition allowing her to produce and make accurate judgments about language.

Critical applied linguistics in conjunction with social and anthropological approaches to the study of language, and nascent fields such as world Englishes, (WEs), English as an international language (EIL) and English as a lingua franca (ELF) have questioned the array of constructs which buttress the native speaker ideology on the grounds of the ambiguity and inconsistency of this set of beliefs. Rajagopalan, (1997, p. 228) posits that "the real issue remains unaltered. It has to do with the myth that purity and authenticity are not merely theoretical constructs but hard facts to be come across in the real world".

The aforementioned biases in this ideology make it difficult to determine who qualifies and who does not "measure up" to native speaker credentials. The number of variables is extensive ranging from the biological Chomskyan arguments to socially constructed notions like the sound of someone's speech and even the way he or she looks. Thus, a substantial part of these criteria reaches beyond the linguistic realm to include sociocultural concerns (Brutt-Griffler and Samimy, 2001; Kramsch, 1997). Speakers' perceived degrees of nativeness further complicate the soundness of this ideology. It is an accepted convention to characterize language users as possessing near native or native like ability meaning that those who do not enjoy native speakership because of origin could at any rate obtain it.

The changing landscape for the composition of the body of native and nonnative speakers around the world emerges as another challenge for nativespeakership. On one hand, the number of nonnative English speakers is exponentially growing (Crystal, 2008); on the other hand, the traditional expectation of nonnative speakers learning the language to communicate mainly with native speakers does not currently apply (Smith, 1976; Gradol, 2003). Nowadays, nonnative speakers' interactions with other non-native speakers is becoming more and more common.

These changes challenge call into question the imposition of native speaker norms on non-native speakers (Cook, 1999; Gradol, 2003; Mahboob, 2005). In a like manner, Train (2010) problematizes the ideologies of national identity underpinning the concept of nativespeakership. The connotation of "nation state", historically packed with ethnolinguistic prejudices (Bonfiglio, 2010) and regarded as the natural environment for acquisition, not only grants legitimate ownership of the language to those born in specific nations, but also "ties the concept to a static model of language acquisition" (Brutt-Griffler & Samimy 2001, p. 104).

Telecollaboration

In the last decade telecollaboration has been embraced as one of the most promising CMC approaches to language teaching and learning (Warschauer, 2001; Blake, 2008). The nature of this pedagogical design can better be grasped when observing another popular name it has been given: internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education (ICFLE) (Thorne, 2005). In order to complement what ICFLE entails, it is worth adding that some of these pedagogical designs, as the one applied in this study, are framed within collaborating educational institutions. In addition, the broad emphasis on "foreign language education" suggests that in conjunction with the development of intercultural and language abilities (Belz, 2003; Belz & Kinginger, 2002; O'Dowd & Ware, 2009; Ware & Kramsch, 2005), ICFLE can support students' advancement in areas including multiliteracies and critical perspectives. (Guth & Helm, 2012; Fuchs, Hauck & Müller-Hartmann, 2012; Train, 2005).

Telecollaboration and sociocultural theory. Among the various approaches that scholars have identified concerning the examination of telecollaboration (Reinhardt, 2012; Dooly & O'Dowd, 2012), this study subscribes to a sociocultural tradition. Sociocultural theory is an umbrella term adopted by various western pedagogical and research philosophies rooted in Vygotsky's cultural historical theory. In Vygotsky tradition, sociocultural theory highlights the

social nature of learning (Vera & Holbrook, 1996; Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007). This entails that as Johnson & Golombeck (2011, p.1) posit "human cognition originates in and emerges from participation in social activities." In the current study, for instance, participants' social interaction with their peers in telecollaboration is regarded as a potential influence in learning. I further argue that such language exchanges between peers through synchronous internet applications, chat and video, can become mediating tools to support their personal reformulation of nativespeakership ideologies. Vera and Holbrook (1996, p. 191), for example, posit that "human activities take place in cultural contexts, are mediated by language and other symbol systems…" and they go on to herald another key principal in sociocultural theory that they "…can be best understood when investigated in their historical development." From the interpersonal dimension, learning moves into an intrapersonal realm. At this stage, internalization or knowledge and the functioning of tools used to appropriate that knowledge, can lead to learning through transformation and reorganization processes.

Although Vygotsky's theory emphasizes the social and cognitive aspects of learning, his embryonic ideas concerning the role of subjectivity categories of human development have inspired other scholars' interest in this dimension. By way of example, in the case of CMC, Darhower, (2002, p. 273) points to "affective functions of interaction" as equally relevant as social and cognitive dimensions in a sociocultural approach.

Studies in telecollaboration have been informed by a sociocultural approach, so that they can delve into participants' development of general language proficiency and socio-pragmatic competence (Kasper, 2001; Belz & Kinginger, 2003; Belz, 2004), interactional features in CMC (Darhower, 2002) and intercultural communication (Belz, 2000; Thorne, 2010). Nevertheless, a sociocultural perspective in telecollaboration has not guided the study of what and how participants think regarding language, its speakers and contexts of use.

Telecollaboration and the intercultural speaker. Foreign language learners´ development of intercultural competence or intercultural communicative competence has been established as a central goal of telecollaboration (Belz, 2007; Belz & Thorn, 2005; Helm & Guth, 2012). Belz (2007, p. 128) justifies this goal based on "the demands of our multilingual and globalized world", "the widely held belief that language and culture are inextricably bound together" and "the humanistic assumption that intercultural understanding is of moral and ethical value." By engaging in telecollaboration, students encounter favorable and unfavorable circumstances, for instance, opportunities for interaction with international peers, pedagogical frameworks and even possible conflicts that enhance their growth as intercultural speakers; thereby, telecollaboration can potentially, but not necessarily enhance intercultural development.

The concept of the intercultural speaker in ICFLE is usually associated with Byram's (1997) work. Despite recent criticism, much of which derives from its original connection to the field of study abroad (Belz, 2007; Risager, 2007), this scholar's intercultural communicative model continues to be embraced by this nascent young field. When compared to other models, Byram's model appears to capture more of the essence of the relationship between the development of a "communicative competence" and an "intercultural competence" as essential goals of foreign language education.

The intercultural speaker, who is the core of Byram's (1997, p. 67) model, is described as an individual who is "able to estimate their degree of proximity to the language and culture of their interlocutor…" or as House (2007, p. 19) puts it, "he or she is a person who has managed to develop his or her own third way, in between the other cultures he or she is familiar with." In order to function as an intercultural speaker, Byram concurs with compositional models (Spitzberg & Changnon, 2009) which establish three dimensions of intercultural competence: attitudes, skills and knowledge.

Byram conceptualizes intercultural speakers as those speakers who should exhibit attitudes conducive to beginning and cultivating relationships with members of other cultural groups they encounter. These attitudes include: respect, openness, curiosity, and willingness to suspend disbelief concerning peers' cultural expressions and belief regarding one's own cultural expressions (Byram, 1997; Deardorff, 2006, Bennette, 2009). In addition to the aforementioned attitudes, intercultural speakers are also expected to possess and develop knowledge of their own culture, their peers' cultures, interactional dynamics and, in general what Deardorff calls sociolinguistics. Attitudes and knowledge leverage a third necessary dimension in intercultural speakers, their "skills of interpretation and establishing relationships between the two cultures" and "skills of discovery and interpretations." (Byram, 1997, p. 33).

As part of the overarching perspective adopted in this study, the concept of the intercultural speaker challenges nativespeakerism. In this vein, Byram and Zarate (1996, p. 241) posit that "…to define the socio-cultural dimension of communicative competence, we have suggested that a model of the intercultural speaker should replace that of the native speaker…" The mythical native speaker, whose leverage focuses on idealized language expertise, becomes obsolete as the encounter of distant peers in culturally diverse contexts demands more than idealized knowledge to succeed in telecollaborative environments. The opposition between these two conceptualizations, the native speaker and the intercultural speaker which eventually become social ideals, is also underscored by Risager (2007) who favors the latter for acting as "negotiators" and "mediators."

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Guided by an overarching qualitative approach (Patton, 2002; Glesne, 2006; Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Creswell, 2007), and specifically rooted in social constructivism (Schwandt, 2001; Patton, 2002; Guba & Lincoln, 2005) and phenomenology (Van Manen, 1990; Schwandt,

2001; Creswell, 2007), this study seeks to answer the following question: how does the nature of the telecollaboration between Colombian prospective English teachers and U.S. English speaking heritage Spanish learners function to allow participants' reconstruction of their self-perceptions as (non) native speakers and prospective teachers?

Because their focal points gravitate towards comprehending and exposing the multi-layered significance that a concept, in this case (non) nativespeakerism, has in the lived experiences of participants (Creswell, 2007), social constructivism and phenomenology favor the examination of telecollaboration as it relates to participants' self-perceptions. These qualitative approaches also leverage the sociocultural tradition behind ICFLE to which this study subscribes. They underscore the influence that peers can have in each other's acting and thinking. Furthermore, these approaches embrace a historical perspective concerning the change in mental constructions. In addition, a case study approach understood, "not as a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied" (Stake, 2005, p. 443), contributes to translate the previous epistemological and ontological assumptions into a research framework.

Setting

The Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia (University A) was one of the two Colombian institutions involved in the study. The university is located in a small city with approximately 145,000 inhabitants characterized by a semirural environment in one of the neighboring Departamentos (states) to the capital city, Bogotá. University A offers a five-year-B.Ed. in education (EFL and Spanish as a mother tongue). The second Colombian university participating in the study was Universidad Nacional (University B). This institution is located in the capital city, Bogotá, which is a megalopolis, with approximately 7 million inhabitants. University B offers a 4-year B.Ed. in education (EFL) and instructional time is concentrated in only one language, English.

Colombia's population is mostly monolingual Spanish speakers (Ordonez, 2011). The variety of this international language spoken in Colombia enjoys high prestige, as a study by Slebus (2012) on language attitudes reveals. This perception concurs with the government's promotion of Colombian Spanish as one of the best in the world. The media has started a similar campaign by promoting this variety on similar grounds using the authority of *Real Academia de la Lengua Española* (RAE). Despite the apparent support of the official language, English and its speakers have historically gained prominence through governmental neoliberal and globalization policies (González, 2010; Usma, 2009). The U.S. variety of English enjoys the highest prestige in the country due to Colombia's economic and political relations with this superpower and the U.S. cultural influence around the world (Velez-Rendon, 2003). British English is also popular because of this country's steady and strong marketing campaign in relation to resources and actions for the teaching of the language and certifications (González, 2010).

A U.S. university, located in the Southwest of the country, became the partner institution for the two Colombian universities in the telecollaboration. This institution is located in Tucson, a city very close to the border with México. The city and the university are heavily influenced by the Hispanic culture. Colombian participants interacted with Sixteen U.S. born student from this institution. All of them were of Hispanic heritage; they were first, second or third generation born in the U.S. Some of their family members migrated mostly from Mexico, but also from other Latin-American nations.

Most of them learned the Spanish they knew from their exposure to the language at home. This contact usually started during their childhood but by the time they entered the school system, English became the dominant language and the majority only heard Spanish from relatives without much speaking practice of the language. Therefore, they lost much of their

Spanish speaking ability and for the most part did not develop a high level of reading and writing expertise.

Despite their lack of self-assurance with their use of Spanish, they exhibited a strong connection with Hispanic culture; in fact, most of them identified as Mexican Americans or Hispanic. Their reasons for registering in the course usually involved their desire to regain the confidence and ability to communicate with their Spanish speaking family members, to expand their knowledge of the Hispanic culture or to increase professional opportunities, rather than the mere need to fulfill a requirement to complete their program.

Telecollaboration Design and Implementation

Participants engaged in telecollaboration with their U.S. peers in the spring of 2014. Due to mismatches between academic calendars of the two institutions, the exchanges took place for 8 consecutive weeks. Every week telecollaborators met virtually for hour-long sessions. These were part of the guidelines all students in the three universities were provided by their professors at the beginning of the exchanges (See Appendix C). Pairs were matched according to their time availability. Most Colombian participants were assigned to two U.S. peers because while there were 2 classes in Colombia, one in each university, there were 3 in the U.S. Instructions required pairs to establish communication 50% of the available time in English and 50% in Spanish.

A Facebook page was created as an official site for the telecollaboration (See Appendix D). Access to the page was restricted only to members of the participating classes. Telecollaborators interacted through synchronous communication tools including the chat application on the Facebook page of the group and video or audio call through Skype. Based on instructions, they engaged in chatting approximately 5 of the sessions and they were required to Skype for at least 3 encounters.

The pedagogical tasks were the product of negotiation between the professors involved and they were also heavily shaped by the existing curriculum at the U.S. university, involved in this study, which already included an online chatting assignment among peers in the same class. The structure of the telecollaboration gravitated towards pre-established conversation topics between peers. Participants needed to complete preparation tasks and often times they employed the products of the pre-telecollaboration to discuss topics with peers. In addition, telecollaborators were also provided with questions (prompts) for conversations according to topics. In general, topics included issues pertaining to their daily life, biographies, heritage and traditions, and language background (See Appendix C).

Participants

The main research question in this study focuses on prospective Colombian English teachers, thus they were the group from which participants emerged. In total, 20 University B and 22 University A prospective teachers telecollaborated with U.S. peers. However, not all of them were selected as participants. First, the primary investigator selected only those prospective teachers with two peers and who missed no more than one session. Subsequently, those participants who completed the primary research instruments (interviews, surveys and telecollaboration recordings), in addition to their weekly reflection logs, were included.

Finally, based on 20 questions that were repeated in both questionnaires, one (prior to the telecollaboration) and the other (after the experience), the principal investigator designed a matrix to track how student answers changed. Prospective students who changed their answers to at least 6 of the 20 questions became participants in the study. As a result of the previous criteria, 3 University B and 5 University A prospective English teachers qualified as participants.

The three University B participants, Nancy, Duban and Renata, were attending the third English course in a sequence of six in a B.Ed. in Education (EFL) program when they engaged in

the telecollaboration experience. In this program, instructional time focuses on the English language. Nancy and Duban were 18 years of age and born in Bogotá. Renata was 25 years old, born in the capital city of a northern state and as an adult moved to Bogotá. The three of them started their education in English when they were in pre-school or early elementary education. While Renata joined the program drawn by her desire to become a teacher, Duban enrolled because he liked the language and Nancy wanted to find opportunities to expand her knowledge of English by interacting with native speakers. Nancy had had contact with native speakers during her pre-school education in a bilingual school. In the case of Duban, starting the previous year, virtual chats became the means for him to practice English with native speakers. Two teachers' assistants from the U.S. and England, who supported instructors' classes, were Renata's only contact with native speakers and they also interacted with Duban and Nancy.

Malena, Carolina, Anabel, Graciela and Ivan were attending the Intermediate English I course when they participated in the study. This was a course in the Modern Languages program (EFL and Spanish as a mother tongue) at Universidad Pedagógica y Tecnológica de Colombia, (University A), in a small city of 145,000 inhabitants, characterized by a semirural environment. Carolina, Anabel, Graciela and Ivan's ages were between 18 and 20. Malena was 25 years old. Carolina and Malena were born in small rural towns while the other 3 participants were born in a bigger city. They all started their education in English by the end of their elementary school and similarly to University B participants, they had not travelled to any country where English was the language spoken by the majority of inhabitants. Their contact with native speakers of English had been through teaching assistants from England, the U.S. and Jamaica who assisted in their English classes. They all enrolled in the program seeking to become language teachers.

Data Collection Instruments

Phenomenological and semi-structured interviews (Seidman, 2006), questionnaires, telecollaboration transcripts and reflection logs became primary research instruments in this study. The primary investigator administered a questionnaire prior to the telecollaboration and another just after the official exchange came to an end (Appendixes D & E). Items in the questionnaires were written in Spanish, like all the instruments employed in the study, and they were taken and/or adapted from existing instruments (Medgyes, 1999; Rajagopalan, 2005; Llurda, 2008) to ensure their validity. The primary investigator administered the two surveys by means of Qualtrics software. The first questionnaire inquired about pre-service teachers' demographics and background, self-perceptions as speakers of Spanish and English, and self-perceptions as prospective (non) native speaker EFL teachers. The final questionnaire elicited similar information to the first one and in addition it gathered data concerning their perceptions of the telecollaboration and their peers' (non) nativeness. Questions concerning biographical information were excluded.

After each survey, prospective teachers participated in an interview. Survey questions were similar to several of those in surveys (Appendix F & G). The interviews sought to elicit information to expand on questionnaire answers and to delve into issues that arose in their telecollaboration exchanges. Interviews were conducted via Skype and participants selected the type of contact with which they felt more comfortable, audio or videocall. The primary investigator employed an internet application and a free software (digital autorecording) to record the conversations. Subsequently interviews were transcribed. The first interviews lasted approximately 50 minutes and the second ones were longer, from one hour to one hour and fifteen minutes. In accordance with Seidman's (2006) phenomelogical design for interviews, the first interview addressed participants' history as learners prior to the exchange and their self-

perceptions. The second interview was adapted to elicit information concerning perceptions in connection with the telecollaboration and the meanings participants made of their self-perceptions considering the two interviews.

