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ABSTRACT

The spread of English as an international language has resulted in an exponential growth of the demand for English language teachers around the world. Among the teacher training programs with a well-established presence globally are the Cambridge English teaching qualifications and courses, such as the CELTA, the DELTA and ICELT courses, which are commonly used as a requirement for teaching entry or professional advancement in private and public institutions. In many countries in Latin America, like Mexico, these certifications have also fulfilled important functions within national-level policy, including serving as the professional standard for teachers’ development within national English programs. However, despite their relevance, little research has been conducted on these certifications outside British academic circles, or even outside Cambridge English, which has resulted in a lack of contextualised understanding of these qualifications.

This study addresses this gap, analysing different aspects of the ethos of one iteration of the ICELT course, a course leading to an in-service teaching qualification explicitly designed to meet needs and conditions in local contexts (Wilson and Poulter 2015). The study looks at predominant discursive practices identified in textual data to identify aspects of representation, discursive implementation of the course, and experiential perception.

The research was conducted according to a qualitative inquiry design informed by ethnography. Most of the data were produced through fieldwork in one iteration of the course that took place in Mexico during a 9-month period corresponding with the duration of the course. The main methods of data production included documentary research, class observations, interviews, focus groups and research journaling. The data were analysed thematically according to three analytic dimensions: ‘on paper’ (fundamentally, the course documents), ‘in practice’ (fundamentally, aspects of the implementation of the course by the tutors through their discursive instructional practices), and ‘experiential’ (in general, the candidates’ perceptions of their own experience in the course). As a way to mitigate bias during the different phases of research, besides reflective journaling, I made a deliberate attempt to suspend judgment, intentionally distanced myself from the data and sought to falsify recurring themes as they were produced. Finally, the data were discussed convergently, and also in relation to three theoretical-problematic areas: ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’, ‘the marketisation of teacher education’ and ‘epistemological decolonisation’.

xvi
The findings of this study show that the representation of the course and the tutors in the iteration of the course researched was to some extent ideological and, as such, was used to legitimise the imposition of pedagogies and epistemologies which in many cases were in tension and conflict with the candidates’ teaching cultures, their knowledge base and their associated instructional practices. This research also shows that, even though complex, the discursive practices of the tutors represented, to a certain extent, a form of symbolic violence to which the candidates responded with pragmatism, conceptualised here as *defensive pragmatism*, i.e., pragmatism used as a form of both practical and theoretical defence. Finally, it is argued that further exploration of this type of teacher training provision is required, particularly from a global south perspective.

Empirically, this study contributes to the existing literature by providing contextualised insight into the complexity of the interrelationship of three analytic dimensions of the course’s life (production, implementation and consumption), showing their potential merits and tensions, making manifest their limitations (particularly in terms of the development of contextually appropriate methodologies) and making visible their ideological nature.

Methodologically, this study contributes to the existing literature by presenting an innovative qualitative design that deals not only with issues of transparency but also error and illusion (Morin 1999, 2007, 2008).
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The Cambridge English teaching qualifications and courses have a well-established presence globally as initial and in-service English language teacher training provision. In many countries, public and private education institutions use these certifications as requirements for teaching entry or professional advancement. In Mexico, these certifications have had a prominent role in the field of English language teacher education fulfilling different functions: as a model for professional development in teacher training programs at higher education level in the public sector (Grounds 2017), as a professional benchmark in the National System of Certification and Accreditation of English language teachers (SEP 2011) and, since 2017, as the professional standard for teachers’ development within the national English program (SEP 2017a), current at the time of writing. However, despite their relevance, relatively little research has been conducted on these qualifications outside of British academic circles, or even outside the Cambridge English teacher training system (e.g., research carried out by course assessors, moderators, and tutors). This has resulted in a lack of a contextualised understanding of these teaching qualifications and, as a consequence, in a poorly-informed adaptation and implementation of them, particularly in countries in the Global South. In view of this, the present study sets out to investigate different aspects of the ethos of one iteration of the ICELT course in Mexico, a Cambridge English in-service teacher training course explicitly designed to meet teaching and learning needs and conditions in local contexts (Wilson and Poulter 2015), with the aim to contribute to developing precisely a hitherto neglected contextualised understanding of this course from a data-led, reflexive, self-critical, and ideologically counter-balanced perspective.

The concept of ethos is understood in this study in two senses: as the images of themselves that individuals build in their discourse, i.e., as self-representation (original historical sense) and as the fundamental elements that characterise an individual, a community, or a culture, e.g., the culture of a course (in a more current conceptualisation) (Amossy 2001; Bermúdez 2007; di Fanti, M. da G. C., & Feré, L. 2018).

In what follows, I will refer briefly to my personal reasons for choosing the topic of this research. I will then outline the research aims, focus and questions of this study, and finally, I will provide an overview of the forthcoming chapters of the thesis.
1.2 Personal motivation for the study

In general, my interest in the Cambridge English teacher training program was originated while looking for opportunities for professional development as an English language teacher in Mexico. As I mentioned above, these qualifications and courses had a presence as a professional benchmark in the field of ELTE in my home country and, in this sense, completing one of these qualifications after obtaining my BA represented a viable option for professional development and career advancement.

Having this in mind, between the years 2010-2015, I completed what at the time constituted the full teaching training program of Cambridge English, including the core and specialist modules of the Teaching Knowledge Test (TKT); the Certificate in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (CELTA); the In-Service Certificate in English Language Teaching (ICELT) and the Diploma in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (DELTA), the latter under the supervision of Jim Scrivener and Mary Spratt, well-known authors in the field of ELT.

Because of its prestige and status, completing this training program gave me a sense of professional achievement and pride. It also provided me with a conceptual framework that helped me organise part of the teaching knowledge acquired in my academic studies and those accumulated as an English language teacher through a career of 10 years. Finally, it gave me a set of new teaching techniques that, I thought at the time, had the potential to help me improve my teaching practice. However, at the same time, I felt that the program presented some serious flaws that questioned its integrity as a model of professional development, such as, for example, its highly prescriptive nature, its apparent Anglocentrism, and its theoretical and methodological self-containment, expressed in a lack of acknowledgement and consideration of other approaches, methodologies, teaching practices outside of those covered in the program.

These factors created some tensions that represented a constant source of concern and puzzlement for me, particularly because of the growing relevance that these qualifications and courses had acquired in the Mexican context but also because, in a sense, they constituted an important part of my professional development. As such, these tensions motivated me to want to learn more about these qualifications and undertake research on the ICELT course that, at the time, was a certification with high demand among teachers in Mexico given its official recognition as a minimum professional requirement for teachers in public schools and universities in the country and also because of its official recognition as one of the requirements to earn a BA in ELT that was offered by the Ministry of Education in Mexico (SEP 2011).
1.3 Research aims, focus and questions

The initial research focus of this study was the possibilities and limitations of teacher autonomy within the ICELT course. The main reason was that I considered that teacher autonomy was not only an intrinsic value of teacher professional development (Barfield & Smith 1999; Smith 2000 & 2003), but potentially a pre-condition for the existence of such development (McGrath 2000), or even the aim of this process (Benson & Huang 2008) and, in this sense, a research-worthy focus. However, a kindly suggestion made by Fiona Barker, at the time the Principal Research Manager at Cambridge English in the U.K., and whom I had originally contacted in relation to the use of official material of the course in this thesis, made me reconsider and redefine the focus of this study. In one of our mail exchanges, Fiona recommended that I clearly identify in my research what came from Cambridge English (e.g., the course's syllabus, assessment, and requirements) from what would come from the centre in which I was going to conduct my research. Even though puzzling at first, this suggestion led me to gradually centre my attention on what ended up to be the research focus of this study, namely: aspects of what was fundamental in the course, i.e., aspects of the ethos of the course. As a research strategy, I decided to explore the course in three different analytical dimensions: the course as such, particularly in terms of the original intentions of the course producers (what I later conceptualised as 'ICELT on paper'); the implementation of the tutors, particularly the tutors' discourse (later called 'ICELT as implemented'), and the experience of the candidates (fundamentally expressed in three case studies).

In turn, the initial review of the literature on the Cambridge English qualifications and courses allowed me to identify knowledge and methodological gaps that also helped me to refine my research aims and focus. Regarding the former, I identified in the literature two strands that in some aspects stood at opposite ends of a continuum: on the one hand, research studies that emphasised positive aspects of the qualifications (e.g., Barduhn 1998; Borg 2002; Lengeling 2006; Godfrey 2009; O’Connor 2011; Personn 2014; Delaney 2015; Wilson & Poulter 2015) and, on the other hand, studies that had a critical perspective on essential aspects of these certifications (e.g., Ferguson & Donno 2003; Gonzalez 2007 & 2009; Torres-Martinez 2009; Richter 2014; Gray and Block 2012; Block and Gray 2015; Usma 2009 & 2015), including some studies which contained both perspectives (e.g., Anderson 2016). The consideration of these perspectives in the literature led me to seek to adopt a data-led, reflexive, and ideologically counter-balanced research perspective.

Concerning the latter, as mentioned above, my initial review of the literature also revealed that very few of the research studies on these certifications had been conducted outside the British
context or by researchers without links with Cambridge English, which was likely to explain the absence of micro-contextual perspectives and understandings in most of these studies. This led me to redefine my research aim and to set out to investigate aspects of the ethos of one iteration of the ICELT course with the aim to develop, precisely, a contextualised understanding of the course. The aspects of the ethos to be researched included elements of representation, ends, distinctive components and prominent discursive practices as expressed and identified in the three dimensions referred to above.

Thus conceptualised, the research questions that guided and shaped this study were the following:

1. What are the fundamental characteristics of ICELT according to course documents and course-related documents?
   1.1 How is ICELT represented, overall?
   1.2 What are the ends of the course?
   1.3 What are the distinctive components of the course?

2. What is particular in the way the course is implemented?
   2.1 How is ICELT represented in one iteration of the course?
   2.2 How are the ends of ICELT expressed in one iteration of the course?
   2.3 How are the distinctive components of ICELT operationalised in one iteration of the course?
   2.4 How do the course tutors position themselves in relation to the course and the participants?
   2.5 What are the most prominent discursive practices in the course?

3. How do candidates express their own experience in ICELT in one iteration of the course?
   3.1 What feelings do participants express in relation to the course?
   3.2 What perceptions do participants have of the course?
   3.3 How (if at all) do candidates express agency?

The rest of this thesis is the account of my attempt to answer these research questions and thus contribute to the literature on language teacher professional development, and in particular to the literature on this important course.
1.4 Structure of the thesis

This study is divided into nine chapters. In this first chapter, I referred briefly to my personal reasons for choosing the topic of this research and then outlined the research aims, focus and questions of this study, including the rationale for this research. Chapter Two provides the background to the study, presenting general information about the Mexican context, particularly regarding the areas of English language teaching and language teacher education in this country. Chapter Three provides an account of the theoretical background of this research, highlighting some perspectives in tension as well as the gaps that my research aims to fill. This chapter includes a review of the relevant literature in the areas of Second Language Teacher Education; formal teacher development, particularly regarding continuing professional development (CPD) programs; and finally, the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications and courses, as a model of CPD. Chapter Four presents a general account of the research approach of this study, including a description of my philosophical assumptions (or worldview); the procedures of inquiry (or research design), and the specific research methods employed in this study in relation to data production, data analysis, and data interpretation. Chapters Five, Six and Seven present the findings of this study concerning the different aspects of the ethos of the course researched as they were identified in course documents and course-related documents (Chapter Five), in the tutors’ implementation of the course through their discursive instructional practices in one iteration of the course (see Chapter Six), and finally, in the candidates’ perceptions of their own experience in the course (Chapter Seven). Chapter Eight discusses the major findings of this study from the three previous chapters convergently and critically, in light of previous research and theoretical conceptualisations, particularly in the areas of marketisation of teacher education, appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy, and epistemological decolonisation, and in relation to the contribution of the present study to the extant literature. Chapter Nine presents the conclusions of this study and summarises its contributions, limitations, and suggestions for further research in this area.
CHAPTER TWO: Aspects of English language teaching and English language teacher education in Mexico

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to provide general information about the Mexican context, particularly regarding the areas of English language teaching and teacher education in this country. As the content presented in this chapter indicates, Mexico is a vast country with diverse and complex English language teaching and learning contexts. In this sense, the information provided seeks to offer only some coordinates to help the reader understand better the general context in which this research was carried out. The chapter is divided into three sections and different subsections. The second section (2.2) after this introduction presents general information about Mexico, including information about its geographical location, population, ethnicity, education, and languages. The third section (2.3), presents a brief description of the development of ELT in Mexico, particularly concerning a) teaching and learning at a national level, especially in the public sector, and b) teacher education with a focus on its professionalisation, including some references to the role that the Cambridge English teaching qualifications, and in particular the ICELT course, have played in this process. Finally, the last section presents a summary of the content of the chapter.

2.2 México: General information

2.2.1 Geographical location, population and ethnicity self-identification

Mexico is located in the American continent, to the south of the United States and the north of Belize and Guatemala, between the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico. It has a territorial extension of 1,972,550 square kilometres which makes it the world's 13th-largest country by area. The country has an estimated population of 125.3 million people, 50% of whom is underage (0 to 17 years old) (CONAPO, 2020). Mexico is the tenth country with the largest population in the world and the fifteenth world economy according to its GDP per capita (World Bank 2020). According to official figures, approximately 21.5% of the Mexican population considers itself
indigenous; 1.6% consider themselves partially indigenous; 74.7% do not recognize any indigenous lineage, and only 6.5% of the population speaks at least one of the more than 60 indigenous languages documented in Mexico (CONAPO 2016).