A third instrument was the transcript of participants' telecollaborations. Their conversations via chat on Facebook or video/audio calls were recorded. Prospective teachers copied the text of chats and sent them to the email account of the primary investigator who also obtained a copy of those records from U.S. students in the course at the U.S. university involved in this study. Similarly they recorded their Skype conversations using the same application that the principal investigator employed to record interviews with them. In total, the primary investigator collected 80 Facebook chat texts and 45 Skype call recordings.

Every week participants wrote a one page reflection log and participated in a Facebook forum for each one of the eight weeks throughout the experience. The purpose of the logs was to capture participants' self-perceptions of their (non) nativeness in relation to their English and Spanish language abilities and their future teaching practice. The primary investigator provided guidelines for how to write the logs and a fixed list of 8 topics and questions to focus their reflection (See Appendix H). They selected one of the 8 topics and started by briefly describing an incident they considered meaningful for them during the target week. Subsequently they elaborated upon the incident by answering the reflection questions. Prospective teachers produced fifty six weekly logs. Participants engaged in the forums only with their Colombian peers to discuss topics concerning language ideologies and the telecollaboration experience (See Appendix I). The researcher assigned the topics and participants were expected to provide one original post and two reactions to peers' posts. Logs and forums were curricular activities for Colombian pre-service teachers and their professors graded them based solely on their completion.

Data Analysis

The primary investigator organized data for analysis with the help of Envivo software for qualitative research. Folders were created for each university, participant and instruments. Within each participant folder, chronological organization was used. A first reading of the data contributed to reducing information connecting it with the main theoretical constructs in the research question. Based on Miles, Hubberman and Saldaña´s (2014) suggested procedure, the primary investigator coded data in two cycles. The first cycle incorporated descriptive and envivo techniques to support the identification of initial patterns within relevant data. The second cycle required to group similar patterns into themes displayed in a tree-shaped fashion by means of the software. On the whole, in addition to organization, the software was useful to explore, visualize and codify the data.

The study of patterns allowed the construction of categories and subcategories (Marshall & Rossman, 2011; Merriam, 2009) with the support of analytic memos to record the ongoing reflection process and clustering to compare and explore relationships among patterns. Constant testing and verification of data in multiple revisions of initial categories and subcategories produced the final version of findings included in this manuscript. The primary investigator conducted this process with the data from each participant. Afterwards, by comparing and contrasting categories among individual students, findings were corroborated and revised not only in regards to the soundness of those categories, but also the interrelations among them.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses how the pedagogically presumed cooperative and intercultural nature of ICFLE, when set in the specific context of this study, became an avenue for participants' potential reconstruction of their self-perceptions as (non)native speakers and prospective teachers. Two patterns were established to explain the connection between the

telecollaboration's resources and how Colombian prospective teachers develop understandings of their ideologically charged statuses as language users: 1) participants' involvement in affective dynamics of shared identification as (non) native speakers and 2) their access to information and experiences that would be essential to their rationalizations.

Affective Dynamics of Shared Identification as (non) Native Speakers

Even before the beginning of the telecollaboration with their U.S. peers, what Colombian prospective teachers expected from their participation seemed to align with the predicated nature of these online exchanges. They looked forward to establishing cooperative relationships, so that they could learn from each other. Their awareness of solidarity as a fundamental condition for the progress of exchanges was expressed in pre-telecollaboration interviews.

Participants' self-perceptions as native speakers of Spanish and nonnative speakers of English suggested a duality that they sensed they shared with their peers and for most of them generated equal conditions as interactants. Nonetheless, they expressed anxiety and nervousness at the prospect of interaction with their peers as native English speakers, in contrast to the willingness to help these same peers when they regarded them as Spanish language learners. Once the telecollaboration started and throughout its development, in either of the aforementioned circumstances, all the participants exhibited solidarity as they attempted to understand and be understood. Three affective dimensions, associated with their mutual construction of (non) nativeness meanings, were commonly identified in participants' telecollaboration with U.S. peers.

Mutual encouragement. Renata´s frame of mind regarding her interaction with her U.S. peer can be traced to a period prior to the actual telecollaboration. In her pre-telecollaboration survey, when asked about her expectations for the exchange, she explained:

> Yo estaba mirando el grupo en Facebook y pues vi que hay varios estudiante de la Universidad de Arizona tienen como apellidos latinos, entonces me llamaba la atención, o sea es como curioso, porque, puede que tengan como familia latina, o que estén muy relacionados con la cultura latina, entonces va a ser como, como no sé, o sea, nos entendamos mejor o algo así, o sea que no haya como una barrera cultural tan gigante para podemos entender (UniB-PTINT-March, 2, 2014). [I was looking at the Facebook group I noticed that various students from the U.S. University had Latino last names. They might have, like… Latino families or that they are very well connected with this culture, so that would be like, like, I don't know, it could be we understand each other better or something like that, probably there won't be such big cultural barriers to understanding each other.]

Considering the relationship that Renata forged with Erin, it seemed her expectations were met. They developed a friendship and in their recordings it was not rare to hear them laughing. Renata justified this success in terms of their early Skyping (they were instructed to start with chat, but they Skyped from their first conversation), their being fortunate for not having any technological problems, their mutually perceived responsibility in the exchange, and their language ability equity.

In the following excerpt of Renata's Skype conversation with Erin about being bilinguals, two of the affective levels associated with their mutual construction of (non) nativeness meanings appeared.

P: Would you consider yourself as a bilingual person?

R: Well, I mean, I don't consider myself as a bilingual person but I…I would say that my level is between B1 level, according to European framework, so yes they have like three categories…and I am like in B1 according to all the tests and university exams and I am in the process to reach a B2 but It is a hard path to follow and C2 which is the higher level, as far as I know it is the native level, of course, a second language apprentice cannot reach that level that easy you know but I can reach like a C1…and that would be like being bilingual, that is very hard to reach, I need like my whole life to reach that level, yes?

P: Yes, but I mean, right now where you are is very good! (Raising intonation), I mean, I see you are doing very good in your English, I mean you write and you also speak it well, maybe with a little accent but that's normal. (She laughs)

R: Oh, Thank you.

P: and you seem to understand me very well, I thought you would consider yourself a bilingual at this level. (Raising intonation again) (UniB-TSR-April, 13, 2014) (Original in English)

Mutual encouragement was a common expression of solidarity when participants shared their disappointment for their lack of ability associated with their self-perceived nonnativeness. In the case of Renata, her judgment of language ability was strongly entrenched in an ideology of native standard language; the Colombia government adopted and imposed, at all levels of education, the Common European Framework of Reference standards (Valencia & Zarate, 2005; Guerrero, 2008) which is based on the native speaker as the ideal.

In this vein, "the authority, validity, and reality of the standard language and its speakers (Train, 2007, p. 214)" led Renata to conclude that she was far from the ideal and she voiced her frustration as a "second language apprentice" who could probably not aspire to native ability and

would have to conform with near-native skills at the cost of hard work throughout her life. Her peer, who was more flexible in her judgment of her own bilingualism because it was a matter of "who [she was] speaking to (UniB-TSR)", praised Renata's English and provided positive feedback regarding her communication skills. Renata wrote the following in her log about this dialogue revealing how this encouragement influenced her self-perception as a user of English:

> Definitivamente lo sucedido si me hizo ser más consiente no sólo de mi uso del inglés, sino de la forma en que me siento respecto a él, y a darme cuenta que en ocasiones me vuelvo muy dura conmigo misma y no soy capaz de rescatar lo bueno que he cultivado en mi proceso de aprendizaje del inglés (UniB-WRL-April, 16, 2014). [Definitely what happened made me more aware not only of my use of English, but also of how I feel about it and to realize that sometimes I am too harsh with myself and I cannot see the good fruit I have cultivated in my English learning process].

Renata's self-perceived awareness as a result of her dialogue was also recorded in her final interview. She seemed to be more aware of her negative tendency to judge her English language ability, and despite the native standard language ideologies undergirding her judgment, she opens herself up to a possible change in her views and attitude. Goldstein (1999, p. 648), within the sociocultural tradition, explains that "the very notion of the co-construction of mind implies a high degree of interpersonal connection between the individuals working together." Renata's interpersonal connection not only involved the exchange of what she and her peer thought at a cognitive level concerning their status as language learners, it also subsumed her peers' encouragement. We see here then the important role of this affective dimension as intertwined with cognition (González, 2000; Mahn & John-Steiner, 2002; Daniels, 2010) in bolstering Renata's openness to new perspectives which can potentially reshape her self-perception of nonativeness.

Tolerance. The second affective level revealed in the same conversation above was the *tolerance* that Renata's peer exhibited towards her uniqueness as an English speaker. When providing feedback to her, Renata's peer made her accent a salient feature of her language use. Renata's peer held the pervasive assumption about accent as an imperfection in language ability. This belief, which is included in the vast list of myths and ideologies associated with nativespeakerism (Lippin-Green, 1997), was also shared by Renata. For these two second language learners, who were educated in contexts where native-like models are the ideal, there was an expectation that they would constantly encounter detrimental views regarding accented language and to great pains to eliminate it (Derwing, 2003).

Despite her unfavorable view about exhibiting an accent, Erin diminished its relevance through her awareness of accents as a regular occurrence in people. Her interaction (in the exchange included above) made manifest her great appreciation of her peer's language ability despite her accent. Renata, who in the pre-telecollaboration survey expressed that she was concerned about her accent in English, by the end of the exchange when asked about the comment Erin had made involving her accent recorded in the last survey:

> Bueno, sí creo que de cierta forma me sentí un poco, aliviada, porque, o sea, en cierta forma sentía que bueno ella al menos entendía lo que le quería decir, entendía si, como no sólo el mensaje, sino que también los sentimientos que le querría transmitir con lo que le comunicaba y pues sí, pues obviamente el acento es algo que me ha estado como torturando desde hace tiempo, pero finalmente ya, si o sea, ya me he dado cuenta que uno, uno siempre va a tener el acento, o sea, incluso por ahí también he leído al respecto teorías que uno no debería ni quiera debería avergonzarse de su acento porque, porque eso significa que uno es una persona bilingüe, que uno habla dos idiomas, cosa que no todas las personas en el mundo hacen y pues ese tipo de cosas me ha ayudado a

> sobrellevarlo mejor… hasta el momento no recuerdo a nadie que pues hablando su lengua nativa y hablando una segunda lengua, no tenga al menos un leve rastro de acento sea inglés o español (UniB, ATINT-May, 19, 2014). [Err, well, yes, I somehow felt alleviated, I felt she understood what I wanted to convey, she understood not only the message but the feelings I wanted to communicate and well, yes, my accent has tortured me for a long time, but finally I already, I mean, I have already realized that I will always have an accent, I have even read theories explaining that you don´t have to feel ashamed because of your accent because that means you are bilingual, that you speak two languages and not everybody can do that. All that has helped me to be over it…Up to now I don´t know anybody who does not have at least a small trace of an accent speaking either their native language or a second one.]

Though it cannot be argued that this apparent change in Renata's self-perception regarding her accent was completely due to her interaction with her peers, it is undeniable that her exchange became part of the ecology that led her to rethink her attitude towards accent. Concerning her dialogue with Erin, Renata's mindset underlying her self-perception of accent as a nonnative speaker was influenced by her awareness that even with an accent her peer understood the content of her ideas, and equally important, there was a personal level of connection through which they understood each other's circumstances and respected their particularities.

In addition to a sociocultural perspective like the one indicated above in the case of mutual encouragement, intercultural theory can potentially contribute to this study´s elaboration on the relevance of participants' tolerance as associated with an affective level in their revision of self-perceptions. Risager (2007, pp. 222-223) explains that "it [the concept of the intercultural speaker] directs attention to the role of negotiator and mediator that the language learner can cultivate through practice and conscious work on the negotiation of meaning: the forming of

meaning in interaction." In order to act as mediators, telecollaborators need a myriad of attitudes, which are highlighted by multiple models of intercultural communication, including Byram's (1997). The tolerance that Renata's peer displayed towards her, a speaker of English living a different context, is manifested in the above exchange. Erin attenuated her own view of accent as undesirable and "suspend[ed] disbelief and judgment (Byram, 1997, p. 34)" of Renata's English language ability. This allowed the two peers to negotiate their self-perceptions of nonnativeness in the exchange and to contribute to Renata's ongoing personal self-image reconstruction into a more comforting idea of herself as an accented English speaker.

Sharing their concerns. A second fragment of Renata´s Skype conversation with Erin serves as an example of the last affective level within participants' and their U.S. peers': their sharing similar concerns. This time it is Erin who voices her views about being or not being bilingual:

> E: Hay mucha que gente que no sabe el español mucho como yo pero sineto que todavía ago mucho errores y unos errores pequeños que se ven como, 'ella no sabe español', y me pongo nerviosa, como si y no, yo creo que eso depende a la persona que me pregunta, si él no sabe español le digo que si, pero si el sabe español, ay no! Yo no me creo bilingüe.
>
> R: Si te entiendo es como que si es una persona que sabe mucho más español te sientes como con más presión y se te borra el casset.
>
> E: Yes.
>
> R: A mí me pasa lo mismo en inglés y como que se te olvida todo lo que sabes y uno siente que acuta como un tonto, y no es 'ay por dios! Qué estoy haciendo. Cierto, ¿es algo así?
>
> E: Si, asi me siento también. (UniB-TSR-April, 13, 2014)

(E: …There are many people who don't know as much Spanish as I do, but I feel I still make many mistakes and well, some small mistakes that look like, 'she does know Spanish' and I get nervous. It is like yes and no [she considers herself bilingual] that depends on who I am speaking to. If he doesn't know any Spanish I would tell him yes, but if he knows Spanish, I still don't think of myself as a bilingual person (she laughs).

R: Yes, I understand your feeling. It's like…if it is a person who knows a lot of Spanish you feel like with more pressure and then everything in your head is like empty.

P: Yes.

R: The same happens to me in English is like you forget what you know and you feel you act like a fool, 'Oh my god, what is it that I am doing?' Right! Something like that?

P: Yes, that's how I feel too.)

The two peers discovered their shared insecurity concerning their language ability when they encounter more expert speakers, who are potentially those regarded as native speakers; this nervousness impacts their language performance. Thus, they share the vulnerability of being in a socially-regarded less advantageous position. In her final interview, when asked about her relationship with Erin, Renata replied:

…Juntas tenemos ese mismo sentimiento, yo creo que también a partir de ahí, pues cómo que empezó a fluir la cosas más natural y yo me relaje un poco en eso de no hacer todo perfecto, no pretenderlo, o sea porque era posible, sino pues hacer lo mejor que podía y pues disfrutar y ya (UniB-ATINT-May, 19, 2014). […Both of us had that fear of using language wrong and at a certain point we had a conversation about it and we keep this feeling, I think that from then on things started to flow more naturally between us and I relaxed a bit in trying not to do everything perfect, not to pretend, I mean it is impossible, the idea was to do the best I can and enjoy and that's it.]

For Renata, sharing her fears with Erin, not only infused their relationship with a sense of ease, but also contributed to her understanding that in aspiring to ideal models, she was chasing an unattainable goal. Considering, as discussed above, the role that the development of "attitudes to value others" can potentially play for intercultural speakers, the influence of Renata's openness to share her fears on building more favorable self-perceptions of nonnativeness aligns with findings in studies conducted by O'Dowd (2003), Stickler and Emke (2011) and Schenker (2012). These studies highlight the impact of telecollaborators' development of personal relationships, which includes communicating feelings and opinions about their learning to responsive peers.

Internet resources, affect and portrayed images of (non)nativeness. The three previous affective dimensions prevailed across the eight participants in the study. Pre-telecollaboration data and information gathered at the end of the exchange suggest that participants' sense of affinity with their peers because of their shared Hispanic roots and the academic nature of the exchange might have facilitated their establishment of cooperative relations with peers.

Nevertheless, an incident between Anabela and one of her peers, Chava, illustrates the type of tensions that telecollaboration can involve and which can increase participants' discomfort with the limitations they associate with their self-perceive nonnativeness. Anabela, whose self-perception of English language ability was less favorable than most of her Colombian peers and who often expressed concerns regarding her oral communicative skills, interacted with a peer she considered a native speaker of both languages. Hence, her peer was in a more advantageous position than her in relation to the languages they were studying. In the next excerpt, Chava questioned Anabela's suspected use of a translator in their second chat conversation:

C: Puedo notar que duras un poco en contestar me…y también no veo que estas escribiendo…estas usando un translator? No hay pena, pero tenes mucho que compartir, y no tengo toda la hora hoy. (I noticed that you are taking too long in answering and I do not see you are writing. Are you using a translator? You shouldn't feel ashamed of that but we have a lot to share and I cannot stay the whole hour today.)

A: tenemos* (We have) (She corrects her peer conjugation of the verb; they had agreed in providing feedback before as they chatted).

A: No, I don't use translate...

C: i have a family dinner, so i will need to leave the chat at the 45 mark, if that is ok with you.