2.2.2 Education

According to the latest official data published at the time of this writing the average length of schooling at a national level is estimated to be 8.6 years with an illiteracy rate among adults of 6.7% (SEP 2016, pp.27-28). The Mexican Education System is divided into two sectors: public and private schools with a total population of 36,518,712 million students (SEP 2020). As a whole, it encompasses three types of educational subsystems: basic education, upper-middle education, and higher education. Attendance to basic education and upper-middle education is compulsory. These levels comprise grades K-12, subdivided into pre-primary education (for children ages 5-6), primary education (grades 1 to 6, for children ages 6 to 12 years old), secondary education (grades 7 to 9, for adolescents 12 to 15 years old), and preparatory or high school education (grades 10 to 12, for students 16 to 18 years old). In turn, higher education is divided into undergraduate education, post-graduate education, and job training. Postgraduate education includes master and doctoral degrees as well as postdoctoral studies. Overall, higher education encompasses different types of institutions such as universities, technology institutes, normal schools (teacher education), and job or occupational training (Ramírez-Romero & Sayer 2016; SEP 2016).

2.2.3 Languages

In terms of language use, Mexico is a multilingual nation where, in addition to the de facto national language (Spanish), more than 60 indigenous languages are spoken (Hamel 2016; Terborg, García & Moore 2006) although by only 6.5% of the population (roughly 8 million). In this sense, the term ‘Bilingual Education’ in Mexico refers not only to the teaching and learning of a foreign language (e.g., English) but also to indigenous education, i.e., an indigenous education system that includes the teaching of Spanish and one of the indigenous languages (Roux 2012 and Sayer 2015a).

Concerning the teaching and learning of English, it is estimated that around 24 million people (approximately 20% of the population) study this language (British Council 2015) in multiple and diverse learning contexts and sectors (e.g., public and private); at various levels (e.g., basic education, upper-middle education, and higher education); via distinct modes (e.g., technology-based learning, face-to-face teaching, fully online programs, and so on) different specialisms, with
emphasis on a functional approach (e.g., General English, Business English, English for Specific Purposes, English as a medium of instruction, Academic English and so on).

In terms of language proficiency, in 2020 Mexico ranked 82nd in the world and 19th among 20 Latin-American countries as reported by the EF English Proficiency Index (English First 2020). Other reports show similar results as will be referred to in 2.3.2.

2.3 Aspects of ELT in Mexico

As an area of formal study, English Language Teaching as a foreign language in Mexico has a relatively short existence, particularly in comparison with other disciplines such as Philosophy or Literature. As will be seen later in this section, its integration into the school curriculum in public education dates back only to the 19th century. Since then, there have been different efforts in the public and private sectors to develop this field, including the area of teacher training. These efforts have been varied and frequently have included the collaboration of government agencies from other countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom, particularly in the public sector.

In what follows, I will refer briefly to some important moments in the history of English Language Teaching in Mexico, particularly regarding English language teaching and learning, and English language teacher education, including a reference to the ICELT course and its significance in the Mexican context. This is not intended as a comprehensive historical account but mostly some highlights of a process, building in part on Ramirez-Romero and Vargas-Gil’s study (2019).

2.3.1 English Language Teaching (ELT)

2.3.1.1 Introduction of ELT in Mexico

Among those who have researched the history of ELT in Mexico, there is no agreement on the exact date when this discipline was first introduced in the public education system in the country. Different authors offer different dates and periods (e.g., See Reyes, Murrieta & Hernández 2011; Bremner 2015; Calderón 2015; SEGOB 2020). One of the most remote references to English Language Teaching in the literature can be found in the first curriculum of the Escuela Nacional Preparatoria (National Preparatory School) (NPS) in 1867 which, in the area of study of foreign languages, included the English language together with Latin, Greek, French, German, and Italian (Cardoso 2008). The historical context of the foundation of the NPS was the so-called Restored
Republic after the defeat of the French imperial monarchy and the return of the republic rule in the nation (Katz 1986). Since this moment, every important landmark in the history of this discipline has been linked to a moment of political change in Mexico, as will be seen later in this section.

In the case of the private sector, the American School Foundation, founded in 1888, is thought to have been the first Spanish-English bilingual school to teach English in Mexico (Davies 2020).

In 1923, the recently created Mexican Secretariat of Education (SEP, for its abbreviation in Spanish) restructured the high-school curriculum and dived it into two sections: Secondary Education and Preparatory Education (Zorrilla 2004, p.3). The curriculum for Secondary School education included the knowledge of a foreign language which could be chosen by each student. The options included French and English. The general aim was to help students to learn to ‘translate [the chosen language] and use it in everyday conversations’ (Santos del Real 1999, p.191). Even though English was eliminated in 1932 from the public education programs, a new curriculum established in 1942 reincorporated it into the secondary school curriculum where has remained since then as a Foreign Language or simply as English (Santos 1998).

2.3.1.2 State Programs

In the context of the trade agreement signed by Canada, the United States and Mexico in 1992, called the North American Free Trade Agreement, or simply NAFTA, English Language Teaching became a compulsory subject in secondary education in Mexico at the federal level (SEGOB 2020), even though some states developed further English language learning programs for students at primary and even pre-primary level at a local level.

According to Ramírez-Romero (2015), at first, only five states (out of 32) started implementing EFL courses in their public schools. By 2010 the number of states that offered English language courses in their schools reached 22 (SEP 2010, p.16). The curricula, methodologies, and materials varied significantly among programs. As some authors maintained, the programs were implemented only in a few schools (Castaneda & Davies 2004; Davies 2009; SEP 2010; Ramírez-Romero 2015). According to Ramírez-Romero and Sayer (2016, p. 5), one of the major achievements of the state programs was ‘to establish an organizational structure which subsequently facilitated the implementation of the national program in 2009’.
2.3.1.3 English Enciclomedia

In 2005 the Mexican government implemented a program called *Inglés Enciclomedia* [English Enciclomedia] (SEP 2006), which was part of a larger Information and Communication Technologies-based program called *Enciclomedia*. According to Ramírez-Romero and Vargas-Gil (2019), the main feature of the program was the inclusion in the classroom of digital resources such as digital school textbooks, computers, electronic whiteboards, overhead projectors, and special software. Even though the *Enciclomedia* program was in general well received by teachers and students, the English program was widely criticised (e.g., López-Gopar 2009; López-Gopar and Caballero 2007; López-Gopar, Núñez Méndez, Montes & Cantera 2009). The main critical points raised against it were that, according to some authors, the program had extolled the concept of ‘native speaker’; that it had reinforced the hegemony of Spanish over indigenous languages and that it had not recognised the country’s multilingualism and interculturalism (e.g., López-Gopar, Núñez Méndez, Montes & Cantera 2009; Ramírez-Romero & Sayer, 2016). After six years since it was first piloted, the program was cancelled in 2011 without having been implemented nationwide.

2.3.1.4 The NEPBE

In 2008, the Mexican government, through the Consejo Nacional de Autoridades Educativas [National Council of Educational Authorities], designed the first national program of English called *Programa Nacional de Ingles para la Educación Básica* (PNIEB) [National English Program for Basic Education (NEPBE)] (SEGOB 2015, p. 4). According to different researchers, some of the factors that prompted the establishment of this program included, among others, the recommendations of ‘experts’ to improve the performance of Mexican students in international tests; the pressure from international organizations in the same direction; the alignment of the Mexican government with the policies of the United States and Canada regulated by NAFTA, and finally, the international trend to incorporate the teaching of English in the early grades (see Cha & Ham 2008, Bremner 2015; Rixon 2013; Moore 2012; Sayer 2015b).

NEPBE started as a pilot program from preschool to 6th grade of elementary school in 2009. In 2011, the testing stage was extended to 1st, 2nd and 3rd grades of secondary school, continuing until 2015, the date on which, according to the Mexican government, the expansion phase was implemented in the 32 Federal Entities of the country (SEGOB 2020). However, some of its critics maintain that its implementation was only partially fulfilled as it only covered effectively 12.57%
of public schools and 25% of the total number of basic education students in the country (see Ramírez-Romero & Vargas-Gil 2019).

Despite these limitations, as mentioned earlier, the program had the merit of being the first national program of English Language Teaching in Mexico, which represented ‘the largest expansion of English language education in the country’s history’ (Sayer & Ramírez-Romero 2013, p. 1). Among its benefits, the program was said to have led to a higher student enrolment at a national level; nationwide recruitment of more English teachers; the design of an official framework for English and the inclusion of English in the school curriculum (Ramírez-Romero & Sayer 2016). In turn, according to different researchers, some of its main problems were related to teacher training (Sayer, Mercau & Blanco 2013), design, development and distribution of textbooks and didactic materials (Castro 2013), and general working conditions (López de Anda 2013). As maintained by Sayer & Ramírez-Romero (Ibid) these problems ended up affecting adversely the operation and legitimacy of the program.

One relevant aspect related to this program was the implementation during these years of a process of certification of the teachers which, among other things, included the official recognition of the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications within the Certification and Accreditation System for English teachers in Mexico (SEP 2011). This implied that teachers who had any of these qualifications (e.g., CELTA or DELTA) were able to obtain official recognition from the federal education authority. The ICELT course, in particular, was recognised as one of the key requirements for obtaining a BA in ELT offered by the Secretary of Public Education (SEP). As was informally confirmed to me by different sources at three language centres authorised by Cambridge English in Mexico, this led to an exponential growth in the demand for this course in Mexico which, as mentioned in the previous chapter, was part of my initial motivation to research this course.

2.3.1.5 Transitional programs

During 2012-2018, a period that corresponded to the six-year term of a new federal administration, the NEPBE was replaced, and de facto eliminated, with a series of programs that finally culminated in the design and implementation of a new national English language teaching strategy for the public education sector, still in operation today. In what follows, I will briefly outline each one of these programs:
2.3.1.5.1 PFCEB

In 2013, the Secretariat of Public Education announced a new basic education program called the ‘Programa S246 Fortalecimiento de la Calidad en Educación Básica’ (PFCEB) [Program to Improve the Quality of Basic Education] which included a section devoted to ‘support the study of a second language (English)’ (SEP 2014). According to Ramírez-Romero & Sayer (2016), the main characteristic of this strategy was the decentralisation of the management of education which implied that each state, with the support of the federal government, had to assume the responsibility of the implementation and administration of the program. Regarding its results, the same authors comment that, in practical terms, this program entailed various administrative problems which in the short term caused the suspension or reduction of local English language teaching programs and the concomitant redundancy of teachers (Ibid, p. 9). According to the education authority, this program reached an estimated 6.7 million students (Ramírez-Romero, Sayer & Pamplón Irigoyen 2014).

2.3.1.5.2 PRONI

Two years later, in 2015, the federal government announced a new program called Programa Nacional de Inglés (PRONI) [National English Program] (SEGOB 2015) in which, according to Sayer (2015a), the same proposed curriculum of the NEPBE was maintained and, at the same time, the administrative responsibility of the states was reinforced.

As Ramirez-Romero and Vargas-Gil (2019) put forth, the main objectives of PRONI were to support state programs, particularly in terms of the implementation of English courses in public elementary schools, from kindergarten to sixth grade; the development of student and teacher skills through the production and distribution of educational materials for English language teaching and learning; the international certification of students in the command of the English language and, finally, the strengthening of the academic knowledge and the teaching skills of teachers, including their ‘international academic certification’ (Ibid, p. 15).

2.3.1.5.3 A new plan

Finally, in 2017, the Secretariat of Public Education (SEP) presented a yet new national English program called Estrategia Nacional de Fortalecimiento para el aprendizaje del Inglés [National Strategy to Strengthen English Learning]. One of the novelties with respect to the previous
programs was the participation of Cambridge English in the elaboration of the whole curricula and the recognition of the Cambridge English teaching training program as the professional standard for teachers’ professional development (SEP 2017a, p. 303).

Besides the curriculum as such, the program included a series of strategic actions to be implemented which, among other things, considered hiring 1,000 English teachers for the normal schools in the country with the aim of training student-teachers as bilingual teachers; the creation of a B.A. in English Language Teaching for basic education and, finally, the improvement of educational materials, including materials for students with disabilities (SEP 2017b).

An external evaluation carried out two years after the implementation of this program established that, in terms of its design and despite its curricular alignment, the program had different areas of opportunity, such as the improvement of the articulation of its rationale as a national program; its long term planning; its mechanisms for identifying and solving problems; the way results were to be measured, and the consideration of the stakeholders (SEP 2018).

2.3.1.5.4 Other programs

Other initiatives that deserve to be mentioned are the English language teaching-learning programs in both public and private higher education institutions in Mexico, in which it is estimated that study nearly four million students (SEP 2020). According to official figures, 48% of these institutions have English as a compulsory subject and/or have English teaching-learning programs to serve their population (Inglés para la competitividad y la movilidad social 2015). In addition, due to the predominance of the English language in the field of science and higher education (Hamel 2016b), some of these programs, particularly in the private sector, have adopted customised approaches to English language learning that are thought to cater better for the needs of their students. Some of these approaches are Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), Language Arts (a student- and response-centred approach to literature-based teaching) and English as a medium of instruction (EMI), broadly defined as ‘the use of the English language to teach academic subjects (...) where the first language (L1) of the majority of the population is not English’ (Dearden 2014, p. 2). These bilingual programs tend to have some type of English language curricula that generally adopts the form of bilingual school or bicultural school, with 50% of its time learning English (British Council 2015, p. 24).

In the case of the public sector, this type of instruction has gained importance in recent years, particularly in tertiary education where at the time of writing there are almost two dozen
technological universities and ten polytechnic universities working under this modality in Mexico (Escalona-Sibaja 2020).

Finally, even though, there are no official data available hitherto about the private sector of English language schools, the commercial English language education system is said to also have had a long-standing presence and active participation in the areas of English language teaching (Davies 2020) and English language teacher training (Grounds 2017) in Mexico, as will be referred to in the next two sections.

2.3.2 English language learning

Despite the efforts carried out and the achievements made, different studies conducted in recent years have shown that Mexico has not achieved the desired objectives in terms of English language learning in all contexts. Different surveys conducted between the years 2009 to 2013 indicated that, for example, English was spoken by a small percentage of the population, as is illustrated in figure 2.1 below:

- CIDAC - Centro de Investigación para el Desarrollo [Centre of Research for Development] (2009): Proportion of people between the ages 14 and 55 who said that they were able to read and understand English very well.
- Consulta Mitofski: People aged 18 or older.

Figure 2.1 Percentage of people who speak English in Mexico (various sources)
Another study found that the level of language proficiency in English among young adults studying at a high school level (16-18) was ‘low or very low’ (Székely, O’Donoghue & Pérez 2015, p. 87). Even though this report, entitled *Sorry: El Aprendizaje del Inglés en México* [Sorry: Learning English in Mexico], has received some sharp criticism (e.g., Sayer 2015b), its findings are relatively consistent with different national studies conducted in the recent past (e.g., Inglés para la competitividad y la movilidad social 2015; British Council 2015). Finally, authors like Davies (2020), advise caution, suggesting that English Language teaching and learning in Mexico, in reality, covers a wide range of situations and contexts and that, in this sense, more research is required in order to have a more accurate assessment of ELL in Mexico and radically improve the general situation of ELT in Mexico. According to this author, one key issue is related to the professionalisation of ELT in Mexico, especially in public institutions, as will be seen in the following section (Ibid, p 10).

2.3.3 English language teacher education

As in the case of English language teaching and learning, the area of English language teacher education has had an important development in Mexico, albeit a relatively short one. In what follows, I will briefly refer to some key moments of this development, particularly in relation to the professionalisation of English language teachers in Mexico, with a focus on the COTE/ICELT course, to offer the readers relevant information on the context of this research.

2.3.3.1 First initiatives of in-house English teacher training in Mexico

According to Davies (2020), one of the first examples of good English language teaching in Mexico can be found in the first English-Spanish bilingual school established in Mexico, called *the American School Foundation*, founded in 1888, as was referred to above. As stated on its website (www.asf.edu.mx), its original purpose was the establishment of a teaching institution that utilised ‘the most modern and effective teaching methods used in the United States’ with which all teachers of this institution had been trained.

Regarding the teacher training institutions as such, the first antecedents were precisely the referred bi-national English language centres founded in Mexico in the 1940s: the Instituto Mexicano Norteamericano de Relaciones Culturales, the British Council Mexico, and the Instituto Anglo Mexicano de Cultura. According to Davies, these institutions became in time the dominant centres not only for English teaching but also for in-house and later out-house professional teacher training (Ibid, p. 9).
2.3.3.2 Professionalisation of English language teachers in Mexico

As such, from the moment of its creation and up to the present, the aforementioned institutions have participated actively with the educational authority in the professionalisation of the sector in various ways, such as the curricular design of teacher training programs; major teacher training and development projects; evaluation and certification of teachers and, in general, the development of public policy in this area. While some authors have viewed this intervention in positive terms (e.g., Grounds 2017, Davies 2020), other authors have raised critical points about their role in national teacher training policy (e.g., Roux 2012; Ramírez-Romero 2015; Ramírez-Romero and Vargas-Gil 2019). However, this area remains underexplored and further research is required.

2.3.3.3 COTE-ICELT scheme

One important moment in the history of the collaboration of these institutions with the government took place in the 1990s, with the implementation of a major training scheme for university teachers of ELT in each of the 32 states of the country through the then Certificate for Overseas Teachers of English or COTE and, later ICELT (Grounds 2020).

This course, originally derived from the International House and the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) pre-service and in-service courses in the 1980s (see Chapter Three) is said to have been redesigned to fit the needs of the Mexican context (Ariel López, General Director of International House Mexico, personal communication, July 2017). According to one of the participants in the first iteration of this course whom I had the opportunity to interview for this research project, this scheme represented a ‘paradigmatic shift’ in teacher training of the time, particularly due to the elements of innovation of the course. According to her, these elements included a balance between theory and practice in the programmatic content of the course; the element of reflection about not only the ‘what’ but also the ‘why’ of what was learned, and the requirement to write essays (Adriana Rebollo, personal communication, June 2017). Finally, among the main tutors of the scheme were teacher trainers such as Ana Maria Aramayo and Pat Grounds, as well as Julian Edge, Simon Harris, and Paul Davies. According to Grounds (2011), between the years 1993 and 1997, this scheme trained up to 3,500 university teachers of English.

2.3.3.4 Other programs
This scheme was preceded by a substantial program of postgraduate training that took place in the early 1990s through the British Council and which was delivered by Aston University and the Institute of Education. This program is said to have contributed to the process of professionalisation of the Mexican tutors who later would lead the efforts of professionalisation in Mexico (Sue Wharton, personal communication). Among the lecturers who led this program were Keith Richards, Steve Mann, Sue Wharton and Sue Garton. This scheme was followed by different short- and long-term initiatives of teacher professionalisation at various levels. One of these initiatives was the Mexican Advanced Professional Program (MAPP) (1991-1995), which sought to build a bridge between the Certificate for Overseas Teachers of English (COTE / CELT) scheme and BAs in ELT. The program involved five British universities in 9 projects on courses designed to upgrade teachers from 31 public universities (Treffgarne 1999). Other joint programs included the setting up of 34 English language learning resource centres with 3,600 teachers being trained in their use across the country; the certification of teachers from different public universities through online courses in E-tutoring (2005), CELT online courses (2007), the British Council program Formador de Facilitadores PNEB (2009), and Postgraduate programs such as the Postgraduate Certificate in English Language Teaching (PGCert) - a course leading to a University of Southampton award (2008) as well as funding by the authority for MA and PhD in ELT online programs from the same University (Grounds 2017).

2.3.3.5 Undergraduate and postgraduate ELT programs

Regarding public universities, even though the first BA in ELT program dates from 1965 (Universidad de Veracruz) and the first MA dates from 1975 (UNAM), it was not until the 1990s, when undergraduate and postgraduate programs began to be created at a national level. According to Sayer (2007, p. 58), the curricula of some of these programs were heavily influenced by the following factors: the input of the British Council Mexico, the direct involvement of the British Council staff in terms of the development of the study programs and ‘the influence of the COTE- and DOTE-trained teachers who [were] teaching in these programs’.

By the year 2007, the number of BA in ELT totalled 105 nationwide (ANUIES 2007) and by 2020 this number was 130, including Postgraduate, BA and MA in ELT programs, with 14,297 enrolled students in them (ANUIES 2020), which certainly indicates exponential growth. However, as was reported in a study on ELT research in Mexico that covered the decade 2000-2011, the research produced in higher education institutions in Mexico has tended to be concentrated in a few states in the centre of the country (Ramírez-Romero 2013, p. 368). In addition to that, according to the data included in this study, 50% of the total of this production has had as a priority obtaining the
grade (Ibid). This suggests that academic research in ELT in Mexico is a field still in development, as is confirmed by the small number of researchers of this area affiliated to the national system of researchers in Mexico at the time of writing (CONACYT 2020).

2.3.3.6 towards a national agenda of English teacher training

In this context of contrasts, between the reduced number of people who speak English in Mexico, the progress in the professionalisation of English teacher education, and the deficit of at least 300,000 teachers to cover the demand of these professionals in Mexico (Calderon 2015, p. 68), twenty-eight major institutions in the country met to discuss the status of ELT in Mexico in 2015. As a result of this gathering, a document was produced containing a proposal for a national agenda in the field entitled 'Inglés es posible: propuesta de una agenda nacional' [English is possible: proposal for a national agenda] (Inglés para la competitividad y la movilidad social 2015). One set of recommendations contained in the proposal referred to teacher training and, particularly, to the need to articulate a professional development plan for teachers. In the case of the normal schools (the institutions that train student teachers at the undergraduate level in Mexico), the proposal suggested restructuring the curriculum by including both English Language learning and English language teaching with the purpose for teacher graduates to become proficient in the language and, at the same time, to learn how to teach it. Among other elements, the Cambridge TKT: Teaching Knowledge Test, was proposed as the 'national standard' within this process, even though the rationale or the justification of this proposal was not discussed in the document (Ibid, p. 39).

Many of the proposals made in the document were considered by the education authority and eventually incorporated into the 2017 National Strategy to Strengthen English Learning. One example was the case of the normal schools, in which one of the conditions of entry to the recruitment process of new teachers to lead the program indicated that ‘the only’ certifications through which candidates could demonstrate their competence in language teaching were the teaching qualifications from Cambridge English, i.e., the TKT, ICELT and/or the DELTA course (SEP 2017b, p. 2), what contributed to reaffirm the predominance of these certifications in the field of ELT in Mexico.

However, in a sudden turn of events that same year and without any known explanation, the Cambridge English teaching qualifications, including the ICELT course, stopped being recognised as official qualifications in the Certification and Accreditation System for English teachers in Mexico, and in this sense, a key requirement for obtaining the BA in ELT offered by the Secretary
of Public Education (SEP), even though they kept their status as an official requirement in the ongoing hiring process of teachers for the normal schools.

A while later, and without any apparent connection, Cambridge English itself announced that following a ‘review of their teaching qualifications’, the ICELT course would be discontinued from July 2020 (Cambridge English 2020).

Whereas these two events took me by surprise while I was still conducting fieldwork, in a sense they both strengthened my conviction in the relevance of the present research, particularly considering the historical influence of this qualification in the ELT in Mexico and, at the same time, the absence of any rationale that justified its inclusion or its exclusion of the national English language policy, as well as the aforementioned paucity of research on this qualification, as will be seen in the next chapter.

2.3.4 Chapter summary

This chapter provided information on the general context in which this research was conducted, including general information about Mexico and the ELT context in this country, particularly regarding some of the historical milestones of its development in the fields of teaching and learning, and also teacher education.

In the case of the area of English teaching and learning, the chapter presented an overview of its historical development, particularly in the public sphere, in which some of its main achievements were described (e.g., its first national English program. See p.10), as well as some of its inconsistencies (e.g., the transitional programs. See p.11) and their areas of opportunity, such as the small percentage of the population that speaks English in Mexico and/or their level of proficiency.

In the case of the area of teacher education, the chapter presented some moments of its development and professionalisation. As was shown, this area has now a clear path of professional development in which, as mentioned in the text, the Cambridge English teaching qualifications, and in particular the ICELT course, have had a permanent presence since their introduction in Mexico. This notion has been summarised by Grounds (2017, p. 14) who maintains that:
Emerging from a non-existent professional career structure, a vision of an on-going progress that begins with basic pre- or in-service training in the form of COTE/ICELT, and moves on to a BA in ELT and MAs in ELT is becoming more readily accessible to Mexican university English teachers. There is already a palpable demand for PhD options.

However, as is also indicated in the body of the text, the reasons for the inclusion (or the exclusion) of these qualifications and courses in the national language teacher education policy have not been sufficiently explained (if ever). At the same time, there is little research about the impact of these qualifications and courses in the Mexican context, as will be seen in detail in the next chapter. In this sense, it could be argued that their inclusion seems to be more a top-down imposition than an inclusive, democratically constructed policy action, based on solid theoretical and empirical grounds, all of which also justifies the present research.
CHAPTER THREE: Literature Review

3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to provide an account of the academic context of my research, highlighting some perspectives in tension as well as some gaps this study aims to fill. The chapter is divided into six sections. In the second part after this introduction, I will refer briefly to the origin and major developments of the disciplinary area of Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE) with the purpose of providing a foundation of knowledge on the general topic area of this research which, as was referred to in Chapter One, aims to investigate aspects of the ethos of one iteration of a globalised in-service language teacher training course. In the third part, I will present content related to Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programs, in itself a typical form of SLTE, making reference to general characteristics of such programs and aspects of them discussed in the literature including principles of effective CDP. The aim is to place this research within the context of the existing literature in this area. In this section, I will also refer to content related to the area of critical teacher education, with the aim to show the range of perspectives in relation to the CPD programs and, at the same time, to offer background information about one of the perspectives to which this study also responds. In the fourth part, I will provide background information about the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications -in itself a formal CPD scheme-, including a research survey into the literature on these qualifications, with the aim to identify gaps and limits in previous research as well as the need for additional research. In the fifth part, I will present a summary of the main gaps identified in the literature of CPD, and in particular in the CETQs literature, that this research aims to fulfil. Finally, in the last part, I will present a summary of the content of the chapter.

3.2 Second Language Teacher Education

3.2.1 Origins

While Teacher Education is a rather ancient discipline —possibly originated, in the case of the Western world, in the medieval European university (Labaree 2008; Schulman 1986), Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE) is conceptualised in some accounts as a relatively new academic discipline. According to Burns & Richards (2009), SLTE had its origin in the 1960s in the contemporaneous developments of two elements: on the one hand, the short training programs for prospective English teachers in the U.K. (see Pulverness 2015 for a detailed chronological
account), and on the other hand, the developments of the specialised academic knowledge from the then ‘nascent’ discipline of Applied Linguistics, or ‘Linguistics Applied’ as conceptualised by Pennycook (2001). However, despite its short existence, SLTE is a disciplinary area that has developed greatly in various directions and dimensions and that today constitutes a well-established specialised area in Second Language Education (see e.g., Richards & Nunan 1990; Flowedew, Brock & Hsia 1992; Freeman & Richards 1996; Bartels 2006; Burns & Richards 2009; Johnson & Golombek 2011; Tedick 2005; Wright 2010; Crandall & Christison 2016; and Walsh and Mann 2019).