A: I just take my time to write as good as I could.

C: Yes, that is important! Ok, i was just checking, because the bubble that shows you typing, isn't always there, and then there is a paragraph later. Ha ha, just wanted to make sure (UniA-TSR-March, 9, 2014). (Original in Spanish and English).

Though Chava tries to mitigate what might have sounded like a blunt complaint by explaining why it would be problematic if Anabela were using a translator and showing understanding, it was clear she objected to her use of a translator. Anabela denies it and explains why it is taking her so long to write in English. The fact that Chava, who is regarded as a native speaker of both languages by Anabela, questioned her possible use of a translator and ultimately demands from the Colombian prospective teacher to be faster in writing in English, could have reflected power inequality their relationship. Anabela commented in her final interview:

Muchas gracias, otras veces, pues sí, por la facilidad que tienen los computadores, pero, no, jamás traductor, nunca en mi vida, yo creo que nunca empleé el traductor y, y pues que ella me dijera eso, pues, en su momento fue como eh, me sentí como atacada, pero

> ahorita me pongo a pensar y me parece gracioso porque no lo haría…Entonces, yo creo que de ahí para adelante yo procuré hacer las cosas como muy rápido, como muy, 'piensa rápido, escribe rápido, enviar' Entonces, pero sí fue bastante brusco, eso sí, o sea, en un momento como atacada (UniA-ATINT-May, 20, 2014). [I thank technology because, yes, computers make things easier, but no, I would never use a translator, never in my life, I never used a translator and, and well that she said that, at certain point it was like, I felt like attacked but now when I think about it I laughed because I wouldn't do it…I think from then on I tried to do things fast, like, 'think fast, write fast, send it then, but it was very rude, I felt I was being attacked.]

In this case, *encouragement and tolerance* were overlooked, and pressure was brought to the fore. It seems that Chava's expectation of efficiency was based on her belief that her peer needed to act with the fluency she expected of herself. The absence of tolerance and encouragement in a relationship that Anabela had just started to build with a person she defined as a native speaker might have compromised the expected cooperation between the peers. From her answer, her denial about using this tool was noticeable and suggests that she did not desire to be associated with a practice that could invest her with the social stigma of incompetence and that might portray her as breaking expected rules of peer interaction.

In the end, this incident did not seem to harm Anabela's relationship with her peer and there was no evidence of any repercussions on her self-perception as a nonnative speaker of English. The two peers engaged for the number of required exchanges, respectfully accepted and provided feedback, and in their recorded interactions they constantly laughed together and were open to sharing information. The brief comment provided by Anabela when asked if she had established a closer relationship with any of her peers hints at this: "Cada semana era diferente, yo creo que una semana me sentía como más cómoda con César y otra con Amanda" (UniA-

ATINT-May, 20, 2014). [Every week it was different, one week I felt more comfortable with Chava and the next with Victor (her second peer).]

This situation reveals a close connection between the affective dimensions associated with participants' self-perception of (non) nativeness and their use of technological resources in the telecollaboration. Four of the eight participants in the study felt that chatting or Skyping was connected with the image that peers could form of them in regards to their level of language expertise and this was of paramount importance for them. Chatting allowed them more time to think and they could find additional resources like online dictionaries to provide more accurate answers, thus their chances of making mistakes decreased. One of them, commented that when he had access to these resources "somehow [he] could pretend [he] knew things beforehand." Moreover, they thought that chatting did not allow their peer to realize they were nervous.

In contrast, for these four participants, Skyping exposed them physically and they felt anxious at the prospect of peers noticing their mistakes which oftentimes led them to make more mistakes. Another disadvantage of Skyping was the possibility of connection quality problems which they believed might, for instance result in sound interference, and ultimately be misinterpreted as limited comprehension skills. Colombian prospective teachers also feared they might have their expertise as native speakers of Spanish called into question when internet technologies affected the exchange quality.

These findings match a study conducted by Yamada and Akahori (2007) on online social presence which revealed that the absence or presence of a peer's image influences participants' consciousness of their second language in communication generating different attitudes when chatting in contrast to videoconferencing. Chatting brings more comfort and relaxation than videoconferencing; however, it triggers anxiety since participants' realize that their mistakes are more obvious and may be printed. Videoconferencing fosters higher emotional and intellectual

connection between peers but its fast speed compared to regular conversation can generate anxiety in learners and the possibility of mishearing is also a threat to their performance. These findings resonate with the case of Colombian prospective teachers since internet technologies associated with telecollaboration influence their awareness of possible favorable or unfavorable social images as (non) native speakers; as a result, affective dimensions such as anxiety and confidence are likely to emerge and they feed their self-perceptions as language users.

Affect and nonnativeness in ICFLE and self-perceptions as prospective NNESTs. The affective dynamics which surrounded Renata while she telecollaborated with her U.S. peer not only contributed to her potential reconstruction of self-perception as a nonnative speaker of English, but they are also expanded into her self-image as a prospective NNEST. In her final interview, she remarked:

> Sí, de pronto el hecho de que , eh, en la misma medida en que yo soy crítica conmigo mismo, yo puedo llegar a ser crítica del de seguro con mis futuros alumnos, o sea m me doy cuenta que si a lo mejor una persona yo creo pesimista que necesita como ser más lapsa, tiende como también al error y margen a la equivocación…por ese lado me aportó bastante para el hecho de haber dejado de ser como tan rígida, eh porque obviamente voy a tener alumnos que pueda que estén muy avanzados en inglés, como puede ser que no estén tan avanzados, puede que hay unos que les guste el inglés, otros que lo detesten, entonces, mi labor como docente será finalmente como incluirlos a todos ellos en un programa y darle a cada uno lo que necesita y que cada uno avance a sui propio ritmo (UniB-ATINT-May, 19, 2014). [Well, maybe the fact that, hmmm, as I am too critical of myself, I could surely be too critical of my future students, I mean I have realized that if I am that pessimistic, I need to be more flexible, I tend to make mistakes and there is a margin of error… it [interaction with peers in the telecollaboration] contributed a lot to

> the fact that I stopped being so rigid, hmm, because I obviously will have more advanced students in English and those who are less advanced, some of them might like the language and others might detest it, then my job as a teacher will be, at the end, to include all of them in a program so each one has what he or she needs so each one can advance at their own pace.]

The issues Renata discussed with her peers concerning her self-perceived nonnativeness, namely her accent and bilingualism, brought to the fore her judgment about her language ability in English. Her peer encouragement and tolerance, coupled with her opportunity to share what concerned her, became avenues for her potential reconstruction of self-perceptions. As she opens up in the reflection above, she shows that by the end of the exchange she was more flexible and self-assured in her judgment of herself.

Cultivating tolerance and encouraging attitudes as a student in telecollaboration offers a tool to draw upon when guiding her future students. She plans to apply a more flexible approach to students' limitations by being more inclusive when faced with their differing language abilities and different levels of interest in language learning. Renata's reflection matches studies on NNESTs (Samimy & Brutt-Griffler, 1999; Dogancay-Aktuna (as cited in Llurda, 2008; Şimşek, 2012) which have determined as Llurda (2009, p. 44) posits that: "they (NNESTs) have walked along the same path as their students sharing with them their previous experience as language learners …", consequently, to a great extent, NNESTs' self-perception as potentially successful in their jobs depends on their being equipped with the experiences they have accumulated from their own learning process.

Information and Experiences: from Interaction to Personal Reflection

The cooperative nature of the telecollaboration promoted a second dimension for the potential reconstruction of participants´ self-perceptions. This resource involved

telecollaborators' personal histories and viewpoints, their awareness of language use in interaction and their awareness of native speakers as culturally nuanced.

Personal histories and beliefs. Colombian prospective teachers oftentimes were exposed to the life experiences and viewpoints that their U.S. peers shared with them. Their peers' Hispanic heritage constituted a salient piece of the information that the Colombian prospective teachers encountered in interactions. The following two extracts revealed chat conversations between Malena, a University A student and her U.S. peers, Pilar and Erin. In this week of the exchange, the telecollaborators' assignment encompassed their prior preparation for the exchange by watching two videos which exposed attitudes towards Spanglish in the U.S. Topics suggested for their chat discussion, in addition to Spanglish, included language ability and bilingualism, among others. In the first conversation Malena interacted with Pilar on April 10th.

P: I think that people who speak Spanglish are bilingual also.

M: I have realized for example in our conversations that, when we start to talk and we forget or we don't know any word we use the word but in our mother tongue.

P: I've noticed that too. I talk very brokenly in Spanish when I talk because I don't remember all the verb tenses and how to form certain words when speaking on the spot, but I know what I'm trying to say. I've noticed since we've started our conversations and I've been using more Spanish I've used Spanglish more and substitute Spanish words in when I'm talking in English. You know?

M: Yes you're right. And about what you were saying, you're right too, I think we have been using Spanglish and that means... we're right or we're wrong, what do you think?

P: I think so also. But I don't think it's a bad thing. I notice that a lot of Spanish and English speakers use both languages throughout a conversation. Personally, I feel that

how we speak is perfectly fine. To me, the point of learning a language is to be able to communicate with others. And when we speak, even when it's not the standard use, we understand each other.

P: What do you think?

M: Yes I agree, it doesn't matter, if we combine sometimes two languages, while people can understand you.

P: Si si. Pudemos empezar en espanol por favor? … [Yes, yes. Can we start in Spanish?]

P: Pienso eso tambien, porque yo se que mi mamá tipicamente hablo conmigo hoy en espanol para practicar mi espanol. [I agree because I know that my mom typically speaks English with me so I practice my Spanish] Pero a veces ella [but she sometimes] switches a ingles without evening knowing it. And I think it might be even more common than just using one language.

M: Yes, absolutely, in fact you just to do it and I guess almost everybody do it inadvertently.

P: Yeah, and I didn't even notice I switched (UniA-TSR-April, 10, 2014). (Original in Spanish and English).

In the second chat conversation below, Malena interacted with Lucinda on April 13th.

M: What do you think about Spanglish?

L: I think Spanglish is good. It is the mixing of languages and I can see that as two cultures accepting one another in a way. If that makes any sense ha ha

M: Yes, I don't know if you have noticed when we speak we have been using Spanglish.

For example when I don't know any word I use it in my mother tongue

L: Ha ha yes I have noticed that I think it just revolves around what we are comfortable with

M: Yes, and what does it mean? We're right or we're wrong?

L: I think we are right! It's just like any new language that comes about, we are showing our native tongue

M: Did you watch the videos?

L: Yes I did, what did you think of them?

Should we start talking in Spanish now ha ha?

M: Si, por supuesto. El primer video es muy chistoso, es divertido ver cómo las personas mezclamos ambos idiomas a veces inconscientemente (Yes, of course. The first video is very funny, it's funny to see how people mix the two languages and sometimes they do it without being aware of that).

L: Si creo que es muy chistoso también. Es como muchas personas hablan (Yes, I think it is very funny too. It is how many people talk).

M: Y cuando estás con tus amigos o familia en la calle o en un supermercado, y escuchan a la gente hablando Spanglish, qué dicen ellos. Es decir qué dicen tus amigos o familia (And when you are with your family or friends in the street or in a grocery store and they hear people using Spanglish, what do they say? I mean, what is that your friends and family say?)

L: Pues yo creo que es bien y como se dicen en el video es cómico y no me importa. Tambien yo hablo Español, Spanglish, con mis padres pero quiero que es más informal. Cuando hablar con mi maestro o personas en mis clases hablé Español formal. (Well, I think it is O.K. and as they say in the video, it's funny and I don't care. I also speak Spanish, Spanglish, with my parents but I think it is

> more informal. When I speak with my teacher or people in my class I speak formal Spanish.)
>
> M: Entonces es fácil para tí cambiar de idioma cuando estas hablando (So, it is easy for you to switch between languages when you are speaking)
>
> L: Es un poco dificil. Necesito mas tiempo cuando estoy hablando. (Well, it is a bit hard. I need more time when I am speaking) (UPTS-TSR-April, 13, 2014). (Original in English and Spanish)

The first resource generated through the solidarity and negotiation of the two peers in the synchronous exchange encompassed cultural information and beliefs. Spanglish was a well-known practice for telecollaborators in both countries and in their particular communities. For Colombian pre-service teachers, it was present in their universities' academic environment, the context where they mainly practiced English. The most widespread attitudes towards Spanglish among participants can be summarized in these two quotes:

> En la universidad no es algo que pues era bien visto, que sea algo como permitido, porque de hecho uno a veces está en clases, participando y los profesores le dicen: "no spanglish" o le hacen como: ´oh, su español es muy malo´ (Renata, UNiB, ATINT-May, 19, 2014). [In the university, it [Spanglish] is not something that you approved of, like something allowed, in fact sometimes when you participate in class, teachers tell you 'no Spanglish' or they go like "Your Spanish is very bad); "The topic of Spanglish is always been like fun, comic, with my peers and family, sometimes, it is like you laugh at things with it, well, not really laugh, but you use it to have fun.] (Graciela, UniB- ATINT-May, 21, 2014)

Spanglish was mainly an indication of ignorance, built upon the academic demands imposed on them or a curious invention to make jokes. At any rate, none of the Colombian prospective

teachers in the telecollaboration manifested awareness of this language variety as an actual practice in existing communities outside their country.

The attitudes towards Spanglish in an academic Colombian context, where Malena has been educated in English, did not differ substantially from her heritage Spanish speaking peers' equivalent context in the exchange. In relation to Spanglish in U.S. schools, Sayer (2008, p. 97) comments that "it has variously been accused of corrupting and endangering the 'real' Spanish language." Even worse, as Otheguy and Stern (2011, p. 86) posit, "the word Spanglish is often used to disparage Latinos in the U.S. and to cast aspersions on their ways of speaking." In both of these school settings, at the core of language ideologies that attempt to overlook and vilify language variation and mixture, there is a deleterious institutionalized belief in the purism of mythical native speaking varieties.

In the two exchanges, Malena´s peers shared with her their views about Spanglish. For these heritage Spanish speakers who live in a U.S. city very close to the Mexican border, this language variety does not carry the harmful and undesirable reputation it has gained in most of Malena´s context and academic setting. In fact, it represents a natural practice entrenched in the contact between two languages and cultures, allowing that language mixture implies tolerance. Heritage Spanish speakers value Spanglish because it facilitates their communication with others, usually their relatives or close friends, and bearing in mind that they might not have as many linguistic resources in Spanish as they possess in English, they feel more confident making use of their dual language repertoire in the same conversation. In that sense, it also speaks of their creativity in employing a "new language." Spanglish is part of their identity; it "is their mother tongue."

As Malena's peers exposed their viewpoints, they mixed personal experiences of their use of Spanglish in their contexts. They spontaneously started talking about these events in their

lives or brought this element into the talks to respond to Malena's curiosity. Their accounts situated Spanglish in a more tangible context; they showed it as part of their daily routines where they interact with common people around them. The nuances of their peers' lives concerning Spanglish, that Malena gathered from their telecollaboration, correspond to what Byram (1997, pp. 35-36) explains in association with the equipment that intercultural speakers require as interactants: "knowledge of social groups and their cultures" that their peers possess as a result of their socialization in specific community language practices. As Bennet (2009, p. 128) posits, she is "discovering knowledge that informs [her]" to analyze probably how Spanglish is regarded in another culture.

Malena's peers' viewpoints and personal experiences of Spanglish are in a stark contrast to what she learned from the Colombian context regarding this language variety. Indeed, several of the associated ideologies around nativespeakerism which object to Spanglish are challenged by her peers' stances. Monolingualism, which is far from being an ideal state, is downplayed by the exaltation of bilingualism; purism does not count as the norm since language mixture has been accepted and the use of the standard becomes a secondary issue when the priority is communication, creativity and a sense of identification. The various opinions put forward by these heritage Spanish speakers concur with scholars (Ferguson, 1992; Kramsch, 1997; Cook, 1999; Belz; 2002, Train, 2007) who questioned the idea of language as "as a monolithic whole, publicly shared on a uniform and egalitarian basis by members of a putatively homogeneous speech community" (Rajagopalan, 1999, p. 205).

Awareness of language use. In her telecollaboration with U.S. peers, Malena did not only discover and negotiate her understanding of the knowledge and shared beliefs that her peers brought concerning Spanglish, she also gained awareness of her use of this variety in comparison to others' who she perceived had a different cultural background, but right then were in "the same boat" as her. In the two conversations, Malena´s peers shared her awareness of their spontaneous use of Spanglish; they were comfortable with Spanglish. Pilar explored the nuances of her use of this language variety further describing further the challenging circumstances surrounding her willingness to use Spanglish.

The second category of knowledge, "of the process of interaction" that Byram (1997) associates with the intercultural speaker, aligns with the language awareness Malena and her peers share. For her, the underlying issue of concern is how appropriate it is for them, nonnative speakers, who are not supposed to be the owners (Widdowson, 1994) but the "renters" of the languages they are learning, to use what in their school settings and at various social levels has been stigmatized as a sign of incompetence. How relaxed should they feel using Spanglish in their interactions? Can it bring any negative consequences to their learning, prestige and ultimately their interaction?