3.2.2 Developments

According to Burns & Richards (2009), the disciplinary area of SLTE has been shaped by its response to major internal and external issues. The internal issues are related to the discipline’s gradual changed understanding of its own essential knowledge base and associated instructional practices, whereas the external issues are related to the external pressures by globalisation and the need for the English language, as an international language, and the concomitant demand by national educational authorities for new language policies, greater central control over teaching and teacher education, and finally, standards and other forms of accountability (2009 p. 1).

Beyond the potential criticism that may generate the aforementioned conceptualisation (e.g., in only considering the literature produced in English, particularly in the U.S. or the U.K.), the distinction between internal and external issues can be useful to show some aspects of the rather complex developments of this disciplinary field.

In what follows, I will refer to some of these developments in a very brief and rather schematic way.

3.2.2.1 Theory and practice

As maintained by Burns and Richards (2009), one major development that has contributed to the gradual ‘changed understanding’ of SLTE’s knowledge and practices is the debate within this field around the relationship between theory (understood as academic knowledge about language and language learning) and practice (understood as teaching skills and pedagogic issues).

According to Trappes-Lomax & McGrath (1999), the theory/practice debate had its peak in the 1990s, when it was accompanied by important reflections on the distinction between the notions of teacher education and teacher training (Widdowson 1990); teacher training and teacher
development (Freeman 1989), teacher education, teacher training and teacher development (Tarone & Allwright 2005) as well as notions such as knowledge about (content knowledge) and knowledge how (pedagogic knowledge and pedagogic content knowledge) (Shulman 1987). See Malderez & Wedell (2007) for a current conceptualisation of these terms. In the following decade, this debate is said to have lost its prominence and been replaced by a reconceptualisation of the knowledge base of SLTE and a shift to a sociocultural perspective (see the following section). However, in recent years this debate seems to be regaining some well-deserved attention (See e.g., ELT Journal 2016).

The theory/practice debate has also been present in the general field of Teacher Education, even though it was not articulated as such until the last quarter of the 19th Century with the foundation of the state normal school in the U.S. Before this date, according to Schulman (1986, p. 6), knowing and teaching were not considered separated entities but ‘one indistinguishable body of understanding’. As this author maintains, in the present, in many educational settings, teaching seems to have taken prominence over knowing given the overemphasis on the practical aspects of teaching, commonly associated with the implementation of rigorous standards for teaching.

This point may require further exploration. However, it is possible to argue at this point that the debate over theory and practice, its relationships and tensions, have been fundamental to the gradual ‘changed understanding´ in SLTE.

3.2.2.2 Knowledge Base and Sociocultural Perspective

The debate about the distinction between theory and practice contributed, as mentioned above, to the reconceptualisation of the knowledge base of SLTE, first called for by Freeman & Johnson (1998) in terms of the need for a new focus of SLTE’s knowledge base on ‘the activity of teaching itself’, centred on ‘the teacher who does it, the contexts in which it is done, and the pedagogy by which it is done’ (p. 397) and away from the historical and theoretical traditions that had defined SLTE, i.e., the transmission of the disciplinary knowledge from Applied Linguistics (as described in Britten 1985 and Freeman & Richards 1993).

According to Johnson (2006, 2009), this reconceptualisation was influential in bringing a new perspective to the field along with other early developments that continued influencing SLTE, such as teacher learning, which interrogated the ways language teaching is learned and the basis in experience and knowledge from which it proceeds (Freeman & Richards 1996); teacher cognition, that helped to understand the role of teachers’ prior experiences in shaping how and why they do what they do (e.g., Borg 2003; Freeman 2002; Woods 1996); reflection (and later reflexivity),
that contributed to the general understanding of teachers’ experiences from the teachers’ view (e.g., Schön 1983 1987; Zeichner 1987; and Zeichner & Liston 1987 1996; Mann & Walsh 2017), or ‘teacher identities’ (e.g., Singh and Richards 2006), among others.

Under this (then) new perspective, teachers were recognised (and encouraged to be) creators/producers of knowledge, or ‘practitioner knowledge’ (Hiebert, Gallimore & Stigler 2002; Johnson 2009) ‘in their own right, by their own means, and as appropriate for their instructional contexts’ (Johnson 2006, p. 240). This knowledge, in turn, was taken as the source of teachers’ practices and understandings. In general terms, this recognition led to a focus in SLTE on ‘teachers, contexts and processes’ of language teaching and learning involving ‘communities of learners engaged in social practices and the collaborative construction of meanings’ (Burns & Richards 2009, p. 4).

The shift in perspective from a top-down instructional-based approach (conceptualised by Day 2000 as ‘the rationalist model’) to a bottom-up sociocultural approach influenced later developments in SLTE, particularly in the form of teacher development practices (called by Wright (2010) ‘the practitioner research culture’). Some examples of these forms are Action Research (e.g., Burns 2005, 2010, 2011); Practitioner Research (e.g., Middlewood, Coleman & Lumby 1999; Auerbach 2000; Zeichner & Nofke 2000); Reflective Practice (e.g., Farrell 2007; Warwick 2007; Mann & Walsh 2013; Walsh & Mann, 2015; Mann 2017); Exploratory Practice (e.g., Allwright 2003 2005; Allwright & Hanks 2009), and more recently Exploratory Action Research (Smith & Rebolledo 2018) and ‘Teacher Research’ in general (Smith 2015b; Burns, Dikilitas, Smith & Wyatt 2017; Sağlam & Dikilitaş 2019; Smith 2020), among others.

These developments, along with other initiatives in the form of Continuing Professional Development have contributed in a significant way to empower teachers worldwide, making them feel confident about themselves and able to innovate professionally, as is narrated in multiple testimonies (e.g., Hayes 2014; Pickering & Gunashekar 2015; Rebolledo, Smith & Bullock 2016. See Padwad & Dixit 2011 for an annotated bibliography on CPD). However, despite remarkable efforts to make them public and accessible, many of these developments remain still unknown in many teaching contexts, partly because of the prominence of top-down professional development programs, whose main characteristics will be described in the following section.
3.3 Formal teacher development: Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programs

Contrasted to teacher development, professional development, or Continuing Professional Development (CPD), can be defined as ‘professional training and qualifications for language teachers’ (Burns and Richards 2009, p. 2), which often takes the form of teacher training programs, such as the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications, (e.g., the CELTA and CELT courses). In this section, I will explore different aspects of these programs.

3.3.1 General characteristics of CPD programs

As Barduhn & Johnson (2009) maintain, CPD programs for English language teachers is a rather broad area, with no distinguishable end, that goes from pre-service teacher courses to undergraduate and postgraduate programs. Just in the U. S. and Canada, for example, the TESOL Directory of Teacher Education Programs refers to information of nearly 420 programs in 232 institutions (Christopher 2005). Currently, this number is likely to be even higher because this directory, possible the latest of its kind, was compiled more than fifteen years ago, and also because it was released before the exponential growth of online courses (e.g., TESOL 2016). Yet, as Mann (2005) suggests, it is possible to distinguish certain elements that characterise these developments, such as:

- top-down and time-bound teaching/learning processes
- the dependency of organisations or accreditations bodies
- reliance on the outsider view
- the preponderance of received knowledge (e.g., pre-prepared methodologies)

We could add to these characteristics the current existence of standards (Katz & Snow 2009), and increasingly, of international standards, recently organised in the form of frameworks (e.g., British Council, Cambridge English & Eaquals 2016; Cambridge English 2016).

Thus characterised, these professional programs are commonly in tension and situated in the borderline of what Burns & Richards (2009) conceptualise as the ‘internal’ and the ‘external’ issues in SLTE, i.e., the internal theoretical and practical development of the discipline, and the external pressures before the processes of globalisation or, as defined in other conceptualisations, the processes of neoliberalism (e.g., Gray 2019) or more specifically, the processes of academic
capitalism (e.g., Slaughter & Rhoades 2004; Cantwell & Kauppinen 2014). One example that illustrates this tension is the first SLTE programs — the pre-service teacher training courses at International House and the Royal Society of Arts (RSA), which were originated to bridge the gap between theory and the practical demands from reality (see Haycraft 1988 & 1998; Weir & Saville 2015). As maintained by Kennedy (2005), today CPD programs struggle to keep a difficult balance between international quality standards and the local needs of the teachers, and even of the students too, particularly in the Global South, as referred to by Howard (2016).

3.3.2. Aspects of CPD programs discussed in the literature

CDP programs have been widely discussed in the literature of English language teacher education. In what follows, I will refer briefly and in a schematic way to some of the aspects most commonly referred to in such literature:

Besides the diversity of content (knowledge base), some authors have discussed the form of delivery of such content that the CPD programs tend to adopt, sometimes conceptualised in the literature as ‘models’ or ‘approaches’. See, for example, Day (1993) and Wallace (1991) and more recently Kennedy (2005). Other conceptualisations have referred to specific aspects of these models, such as reflection and reflexivity in teaching, contrasting, for example, technical reflective teaching (Cruickshank 1981) and critical reflexive teaching (Calderhead 1989; Zeichner 1983; Zeichner & Liston 1996) or even advocating for a more dialogic, data-led and collaborative reflexive approach (e.g., Mann & Walsh 2013 2017).

Other authors have considered the conception of teachers and teaching that are behind such models of teacher development. Within this strand and from a critical perspective, different authors (e.g. Block, Gray & Holborow 2012, Block & Gray 2015; Gray 2019), have compared and contrasted models of language teacher education derived from and driven by free-market ideologies and policies, such as neoliberalism, with models opposed to it, conceptualised under the umbrella term of critical language teacher education (Gray 2019). According to these authors, the former is generally characterised by a conceptualisation of teachers as effective practitioners (Gray 2019) and, at the same time, a conceptualisation of teaching narrowly focused on: a) teaching skills, b) tight controls over what teachers can and cannot do, and what they can and cannot say about their teaching (Block & Gray 2015), and finally, c) a highly instrumental discourse of standards, objectives and targets (Block, Gray & Holborow 2012; Block & Gray 2015). In turn, critical language teacher education is presented as an opposed and alternative, even though still
marginal, model of teacher preparation and development (Gray 2019), as will be seen in the following section.

Other authors have discussed principles of what they consider to be effective CPD programs, particularly in terms of PRESET and INSET courses. Among them, some have argued for the need to have a long-term perspective in the provision of professional development offered to teachers (e.g., Wallace 1991, Lamb 1995, Hayes 2019). Others have argued for the need for context-sensitive (e.g., Bax 1997; Li 2015; Hall 2019; Kuchah, Djigo, & Taye, 2019), and bottom-up (e.g., Nunan 1989) forms of professional development or even a functional combination of the two to achieve maximum development (Farrell 2000). Others have expressed the need for any form of CPD to offer opportunities for continuous professional learning (CPL) (Hayes 2019). Hayes himself cites an OECD study (2009) carried out in 23 countries in which was found that the most effective forms of development with the greatest impact were 'individual and collaborative research', 'informal dialogue to improve teaching' and 'qualification programs' (OECD 2009, p. 74), among others.

Finally, a more recent study (Borg & Albery 2015, p. 37-45) has proposed a set of eleven principles that are argued to underpin effective in-service teacher education. These principles are:

1. Acknowledging and building on teachers' prior experience, beliefs and knowledge
2. Positioning In-service teacher education (INSET) as a developmental activity, not a deficit-oriented one
3. Developing theoretical and practical knowledge in an integrated manner
4. Recognising both public and personal forms of teacher knowledge and their contributions to teacher learning
5. Providing opportunities for teachers to learn collaboratively
6. Avoiding methodological prescriptivism
7. Promoting reflective practice
8. Providing opportunities for active and experiential learning
9. Modelling 'good practice' through the way trainers work
10. Eliciting formative and summative feedback and use this to inform delivery and design
11. Providing sustain contextualized opportunities for teacher learning

Despite their theoretical value, these principles seem to presuppose the universality of agents, teaching cultures and contexts and, in this sense, possess limited representation, correspondence or appropriateness. This is particularly relevant to contexts in the Global South where conditions
are sometimes very different from the ones presupposed in these principles (e.g., Mahboob & Elyas 2014; Barnawi & Ha 2015; Ramírez-Romero 2016; Kuchah & Shamim 2018).

Even though to a different degree, sometimes these assumptions are also present in the critical teacher education literature, as will be mentioned in the following section.

3.3.3 Critical teacher education

As is commented by Hawkins and Norton (2009), the concept of critical teacher education in Applied Linguistics and ELT is commonly associated with different theoretical and practical traditions, from critical theory, critical pedagogy and critical literacy to critical applied linguistics, critical discourse analysis or critical reflection, etc. The very concept of ‘critical’ is polysemic and rich in content (cf. Foucault 1978/2002 for a genealogy of this concept). In this section, I will then only refer briefly to three developments from these traditions that I consider relevant to enrich the analytic perspective of my analysis: critical pedagogy; critical reflective teaching, and critical analysis of language teacher education.

3.3.3.1 Critical pedagogies

As a form of praxis, critical pedagogies were first developed by Brazilian Educationalist Paolo Freire (1958, 1967, and 2004) whose work was fundamentally concerned with empowering people to challenge oppression through radical education, critical consciousness, and dialogue for change (Grollios 2009/2016). Regarding the concept of education within this perspective, perhaps is worth quoting at length Freire’s disciple Miles Horton who refers to it in the following way:

I think if I had to put a finger on what I consider a good education (...) it wouldn’t be anything about methods or techniques. It would be loving people first. (...) And wanting for them what you want for yourself. And the next is respect for people’s abilities to learn and to act and to shape their own lives. (...) The third thing grows out of caring for people and having respect for people’s abilities to do things, and that is that you value their experiences. These are the kind of elements that seem to me to be important, rather than methodology or techniques (Horton and Freire 1990, p. 177-178).

According to Pennycook, more than a static body of knowledge and practices, within ELT critical pedagogies are (principled) perspectives or attitudes of ‘questioning, restively problematizing the given, being aware of the limits of their own knowing, and bringing into being new schemas of
politicisation’ to help us deal ‘with the most significant issues of our time’ to promote social justice (1999, p. 329). Some classic thematic areas within this perspective are linguistic imperialism (e.g., Phillipson 1992 & 2009); appropriate methodology (e.g., Holliday 1994; Pennycook 1994; Canagarajah 1999); and critical language awareness (e.g., Fairclough 1999/2014), among others (See López-Gopar 2019 for an overview on international critical pedagogies).

3.3.3.2 Critical reflective teaching

Linked to critical pedagogy, or rather a form of it, critical reflective teaching has been conceptualised as ‘a means towards emancipation and professional autonomy’ through teacher empowerment (Calderhead 1989, p. 45). According to its proponents, some functions of this approach are:

- Examining, framing and solving the dilemmas of the classroom practice
- Questioning own’s teaching assumptions and values
- Examining the institutional and cultural teaching context
- Taking part in curriculum development and school change efforts
- Taking responsibility for own’s professional development

(Zeichner, 1996).

It is important to mention that the development of technical skills of teaching remains an important element in this approach but it is considered as ‘a means for bringing about desired ends’ rather than an end in itself (Zeichner 1983, p. 6).

Other authors have put forward approaches to critical reflective practice at a discourse level to examine how language shapes and reproduces power relations (Fairclough 1995), or to explore the links between micro relations of applied linguistics and macro relations of society and also as a form of self-reflexivity (Pennycook 2001), whereas others have simply conceptualised it as a form of resistance (Anton 2007).

3.3.3.3 Critical analysis of language teacher education

As referred to above, critical teacher education has also adopted the form of critical analysis of the different forms of Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE), i.e., as a critique of Teacher Education’s own developments. One notable example is the critical review of John Gray and David Block (e.g., 2012 & 2014) who, among other things, have questioned the way in which the very history of SLTE is conceptualised; the ‘marketisation’ of Language Teacher Education; and the
instrumental and ideological rationality behind the mainstream programs of language education in ELT, indifferent to local contexts and local language teaching traditions (Block 2013).

Other authors have postulated the need to rethink teacher education in the light of a) ‘today’s world’-characterised, among other things, by ‘significant developments in geopolitical conditions (...) changes in technology and communications (...) [and a] profound philosophical reorientation in scholarly and public discourses’ (Canagarajah 2015, p. 8) or put it more succinctly, by the shift from modernity to postmodernity (Kramsch 2014), or ‘transmodernity’ (Mura, 2012) and b) the ‘globalizing perspectives’ (postnational, postmodern, postcolonial, post-transmission, and postmethod perspectives), as described by Kumaravadivelu (2012).

These perspectives are clearly relevant because they take knowledge and insights from other fields of knowledge (e.g., Philosophy, Economy, Sociology, and so on) to shed light on issues of power, ideology, and social justice in the field of ELT that otherwise would remain unarticulated or hidden. However, as was referred to earlier, it is possible to argue that these perspectives sometimes lack adequate empirical support and remain expressed mostly in theoretical or abstract terms. Or, when they refer to actual cases, these perspectives often lack a project of practical transformation and, in this sense, their criticism remains limited to the sphere of the moral ought. Finally, even though they represent a critique of different forms of imperialism, they sometimes reproduce some forms of imperialistic behaviours (e.g., maintaining vertical or patronising forms of dialogue, if any, with practitioners or researchers from the Global South).

3.4 A CPD scheme: the Cambridge English teaching qualifications and courses

One example of a CPD program with a well-established international presence is the Cambridge English teaching qualifications and courses scheme, which includes, among other qualifications the TKT, CELTA, ICELT, and DELTA courses (see Table 3.1).

As commented by Weir (2013a), one of the first modern antecedents of this scheme was the Certificate of Proficiency in English (CPE) (now known as C2 Proficiency) which was instituted in 1913 by the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES) with the stated purpose of providing foreign students of English with proof of their knowledge of the language with a view to teaching it (UCLES 1913). Even though the emphasis on the first versions of the exam was on language proficiency and not specifically on English language teaching, the knowledge of pedagogy of the candidates was also directly assessed as shown in Table 3.1 below:
More direct antecedents or origins of what today constitutes the Cambridge English teacher training program are the International House pre-service teacher-training course, the Royal Society of Arts (RSA) in-service Certificate in the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language, and the joint IH-RSA pre-service and in-service qualification schemes (See Pulverness 2015 for a brief history of the Cambridge English Language Assessment Teaching Qualifications).

According to Pulverness (2015), despite their changes, today’s Cambridge English teacher-training qualifications and courses, including the ICELT course, maintain the principles and procedures of the pre-service teacher-training course instituted by International House in 1962, including a practical orientation, high intensity, a criterion-referenced and competence-based assessment criteria (inherited from the original RSA in-service certificate), and a mode of inter-centre moderation as the base of the assessment system around which the whole scheme is organised.

Today, as is known, in many countries, public and private education institutions use these course-based qualifications as requirements for teaching entry or professional advancement. In Mexico, as was referred to in Chapter Two, these qualifications have played a prominent role in the professionalisation of English language teachers (see p. 16). However, despite their relevance, relatively little research on them has been conducted outside of British academic circles, or even outside the Cambridge English teacher training system (e.g., by course assessors, moderators, tutors, etc.), with the purpose of developing a contextualised understanding of this system. The following two sections look into the literature on the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications (henceforth CETQs) and, in particular, on the ICELT course, and point out the gaps that this research aims to fill.
3.4.1 The research so far

In contrast to the considerable literature on teacher education in the field of second language teacher education (SLTE), the Cambridge English teaching qualifications and courses, in general, and the ICELT course, in particular, have been comparatively little explored, despite their attributed ‘intrinsic value’ (Barduhn 1998; Borg 2002; Delaney 2015; Godfrey 2009) and their ‘external impact’ in terms of a) their economic contribution to the British Education Industry (British Council 2013); b) the considerable size of their global candidature (Poulter 2007; Morgan 2015; Cambridge English 2016a), and c) their significance in national teacher education programs.
where they serve, in many cases, as the main reference standard of the Public Systems of Certification and Accreditation of English language teachers in countries like, for example, Colombia (Correa, Usma & Montoya 2014; Gonzalez 2007 & 2009; Torres-Martinez 2009; Usma 2009 & 2015); Mexico (SEP 2011 & 2015); Turkey (Personn 2014), Ukraine (Watkins 2007), and Australia (O’Connor 2011), among others.

In turn, the inexistence of a comprehensive review of the literature on these teaching qualifications is, by itself, illustrative of the comparatively little attention that they have received, particularly at a postgraduate level. In this sense, this literature review may be well considered one of the first attempts to review the literature produced on the CETQs.

Overall, taking into consideration the perspective adopted and content produced, it is possible to categorise the existing literature on the CETQs in a continuum stretching from research that tends to emphasise the positive aspects of these qualifications and research that has a critical perspective on essential aspects of these certifications, locating most of the work produced in either one of the poles, as will be seen in the following section.

3.4.1.1. Literature that tends to emphasise the positive aspects of the CETQs

In this section, I will review, in a succinct way, some representative research on the CETQs that tends to look at and emphasise positive aspects of these qualifications, including the research literature produced by a) Cambridge English, b) the research studies produced at postgraduate level, and c) the academic production in journal articles.

3.4.1.1.1 Cambridge’s own research literature

In the first place, The CETQs have been researched by the University of Cambridge itself through the so-called Research and Validation Group, one of the language assessment bodies of Cambridge English Language Assessment (Hawkey & Milanovic, 2013) which is, in turn, one of the three exam boards of the University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (UCLES) or Cambridge Assessment, according to its trading name.

To this day, three volumes have been published (Cambridge ESOL 2003 2007a; Wilson & Poulter 2015) each one containing relatively the same types of texts: 1) a document with an overview of the historical evolution, current state and future direction of the Cambridge Qualifications (e.g., Poulter 2003 & 2007; Pulverness 2015), 2) progress reports on the state of development of the
thus conceptualised ‘Cambridge products’ (Cambridge ESOL 2007b, p. 1) (e.g., Green 2003; Russell 2003; Delaney 2007; Watkins 2007), and 3) ‘successful stories’ (small-scale qualitative studies) of the implementation of these qualifications (e.g., Thaine 2003; Phipps 2007 2010; Delaney 2015; Valazza 2015).

Overall, these studies are of considerable importance because they represent a rich source of data to gain understanding into the notions on which the QETQs, and in particular, the ICELT course, are predicated from the course producer’s perspective, as well as the principles behind its development over the years. However, as expressed above, this literature frequently tends to present in their findings a rather positive and, sometimes, over-celebratory image of the qualifications and courses, focusing their attention on the positive aspects of the course, stating for example that the iteration of the course or courses under research made a significant difference in the candidates ‘by improving their confidence and awareness’ and ‘by stimulating a greater depth of understanding of [their] beliefs and teaching’ (Phipps 2007, p. 15). While it is valid and necessary to record what may be considered to be good practice, this literature tends to avoid accounting in earnest for the limits and shortcomings of the courses and/or consider the broader social context.

3.4.1.1.2 Research Studies at MA and PhD level

The CETQs have also been researched at MA and PhD level, not only in universities in the United Kingdom but also in the United States, Australia, and Cyprus. In my review, I was able to identify twelve theses (ten at PhD level and two at the MA level) produced in the English language. Out of those, nine of them focus on Celta courses and three focus on ICELT courses. Table 3.3 summarises the aim, main focus, research questions, research instruments and main findings of each one of these theses with information taken from their abstracts. The wording of each instance is kept unchanged.
Thesis 1 (PhD)  
Barduhn, S. (1998) – CELTA - SIT, USA

Title  
Traits and Conditions that Accelerate Teacher Learning

Role of the researcher  
Researcher/Main course tutor

Thesis’ aim  
To discover more about the process of learning to teach

Thesis’ focus  
The focus is on those trainees for whom this process is accelerated. The research also examines the CELTA itself to analyse and explain why it is effective.

Research questions  
1) Why do some trainees do well and others not? 2) What are the characteristics of the learning that takes place? 3) What is it about this course that usually makes it so effective?

Research strategies  
Data gathered from trainees. Tools: a repertory grid, the Honey Mumford Learning Styles Questionnaire, dialogue journals, a written assignment on learning styles and a guided discussion questionnaire that elicited opinions from the trainees about their experiences on the course.

Main findings  
The findings indicate that inherent personal characteristics and learning styles had the greatest influence on determining a successful outcome in the course for those who do well. Among the most significant characteristics were aptitudes for engaging in reflective activities and the possession of metacognitive awareness. The findings also identify the course itself as intuitively following the Experiential Learning Cycle (Kolb 1984) which makes it a rich learning experience for different kinds of learners.

Thesis 2 (PhD)  

Title  
Learning to Teach: CELTA trainees’ beliefs, experiences and reflections

Role of the researcher  
Researcher

Thesis’ aim  
To explore the learning of the CELTA programme

Thesis’ focus  
The focus is on the pedagogic beliefs of the trainees themselves (considering the social and contextual learning environment)

Research questions  
1) What is the impact of the CELTA course on the pedagogical beliefs of trainee teachers? 2) How do the trainees experience the CELTA course? 3) What are the trainees’ immediate reflections on the course as evidenced in the final week of the course? 4) What learning conditions and learning opportunities does the course provide? What role does social interaction play in their learning?

Research strategies  
In-depth case study approach, using multiple research tools: interviews, questionnaires, observation of a course in its entirety, in addition to collection of documents such as lesson plans and assignments.

Main findings  
The findings indicate that trainees began the course with a range of beliefs, some of which were idiosyncratic and ‘anti-didactic’ beliefs which often seemed to be a reaction to their school experiences. As such, the trainees welcomed the more student-focused approach to which they were exposed on the course but their beliefs remained largely unchanged.

The findings also suggest the importance of social interaction amongst the trainees for learning to teach which should be considered for mainstream teacher education courses. These findings also indicate that trainees’ beliefs need to be recognised and engaged on teacher education courses in general and, in particular, the CELTA programme.