Malena's questioning about how right or wrong it is to use Spanglish and the answers she generates from her peers are resources they bring to the telecollaboration at the level of "…critical language awareness…as world citizens" (Risager, 2007). They are not only sharing and negotiating metalinguistic awareness; they are also interrogating the status quo. These telecollaborators are taking positions on issues that pertain, not only to Colombians and U.S. language users, but to interactants in similar circumstances around the globe.

Awareness of native speakers as culturally nuanced. The last resource generated through the solidarity and negotiation of the two peers in the telecollaboration involves their realization that the nativeness of those they regarded as native speakers went beyond the issue of language ability and intersected with cultural dimensions. Though culture was mentioned prior to the telecollaboration, participants mainly viewed it as a collection of typical habits and products to be found in native countries like the U.S. and England. At that point it was not a major topic for prospective teachers. Nevertheless, by bringing language users from diverse backgrounds and contexts together, the telecollaboration potentially contributed to "bring[ing] culture to the center" (Negueruela-Azarola, 2011).

To the previous perspectives that participants held of culture, they added other perceptions in connection with their involvement in telecollaboration and their self-perception of (non) nativeness. In order to illustrate this resource, the next fragment shares Malena's reflection in her weekly log about the conversations presented above:

> Cuando hablé con mis compañeras acerca de bilingüismo un hecho quedó claro y es, que la cultura Norteamericana y Latina son tan cercanas como para que un fenómeno como el Spanglish ocurra. Mis compañeras me contaban que ellas utilizan mucho el spanglish en muchos lugares, en sus conversaciones diarias, con personas que no tienen un legado Hispano como ellas, lo que me hace pensar que los norteamericanos dan cabida, o dejan la puerta abierta para que otras culturas se mezclen con la suya y que aquí se refleja por medio de la convivencia de dos idiomas. Esto ayuda a cambiar mi opinión sobre los norteamericanos porque es bien conocida su mala fama o estereotipo de clase superior, que no permite que nada ni nadie permee su cultura y país (UniA-WRL-April, 16, 2014). [A fact that became clear for me was that North American and Latino cultures are not that distant, that´s why, a phenomenon like Spanglish takes place. My peers told me that they

> use Spanglish in many places, in their daily conversations, with people who don't necessarily have a Hispanic heritage like they do, this makes me think that North Americans allow or "open the door" so people from other cultures mix with their own, two languages coexist there. This kind of makes me change my mind concerning North American people because it is well-known that they are famous or stereotyped in an unpopular way, as a superior type of people that do not allow anything or anybody to permeate their culture and country.]

At the onset of her log entry, Malena focused on the interaction she had with her Spanish heritage speaking U.S. peers concerning Spanglish a couple of days before. Those prior exchanges gravitated mainly towards the appropriateness of this language variety; it seemed she was concerned about how using Spanglish might violate native standard language norms and therefore, might be taken as a sign of her lack of language ability.

In her log reflection, she moves beyond that initial preoccupation and brings to the fore other levels of Spanglish complexity. These dimensions hinge upon a cultural representation of U.S. people as open to multiculturalism. Though her viewpoint is a generalization about the U.S. population, what becomes of paramount significance is how the knowledge she is gathering from her peers is leading her to see those she regards as native speakers of English as culturally complex. Consequently, the latent reductionism of stereotyping is questioned. Similarly, Ware and Kramsch's (2005) study shows how the cultural stereotypes students held in regards to native speakers are challenged when participants had the chance to encounter "real speakers."

As illustrated above, Malena discovered beliefs and information about Spanglish in her peers' communities and gained awareness of shared meanings this language variety had for them as part of their regular online exchanges. Through the mediation that language offered as she interacted with peers, Malena gained awareness of her use of this variety in her socialization

process. The telecollaboration arrangement facilitated Malena's interaction, cooperation and negotiation with peers, who shared certain cultural background with her, but were also diverse. As a sociocultural approach to learning based on Vygotsky's theory (Vera & Holbrook, 1996; Lantolf, 2000; Lantolf & Thorne, 2007) posits, the telecollaboration became a social source for her learning. In connection with that social level of her learning, Malena's individual reflection, included above in her log, points to an intrapersonal level of knowledge construction.

Apparently she worked "with, through and beyond what [she] had appropriated in social participation" (Vera & Holbrook, 1996, p. 197), leading to the apparent reconstruction of her perception of Spanglish. The following comment in her final interview illustrates what might be a potential transformation in her viewpoints:

> Uhmm, de spanglish, eh, yo tenía la idea de...cómo le llamo, como muy pobre, como muy peyorativo, para la persona que utiliza spanglish porque no tiene el suficiente conocimiento, y no sabe hablar bien, y lo miraba como, o sea, como que lo menospreciaba, y ya después de la experiencia uno se da cuenta que es una forma que la gente emplea, pues, para comunicarse, y ya no lo veo como tan mal, como con tan malos ojos, y si eso les permite comunicarse, y tener una buena conversación, o no sé, pues, bienvenido sea, o sea, ya no lo veo con malos ojos (UniA-ATINT-May, 18, 2014).
>
> [Hmmmm of Spanglish, er, I had the idea of…how can I call it? Hmmm, like it was something very poor, pejorative as the person who used Spanglish because he/she did not have enough knowledge, and doesn't know how to speak properly and I used to look down at it and after the experience one realizes that is a way people have to speak and I don't think it is that bad and if that allows people to communicate and to have a better conversation, I don't know, well, welcomed, I mean, I don't see it as something that bad now.]

The knowledge and awareness of Spanglish, initially regarded by Malena as a faulty version of Spanish and English mostly associated with nonnative speakers, was at the end of the exchange perceived as a means for communication that individuals with knowledge of Spanish and English used to achieve communication. The knowledge and awareness that Malena negotiated and constructed with her peers through telecollaboration facilitated their apparent transformation of her perception. Information provided by Malena in her reflection logs and final interview indicated that her self-perception as a prospective teacher was also impacted by her evolving awareness of this practice in her telecollaboration exchanges. She wrote in her log:

> Durante su explicación, ella comenzó hablando en español, pero a medida que iba avanzando y necesitaba hacer uso de más vocabulario para hacerse entender, ella simplemente comenzó a hablar en inglés; yo la noté como un poco incómoda porque su discurso en español no estaba resultando tan fluido y por consiguiente ella temía que yo no le estuviera entendiendo. Esto demuestra cómo ante momentos de incomodidad o incapacidad de poder decir algo, pues simplemente optamos por hablar en nuestra lengua materna. Este tipo de situaciones, estoy segura me irá a ocurrir en mi trabajo, ya como docente; a la vez esto me pone a pensar qué debo hacer para evitar, o por lo menos menguar, ese sentimiento de frustración inicial en mis estudiantes al no poder hablar con algo de claridad y seguridad en una segunda lengua, lo cual puede llevarlos a simplemente no querer intentarlo más. [UniA-WRL-April, 25, 2014) (During her explanation, she [her peer] started speaking Spanish, but as she progressed and she needed more vocabulary, she just started to speak in English. I noticed she was a bit uncomfortable because she was not talking in Spanish as fluently as she expected and she feared I was not getting what she meant. This showed that when we are uncomfortable or we feel unable to use the target language we tend to speak in our mother tongue. This

> type of situation will surely occur in my job as a teacher. That leads me to think about what I can do to avoid or at least diminish this kind of initial feelings of frustration in my students' when they cannot talk clearly and confidently in a second language, this might simply lead them to refuse to try again.]

Starting from the experience she accumulated interacting with her U.S. peer in the telecollaboration, Malena reaches a conclusion to justify the need to use one's L1 when attempting communicate in a language being learned, in this case English; frustration can lead learners to employ their L1 to achieve understanding. Her conclusion becomes the core of another level in her reflection, her future teaching practice. In this regard, her concern gravitates toward the role she will play in making students feel more comfortable and keeping them encouraged. Malena's reflection parallels findings discussed above for Renata's reflection connecting affective dimensions in telecollaboration and self-perception as prospective NNESTs. Malena's gained awareness of her and her peers' use of Spanglish and how it impacted their self-image as speakers of English can leverage her future teaching practice in a twofold manner: by building on her ability to "anticipate the difficulties that will appear in the learning process" and "be more empathetic of the needs and problems of students" (Llurda, 2009, p. 44).

CONCLUSIONS

This article investigates how the nature of an ICFLE experience between Colombian prospective English teachers and U.S. heritage Spanish learners (dis) allowed the Colombian participants' apparent reconstruction of their self-perceived (non) nativeness. Findings suggest that participants' cooperative and intercultural relationships with their telecollaboration partners generated affective dimensions and put them in contact with knowledge that led them to revise rationalizations behind their self-perceptions as (non)native speakers and prospective NNESTs.

Participants' solidarity was characterized by their provision of favorable feedback that

encouraged them to look at themselves beyond pervasive nonnative standard language ideologies. They also exhibited tolerance towards peers' unique characteristics as foreign language speakers and shared the anxiety generated at the prospect of faulty performance or social stigmatization because of their perceived nonnativeness. These affective dimensions aligned with the type of attitudes that intercultural speakers can potentially exhibit (Byram, 1997; Risager, 2007; Bennett, 2009) and that in the case of telecollaborators promoted their mutual understanding as participants in a global culture of language ideology. Affective dimensions intersected the personal and social realms of telecollaborators when their use of internet technologies (translators, chat and videocall) generated self-awareness of their projected social image as (non) native speakers, namely self-consciousness and self-assurance.

ICFLE was a site for Colombian prospective teachers to have access to their peers´ viewpoints and firsthand cultural information depicting their lives in their communities. From this knowledge Colombian participants could grasp and develop through their meaning negotiation in their interactions with peers; the study identified their attitudes towards language and their particularities of how language is experienced in their academic and social contexts. They also gained in their understanding of the cultural complexity experienced by those they regarded as native speakers.

Another source of knowledge emanated from Colombian prospective teachers and peers' joint reflection of their language in use. The awareness of language, its speakers and contexts that participants developed in their exchanges with their U.S. peers, was enriched by their subsequent personal reflection as manifested in logs and interviews. The initial telecollaborative socially- based and subsequent personal levels of rationalization contributed to Colombian prospective teachers' rethinking their language abilities and practices ideologically stigmatized by nativespeakership and related ideologies.

Findings also suggested that participants views of themselves as prospective NNESTs intertwined with the affective and knowledge-based telecollaborative resources that enhanced their reconstruction of affiliated self-perceptions as speakers. Participants thought of themselves as prospective teachers who would transfer the experience accumulated as students in telecollaboration to their professional practice; in particular, they thought that in the future they would become more supportive, tolerant towards errors, and more flexible with students' differences as language learners.

IMPLICATIONS

Colombian prospective teachers as telecollaborators encountered resources that enhanced their reexamination of self-perceived (non) nativeness building more favorable images of themselves, attitudes to confront the detrimental effects of nativespeakership ideologies, and knowledge to dismantle them. The potential of ICFLE matches the goals of several research fields which propose pedagogical frameworks to expose and counteract these beliefs, namely critical language awareness (Clark, Fairclough, Ivanič, & Martin-Jones,1991), critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2013), and critical pedagogy (McLaren,1998; Giroux, 2011) among others. These fields can inform ICFLE so that these exchanges can progressively become more solid ground to "engage and contest the nativist focus on competence as formal accuracy and communicative appropriateness that is associated with an idealized Ns and the NSL along with its concern for communicative efficiency" (Train, 2007, p. 261).

Pedagogical Implications

Among the features that the telecollaboration integrated and might have facilitated participants' reexamination of self-perceptions, the selection of the type of population to pair telecollaborators becomes a critical pedaogical decision. Because of their various degrees of biculturalism and bilingualism, Heritage Spanish learners provided a rich source of information

and experiences to challenge the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies. A purposeful selection of the population to pair with students should reflect the diversity of English and Spanish speakers in the real world. This concurs with the goals of approaches in the teaching of English like English as a lingua franca (ELF), World Englishes (WEs) or English as an international language (EIL). These goals can be summarized in words of Marlina (2014, p. 7):

> 1) Gain knowledge and awareness of the pluricentricity of English and the plurilingual nature of today's communication; (2) inspire students to give equal and legitimate recognition of all varieties of English; and (3) develop the ability to negotiate and communicate respectfully across cultures and Englishes…

In this study participants were instructed to interact with peers via chat for the first five exchanges and via audio or videocall for the last three sessions. The rationale behind the alternation and sequence in using the two internet applications was the anticipated difficulties telecollaborators could face accessing or employing audio or videocalls vs. chatting. Despite the established guidelines, flexibility prevailed as far as telecollaborators also used videocall and being free to skype as many sessions as they wished. Information provided by participants suggests how appropriate these decisions were. Most Colombian prospective teachers commented that starting by chatting was easier since it allowed them to gain confidence in what they perceived as a safer environment. Nonetheless, they suggested that the transition to videocall should be faster. Preferences for audio or videocalls from the start or for no Skyping at all were few, but noted. Considering results in this study that highlight the role of internet applications as resources connected with the affective dimensions imbued in participants' self-images as (non) native speakers, reasonable flexibility for telecollaborators to choose communication tools should be a principle in the planning of ICFLE experiences.

The weekly reflection logs, interviews and forums proved to be supportive of telecollaborators' interpersonal and intrapersonal self-perception and rethinking process. Logs and interviews guided participants to work on the mental and affective processes they had already started in online interaction with their partners. These instruments proved they can take participants further in their self-perception reexamination. A further exchange could encourage telecollaborators to share logs among them or to allow their use for forum discussions. Interviews could take a pedagogical rather than a research format. Based on their studies, Ware and O'Dowd (2008) and O'Dowd and Ware (2009) suggest the use of ethnographical interviews between peers in telecollaboration. These elicitation tools can become teachers' instruments to generate tasks that challenge students to reach higher levels of what scholars have called ideological literacy (Modiano, 2001).

In this study, the forums took place with the Colombian students in the two participating institutions due to curriculum flexibility constraints; it was not feasible to involve the U.S. university students. To make international peers part of the forum experience was a suggestion of Colombian participants. Scholars such as Dooly (2001) and Ware and O'Dowd (2008) have illustrated the array of options to integrate forums in ICFEL. Forums to debate issues around (non) nativeness can generate the type of dynamics which allow telecollaborators to explore their self-perceptions in contrast to the viewpoints peers can hold and express, and process both favorable and unfavorable feelings towards pervasive nativespeakership ideologies. However, teachers' careful organization and monitoring is necessary to make of these practices enriching spaces where students can be educated about intercultural attitudes, knowledge, and skills in connection with participants' ideological stances towards language.

Reflections upon the impact of the exchange on their prospect as NNESTs were not as abundant in participants' responses as their elaborations on their self-perceptions as (non) native

speakers. In fact, some participants expressed difficulty connecting the two levels. Tasks can be incorporated so prospective teachers can build their understandings of how they view themselves as speakers which have implications in how they imagine themselves as future teachers. Considering that participants were not at a stage of their program where specific pedagogy courses for ELT or initial teaching practicum experiences were offered to them, telecollaboration tasks could bolster the link between these two facets of their language-related identities. Nonetheless, other courses, such as sociolinguistics, which might be common in universities language teacher education programs, can be integrated to telecollaborative projects; not only does sociolinguistics examine a myriad of the issues in relation to language ideologies; it employs varieties of the techniques, such as anthropological surveys.

Suggestions for Further Research

Findings showed mostly the positive side of telecollaboration as a resource to foster the potential transformation of foreign language learners and prospective teachers' ideologically charged self-perceptions. Provided that currently the nature of ICFLE experiences is not alien to conflicts rooted in misunderstandings and miscommunications problems (O'Dowd & Ritter, 2006; Ware, & Kramsch, 2005), studies looking at how telecollaboration resources function in those adverse situations to (dis)allow participants' construction of their self-perception in relation to their nativeness can inform various fields.

Colombian prospective English teachers were paired with U.S. heritage Spanish learners. Their U.S. peers were undergraduate students majoring in diverse fields. Matching Colombian participants with this type of U.S. student was an effort, as discussed at the onset of this article, to capitalize on the potential that these heritage Spanish speakers' sociocultural and language backgrounds had to generate in Colombian participants reflection on nativespeakership ideologies. The difficulties reported by Colombian participants with connecting their roles as

speakers and learners to their roles as future teachers call for research initiatives to bolster this connection. A potential study could emerge from pairing prospective teachers with peers in similar professional programs. In this case, Colombian prospective teachers' future partners could be in-service or pre-service teachers and they could, for instance, share their teaching practices or teacher education to identify and gain awareness of pervasive language ideologies which is an avenue for increasing ideological competence.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUDING REMARKS

The three articles in this dissertation have provided findings concerning three different perspectives on Colombian participants' self-perceived (non) nativeness as language speakers and prospective English teachers. At the core of this study, a telecollaboration served as a pedagogical environment to examine participants' self-perceptions. Their online interaction with U.S. heritage Spanish speakers revealed how Colombian prospective teachers' previously formed self-perceptions tended to evolve. It was also the aim of this dissertation to delve into the potential dynamics and resources that the telecollaboration offered to enhance or not enhance participants' reconstruction of their self-perceptions regarding their (non) nativeness. The study revealed specific nativespeakership and associated ideologies permeating their self-perceptions and in some cases the origin of these rationalizations within the sociocultural and academic contexts where participants were educated. The effects of these ideologies on participants' self-images were also disclosed by the study.