Thesis 3 (PhD)  

Title  
Learning to Teach English to Speakers of Other Languages: Towards a Critical Curriculum

Role of the researcher  
Researcher

Thesis’ aim  
To elicit and interpret the descriptions of course trainees and tutors’ of their experience as participants on a CELTA course with a view to identifying the factors affecting their learning
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>1) How is the CELTA course experienced by participants 2) What are participants’ concerns as they progress through the course?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research strategies</td>
<td>Fieldwork, participant observation, interviews, informal discussions, journals, notes, and documentary analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main findings</td>
<td>In phase 1 of the analysis issues experienced by course participants in the course were classified within nine categories. In phase 2, CELTA graduates and tutors responded from different countries after the course, enabling substantiation, rejection, modification and supplementation of initial findings, leading to the identification of issues in two categories: a) separation of the training process from authentic classroom practice and b) marginalisation of language learners and trainees learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Peer Mentoring and Professional Development: A Study of EFL Teaching in the Middle East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the researcher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Thesis’ aim | - to improve the quality of teaching and learning within IPETQ/MINDEF and an international school  
- to create an institution-wide peer mentoring base within IPETQ and a chosen international school  
- to investigate the correlation between teacher training and teacher approaches to teaching and learning  
- to create conditions within which wide experience of life can be utilised  
- to benefit teachers, students and the institution as a whole |
<p>| Research questions | 1) To what extent does peer mentoring affect the continuous learning of teachers 2) To what extent does peer mentoring affect subject knowledge (in this case EFL)? 3) How does peer mentoring affect the quality of teaching? 4) How does peer mentoring affect curriculum development and building? 5) How does peer mentoring affect the way teachers respond to change? 6) How do peer mentoring trials affect the role of teachers? |
| Research strategies | Questionnaires, interviews, constructed pro-forms and diary notes |
| Title | Becoming an English Teacher: Participants’ Voices and Identities in an In-Service Teacher Training Course in Central Mexico |
| Role of the researcher | Researcher/Main course tutor |
| Thesis’ aim | To examine the identity formation of EFL (English as a Foreign Language) teachers who went through a one-year in-service training course |
| Thesis’ focus | Exploration of a sociocultural perspective of teacher education and how it applies to the Mexican context. |
| Research questions | 1) What emotions and cognitive processes do teacher-learners go through during COTE? 2) What problems and struggles do trainees encounter throughout the course? 3) How does this teacher training impact the teachers' sense of identity? |
| Research strategies | broad qualitative ethnographic approach using three concepts as a basis for inquiry: voices, reflexivity and bricolage. The sources of data are journals, observations, interviews, and focus group discussion of tutors |
| Main findings | The data reveals how the course trainees constructed meaning of gained knowledge with fellow colleagues and how they transformed their identities. The trainees not only gained skills but self-confidence which empowered them emotionally and professionally |
| Title | Feedback in pre-service English language teacher training: discourses of process and power |
| Role of the researcher | Researcher / Main course tutor |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis' aim</th>
<th>To uncover discourses of process and power in feedback sessions in pre-service English language teacher training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research questions</td>
<td>1) What are the generic features of this feedback event? 2) Which hegemonic positions are enacted and reproduced by trainers at the Chamberlain Centre? What strategies do these trainers and trainees use to introduce, maintain and negotiate power in their feedback sessions? 4) Are these trainers and trainees adequately prepared to take on the feedback genre?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research strategies</td>
<td>Case study approach using tools of linguistic ethnography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main findings</td>
<td>The findings show that feedback can be considered a genre, with participants orienting to a set of conventionalised expectations for this performance. The findings also show that feedback was not always smooth, and that participants were able to challenge hegemonic principles of English language teaching through refusing to play by the rules of the game. At the same time, those in gatekeeping roles upheld English language teaching orthodoxies through a range of discourse and linguistic practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thesis 7 (EdD)**  

**Title**  
Following the Yellow Brick Road of Teacher Training: A Fourth Generation Evaluation of An INSET Course in Istanbul

**Role of the researcher**  
Researcher / Main course tutor

**Thesis' aim**  
To examine both the processes of teacher learning (i.e. how do teachers learn) as well as the product (what are their claims, concerns and issues) regarding the training programme

**Thesis' focus**  
The focus is on teachers’ talk, as a manifestation of individual modes of thinking in a Cambridge In Service Certificate of English Language Teaching (ICELT) training course which is designed as an internationally appropriate INSET programme that can satisfy the training needs of (both native and non-native) EFL teachers.

**Research questions**  
1) What are the claims, concerns and issues of stakeholders in the ICELT programme? 2) How can identification and interrogation of claims, concerns and issues be acted upon in order to improve and develop programme effectiveness? 3) In what ways does participation in the evaluation process impact on stakeholder’s professional development?

**Research strategies**  
A responsive / constructivist methodology based on the conceptual and procedural framework of the Fourth Generation Evaluation (FGE). The emergent data was analysed with findings grounded in literature of teacher learning and parallels made with the researcher’s reflections on the processes of learning through the research experience itself.

**Main findings**  
In terms of the evaluation outcomes (product) it was possible to identify modes of learning that concern tasks (how), knowing (what) and awareness of self and socio-cultural context (why). At the same time, analysis of the teachers’ talk as collaborative interaction showed little evidence of learning taking place. There were no obvious sections of exploratory talk that is conducive to the construction of new meanings and learning. However by analysing teachers’ talk as a manifestation of individual modes of thinking, it was possible to identify modes of thinking that have clear parallels with a framework of teacher learning that contains techno-rational thought (how), reflective thought (what) and critical thought (why). The descriptive framework therefore depicts the integration of levels for both the process of learning and the products of learning and as such is a powerful tool for teacher educators.

**Thesis 8 (PhD)**  
**O’Connor, B. (2011) – CELTA - Deakin University, Australia**

**Title**  
Life after CELTA: A precarious transition into English Language Teaching

**Role of the researcher**  
Researcher/ Main course tutor (Though research was carried out ‘after the course’)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thesis’ aim</th>
<th>To examine the transition process of newly graduated trainees with a CELTA certificate into diverse English Language Teaching sites around the world</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thesis’ focus</td>
<td>The focus is on the stories of 11 new CELTA-qualified teachers from one Melbourne education institute in their first year of teaching in Australia or overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research questions</td>
<td>1) What is the relationship between skills-based training and successful transition to the teaching profession?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research strategies</td>
<td>The study is situated within an interpretive framework through the lens of teacher cognition, teacher career cycles and cross-cultural communication. Using a mixed-methods design the data include a survey, interviews, email journals and stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main findings</td>
<td>Key findings reveal that contextual, organisational and personal constraints affected a successful transition into English Language Teaching for many CELTA graduates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis 9 (PhD)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Harris, A. (2013) – CELTA – Newcastle University, U. K.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Professionals developing professionalism: the interactional organisation of reflective practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the researcher</td>
<td>Researcher / Main course tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis’ aim</td>
<td>To investigate the reflexivity among the institutional goal (reflective practice), the theoretical models that underpin this goal and the talk-in-interaction of feedback meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research questions</td>
<td>1) How is the talk-in-interaction of the feedback meetings organised? 2) How do these organisations related to the institutional goal of this interactional context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research strategies</td>
<td>Audio and video recordings analysed employing Conversation Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main findings</td>
<td>The findings explicate a process of reflective practice, as it is instantiated by the participants through talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thesis 10 (MA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Personn, J. (2014) – ICETF - Technical University – Northern Cyprus Campus, Cyprus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>The Effects of An In-service Teacher Training Certificate Program on the Teaching Practices of Novice Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the researcher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis’ aim</td>
<td>To investigate whether novice teachers who have taken the [ICETF] course benefit regarding their in-class teaching in a university setting and how the course contributes to their professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis’ focus</td>
<td>Focus on an INSET course designed by a reputable British University offered at a Turkish University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research questions</td>
<td>1) What do novice English Preparatory school teachers learn through ICETF in relation to teaching skills and their use? 2) How do the novice language teachers’ assess the relevance of ICETF for the classroom context in terms of its cultural, psychological and educational aspects? 3) What impact of ICETF do novice teachers perceive on their knowledge and professional expertise?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research strategies</td>
<td>Tools: class observations and stimulated recall interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main findings</td>
<td>The findings indicate that although participants responded positively to the contents of the program and felt that the course had contributed to their professional development, the course did not have much effect on their teaching, due to the interplay of cultural, contextual and institutional constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Learning to do, doing to learn: An exploration of teacher knowledge and learning through the narratives of trainees on a CELTA course.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the researcher</td>
<td>Researcher/ Main course tutor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis’ aim</td>
<td>1) To examine the nature of teacher knowledge from the perspective of participants on a teacher education course 2) To explore the views of the researcher as teacher educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With some notable exceptions such (e.g., Brandt 2003, Copland 2008 and O’Connor 2011), the findings in these studies coincide in general with the Cambridge English literature, referred to above, by presenting a fundamentally positive response to the course researched (either CELTA or ICELT) from the candidates, who in general recognise not only its usefulness (e.g., Anderson 2016), but also its contribution to their professional development (e.g., Personn 2014) and, in some cases, even to their emotional and professional empowerment (e.g., Lengeling 2006).

Table 3. 3 Research Studies at MA and PhD level on the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>A qualitative study into the role of initial teacher training courses in the professional development of experienced non-native speaker teachers of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of the researcher</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis’ aim</td>
<td>To provide an in-depth understanding of the role of initial teacher training courses (ITCs) such as the Cambridge CELTA and the Trinity Cert TESOL in the professional development and careers of experienced non-native speaker English teachers (NNESTs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research questions</td>
<td>1) What factors contribute to NNESTs with prior teaching experience taking the decision to enrol on ITCs? 2) How useful and productive do NNESTs find ITCs (considering needs, contexts and challenges)? 3) What impact do ITCs have on NNESTs, including impact on teaching practice, and career development? 4) What suggestions/feedback do respondents have for other NNESTs and for providers of ITCs to ensure that courses are as useful for NNESTs, as for other participants?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research strategies</td>
<td>Qualitative interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main findings</td>
<td>The findings indicate that most NNESTs are intrinsically motivated to enrol on ITCs. However, while NNESTs find ITCs useful, they are sometimes under-challenged, especially concerning explicit language awareness and pedagogic theory. Findings also show that ITCs have clear impact on the classroom practice of NNESTs. However, more experienced NNESTs often faced significant challenges when attempting to change habituated practices to conform to course requirements. Regarding career prospects, while some participants described life-changing career moves, others encountered repeated frustration at overt discrimination towards non-native speaker teachers when attempting to find work internationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Delaney 2015), commonly conceptualising their overall experience in the course as ‘life-changing’ (e.g., Shamim & Sarwar 2018).

Despite accounting for some limits and shortcomings in the courses researched, these studies rarely mention or address in earnest and at length aspects of the researchers’ subjectivity, including their positionality and ideological bias. In this sense, it remains unclear how these elements were effectively counterbalanced, minimised, or dealt with in these pieces of research. This topic becomes particularly relevant when we consider that, as Table 3.3 indicates, most of the researchers were Cambridge English tutors that acted as main tutors in the iterations of the courses researched, which makes it difficult to assess the research integrity of their work (Morse 2018).

3.4.1.1.3 Non-academic literature

Besides the academic literature produced in the English language referred to above, there is considerable non-academic literature on the CETQs that also adopts a mostly celebratory tone and content. This literature is commonly made public at ELT conferences (e.g., at the IATEFL conference celebrated annually in the U. K.), articles published in online blogs, and texts disseminated through social media (see Jordan 2018 for a comprehensive list).

Despite their popularity, very few of these texts are research-based and, in this sense, their research value is limited for this study.

3.4.1.2 Critical literature

The CETQs have also been researched/addressed in journal articles and book chapters where the production has been more copious than in the previous sources referred to earlier. Within the existing literature of this type is possible to identify a predominant tendency that could well be characterised as ‘critical’. In what follows, I will comment on some samples that illustrate the range of criticism on what seems to represent a continuum:

3.4.1.2.1 Journal articles and book chapters

On one side of this continuum, one work that has been consistently read and referred to since its publication (see ELT Journal 2016) is the article One-month teacher training courses: time for a change?, authored by Ferguson & Donno and published in 2003. The date of its publication is
relevant because this was the year when the CETQs went under major changes (Poulter 2003). Some of those changes seem to have taken account of the authors’ criticism and suggestions which, in turn, were likely to have been inspired by some critical points raised by Phillipson (1992); Seidlhofer (1999); Cook (1999); Prabhu (1990) and Holliday (1994), among others. In this sense, one of the articles’ merit seems to have been, precisely, the fact of having expressed some of the major criticism at the time in one single piece. As it can be anticipated, the criticism raised in the article focused its attention on issues related to ‘linguistic imperialism’; the ‘structural privileging of native speaker teachers’; the ‘native-speaker usage as the sole descriptive basis for teaching materials’, and ‘the culture-bound nature of language teaching’, and so on. According to the authors, what was being questioned was not so much ‘aspects of the delivery of the course’ but rather its ‘underlying assumptions’ (p. 32). Finally, even though the article focuses on the CELTA course, its criticism had clear implications for the whole set of qualifications. In turn, this article has been criticised for its limits in only ‘looking at the branches instead of the roots’, ignoring the ‘multiplicity of interest at stake’ and therefore leaving the real problem untouched (Horne, 2003).

On the other side of the continuum, one of the sharpest (and radical) criticisms of the CETQs is expressed in the work of David Block and John Gray (e.g., 2012, 2013 & 2015). Here, the criticism is made from a broader political-economic (and cultural) perspective, focusing its attention on neoliberalism and its processes, including the marketisation of the ‘relations of production’ in general, and of education, in particular. For the authors, the CETQs represent a particular ‘market-driven model’, based on rational modes of thought and scientific management that reinforces a ‘decontextualised’ model of English ‘as purely instrumental’, deskillling teachers and discrediting the profession as a whole.