Focused on 41 participants, findings in the first article suggested that as Spanish and English speakers, participants adhered to the myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies, namely, native speaker standard language, non-accent, and monolingual bias. These ideologies reify prescriptivism and purism as associated with ideal models of language use which are socially validated. In their prospective teaching roles, participants partially embraced the native speaker fallacy; they regarded themselves as having a disadvantage in comparison with NESTs when the issue was their language ability. However, when they expanded their views of what teaching English encompassed: because of their accumulated experience as learners, the shared knowledge of the sociocultural context with future students, and their potential to become a bridge between English and Spanish cultures and languages, they thought they could succeed in their future jobs.

The ideologies influencing Colombian prospective teachers' self-images were rooted in their lifetime of academic experience in Spanish and English. Actors in their education, curricular components, language educational policies, academic institutional prestige and their country's alliances with representative of those regarded as native speakers and owners of those languages all shaped their viewpoints. In addition, circulating ideologies in their social contexts, which privileged the educated native speaker, were fed by the economic, cultural and political power of those nations from where those considered native speakers originated.

Nativespeakership and associated ideologies affected participants' self-perceptions as speakers and future teachers. Pride and self-assurance characterized the image they held of themselves as Spanish users to the extent that several participants did not identify any limitations due to their status as educated native speakers. Conversely, the use of the word "missing" to connote the disappointment experienced at the prospect of unceasing incompleteness in their English language ability, was iteratively used by a substantial number of participants. Most of them "set the bar" for their aspirations concerning language skills in English as high as socially-sanctioned near nativeness. Though their concerns in relation to their self-perceived insufficient skills were mitigated by their trust in their ongoing education and the expected reward of all the "wonders learning English could bring," their preoccupation also imbued their images of themselves as future teachers. Social sanctions embodied in a lack of prestige, rejection and difficulties with finding jobs, became evident as they voiced their future expectations as NNESTs. Despite these fears, they perceived that their own history as English learners, in the Colombian context, was a major advantage in their future professional lives. Most participants perceived themselves as potential successful NNESTs, though they regarded the mythical native-speaker like language ability as desirable.

By participating in telecollaboration with U.S. heritage Spanish speakers, most

Colombian prospective teachers' previously established focus on achieving native-like proficiency was displaced by their concerns about becoming meaning makers so that they could succeed in their interactions with international peers. In addition to this change of focus, two overarching resources, which intertwined with the potentially sociocultural and intercultural nature of these online exchanges, contributed to participants' reexamination of their self-perceived (non) nativeness. First, they encountered affect in the form of mutual encouragement and tolerance. The internet technologies they used, namely, translators, dictionaries, audio/videocall, and chatting were also associated with their affective dimensions when participants' gained awareness of possible favorable or unfavorable social images as (non) native speakers. Thus, both anxiety and confidence emerged in their interactions. Their telecollaboration exchanges were also starting points for obtaining knowledge of peers' cultural experiences, beliefs and realities. They gained awareness of their peers' language use in exchanges and of their peers' cultural layers which complicated the seemingly standardized native speaker. The previous factors were not the only influences guiding Colombian prospective teachers' apparent changes in their self-perceptions; their exposure and reflection upon information pertaining to sociolinguistic topics, which included for instance, language variation, bilingualism and languages in contact, also played a role. In this regard, university courses were mentioned by a few participants as sources of this information.

Articles two and three included as participants eight Colombian student teachers. On the whole, the nature and resources of telecollaboration led most of these 8 participants to gain more favorable and context-bound informed views of their language abilities. They increased their confidence in their English language skills and questioned their presumed ideal knowledge in Spanish and of their peers' in English. Even though participants were less focused and concerned about (non) nativeness as language speakers and questioned native-like models, the

myth of the native speaker and associated ideologies persisted. The recurrence of these ideologies was identified in Colombian prospective teachers' purism and prescriptivism as they supported their peers' Spanish learning. In a like manner, when critical incidents in telecollaboration troubled participants' self-perception of and confidence in their language performance, they maintained or in some cases increased their focus on native-like models.

Telecollaborating influenced participants' self-perceptions as prospective NNESTs. Those participants whose language ability and confidence were more favorable at the end of the exchange continued rejecting the native speaker fallacy in general, and this position became stronger in comparison to their pre-telecollaboration self-perceptions. The opposite occurred with those prospective teachers whose troubled self-images as English learners did not differ from those they exhibited prior to the exchange or with those participants who became more concerned about their language knowledge and skills. Finally, participants generated reflections which connected their evolving self-perceptions as English learners with their prospective roles as teachers. Some of them suggested that they had gained awareness about the need for flexibility to tolerate students' varying interests, language ability and strategies, such as Spanglish, to face communication challenges.

APPENDIX A: PRE-TELECOLLABORATION SURVEY

The following survey seek to explore your history, previous experience as a language learner, your feelings in regards to this process and your expectations as a future teacher. Read each question carefully and follow the instructions provided in each case. Providing full answers in those questions in which explanations and details are required is absolutely important for the success of this survey. Please, make sure you provide the necessary information. Thanks once again for taking the time to answer this survey.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">DEMOGRAPHICAL AND EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">1) Name</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">2) Sex:</td></tr>
<tr><td>3) Age:</td><td>A-up 20</td><td>B-from 21 to 25</td><td>C-from 26 to 30</td><td>D-from 31 to 35</td><td>E-more than 35</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">4) Birth place (city/town):</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">5) Before attending your current academic study program, did you attend any other program?

If you answer to the previous question was “yes”, write:

a) which program you atended: _____
b) how long you attended this program:_____</td><td>YES</td><td>NO</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">6) Age when you started to learn English:</td></tr>
</table>

7) Grade when you started to learn English (kindergarten to 11th):		
8) Have you studied English in institutions different from your elementary or secondary school(s), or your current university? If you answer was "yes", say: a) In which institution? _____ b) For how long? _____	YES	NO
9) If you have lived at an English speaking country, indicate: a) your main activity while being there: A- Teaching Spanish B-Studying at a university C-Working; D- Others. Specify: ___ b) provide a brief description of the activity in which you were involved :		
10) Indicate the amount of time you have spent in an English-speaking country: A- none B-less than one month C-1-3 moths D-about half a year E- about a whole year F-More than a year		
11) Have you had any interaction with native speakers of English before? If your answer was "yes", say: a) when you communicated with them: _____ b) for how long you interacted (day, weeks, months, years): _____ c) how often you interacted with them:	YES	NO

_____ d) what purposes you had for this communication: _____		
12) Have you ever had any native speaker teachers? If your answer was "yes", say: Briefly describe how your experience interacting with them was: - _____ _____	YES	NO
SELF-PERCEPTION OF LANGUAGE ABILITY		
13) Compared to other non-native speakers of English in your country, how would you rate your command of English? Circle your answer. (5 is best.) 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.		
14) Compared to other native speakers of Spanish in your country, how would you rate your command of Spanish? Circle your answer. (5 is best.) 1. 2. 3. 4. 5.		
15) If you think you have difficulties in the use of English, what are they? Describe them briefly. _____		

16) If you think you have difficulties in the use of Spanish, what are they? Describe them briefly.

_____

17) On a scale from 1 to 5, 5 being excellent and 1 being very low, how would you describe your level of proficiency in English in the following areas? Circle your answer.

Reading comprehension *(very low) 1 2 3 4 5 (very high)*

Writing/Composition *1 2 3 4 5*

Listening comprehension *1 2 3 4 5*

Speaking/ Oral communication *(very low) 1 2 3 4 5 (very high)*

Grammar accuracy in use *1 2 3 4 5*

Knowledge of grammar rules *1 2 3 4 5*

Breadth of vocabulary *1 2 3 4 5*

Pronunciation *(very low) 1 2 3 4 5 (very high)*

18) On a scale from 1 to 5, 5 being excellent and 1 being very low, how would you describe your level of proficiency in Spanish in the following areas? Circle your answer.

Reading comprehension *(very low) 1 2 3 4 5 (very high)*

Writing/Composition *1 2 3 4 5*

Listening comprehension *1 2 3 4 5*

Speaking/ Oral communication *(very low) 1 2 3 4 5 (very high)*

Grammar accuracy in use *1 2 3 4 5*

Knowledge of grammar rules *1 2 3 4 5*

Breadth of vocabulary *1 2 3 4 5*

Pronunciation *(very low) 1 2 3 4 5 (very high)*

19) Is there any aspect of the English language that you find particularly difficult? Specify:

20) Is there any aspect of the Spanish language that you find particularly difficult? Specify:

21) Do the language difficulties you experience represent a problem for your future work as a teacher of English? Circle your answer.

(very little) 1 2 3 4 5 (very much)

22) What do you think is the most effective activity for improving your English level? (Choose only one answer)

A- Stays in English-speaking countries
B- Contact with native speakers (NSs) of English in Colombia
C- Contact with non-native speakers (NNSs) of English in Colombia
D- Watching TV-video
E- Reading books and magazines
F- Keeping on the study of the language
G- Teaching practice

23) What do you think is the most effective activity for improving your Spanish level? (Choose only one answer)

A- Stays in English-speaking countries
B- Contact with NSs of English in Colombia
C- Contact with NSs of English via the internet
D- Contact with NNSs of English in Colombia
E- Watching TV-video
F- Reading books and magazines
G- Keeping on the study of the language

H- Teaching practice

I- Other_____

24) How often do you interact (in oral and written form) in English outside the classroom?

24a) ORAL	24b) WRITTEN
A-rarely / some times a year B-some times a month C-every week / every day	A- rarely / some times a year B- some times a month C- every week / every day

PERCEPTIONS AS A NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE SPEAKER

25). As a (non) native speaker of English , what feelings related to the process of learning or teaching English have you had or do you have now?

_____
_____

26). As a native speaker of Spanish, what feelings related to the process of learning or teaching Spanish have you had or do you have now?

27). Have you ever been concerned about your accent as a nonnative English speaker? Explain, why "yes" or why "no" : _____	YES	NO
28). Have you ever been concerned about any aspect of your language ability as a native speaker of Spanish? Explain, why "yes" or why "no"	YES	NO

_____		
29). As a non-native speaker of English, do you compare yourself to native speakers of English? Explain, why "yes" or why "no" _____	YES	NO
30). As a native speaker of Spanish, do you compare yourself to native speakers of Spanish? why "yes" or why "no" _____	YES	NO

SELF-PERCEPTION AS A PROSPECTIVE NON-NATIVE TEACHER OF ENGLISH?

31) What is the main reason why you want to become a teacher? Choose **only one**:

A- I liked teaching

B- I liked English

C- It was my best professional option

D- Others: ……..

32) Which one of the following goals would better corresponds to yours if you already were a teacher of English?

A- To learn a high amount of language structures

B- To develop a high amount of communicative strategies

C- To know a high amount of communicative functions of the language

D- Others: …….

33) What English variety would you like your students to use?

A- British English

B- American English.

C- I would like them to be able to speak English efficiently for international communication, even though they speak with a Spanish accent, and they use a mixture of elements from British and American English.

D-Others:
……

34) What would be your biggest worry as a teacher of English in respect of not being a native speaker of the language you will teach?

A-not knowing the right answers

B- being caught in making mistakes

C-not being respected as a teacher/professional

D-not being able to advance in your career

E-feeling like you are chasing something impossible to achieve

F-being treated as a second class citizen in the job environment

35) What do you think can NSS English teachers who teach in Colombia contribute to their students? (choose **a maximum of four** items):

A. Higher confidence in the teacher and his/her adequacy to the job

B. A more active and innovative methodology

C. A good role model
D. More help to understand and adapt to the foreign language culture
E. More techniques to address learning difficulties
F. More knowledge of learning strategies for language learning
G. Higher awareness of students' sociocultural background
H. More attention to emotional and psychological issues

36) What do you think can NS English teachers who teach in Colombia contribute to their students? (choose **a maximum of four** items):

A. Knowledge of a broader vocabulary

B. Acquisition of a better oral fluency

C. A more real an authentic atmosphere in class

D. More cultural information

E. Higher confidence in the teacher and his/her adequacy to the job

F. A more active and innovative methodology

G. Acquisition of better pronunciation

H. Wider range of teaching resources

I. Others: ……

37) What do you think NNSs lack as compared to NS teachers? (choose a **maximum of four** items):

A. More fluency

B. More accuracy in oral language

C. More accuracy in written language

D. A higher preparation in the English teaching resources

E. A better knowledge of the culture(s) associated to the English language

Others: …….

38) What do you think NSs lack as compared to NNS teachers? (choose a **maximum of four** items):

A. Knowledge of the teaching environment and context

B. Preparation in linguistics and knowledge of grammar rules

C. Higher empathy with students

D. Knowledge of the EFL learning processes and strategies

E. A more active and innovative methodology

F. Knowledge of the local programs and educational currricula

G. A wider range of teaching resources

H. Intuition with regard to the areas where learners will experience difficulties

I. Capacity to mediate between the target and the learners' culture

J. A sensible use of the L1 in the classroom

Others: ……

39) Do you think that having learned English as a foreign language provides you with a special advantage to teach EFL over NSs, as NSs have not gone through the process of learning the language in adulthood?	YES	NO

40) Who do you think is more successful in teaching English as a foreign language:

A-The native speaker of English:

B-The non-native speaker of English:

Give your reasons to justify your answer
:_____

41) If you had to advise your brother about English classes, what teacher would you advise him to have?

A- A NNS from a different country (*e.g.*, German, Greek, …) who can speak Spanish

B- A NS of English who can speak Spanish

C- A NNS from Colombia

D- A NNS from a different country (*e.g.*, German, Greek, …) who cannot speak Spanish

E- A NS of English who cannot speak Spanish

42) If you were the director of a language school and were responsible for hiring teachers, what would you prefer?

A- To hire more NSs than NNSs

B- To hire as many NSs as NNSs

C- To hire more NNSs than NSs

Explain your preference: _____

43) Do you regard teaching as your main future professional interest? If your answer was “no”, say why you enrolled in this program _____	YES	NO

APPENDIX B: PROTOCOL INTERVIEW I

1. How was your experience learning English before enrolling in the program?

2. How did you become interested in learning English?

3. Before enrolling in the program, did you have any expectations in relation to the learning objectives you wanted to accomplish in regards to English?

If so, which were those objectives?

4. Compared to other non-native speakers of **English** in Colombia, how would you perceive your command of **English**?

5. Compared to other native speakers of **Spanish** in Colombia, how would you perceive your command of **Spanish**?

6. Tell me about the most difficult obstacle you have faced so far as a non-native **English** Speaker?

7. Tell me about the most difficult obstacle you have faced so far as a native **Spanish** Speaker?

8. In the past, did you compare yourself to native speakers of **English**? Why yes or why not?

9. In the past, did you compare yourself to other native speakers of **Spanish**? Why yes or why not?

10. As a non-native English speaker, what feelings related to the process of **learning** English did you have before you enrolled in this program?

11. As a non-native English speaker, what feelings related to the process of **teaching** English did you have before you enrolled in this program?

12. As a native **Spanish** speaker, what feelings related to the process of learning Spanish did you have before you enrolled in this program?

13. Have you ever had any interaction with native speakers of English? If so, could you provide details of this interaction?

14. Have you ever been in contact with US culture? If so, could you describe they type of contact you have had.

15. How did you become interested in being a language teacher?

16. How did you become interested in the academic program you are currently enrolled in?

17. Throughout your experience as a learner of English, did you have any native English speaker teachers?

18. What do you think about their performance?

19. What do you think about the non-native speaker teachers you had in your primary and secondary school education?

20. Did you regard any of them as a role-models for what you wanted to become?

21. What expectations do you have about your collaboration with US native speakers of English in the telecollaboration?

22. What expectations do you have about your collaboration with US non-native speakers of Spanish in the telecollaboration?

23. Describe how you imagine your US partners will be like (appearance, use of English, origin, attitudes etc.).

24. Are there any concerns you have about this collaboration?

25. What aspects of being a Colombian pre-service teacher of English do you see as potential **advantages** in your collaboration with US partners?

26. What aspects of being a Colombian pre-service teacher of English do you see as potential **disadvantages** in your collaboration with US partners?

In relation to the support you can provide US Spanish learners (next two questions):

27. What aspects of being a native speaker of Spanish, do you see as potential **advantages** in your collaboration with US partners?

28. What aspects being a native speaker of Spanish, can you see as potential **disadvantages** in your collaboration with US partners?

29. As a future teacher of English, what concerns do you have about not being a native speaker of the language you will teach?

30. As a future non-native teacher, what do you think you will be able to contribute to your students?

APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONS FOR TELECOLLABORATORS

1. ATTENDANCE

a) Attendance is mandatory.
b) Attendance equals at least 45minutes per session to receive full credit.
c) Punctually is very important.
d) If you have to miss a session, you need to e-mail your group member beforehand to let him know. You will lose the points for this assignment.
e) If you want to change the day of the chat, your partner needs to be in complete agreement.
f) Missing more than 2 sessions will remove you from the exchange and jeopardize your participation in the overall project (i.e. your grade)

2. LANGUAGE USE

a) The chat needs to be 50% in Spanish and 50% in English.
b) Bad language and/or disruptive language is not permitted.

3. SUBMITTING ASSIGNMENT

To receive grades for your participation, you must:

a) At the end of each session, copy and paste the entire chat session into a word document or send a video or audio recording of the session if the session was a video or audio call; include the names of the participants in that chat or session.
b) For Chats 1,4,7,8 also submit the materials you prepare for the discussion.

4. REPORTING PROBLEMS

All problems must be reported to your instructor immediately

How to succeed in this project and be courteous to your partners:

a) Prepare for each session PRIOR to starting the chat by reading the topics ahead of time and developing the preparation activities.
b) Always be on time and continue to chat through the entire session.
c) Discuss each topic thoroughly before moving on to any another topic.
d) Prepare questions for discussion, pay attention to your partners' contributions and learn to ask follow-up questions
e) Do not correct your partners' speech, only offer direct assistance when it is requested or discuss at the beginning how you both feel about corrections.
f) Request assistance! If you aren't sure if you are stating something correctly, ask!
g) Ask for clarification if there is something that you don't understand.
h) Remember to greet your partners at the beginning of the session and to close the conversation with a short expression.

APPENDIX D: WEEKLY TOPICS AND PREPARATION TASKS

TOPICS	PREPRATION TASKS	CHAT
1. Getting to know each other Biographical Information: age, origin, languages you speak etc. Educational background: primary and secondary education, your university studies etc. Favorite activities and interests, interesting activities you can do in your city or town. Your city in a typical day, topics you would like to talk about during the semester.	-Select images (4 o 5) which can give your peer an idea of who you are and where you live. Do not write any description next to the images. -Write an introductory message to your peer letting him or her know you will be his/her partner for the exchange. Do not give any biographical information about you by now, but send the pictures or images. Invite your partner to use the images or pictures to make some guesses about your life. -Finally, when you receive your peer's message and the images (pictures), get ready for conversation # 1. Write a list of what you can guess about your peer's life from looking at the pictures.	This conversation will take place by using the application "messages" or "chat" on the Facebook page created for the exchange. Take turns with your peer to share how each one of you thinks each other's life is, What you think you have guessed based on the pictures. Confirm and correct your peer's guesses and ask questions to go deeper into the information that might be of interest for you.
2. *University Life* The university: How is your peer's university? What kind of institution is it? Why is it known at the national level? What kind of students attend this university? Activities in the university: if you work, how do	-Go to the internet and Log in "YouTube." For your search write your peer's university name in the original language. Among the videos that you find in your search, select at least 3. Try to find videos showing different aspects of the	This conversation will take place by using the application "messages" or "chat" on the Facebook page created for the exchange.

you divide your time between both activities? How do university students usually have fun in Colombia? What are typical activities in universities?	university. Watch the videos. -Prepare questions for your peer about his/her university based on the videos you saw. -Send your peer the links to the videos you saw in a message. -Using the links your peer sent you, watch the videos about your university.	Take turns with your peer to talk about what the videos showed about each university. Talk about what called your attention and about how accurate what these videos show is. Find out about the university and your peer's life there from your peer's perspective.
3. *Experience in learning language* Your history learning Spanish and English: How did you start? Where have you studied? How have you felt? Do You feel like an expert? Strengths and weaknesses? What is the meaning of being or not a native speaker of these languages? Objectives and learning expectations: What would you like to achieve in your learning of languages? How can you reach your objectives? Is there any person that is the model of how you would like to speak and write in these languages?	-Make sure you have written your cultural and linguistic biography. -Share this document with your peer through email. -In a like manner, read the document(s) that your peer will send you in relation to his/her experience.	This conversation will take place by using the application "video-calling" on the Facebook page created for the exchange or any similar application for video calling or voice-calling, e.g. "Skype" o "Google Talk. Remember that in this case you will also need an application for recording the conversation, for instance "Audacity" Each one of you will take turns to talk about similarities and differences that you perceive between your process and your peer's. In addition, you can use the questions included in this chart.
4. My family and my heritage Your family: who are the members of your family?	-Draw a family tree and include your relatives' names (from the 1st to the third generation). Write their origin and language	This conversation will take place by using the application "messages" or "chat" on the Facebook

Provide some description. Heritage: Where do they originally come from? Do you have any relatives or friends in you city or town of origin? Do you visit them often? Have you lived or worked in these places? Heritage and connection with Spanish and English languages: how is the language or the variety of the language your relatives use?	they speak. -Send the family tree to your peer and include a 10-line explanation of the tree. Also talk about how You think the way of talking the language in your family has changed. -Read the family tree your peer has sent you.	page created for the exchange. During the conversation take turns with your peer to talk about the family tree and the languages or verities of language spoken in your family. Answer your peers' questions and explore the topics and subtopics propose for this conversation.
5. Movies, music and traditions *Movies, music*: Favorite movie and music. What kind of movies do you like? How often do you go to the movies? What's your favorite song and group? Traditions: Which are some of the most popular traditions and festivities in your country and in your family? How are special dates celebrated? Can you remember a time during a traditional celebration which was memorable for you?	-Search on the internet for the video of 1) one of your favorite songs (and information about the song) 2) one of your favorite movies (trailer) 3) information about one of your favorite traditions or festivities in Colombia. -Send a message to your peer with the links to see the videos and a brief explanation of what they are about. -Watch the videos and read the message that your peer will send you in relation to the videos. -Design a prezzi or power point	This conversation will take place by using the application "video-calling" on the Facebook page created for the exchange or any similar application for video calling or voice-calling, e.g. "Skype" o "Google Talk. Remember that in this case you will also need an application for recording the conversation, for instance "Audacity When you are talking, take turns to talk about the videos that your peer shared with you. Find out about why your peer likes these artistic and cultural pieces. Do you like them or not? Similarly talk about your preferences in relation to the videos you shared with your peer.
6. Bilingualism and Spanglish		

To what extend do you think of yourself as being bilingual? When do you think you became or will become bilingual? How being or not a native speaker of the languages you speak has affected your opportunities to be bilingual? Do you feel comfortable using the languages you speak? How do you speak these languages? Who with? How often? Can you easily switch between languages? What do you think about Spanglish? How do you feel about this linguistic variety? What do people around you think about it? How Spanglish is compared to Spanish in other Latin-American countries for instance Colombia? Would you say that there is certain kind of Spanish that sounds better than others? What about in the case of English? What kind of English and Spanish should be spoken or taught in Colombian schools?	-Look at these videos about Spanglish. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fKPFRNghCKE http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-J6quUmh2L4 -Make use of the main ideas being discussed in the videos to reflect upon your ability to use two languages in communication.	-This conversation will take place by using the application "messages" or "chat" on the Facebook page created for the exchange. While talking with your peer, take turns to present your opinions in regards to bilingualism and the use of Spanglish. Exemplify and use anecdotes to illustrate your views. Ask your peer about his or her perceptions in relation to being bilingual and Spanglish.
7. stereotypes Which are some of the most common stereotypes of US citizens? Which are some of the most common stereotypes of Mexicans of Latinos in the US? Which are some of the most common stereotypes of Colombians? Some stereotypes can be related to people's language, way of speaking, look, personality, priorities, life style, Jobs, their relations with their families and friends.	-Answer the quizzes about the stereotypes that people from other countries and cultures hold about your country, Hispano-Americans and US citizens? -Exchange your answers to these quizzes with your peer (s). -Use the quizzes to analyze similarities and differences in perceptions and how objective and valid stereotypes are.	This conversation will take place by using the application "video-calling" on the Facebook page created for the exchange or any similar application for video calling or voice-calling, e.g. "Skype" o "Google Talk. Remember that in this case you will also need an application for recording the conversation, for instance "Audacity In this conversation take turns with your peer to talk

		about stereotypes of each country and culture. Involve your answers in quizzes. Express your opinions and disagreements. Use your knowledge of your culture and country to show, by means of examples and anecdotes, the veracity or falsehood of these stereotypes.
8. Let's talk about the meaning of this experience How did this experience support your development of communicative abilities? What did you learn about the culture of the countries involved in the exchange? Do you notice any change in your idea of yourself as a speaker of English and Spanish? Did you strengthen your strategies to communicative with other speakers of Spanish and English? What do you think of the learning you can achieve now as a native speaker of Spanish and Non-native speaker of English? Can you understand better the differences between your country and your peer's country and culture? Do you notice any change in your attitude and beliefs about the countries involved in the exchange?	-Answer the evaluation survey about this online exchange experience you had with your US peer? -Share the answers to the survey sending it to your peer. -Read your peer's answers in regards to his experience.	-This conversation will take place by using the application "messages" or "chat" on the Facebook page created for the exchange. While talking with your peer, take turns to provide your opinion about what you think of the online exchange experience and your participation. Give your opinion about how you think you both might have learn and growth, and the challenges you still need to overcome. Ask your peer about his or her opinion.

APPENDIX E: FACEBOOK TELECOLLABORATION GROUP

APPENDIX F: AFTER TELECOLLABORATION SURVEY

You answered a previous survey and you will find that some of the questions are similar. The previous survey was mostly about your past experiences. This second survey seek to explore your experience as a language learner and your feelings as a participant in the telecollaboration with US partners. We want to see if your experiences, perceptions, feelings and expectations remain the same or if there have been changes. Read each question carefully and follow the instructions provided in each case. Answer all the questions and remember that providing full answers in those questions in which explanations and details are required is absolutely important for the success of this survey. Please, make sure you provide the necessary information. Thanks once again for taking the time to answer this survey.

1. Con respecto a los dos idiomas (español e inglés), ¿usted se considera...?

#	Question	Hablante nativa(o)	Hablante no nativo(a)	Otro(a)
1	Inglés			
2	Español			

2. ¿Usted seleccionó la opción "otro" en la pregunta anterior, entonces, cómo se escribiría en el caso del inglés?

3. ¿Usted seleccionó la opción "otro" en la pregunta anterior, entonces, cómo se describiría en el caso del español?

4. Para cada idioma, explique por qué se autodenomina hablante nativo(a), no nativo(a) u otro(a)?

5. (En esta pregunta, si usted tuvo 2 compañeros en la telecolaboración, piense en uno de ellos como compañero (a) 1 y en el otro (a) como 2. Con respecto a los dos idiomas ¿Cómo considera usted a su compañero(a) # 1 de la Universidad de Arizona...?

6. ¿Usted seleccionó la opción "otro" en la pregunta anterior, entonces, cómo escribiría en el caso del inglés a su compañera(o)?

7. ¿Usted seleccionó la opción "otro" en la pregunta anterior, entonces, cómo describiría, en el caso del español a su compañera(o)?

8. Escriba el nombre de su primer o único compañero (a) y para cada idioma, explique por qué la (o) considera hablante nativo(a), no nativo(a) u otro(a)?

9. ¿Cuántos compañeros tuvo usted?

10. En relación con los dos idiomas usted considera a su compañero(a) # 2 de la Universidad

de Arizona...?

#	Question	Hablante Nativo(a)	Hablante no nativa(o)	Otro(a)
1	Inglés			
2	Español			

11. ¿Usted seleccionó la opción "otro" en la pregunta anterior, entonces, cómo describiría, en el caso del inglés, a su compañera(o)?

12. ¿Al seleccionar la opción "otro" en la pregunta anterior, entonces, cómo describiría, en el caso del español, a su compañera(o)?

13. ¿Cómo hablante del español, cómo se sintió respecto a la forma en que su compañero de Estados Unidos utiliza e interactúa en este idioma?

14. Cree Usted que a través de esta interacción con su compañera(o) estadounidense, conoció nuevos aspectos sobre cómo son los hablantes de Inglés en ese país?

15. Explique la respuesta anterior

16. En cuanto al uso del inglés, ¿Se comparó a sí mismo(a) con su compañero(a) estadounidense durante la telecolaboración?

17. Explique porqué sí o por qué no

18. En cuanto al uso del español, ¿Se comparó a sí mismo(a) con su compañero (a) estadounidense durante la telecolaboración?

19. Explique por qué sí o por qué no.

20. ¿Llenó esta experiencia sus expectativas en cuanto a interactuar con un hablante nativo del inglés?

#	Answer
1	Siempre
2	Frecuentemente
3	Algunas veces
4	Rara vez
5	Nunca

21. Explique la respuesta anterior.

22. Respecto a la percepción que su compañera(o) pudo tener de usted como hablante de inglés y español, ¿cree que el formato de comunicación electrónica por chat afectó?

#	Answer
1	Siempre
2	Frecuentemente
3	Algunas veces
4	Rara Vez
5	Nunca

23. Escriba un ejemplo de una situación que recuerde o expliqué cómo se dio este efecto.

24. Respecto a la percepción que su compañera(o) pudo tener de usted como hablante de inglés y español, ¿cree que el formato de comunicación electrónica por Skype afectó?

#	Answer
1	Siempre
2	Frecuentemente
3	Algunas veces
5	Nunca

25. Escriba un ejemplo de una situación que recuerde o expliqué cómo se dio este efecto.

26. Esta interacción con su compañera (o) estadounidense, ¿fue como usted se imaginaba sería interactuar con un(a) hablante no nativa (o) del español?

#	Answer
1	Siempre
2	Frecuentemente
3	Algunas veces
5	Nunca

27. Explique la respuesta anterior.

28. ¿Si pudiera seleccionar otros hablantes de inglés para interactuar en una futura telecolaboración, qué clase de hablantes eligiría y por qué?

29. ¿Cree usted que el contexto pedagógico (un curso en un programa de aprendizaje de lengua extranjera), en el cual se enmarcó esta experiencia, influyó en la percepción que Usted

y su(s) compañeros(as) estadonidense(s) construían el uno del otro como hablantes nativos o no nativos de español e inglés?

#	Answer
1	Siempre
2	Frecuentemente
3	Algunas veces
4	Rara vez
5	Nunca

30. Proporcione un ejemplo de algún evento o expliqué cómo el contexto pedagógico influyó en su caso o explique por qué no influyó.

31. Teniendo en cuenta la exploración que usted pudo hacer de sus habilidades en inglés a través de la telecolaboración, ¿cómo evaluaría su habilidad en el uso del inglés en comparación con otros hablantes de inglés como lengua extranjera en Colombia? (5 es lo más alto)

#	Answer
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5

32. Teniendo en cuenta la exploración que usted pudo hacer de sus habilidades en español a través de la telecolaboración, ¿cómo evaluaría su habilidad en el uso del español en comparación con otros hablantes nativos en Colombia? (5 es lo más alto)

#	Answer
1	1
2	2
3	3
4	4
5	5

33. Basada(o) en lo que esta experiencia pudo mostrarle sobre sus habilidades en inglés, si

cree que tiene dificultades o aspectos que mejorar en el uso del inglés, ¿cuáles son? Descríbalas brevemente.

34. Basada(o) en lo que esta experiencia pudo mostrarle sobre sus habilidades en español, si cree que tiene dificultades o aspectos que mejorar en el uso del español, ¿cuáles son? Descríbalas brevemente.

35. En una escala de 1 a 5, siendo 5 excelente y 1 muy bajo, ¿cómo describiría su nivel de habilidad en el inglés en las siguientes áreas?

#	Question
1	Comprensión de Lectura
2	Escritura/Composición
3	Comprensión auditiva
4	Habla/ Comunicación oral
5	Gramática en uso
6	Conocimiento de reglas gramaticales
7	Amplitud de vocabulario
8	Pronunciación

36. En una escala de 1 a 5, siendo 5 excelente y 1 muy bajo, ¿cómo describiría su nivel de habilidad en el español en las siguientes áreas?

#	Question
1	Comprensión de Lectura
2	Escritura/Composición
3	Comprensión auditiva
4	Habla/ Comunicación oral
5	Gramática en uso
6	Conocimiento de reglas gramaticales
7	Amplitud de vocabulario
8	Pronunciación

37. ¿Qué sentimientos relacionados con su proceso de aprendizaje del inglés ha generado esta experiencia?

38. ¿Qué sentimientos relacionados con su proceso de aprendizaje del español ha generado esta experiencia?

39. Después de esta experiencia, en relación con su acento al hablar en inglés ¿usted...?

#	Answer

	Se siente igual que al comienzo de la experiencia y es algo que le
	Se siente igual que al comienzo de la experiencia y es algo que no le
3	Se siente más preocupada(o)
	Se siente menos preocupado (a)

40. Explique la respuesta a la pregunta anterior.

41. ¿Cuál cree que es la actividad más efectiva para mejorar su nivel de inglés? Elija (solamente una respuesta)

#	Answer
1	Visitar países de habla inglesa
	Contacto con hablantes nativos de inglés en Colombia
	Contacto con hablantes no nativos de inglés en Colombia
4	Mirar television
5	Leer libros y revistas
6	Estar estudiando la lengua de forma
7	Enseñar la lengua

42. ¿Cree usted que esta experiencia la (o) llevo a explorar sus habilidades como futuro (a) profesor (a) hablante nativ(a) / no nativ(o) de inglés?