Located in the middle of this continuum, different authors have criticised, different aspects of these certifications, such as their imposition as a model of professional development within national English programs to the detriment of locally produced knowledge and practices (e.g., Gonzalez 2007 & 2009; Richter 2014), their implied notion of language teachers as apolitical language instructors reduced to the command of the language and the ability to use prescriptive (and prescribed) teaching methods (e.g., Torres-Martinez 2009), and finally, their legitimation through the overt exercise of power and control, and also through the introduction of new discourses, notions, and imaginaries (Usma 2009 & 2015)

In my opinion, these perspectives are in general meritorious, because they attempt to understand the CETQs from a broader perspective and context. At the same time, they do encourage a ‘more interdisciplinary, more politically engaged’ and ‘more fit for the times’ academic work (Block &
Gray 2012, p. 12), shedding light and bringing attention to fundamental issues of power and social justice in ELT, among other things. However, as in the previous case, this literature generally fails to provide a detailed account of how the researchers’ subjectivity has been managed while conducting their studies and how ideological bias has been dealt with. At the same time, it frequently lacks self-reflexivity, in the sense of a critical stance also turned on itself (Pennycooke 2001, p. 7), especially in methodological terms. This is particularly important given the weight that theory has in this perspective. At the same time, as suggested by Mora, Trejo & Roux (2014), these perspectives frequently fail to provide nuanced and detailed findings that could account for the complexity of the social phenomena they are researching. Finally, as expressed in Chapter One, this literature tends to lack a micro-contextual perspective and, as a consequence, does not produce contextualised understandings.

3.4.1.2.2 Other

The CETQ’s has also been commented on in informal outlets, such as blogs, wikis, discussion forums, posts, chats, tweets, Facebook comments, podcasts, and so on. As in the case of the celebratory literature, the nature of these comments is anecdotal and therefore of limited value for this research.

3.5 Summary of the gaps and limits in the literature

The main gaps and limits identified in the literature of CPD and, in particular, of the CETQs, that this research aims to deal with are:

- the paucity of studies at a postgraduate level on the CETQs, particularly with the aim to develop a contextualised, minimal ideological understanding of the ICELT course.

- the frequent absence in the literature on the QETQs of a research account that shows in earnest and at length how issues related to the general integrity of their studies were dealt with such as, for example, the researcher’s subjectivity (e.g. their positionality), issues of error and illusion (e.g., confirmation bias), issues of complexity (e.g., the research participants’ truthfulness or lack thereof), or even issues of self-reflexivity (e.g., awareness of limits of knowing), etc. In this research, these issues are dealt with comprehensively, as detailed in 4.3.3.
• In the specific case of the literature that emphasises positive aspects of the CETQs, its failure to generally deal with the researchers' ideological bias, particularly considering their role as tutors in the courses researched. This bias is commonly expressed in the form of assumptions of the effectiveness and/or appropriateness of the course which are expressed through, for example, value assumptions or fallacious implications, e.g., characterising the ICELT course as 'an INSET course designed by a reputable British University' (Personn 2014, p. iv); unfounded claims, e.g., characterising the ICELT course as a training course that is designed as 'an internationally appropriate INSET programme that can satisfy the training needs of (both native and non-native) EFL teachers' (Godfrey 2009, p. 3), and through propositional assumptions. e.g., seeking to answer research questions such as 'what is it about this course that usually makes it so effective?' (Barduhn 1998, p. iii), which assumes what in principle should be explored first, namely: the effectiveness of the course. See p.50 for an account of how ideological bias was dealt with in this research.

• Finally, in contrast to the overreliance 'on theory' of many studies produced within the critical literature on the CETQs, this research seeks to be based predominantly on empirical evidence without being tied to any particular theoretical framework to avoid, among other things, cherry-picking and anecdotalism (Ushioda 2014), and/or confirmation bias (see p. 46).

3.6 Chapter summary

This chapter provided a review of the literature related to the research topic of this study, namely: aspects of the ethos of the ICELT course. Firstly, I presented some background information on the academic field of Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE). Then, I presented content related to the area of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programs, including general aspects, some models and principles of CPD programs. I also included a section on content related to critical teacher education. Finally, I presented a survey of the existing literature on the CETQs and the ICELT course, where I identified two general strands within a continuum. Here, I highlighted some of their main themes, gaps, strengths and weaknesses.

As was referred to in the previous section, while the existing literature provides relevant insights into the Cambridge English teaching qualifications and courses, including relevant knowledge about their historical development, successful stories, assumptions, ideology, and also critical aspects such as their imposition in national contexts, the literature also contains some gaps that
this research aims to deal with. These gaps range from a paucity of non-celebratory studies on the CETQs at postgraduate level to the common lack of a research account that shows in earnest and at length how aspects of subjectivity, issues of error and illusion, self-reflexivity and/or issues of complexity were dealt with in the studies conducted.

Finally, as was also mentioned in the body of this chapter, this study also intends to fulfill the paucity of research with the analytical perspective of the critical literature but without its frequent overreliance ‘on theory’ in order to avoid cherry picking, anecdotalism and/or confirmation bias.
CHAPTER FOUR: Research Methodology

4.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to present a general account of the research approach that I employed in this study. According to Creswell & Creswell (2018, p. 45), the term research approach refers to 'the plan or proposal to conduct research' including three elements that intersect and inform each other: the researchers' philosophical assumptions (or worldviews) in relation to the study to be undertaken, procedures of inquiry (or research design), and specific research methods of data production, data analysis, and data interpretation (or research methods or strategies). Creswell & Creswell represent graphically this research framework as follows (Figure 4.1):

![Figure 4.1 A Framework for Research (Creswell & Creswell 2018, p. 45)](image)

In this chapter, I will use this framework to present a description, explanation and justification of the research approach that I employed in this study considering each of the elements referred to above: my philosophical assumptions, its research design and the research methods employed, correspondingly. At the end of the chapter, I will refer to the ethical considerations that guided this study, and finally, in the last section, I will summarise the content of this chapter.

4.2 Philosophical assumptions (or worldview)
As mentioned by Creswell & Creswell (2018, p. 46), all research approaches are underpinned by philosophical assumptions that influence, or guide, the practice of research. In the literature, these assumptions have been conceptualised in different ways. For example, Guba (1990, p. 17) uses Kuhn’s notion of ‘paradigm’ (1970) to conceptualise them as ‘a basic set of beliefs that guide action’ (1990, p. 17), in this case ‘action taken in connection with a disciplined inquiry’ (Ibid). Examples of inquiry paradigms are positivism, postpositivism, critical theory, and constructivism, each one of which adopts different ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies.

Other authors (e.g., Crotty 1998; Cohen, Manion & Morrison 2011; Snape & Spencer 2003; Manion & Morrison 2011) have conceptualised these assumptions precisely in relation to the philosophical notions of ontology and epistemology. The former is concerned with the nature of reality as such, or the researchers’ beliefs about ‘what there is to know about the world’ (e.g., ‘whether or not social reality exists independently of human conceptions and interpretations’). The latter is concerned with certain ways of understanding knowledge and knowing, or the researchers’ beliefs about ‘what it means to know’ (e.g., responses to questions such as ‘how can we know about reality and what is the basis of our knowledge?’) (Snape & Spencer 2003, p. 13). According to Crotty (1998), ontology and epistemology tend to be together in research, which makes it problematic to keep them apart conceptually. Examples of different philosophical stances within this conceptualisation are realism, materialism, and idealism (Snape & Spencer 2003, p. 11).

In turn, Creswell & Creswell conceptualise these philosophical assumptions in terms of worldview. For these authors, this term is defined as a ‘general philosophical orientation about the world and the nature of research that a researcher brings to a study’ (2018, p.46). In their work, Creswell & Creswell describe four different forms of worldviews: postpositivism, constructivism, transformative, and pragmatism (p.46).

For this research, I adopted a philosophical stance informed by the basic tenets of critical realism (CR) that I later complemented with some notions on ‘error and illusion’, drawn from Edgar Morin’s conception of ‘complex thought’ (e.g., 1999, 2007, and 2008). I adopted this stance not only because it was consistent with my worldview, but also because I considered that this paradigm was adequate to inquire into the nature of the object of study of this research, namely, the ethos of one iteration of the ICELT course. I also thought that this paradigm would help me to answer in a more data-driven and perhaps less ideological fashion the research questions that had given origin and foundation to this study. As different authors maintain (e.g., Gorski 2013; Vandenberghe 2015; Archer 2016), CR is an alternative paradigm situated in the juncture of three
classical traditions (postpositivism, constructivism, and transformative) that takes different elements of each one of these paradigms (e.g., an empirical orientation; an interpretivist stance, and a social justice vocation), without being reduced or confounded with any of them.

Despite internal differences, the main principles of CR can be summarised in the notion that reality exists independent from our perceptions, beliefs and theories, but that these realities can only be accessed precisely through these constructions (Hunt 2003; Vandenberghe 2015). Snape & Spencer express this notion in the following way: ‘[In CR] social phenomena are believed to exist independently of people's representations of them but are only accessible through those representations’ (2003, p. 13). For her part, Archer (2016) indicates that although complex, partial, and relative, within CR such access to social phenomena, is considered plausible. In this way, CR combines forms of ontological realism (e.g., the notion that reality exists independently of our knowledge or awareness of it), epistemic relativism (e.g., the recognition that the human knowledge about reality is historically, socially, and culturally situated), and also judgmental rationality (e.g., the attempt to create a descriptive and/or explanatory account to provide a plausible model of the object of inquiry (Ibid).

Regarding the relationship between ontology and epistemology, Vandenberghe affirms that CR defends the thesis that ‘the theory of being cannot be reduced to the theory of knowledge’, (2015, p. 3), i.e., that both philosophical dimensions are related but separated. In my opinion, this separation is relevant because it helps those who adhere to the principles of CR to deal with complexity, perhaps in a more appropriate way than in other traditions (e.g., in issues related to the structure and agency debate. See Bhaskar 2014).

Overall, the ontological and epistemological stance that I adopted in this research adhered to and was shaped by these principles. This is expressed, in part, in the choice of the research design and methods employed in this study, which are qualitative in nature, as will be described in some detail in the following sections of this chapter.

This stance is also expressed in the research focus of this study, which sought a deep and broad exploration of the phenomena researched. According to Bhaskar (2008), CR postulates that the objects of study require a complex approach to reality which is said to be composed of three stratified domains: ‘the real’, which consists of real structures and mechanisms with causal powers; ‘the actual’, which consists of patterns of events that take place, and ‘the empirical’, which refers to events observed or sensed by human beings. The research focus of this study adhered, in general terms, to this ontology, in looking at a) how discourse was expressed and
interacted within three overlapping layers of reality, and b) how the relationship among all three
took an organised complex form. As mentioned earlier (p. 3), these layers were ‘on paper’, e.g.,
the course documents and course-related documents (which at a micro-level represents a social
structure); ‘in practice’, e.g., aspects of the implementation of the course’s principals by the tutors
through their discursive instructional practices, and ‘experiential’, in general, the candidates’
perceptions of their own experience in the course.

Finally, this philosophical stance is also expressed in the choice of language used in this study,
particularly in the analysis and discussion chapters. One example is the reference to my analytic
process instead of the reference to the participants or the phenomenon when referring to my
findings, as in 'my analytical process show" and not "X thinks or believes Z", which attempts to
express the relative nature of my research and its findings, the active role of the researcher, and
still the possibility to create a plausible, deeper and broader descriptive and/or explanatory
account of the phenomena under investigation, as expressed earlier.

At the same time, as mentioned above, my ontological and epistemological stance in this study
was also informed by the conception of ‘complex thought’ of Edgar Morin, particularly regarding
his conceptualisation of ‘error and illusion’ (e.g., 1999, 2007 & 2008). In general, this author
maintains that ‘knowledge is not a mirror of things or of the outside world’ and that, as a product
of ‘translation/reconstruction by way of language and thought’, knowledge is ‘subject to error and
illusion’ (Morin 1999, p. 5). Consequently, Morin argues for the need to criticise our knowledge
and detect our cognitive errors and illusions, such as mental errors, intellectual errors, and errors
of reason.

Based on this and having as a referent the reflections on knowledge and knowing of this author, I
designed and implement different strategies to deal with error, illusion and bias during the
research process in this study. Among these research strategies, I adopted and kept an open,
reflexive and dialogic perspective throughout the course. At the same time, I identified and
reflected on the factors that could potentially influence the research process, such as my own
errors and cognitive biases, as well as those of the research participants. Finally, I implemented a
series of mechanisms to deal with such factors, such as a falsification phase in the data production,
data analysis, and data interpretation stages, which I will describe in some detail later in this
chapter.

4.3 Procedures of inquiry (research design)
The second element of my research approach is the research design, or procedures of inquiry, employed in this study. According to Creswell & Creswell (2018, p.53), a research design is a type of inquiry within quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods approaches that gives ‘specific direction for procedures in a research study’. In this research, I employed a qualitative research design informed by ethnography and case study.

4.3.1 Rationale

I chose this design because I considered that it would allow me to conduct an in-depth exploration of my research topic (the ethos of one iteration of the ICELT course) and answer the research questions and sub-questions of this study in an appropriate way (see p. 55). I also thought that it would allow me to privilege the perspective of the research participants, including my own, as a researcher, as well as the wider context. Particularly important in choosing this design was its conceptual and methodological openness and flexibility (Pole & Morrison 2003), which I thought was fundamental to research the complexity of social action systematically and thoroughly within a discrete setting.

This perspective coincides with different authors who maintain that qualitative designs are appropriate for in-depth inquiries of persons, peoples or cultures (e.g., the culture of a course) and which are thought to help researchers to deal effectively with issues of complexity (e.g., Patton 2014, Holliday 2016; Creswell & Guetterman 2020). Holliday (2016, p. 6) expresses this notion in the following way:

> Qualitative research looks deep into the quality of social life. It locates the study within particular settings, which provide opportunities for exploring all possible social variables and set manageable boundaries. An initial foray into the social setting leads to further, more informed exploration as themes and focuses emerge.