#	Answer
1	Siempre
2	Frecuentemente
3	Algunas veces
4	Rara vez
5	Nunca

43. Explique su respuesta a la pregunta anterior

44.¿Cuál de los siguientes objetivos corresponderían más con los suyos si usted ya fuera un profesor (a) de inglés?

#	Answer
1	Aprender una gran cantidad de estructuras lingüísticas
2	Desarrollar una gran variedad de estrategias comunicativas
3	Saber una gran cantidad de funciones comunicativas de la lengua
4	Otros

45. ¿Qué variedad lingüística le gustaría que sus estudiantes usaran?

#	Answer
1	Inglés británico
2	Inglés Americano
3	Me gustaría que hablaran en inglés eficientemente con propósitos de comunicación internacional, aunque tuvieran acento con influencia del español, y que usaran una mezcla de
4	Otras

46. Al pensar en su futuro como profesor de inglés, ¿alguna vez se ha preocupado usted por ser visto como un profesor no hablante nativo de la lengua que enseñará?

#	Respuest.
1	Si
2	No

47. ¿Cuál sería su mayor preocupación por no ser un hablante nativo de la lengua que va a enseñar?

48. ¿Qué cree que los profesores hablantes no nativos de inglés pueden brindar a sus estudiantes? (Eliga un máximo de cuatro respuestas):

#	Answer

1	Mayor confianza en su profesora(o) y en su capacidad para hacer el trabajo
2	Una metodología más activa e
3	Un buen modelo a seguir
4	Más ayuda para entender y adaptarse a la lengua y la cultura extranjera
5	Más técnicas para abordar las dificultades en el aprendizaje
6	Más conocimiento de estrategias del lenguaje para el aprendizaje del
7	Más conciencia del bagaje sociocultural de los estudiantes
8	Más atención a factores emocionales y sicológicos
9	Otro

49. ¿Qué crees que los profesores hablantes nativos de inglés pueden brindar a sus estudiantes? (Eliga un máximo de cuatro respuestas):

#	Answer
1	Conocimiento de un vocabulario más
2	Mayor fluidez
3	Un ambiente más real y autentico en
4	Más información cultural
5	Mayor confianza en su profesora(o) y en su capacidad para hacer el trabajo
6	Una metodología más activa e
7	Adquisición de mejor pronunciación
8	Mayor variedad en recursos para la enseñanza

50. ¿Cree que haber aprendido inglés como una lengua extranjera les da cierta ventaja a los profesores no nativos?

#	Answer
1	Sí
2	No

51. ¿Quién cree que tiene más éxito en la enseñanza del inglés como lengua extranjera?

#	Answer

1	El hablante native
2	El hablante no native

52. Explique la respuesta anterior

53. Si tuviera que aconsejar a un familiar sobre tomar clases de inglés, ¿Qué profesor le sugeriría que consiguiera?

#	Anser
1	Un hablante nativo de otro país (e.g.. Aleman, Griego) que pudiera hablar español
2	Un hablante no nativo de otro país (Ejem, Aleman, Griego, …) que pudiera hablar español
3	Un hablante nativo de inglés que pudiera hablar español
4	Un hablante no nativo de fuera de Colombia
5	Un hablante nativo que no pudiera hablar español

54. Si Usted fuera el director de un instituto de idiomas y fuera responsable de contratar profesores, ¿qué preferiría?

#	Answer
1	Contratar más hablantes nativos que hablantes no nativos
2	Contratar la misma cantidad de hablantes nativos que hablantes no
3	Contratar más hablantes no nativos que hablantes nativos

55. Explique su preferencia.

56. ¿Considera la enseñanza su principal interés profesional?

#	Answer
1	Si
2	No

57. ¿Cuál fu la razón que la (o) llevo a matricularse en este programa?

APPENDIX G: PROTOCOL INTERVIEW II

1. How has your learning experience been throughout the telecollaboration?

2. In what areas do you think you have grown?

3. In what areas do you think you have not grown that much?

4. Did you have any objectives in relation to the language ability you wanted to accomplish through the telecollaboration? Explain.

5. Tell me about the obstacles you have faced as a non-native English Speaker throughout the telecollaboration?

6. Tell me about advantages you have as a non-native English speaker while you telecollaborated with your US partners?

7. Tell me about the obstacles you, as a native Spanish Speaker, have in the telecollaboration?

8. Tell me about the advantages you faced as a native Spanish Speaker throughout the telecollaboration?

9. Did you compare yourself to native speakers of English throughout the telecollaboration? Why "yes" or why "not"

10. As a non-native English speaker, what feelings related to the process of learning or teaching English did you have as you telecollaborated?

11. As a native Spanish speaker, what feelings related to the process of learning or teaching Spanish did you have as you telecollaborated?

12. Describe your interaction with your US partners during the telecollaboration.

13. Has your interaction with your US partners surprised you in any way? Explain.

14. Describe a regular meeting with your US partners when you interact using mostly **English**.

15. Describe a regular meeting with your US partners when you interact using mostly **Spanish.**

16. Are you meeting the expectations you had about your collaboration with USA native speakers of English throughout the telecollaboration? Explain.

17. Are you meeting the expectations you had about your collaboration with USA native speakers of English throughout the telecollaboration? Explain.

18. Are you meeting the expectations you had about your collaboration with USA non-native speakers of Spanish throughout the telecollaboration? Explain.

19. Are your US partners similar or different from what you imaged they would be? Explain.

20. Have you felt at a disadvantages in your collaboration with your US partners because you are a Colombian pre-service teacher of English? If so, explain.

21. Have you felt you possess any advantages in your collaboration with USA partners because you are a Colombian pre-service teacher of English?

22. At this point, as a future teacher of English, what concerns do you have in respect to not being a native speaker of the language you will teach?

23. As a future non-native teacher, what do you think you will be able to contribute to your students?

APPENDIX H: INSTRUCTIONS FOR REFLECTION LOGS

Weekly Reflection Logs

In order to encourage your analysis of the experiences you are going through in the telecollaboration, you have been requested to produce a weekly log. It is expected that in the first part of the log, you narrate an incident that you consider relevant. In the second part, you will look at the weekly incident that you selected and produce a reflection about it.

Procedures to Write the Logs

You will be provided 10 possible topics for your reflection. Under each main topic, you will find some questions to help you think in detail about the topic. You need to select three topics every week to write your reflection.

Write your reflection using the academic conventions you normally use to write papers in your class. Each log needs to be not shorter than one page, double space. You are expected to submit the log every Sunday night. You can send it to my email address or to your professor's.

Temas	Preguntas
1	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened is related to the way you feel regarding your ability when using English?
2	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened is related to the way you feel regarding your ability when using Spanish?
3	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened might be related to your future job as a teacher?
4	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened might be leading you to think differently or not in regards to you and your peer as speakers of English and Spanish?
5	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened might be leading you to think differently or not in regards to the culture of the languages you and your peer speak in the telecollaboration?
6	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened shows the advantages or constrains you might have as a Spanish speaker? c. Did your peer react in any way you might consider unexpected? If so, describe their reaction and how you felt about it.

7	c. What happened? a. How do you understand that what happened might be related to the way how your peer think of you as an English speaker?
8	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened might be related to the way how your peer think of you as a Spanish speaker?
9	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened shows you as a speaker of English as a second language?
10	a. What happened? b. How do you understand that what happened shows the advantages or constrains you might have as a speaker of English? c. Did your peer react in any way you might consider unexpected? If so, describe their reaction and how you felt about it.

APPENDIX I: INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE FACEBOOK FORUM

REFERENCES

Alptekin, C. (2002). Towards intercultural communicative competence in ELT. *ELT journal*, *56*(1), 57-64.

Árva, V., & Medgyes, P. (2000). Native and non-native teachers in the classroom. *System*, *28*(3), 355-372.

Baleghizadeh, S., & Motahed, M. J. (2010). An analysis of the ideological content of internationally-developed British and American ELT textbooks. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, *2*(2), 1-27.

Barrat, L (2010). Strategies to Prepare Teachers Equally for Equity. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens,* (pp. 180-201). New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Beaudrie, S. & Fairclough, M. (2012). Introduction, *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States.* In S. Beaudrie & M. Fairclough. *Spanish as a heritage language in the United States: The state of the field*, (pp. 1-17). Washignton: Georgetown University Press.

Belz, J. A. (2002). Social dimensions of telecollaborative foreign language study. *Language Learning & Technology,* 6(1), 60-81.

Belz, J. A. (2002). The myth of the deficient communicator. *Language Teaching Research*, *6*(1), 59-82.

Belz, J. (2003) Linguistic perspectives on the development of intercultural competence in Telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology,* 7(2), 68-99.

Belz, J. A. (2007). The development of intercultural communicative competence in telecollaborative partnerships. In R. O'Dowd. *Online intercultural exchange: an introduction to foreign language teachers*, (pp.127-166). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Belz, J. A., & Kinginger, C. (2002). The cross-linguistic development of address form use in telecollaborative language learning: Two case studies. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*(2), 189-214.

Belz, J. & Kinginger, C. (2003). Discourse options and the development of pragmatic competence by classroom learners of German: The case of address forms. *Language Learning, 53*(4), 591-647. doi: 10.1046/j.1467-9922.2003.00238.x

Belz, J. A., & Müller–Hartmann, A. (2003). Teachers as intercultural learners: Negotiating German–American telecollaboration along the institutional fault line. *The Modern Language Journal*, *87*(1), 71-89.

Belz, J., & Vyatkina, N. (2005). Learner Corpus Analysis and the Development of L2 Pragmatic Competence in Networked Inter-cultural Language Study: The Case of German Modal Particles. *The Canadian Modern Language Review / La revue canadienne des langues vivantes*, *62*(1), 17–48.

Belz, J. & Thorne, S. (2005). Introduction: internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education and the intercultural speaker. In J. Belz & S. Thorne, (Eds.), *Internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education and the intercultural* (pp. IX-XXV) Heinle.

Bennett, J. (2009). Cultivating Intercultural Competence. In D. Deardorff, (Ed.).*The SAGE handbook of intercultural competence,* (pp.121-140). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Bernat, E. (2008). Towards a pedagogy of empowerment: the case of "impostor syndrome" among pre-service non-native speaker teachers in TESOL. *English Language Teacher Education and Development*, 11, 1-8.

Blake, R. J. (2011). Current trends in online language learning. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *31*, 19-35.

Bloomaert, J. (2006). Language ideology. In Encyclopedia of language and linguistics (pp.510-522). Elsevier.

Bonfiglio, T. (2010). *Mother tongues and nations: The invention of the native speaker* (Vol. 226).Walter de Gruyter.

Braine, G. (2005). A history of research on non-native speaker English teachers. In G. Brain (Ed.), *Non-Native Language Teachers* (pp. 13-23). Springer US.

Braine, G. (Ed.). (1999). *Non-native educators in English language teaching*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Brutt-Griffler, J. (2002). *World English: A study of its development* (Vol. 34). Multilingual Matters.

Butler, Y. G. (2007). How Are Nonnative-English-Speaking Teachers Perceived by Young Learners? *Tesol Quarterly*, *41*(4), 731-755.

Byram, M. (1997). *Teaching and assessing intercultural communicative competence*. Multilingual Matters.

Byram, M., & Zarate, G. (1996). Defining and assessing intercultural competence: Some principles and proposals for the European context. *Language Teaching*, *29*(04), 239-243.

Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). Interrogating the "native speaker fallacy": Non-linguistic roots, no-pedagogical results. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The sociolinguistics of foreign-language classrooms: contributions of the native, the near-native, and the non-native speaker. Issues in language program direction* (pp.77-920). Boston: Heinle.

Carreira, M. (2004). Seeking explanatory adequacy: A dual approach to understanding the term "heritage language learner." *Heritage Language Journal*, *2*(1), 1-25.

Chen, W.C., Pedersen, S., Eslami, Z. & Chen, I.J. (2007). Pen-pals as Language Tutors: A Telecollaborative Project for Individualized Instruction in Large EFL Class. In R. Carlsen

et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference 2007* (pp. 2790-2795). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.

Cho, J., & Trent, A. (2006). Validity in qualitative research revisited. *Qualitative research*, *6*(3),

Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanič, R., & Martin-Jones, M. (1991). Critical language awareness part II: Towards critical alternatives. *Language and Education*, *5*(1), 41-54.

Clark, E., & Paran, A. (2007). The employability of non-native-speaker teachers of EFL: A UK Survey. *System*, *35*(4), 407-430.

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

Cook, V. (2007). The Goals of ELT. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 237-248). Springer US.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Lincoln: Sage.

Creswell, J. & Plano, V. (2010). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Crystal, D. (2008). Two thousand million? *English Today*, *24*(01), 3-6.

Chomsky, N. (1986), Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use: New York, Praeger.

Daniels, H. (2010).Motives, emotion, and change. *Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 2, 24-33.

Darhower, M. (2002). Interactional features of synchronous computer-mediated communication in the intermediate L2 class: A sociocultural case study. *CALICO journal*, *19*(2), 249-277.

Darhower, M. (2007). A tale of two communities: Group dynamics community building in a Spanish-English telecollaboration. *CALICO Journal, 24*(3), 561-589. (https://www.calico.org/p-5-CALICO Journal.html)

Davies, A. (2004). The native speaker in applied linguistics. In A. Davis and C. Elder (Eds.), *The handbook of applied linguistics*, (pp. 431-450). Oxford: Blackwell.

Davies, A. 2003. *The native speaker: myth and reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Deardorff, D. K. (2011). Assessing intercultural competence. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2011*(149), 65-79.

De Mejía, A. M. (2005). Bilingual education in Colombia: Towards an integrated perspective. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 7(5), 381-397.

Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2005). Second language accent and pronunciation teaching: A research-based approach. *Tesol Quarterly*, *39*(3), 379-397.

Dooly, M. & O'Dowd, R. (2012). Researching online foreign language interaction and exchange: Introduction to the volume. In M. Dooly & R. O'Dowd (Eds.), *Researching online foreign language interaction and exchange* (pp.12-41). Bern: Peter Lang.

Doryei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Dussias, P. E. (2006). Morphological development in Spanish-American telecollaboration. In J. Belz & S. Thorne, (Eds*.), Internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education*, (pp.121-146). Heinle.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Routledge.

Ferguson, (1992). Foreword. In B. Kachru, (Ed.). (1992). *The other tongue: English across cultures*. University of Illinois Press.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The modern language journal*, *81*(3), 285-300.

Fuchs, C., Hauck, M., & Müller-Hartmann, A. (2012). Promoting learner autonomy through multiliteracy skills development in cross-institutional exchanges. *Language Learning & Technology*, *16*(3), 82-102.

García León, J., & García León, D. (2012). Políticas lingüísticas en Colombia: tensiones entre políticas para lenguas mayoritarias y lenguas minoritarias. *Boletín de filología*, *47*(2), 47-70.

García, O. (2005). Positioning heritage languages in the United States. *Modern Language Journal*, 601-605.

Giroux, H. A. (2011). *On critical pedagogy*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Glesne, C. (2006). Becoming qualitative researchers. Boston: Pearson

Goldstein, L. S. (1999). The relational zone: The role of caring relationships in the co-construction of mind. *American Educational Research Journal*, *36*(3), 647-673.

González, A. (2010). English and English teaching in Colombia. *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*, 332.

Graddol, D. (2003). The decline of the native speaker. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.). *Translation today: trends and perspectives* (pp.152-167). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Groenewald, T. (2004). A phenomenological research design illustrated.

Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2005). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N.K Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp.191, 215). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Guerrero, C.H. (2008). Bilingual Colombia: What does it mean to be bilingual within the framework of the National Plan of Bilingualism? *Profile*, *9*, 27-45.

Guerrero, C. H. (2010). Is English the key to access the wonders of the modern world? A Critical Discourse Analysis. *Signo y Pensamiento*, *29*(57), 294-313.

Guth, S. & Helm, F. (2010). Introduction. In S. Guth & F. Helm (Eds.), *Telecollaboration* 2.0 (pp.1323). Bern: Peter Lang.

Helm, F., Guth, S., & Farrah, M. (2012). Promoting dialogue or hegemonic practice: Power issues in telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology*, *16*(2), 103-127.

Holliday, A. (2006). Native-speakerism. *ELT journal*, *60*(4), 385-387.

House, J. (2007). What Is an 'Intercultural Speaker'? In *Intercultural language use and language learning* (pp. 7-21). Springer Netherlands.

Inbar-Lourie, O. (2005). Mind the gap: Self and perceived native speaker identities of EFL teachers. In E. Llurada (Ed.), *Non-native language teachers* (pp. 265-281). New York: Springer US.

Jenkins, J. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca. *Tesol Quarterly*, *40*(1), 157-181.

Johnson, K. & Golombek, P. (2011). *A sociocultural theoretical perspective on teacher professional development. In K*. Johnson & P. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective on Professional*. Taylor & Francis.

Kabel, A. (2009). Native-speakerism, stereotyping and the collusion of applied linguistics. *System*, *37*(1), 12-22.

Kachru, B. (1990). *The alchemy of English: The spread, functions, and models of non-native Englishes*. University of Illinois Press.

Kachru, Y. (1994). Discourse strategies, pragmatics, and ESL: Where are we going? In R. K. Agnihotri & A. L. Khanna (Eds.), *Second language acquisition* (pp. 289-304). London: Sage.

Kachru, B. B. (1996). World Englishes: agony and ecstasy. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 135-155.

Kachru, B., & Nelson, C. (1996). World Englishes. In S. L. Mckay & N.H.Hornberger. Sociolinguistics and Langue Teaching (pp. 71-102). Cambridge: CUP.

Kamhi-Stein, L. D. (2005). Research perspectives on nonnative English-speaking educators. In P. Bruthiaux, D. Atkinson, W. Eggington, W. Grabe, & V. Ramanathan, (Eds.), *Directions in applied linguistics: Essays in honor of Robert B. Kaplan* (pp. 72–83). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Kasper, G. (2001). Four perspectives on L2 pragmatic development. *Applied linguistics*, *22*(4), 502-530.

Ke, I. (2009). Haunting Native Speakerism? Students' Perceptions toward Native Speaking English Teachers. *English Language Teaching*, *2*(3), 44-52.

Kern, R. (2006). Perspectives on technology in learning and teaching languages. *Tesol Quarterly*, *40*(1), 183-210.

Kim, H. K. (2011). Native Speakerism Affecting Nonnative English Teachers' Identity Formation: A Critical Perspective. *English Teaching*, *66*(4), 53-71.

Kinginger, C., & Belz, J. A. (2005). Socio-cultural perspectives on pragmatic development in foreign language learning: Microgenetic case studies from telecollaboration and residence abroad. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *2*(4), 369-421.

Kramsch, C., & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, *50*(3), 199-212.

Kramsch, C. J. (1998). The privilege of the intercultural speaker. In M. Byram & M. Fleming (Eds.), Language *Learning in Intercultural Perspectives: Approaches to Drama and Ethnography* (pp.16-31). Cambridge: CUP

Kramsch, C. & Lam, W. S. (1999). Textual identities: The importance of being non- native. In G. Braine (Ed.). *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp.57-72). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Kramsch, C. (2000). Second language acquisition, applied linguistics, and the teaching of foreign languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, *84*(3), 311-326.

Kramsch, C. (2003). The privilege of the non-native speaker. In C. Blyth (Ed.), *The Sociolinguistics of Foreign-Language Classrooms: Contributions of the Native, the Near-native, and the Non-native Speaker* (pp.251-262). Boston, MA: Heinle.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2008) Language Ideologies. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *A Companion to linguistic anthropology* (pp.496-527).Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2010). Language ideologies–Evolving perspectives. *Society and language use*, *7*, 192-209.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The post method condition: (E) merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *Tesol Quarterly*, *28*(1), 27-48.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (p. 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. and Thorne, S. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In B. Van Patten and J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp.201-224). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum, Publishers.

Leather, J., & Van Dam, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Ecology of language acquisition*. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lee, L. (2002). Synchronous online exchanges: A study of modification devices on non-native discourse. *System*, *30*(3), 275-288.

Lee, L. (2004). Learners' perspectives on networked collaborative interaction with native speakers of Spanish in the US. *Language Learning & Technology*, *8*(1), 83-100.

Leech, B. L. (2002). Asking questions: techniques for semi-structured interviews. *Political Science and Politics, 35*(4), 665-668.

Liaw, M. L., & Bunn-Le Master, S. (2010). Understanding telecollaboration through an analysis of intercultural discourse. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *23*(1), 21-40.

Ling, C. & Braine, G. (2007). The attitudes of university students towards non-native speakers English teachers in Hong Kong. *RELC journal*, *38*(3), 257-277.

Lippi-Green, R. (1997). *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. Psychology Press.

Llurda, E. (2004). Non-native-speaker teachers and English as an International Language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *14*(3), 314-323.

Llurda, E. (2008). The effects of stays abroad on self-perceptions of non-native EFL teachers. In S. Dogancay-Aktuna & J. Hardmann (Eds.), *Global English teaching and teacher education: Praxis and possibility* (pp. 99-111). Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Llurda, E. (2009). The Decline and fall of the native speaker. *Contemporary Applied Linguistics*, *1*, 37-53.

Llurda, E. & A. Huguet (2003). Self-awareness in NNS EFL primary and secondary school teachers. *Language Awareness* 13, 220–235.

Macias, D. (2010). Considering new perspectives in ELT in Colombia: From EFL to ELF. *How, A Colombian Journal for Teachers of English*, 17, 181-194.

Mahn, H., & John-Steiner, V. (2002). Developing the affective zone of proximal development. In G. Well & G. Claxton (Eds.). *Learning for life in the 21st century: Socio-cultural perspectives on the future of education* (pp.46-58). Oxford: Blackwell.

Mahboob, A. (2003). Status of non-native English speaking teachers in the United States. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Indiana University, Bloomington, N.

Mahboob, A. (2005). Beyond the native speaker in TESOL. *Culture, context, & communication*, 60-93.

Mahboob, A. (2010). *The NNEST lens*. New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Marlina, R. (2014). The Pedagogy of English as an International Language (EIL): More Reflections and Dialogues. In *The Pedagogy of English as an International Language* (pp. 1-19). Springer International Publishing.

Mar-Molinero, C. (2000). *The politics of language in the Spanish-speaking world: From colonisation to globalisation*. London: Routledge.

Mar-Molinero, C. (2004). Spanish as a world language: Language and identity in a global era. *Spanish in Context*, 1(1), 3-20.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2011). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

McKay, S. L. (2002). Teaching English as an international language: Rethinking goals and perspectives. *NY: OUP*.

McLaren, P. (1998). *Life in Schools. An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. *NY: OUP*.

Medina, S. & Arcila, F. (2013). Sociocultural factors involved in the teaching of English as foreign language in rural areas of Colombia: an analysis of the impact on teachers' professional development. *Research in Teacher Education,* 2(3), 28-33.

Medgyes, P. (1999). *The non-native teacher*. Germany: Hueber.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M., Huberman, A. & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.

Milroy, J. (2001). Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization. Journal of sociolinguistics, 5(4), 530-555.

Modiano, M. (1999). Standard English (es) and educational practices for the world's lingua franca. *English Today*, *15*(04), 3-13.

Modiano, M. (2001). Ideology and the ELT practitioner. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *11*(2), 159-173.

Moussu, L. (2006). Native and non-native English-speaking English as a second language teachers: Student attitudes, teacher self-perceptions, and intensive English program administrator beliefs and practices. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Purdue University, West Lafayette.

Moussu, L., & Llurda, E. (2008). Non-native English-speaking English language teachers: History and research. *Language Teaching*, *41*(03), 315-348.

Mukherjee, J. (2005). The native speaker is alive and kicking: linguistic and language pedagogical perspectives. *Anglistik*, *16*(2), 7-23.

Müller -Hartmann, A. (2007). Teacher role in telecollaboration: Setting up and managing exchanges. In R. O'Dowd. *Online intercultural exchange: an introduction to foreign language teachers*, (pp.169-191). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Negueruela-Azarola, E. (2011). Changing reasons as reasoning changes: a narrative interview on second language classroom motivation, telecollaboration, and the learning of foreign languages. *Language Awareness*, *20*(3), 183-201.

Norton, B., & Tang, C. (1997). The identity of the nonnative ESL teacher on the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. *Tesol Quarterly*, *31*(3), 577-580.

O'Dowd, R. (2003). Understanding the "other side": Intercultural learning in a Spanish-English e-mail exchange. *Language Learning & Technology*, *7*(2), 118-144.

O'Dowd, R., & Ritter, M. (2006). Understanding and working with failed communication in telecollaborative exchanges. *CALICO journal*, *23*(3), 623-642.

O'Dowd, R., & Wire, P. (2009). Critical issues in telecollaborative task design. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *22*(2), 173-188.

Ordóñez, C. L. (2011). Education for bilingualism in international languages in a monolingual Socio-Linguistic context. *Lenguaje,* 36(2) 353-384.

Otheguy, R., & Stern, N. (2011). On so-called Spanglish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, *15*(1), 85-100.

Paffey, D. (2007). Policing the Spanish language debate: verbal hygiene and the Spanish language academy (Real Academia Española). *Language Policy*, *6*(3-4), 313-332.

Paikeday, T. (1985). *The native speaker is dead!: An informal discussion of a linguistic myth with Noam Chomsky and other linguists, philosophers, psychologists, and lexicographers*. Ontario: PPI.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks: Thousand Oaks: Sage.

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

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Routledge.

Pennycook, A. (2007). ELT and colonialism. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 13-24). Springer US.

Phillipson, R. (1992). ELT: the native speaker's burden? *ELT journal*, *46*(1), 12-18.

Rajagopalan, K. (1997). Linguistics and the myth of nativity: Comments on the controversy over 'new/non-native Englishes'. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *27*(2), 225-231.

Rajagopalan, K. (2005). Non-native speaker teachers of English and their anxieties: Ingredients for an experiment in action research. In E. Llurda (Ed.) *Non-Native language teachers: Perceptions, challenges and contributions to the profession* (pp. 283-303). Springer US.

Rampton, M. B. H. (1990). Displacing the 'native speaker': Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT journal*, *44*(2), 97-101.

Reinhardt, J. (2012). Accommodating divergent frameworks in analysis of technology-mediated L2 interaction. In M. Dooly & R. O'Dowd (Eds.). *Researching Online Foreign Language Interaction and Exchange: Theories, Methods and Challenges* (pp.45-77). Wien/Bern: Peter Lang

Reyes, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-Image: An international survey. *System*, *22*(3), 353-367.

Ricento, T. (2000). Ideology, politics and language policy. Introduction. In T. Ricento (Ed.). *Politics and language policies: Focus on English* (Vol. 6) (pp.1-8). John Benjamins Publishing.

Risager, K. (2007). *Language and culture pedagogy: From a national to a transnational paradigm* (Vol. 14). Multilingual matters.

Samimy, K. & J. Brutt-Griffler (1999). To be a native or non-native speaker: Perceptions of 'non-native' students in a graduate TESOL program. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English Language Teaching* (pp127–144). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Samimy, K. K., & Kurihara, Y. (2006). Nonnative speaker teachers. In K. Brown (Ed.), Encyclopedia of language & linguistics (second edition) (pp. 679-686). Oxford: Elsevier. doi:http://dx.doi.org.ezproxy2.library.arizona.edu/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/00614-3

Sayer, P. (2008). Demystifying language mixing: Spanglish in school. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, *7*(2), 94-112.

Schenker, T. (2012). Intercultural Competence and Cultural Learning through Telecollaboration. *CALICO Journal*, *29*(3), 449-470.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

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

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York: Teachers college press.

Şimşek, M. (2012). Evaluation of Student Teachers' opinions on The Native /Non-Native Dichotomy. *Mustafa Kemal University Journal of Social Sciences Institute*, 9(17), 469-496.

Slebus, E. (2012). La percepción y las actitudes lingüísticas hacia el castellano peninsular y distintas variantes del español hispanoamericano. Retrieved from http://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/248895

Smith, L. E. (1976). English as an international auxiliary language. *RELC journal*, *7*(2), 38-42.

Snow, M. A., Kamhi-Stein, L. D., & Brinton, D. M. (2006). Teacher training for English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, *26*, 261-281.

Spitzberg, B.H., & Changnon, G. (2009). Conceptualizing multicultural competence. In D.K. Deardorff (Ed.), *Handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 2-52). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies. In N.K Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (pp.* 443-466*)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Stickler, U., & Emke, M. (2011). Literalia: towards developing intercultural maturity online. *Language Learning & Technology*, *15*(1), 147-168.

Thorne, S. (2005). Pedagogical and praxiological lessons from internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education research. In J. Belz & S. Thorne, (Eds*.), Internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education* (pp. 2-30). Heinle.

Thorne, S. L. (2008). Mediating technologies and second language learning. Handbook of research on new literacies, 417-449.

Thorne, S. (2010). The intercultural turn and language learning in the crucible of New Media. In F. Helm & S. Guth (Eds.), *Telecollaboration 2.0 for Language and Intercultural Learning* (pp. 139-164). Bern: Peter Lang.

Timmis, I. (2002). Native-speaker norms and International English: a classroom view. *ELT journal*, *56*(3), 240-249.

Tollefson, J. W. (2000). Policy and ideology in the spread of English. In J. Hall & W. Eggington. (Eds.), *The Sociopolitic of English language teaching* (pp.7-21). Retrieve from Ebsco Publishing.

Tollefson, J. W. (2007). Ideology, language varieties, and ELT. In *International handbook of English language teaching* (pp. 25-36). Springer US.

Train, R. (2005). A critical look at the technologies and ideologies in Internet-mediated foreign language education. In J. Belz & S. Thorne (Eds.), *Internet-mediated intercultural foreign language education* (pp.217-284). Boston: Heinle.

Train, R. (2007). "Real Spanish:" Historical Perspectives on the Ideological Construction of A (Foreign) Language. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies*, *4*(2-3), 207-235.

Train, R. (2011). Language ideology and foreign language pedagogy. In, D. Ayoun (Ed.). *French applied linguistics*, (pp. 238-269). Retrieved from John Benjamins Publishing.

Tudini, V. (2003). Using native speakers in chat. *Language Learning & Technology*, *7*(3), 141-159.

Usma, J. (2009). Globalization and language and education reform in Colombia: A critical outlook. *Íkala*, 14 (2), 19-42.

Usma, J. (2009). Education and language policy in Colombia: exploring processes of inclusion, exclusion, and stratification in times of global reform. *Profile Issues in teachers Professional Development*, (11), 123-141.

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. Ontario: Suny Press.

Valdés, G. (1999). Heritage language students: Profiles and possibilities. *IDENTIFIERS'*, 37.

Valdés, G., González, S. V., García, D. L., & Márquez, P. (2003). Language ideology: The case of Spanish in departments of foreign languages. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *34*(1), 3-26.

Valencia, M. (2013). Language Policy and the Manufacturing of Consent for Foreign Intervention in Colombia. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, *15*(1).

Van Lier, L. (Ed.). (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: A sociocultural perspective* (Vol. 3). Springer.

Velez–Rendón, G. (2003). English in Colombia: A sociolinguistic profile. *World Englishes*, *22*(2), 185-198.

Vera, J. & Holbrook, M. (1996). Sociocultural approaches to learning and development: A Vygotskian framework. *Educational psychologist*, *31*(3-4), 191-206.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The genesis of higher mental functions. In J. V. Wertsch (Ed.), The concept of activity in Soviet psychology. Armonk, NY: Sharpe.

Wang, D. (2014). Effects of Study Abroad on Teachers' Self-perceptions: A Study of Chinese EFL Teachers. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *5*(1), 70-79.

Ware, P.D., (2005). Missed communication in online communication: Tensions in a German-American telecollaboration. *Language Learning & Technology*, *9*(2), 64-89.

Ware, P.D., & Kramsch, C. (2005). Toward an Intercultural Stance: Teaching German and English through Telecollaboration. *The Modern Language Journal*, *89*(2), 190–205.

Ware, P. D., & Rivas, B. (2012). Researching language integration of online language learning projects: Mixed method approaches. In M. Dooly & R. O'Dowd. (Eds.). *Researching Online Foreign Language Interaction and Exchange: Theories, Methods and Challenges* (pp.107-131). Postfach: Peter Lang AG.

Warschauer, M. (1998). Researching technology in TESOL: Determinist, instrumental, and critical approaches. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(4), 757-761.

Warschauer, M. (2001). On-line communication. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp. 207–212). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Warschauer, M. (2005). Sociocultural perspectives on CALL. In J. Egbert & G. Mikel (Eds.) *CALL research pers*pectives (pp.41-51). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Wertsch, J. V. (1994). The primacy of mediated action in sociocultural studies. Mind, Culture, and Activity, 1(4), 202-208.

White, L., & Genesee, F. (1996). How native is near-native? The issue of ultimate attainment in adult second language acquisition. *Second Language Research*, 17, 233-265.

Widdowson, H. G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL quarterly*, *28*(2), 377-389.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. *Annual review of anthropology, 23,* 55-82.

Wu, A., Liang, J. & Csepelyi, T. (2010). Coping strategies for NNESs teachers' Development. In A. Mahboob (Ed.), *The NNEST lens,* (pp.202-221). New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Zárate, J. A., & Álvarez, J. A. (2011). A perspective of the implications of the Common European Framework implementation in the Colombian socio-cultural context. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, (7), 7-26.

Ziaei, S. (2012). Examining Cross-Cultural Clues as to Globalization and Iran's Culture in an International ELT Book Series-American English File. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 141.