4.3.2 Main characteristics

According to Creswell and Creswell (2018, p. 291), this type of designs is characterised by the following elements: conducting research in a natural setting; having the researcher as a key instrument; producing multiple forms of data through interviews, observations, documents and audio-visual information; analysing the data inductively and deductively, ‘building patterns, categories and themes from the bottom up’; keeping a focus on the participants’ meanings;
following an emergent research design; being reflexive about the researcher’s role in the study; and finally, attempting to ‘develop a complex picture of the problem or issue under study’. According to these authors, the quality of qualitative research is achieved through the implementation of different strategies, as will be discussed in what follows.

4.3.3 Research integrity

Despite the existing debate concerning the criteria to ensure quality in qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln 2018), there is some consensus in the literature regarding the fact that the researcher requires to build strategies into the process of inquiry to ensure the integrity of their research (Morse 2018). In this study, I employed different strategies to improve its quality and, at the same time, deal more effectively with the challenges, complexities and uncertainties that I encountered as the research process unfolded. In what follows, I will describe briefly the general strategies and the core strategy that I used for this purpose.

4.3.3.1 General strategies

Some of the strategies that I used during fieldwork in a consistent way were:

_Prolonged time in the field._ I produced data through fieldwork during a period of 10 months, including 4 weeks of a piloting phase, trying out the main research instruments, previous to the formal beginning of the course. This helped me develop an in-depth perception of different aspects of the ethos of the course which informed my analytic perspective during the analysis and discussion phases.

_Triangulation._ I examined data from different sources to produce the main themes during the analysis phase in each one of the dimensions considered for analysis, namely: ICELT on paper, ICELT as implemented, and experiences in ICELT. For example, in the particular case of the analysis of the course documents (Chapter Five: ICELT on paper), I examined official course documents (e.g., the course syllabus and the assessment guidelines) and course-related documents (e.g., literature produced by Cambridge English on its own teaching qualifications). In addition, I interviewed people at the main offices of Cambridge English in the U.K. and Cambridge English Mexico, who were involved with the original production and importation of the ICELT course as well as its current administration in both countries, which finally served me as background information to inform my analytic perspective.
Thick description. I used this strategy to convey the findings in the case studies of this research (Chapter Seven: Experiences in ICELT), providing detailed descriptions not only of each candidate, including their background; the tutors’ perceptions of them and their performance in the course, and the candidates’ feelings and perceptions of their experience in the course but also of their institutional context, including information about the general values and principles that guided the program's curriculum, the institutions’ teaching philosophy and their teaching/learning culture. To produce these accounts, in addition to the case study teacher, I interviewed different stakeholders, such as the authorities, teachers and students of each institution and, whenever this was possible, I made ethnographic observations, including class observations, staff room observations and recess observations.

Falsification. Drawing on Popper’s principle of falsifiability, which suggests that a statement, theory or hypothesis must be able to be tested and proven false to show its scientificity (Popper, 1959/2002), I developed a strategy to deal with personal bias as well as error and illusion (Morin 1999). Overall this strategy consisted of suspending judgment in a deliberate way, intentionally distancing myself from the data and seeking to falsify recurring themes. I used this strategy during fieldwork, and also during the analysis and discussion phases, as will be referred to later in this chapter.

Peer debriefing. Finally, throughout my research project, I resorted to two peers who were not involved with it to ask questions about my study with the purpose of making the research account resonate with people other than myself. This helped me to clarify concepts, develop and refine aspects of the research narrative and, finally, make the text of the thesis more coherent and cohesive. These exchanges also helped me to improve the content of my research by helping me identify and manage instances when my own bias, emotions or even tiredness were clearly skewing my perception and judgement in the different phases of the research process.

4.3.3.2 Core strategy: reflection and reflexivity

Besides the different strategies mentioned above, reflection and reflexivity were both consistently used as core strategies in my research.

According to Mann (2016, p.27), reflection in research can be defined as simply ‘thinking about something’, whereas reflexivity is ‘more explicitly tied to the self and the researcher’s influence on the research and its outcomes, as well as the research’s influence on the researcher’. However, at the same time, Mann recognises that in practice these two processes frequently overlap. In my research, both processes were closely tied up, and operated as a unified strategy, informing one
another. In what follows, I will describe the general characteristics that these two processes had in my research and then provide an example of how they interacted.

In general, I resorted to written, spoken, and unspoken modes of expression to reflect during fieldwork. The written mode included a research journal, memos, and informal notes. The spoken mode included digital voice recordings, dialogic reflections, and dialogic reading. The unspoken mode consisted of different forms of meditation which included philosophical meditation, walking mediation, and mindfulness meditation, or combinations of them. The adoption of these modes was random and did not follow any specific method or procedure but it was constant and permanent, even up to the time of writing this chapter.

The content of my processes of reflection and reflexivity was comprehensive and varied, running the gamut from topics related to my philosophical principles and personal bias to issues related to the complexity of conducting research as well as ways to deal with it.

Regarding my philosophical principles, one of the things I reflected on was precisely the convenience of adopting a critical realist paradigmatic stance over a transformative one (Creswell and Creswell 2018), or a critical one (Denzin & Lincoln 2018), with the purpose of establishing a clearer, data-led and perhaps less ideological account of the ethos of the course as a starting point for future analysis.

Concerning my personal bias, I reflected dialogically and critically on the way in which my pre-existing knowledge, theoretical and methodological assumptions, influenced the processes of data production and data analysis what, for example, led me to implement strategies to minimise bias, such as bracketing (Tufford & Newman 2012).

Concerning the issues related to the complexity when conducting research, as well as ways to deal with it, I reflected on different factors that affected the processes of data production, such as the level of rapport and trust between the research participants and the researcher; the type of conversation establish with the research participants, or the research participants’ desire to please the researcher (also referred to in Holliday 2016 p.4), among other factors.

At the same time, reflection and reflexivity enabled me to learn new ways to consider things and implement different research strategies to, for example, listen more (e.g., by sitting among the candidates and making myself available as a resource); to listen better (e.g., by using mostly data-driven codes to represent the voice of the research participants more accurately); and to manage my subjectivity (e.g., by deliberately attempting to suspend judgment, intentionally distancing
myself from the data and seeking to falsify recurring themes as they were produced in the production, analysis and discussion phases).

Reflection and reflexivity also helped me to manage my emotions during fieldwork (e.g., dealing with my feelings of indignation and guilt before the predominant discursive practices in the course. See 6.7), and during the analysis and discussion phases (e.g., dealing with my feelings of frustrations for having relatively large amounts of data and not knowing how to process it, and so on). In this sense, I was able to reflect not only on my emotions but also on the ways in which I was reflecting on them. As expressed by Myerhoff & Ruby (1982, p.2) reflexivity ‘describes the capacity of any system of signification to turn back upon itself, to make itself its own object by referring to itself: subject and object fuse’.

One example of the interplay between reflection and reflexivity

One example of the way in which the processes of reflection and reflexivity took place during fieldwork is related to my observations of the tutors’ proxemic behaviour during the input sessions, which I characterised in my field notes as generally ‘dominant, self-confident, and in control’ (see p. 160). Given the form it adopted, this behaviour frequently made me reflect on different topics which eventually generated a reflexive process that I documented in my research journal and notes. One of the things that the proxemic behaviour of the tutors made me reflect on was the concept of symbolic power, which refers to the implicit modes of cultural/social domination through a tacit form of violence, such as discourse (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990). At the same time, their proxemic behaviour also made me think about my own proxemic behaviour in the session’s room, particularly in terms of the potential effects that this behaviour was having on the candidates. Even though unrelated, the consideration of these elements led me to a reflexive process. On the one hand, thinking about symbolic power helped me to make explicit, for example, my own bias, inasmuch as the single consideration of this topic revealed part of the implicit theoretical basis that informed my observations, which I later bracketed. At the same time, thinking about my own proxemic behaviour made me consider potential changes to improve my relationship with the candidates. One change that I implemented was to sit among them, just as another candidate, instead of at the back or the front of the room, as I had done until that moment. In the short term, this single measure seemed to have had a significant impact on my relationship with the candidates, particularly in terms of the improvement of my rapport, trust, and confidentiality with them. I later improved this strategy by making myself available to the candidates as an academic resource in my capacity as a former ICELT candidate. In time, these
improvements contributed to render more trustworthy conversational data and, at the same time, helped me to develop an emic perspective.

However, as the course progressed, I started to develop an emotional bond with the candidates and I ended up identifying myself with some of their most prominent and prevalent feelings experienced in the course, such as fear and anxiety (see p. 196). A short later, this identification made me develop feelings of indignation and guilt. To deal with this, I implemented different mechanisms which included further reflexivity (e.g., in the form of dialogic reflexivity with some of the candidates) and new strategies to manage my proxemic behaviour and my non-verbal behaviour, in general. This led me to further reflections about the subjective nature of qualitative research, particularly in terms of the values that informed my research practice, and also about the relative nature of the data produced (summarised from my research journal). See Figure 4.2

![Figure 4.2 Network of concepts and ideas of the processes of reflection/reflexivity on the observation of the tutors’ proxemic behaviour](image)

Even though complex (Mann & Walsh 2017), multifaceted (Byrd Clark & Devin 2014) and, finally, inescapable processes (Whitaker & Atkinson 2019) the processes of reflection and reflexivity helped me to improve the rigour, credibility and trustworthiness of this study. They also helped to improve as a researcher, for example by learning to 'let go' of important amounts of work done, and still enjoy the research process.
4.4 Research process and methods

The third element of my research approach is the research process and the specific methods used in this study. In what follows, I will provide an overview of the research process, and then I will describe each one of its phases including the data production, data analysis and discussion. In each case, I will give an account of the research methods used.

4.4.1 Overview of the research process and methods

As I referred to earlier, I produced data through fieldwork during 9 months, between October 2016 and July 2017, the length of one iteration of the ICELT course. This period was preceded by a piloting phase where I tried out the main research instruments to be used during fieldwork. The main methods of data production included documentary research, class observations, participant interviews, focus groups, and a research diary. The data were analysed thematically in relation to three analytic dimensions: ‘ICELT on paper’ (fundamentally, the course documents), ‘ICELT as implemented’ (fundamentally, aspects of the tutors’ implementation through their discursive instructional practices, and ‘experiences in ICELT’ (in general, the candidates’ perceptions of their own experience in the course). The data were then discussed convergently, and also in relation to three theoretical-problematic areas: ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’, ‘the marketisation of teacher education’, and ‘epistemological decolonisation’.

While I followed a principled approach, the day-to-day research involved ‘shortcuts, hunches, serendipity and opportunism’ (Holliday 2016, p. 7) as well as emotion and personal bias (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). As referred to above, as the research process unfolded, I developed different strategies to deal with this, including, in particular, a process of reflection/reflexivity and falsification strategies that I implemented in different phases of this study.

4.4.2 Research aim and research questions

As was referred to earlier, the research aimed to gain a contextualised understanding of the ethos of one iteration of the ICELT course. As I mentioned in Chapter One, the concept of ethos was understood in two senses: as the images of themselves that individuals build in their discourse, i.e., as self-representation (original historical sense) and as the fundamental elements that characterise an individual, a community, or a culture, e.g., the culture of a course (in a more current conceptualisation). As I also referred to in Chapter One, the choice of the research focus was influenced by three elements: my desire to improve my understanding of this course given
my interest in the area of teacher education, and in particular of Continuous Professional Development (CPD); the importance of the course in the area of ELT in Mexico and the lack of justification of its prominence and prevalence (as referred to in Chapter Two), and finally, the perceived need for a less ideological, self-reflexive and in-depth research on this course (as referred to in Chapter Three).

In this sense, the research questions that guided the study were the following:

1. What are the fundamental characteristics of ICELT according to course documents and course-related documents?
   1.1 How is ICELT represented, overall?
   1.2 What are the ends of the course?
   1.3 What are the distinctive components of the course?

2. What is particular in the way the course is implemented?
   2.1 How is ICELT represented in one iteration of the course?
   2.2 How are the ends of ICELT expressed in one iteration of the course?
   2.3 How are the distinctive components of ICELT operationalised in one iteration of the course?
   2.4 How do the course tutors position themselves in relation to the course and the participants?
   2.5 What are the most prominent discursive practices in the course?

3. How do candidates express their own experience in ICELT in one iteration of the course?
   3.1 What feelings do participants express in relation to the course?
   3.2 What perceptions do participants have of the course?
   3.3 How (if at all) do candidates express agency?

4.4.3 The research setting

To answer the above research questions, I conducted fieldwork in one authorised Cambridge English Examinations Centre located in Mexico City. The choice of this research setting was mainly principle-based but it can also be explained as a product of opportunity (Holliday 2016). ‘Principle-based’, because my original intention was to study a well-established iteration of the course in
Mexico but at the same time *up-to-date*, fundamentally in terms of the course delivery, which is said to be the only component decided by the authorised centres, as opposed to the course content, its structure, and its assessment criteria, which are said to be standardised worldwide. ‘Product of opportunity’, because I knew personally and had a good relationship with the General Director of an authorised centre whose teaching training program presumably met this criterion (e.g., its iteration of the course was the only one in Mexico that included an online learning component, and so on).

Given that according to the course syllabus the candidates needed to be observed teaching in their own teaching contexts, fieldwork was also conducted in ELT classrooms of different institutions located in various parts of the City and also in different cities in the neighbouring state of Mexico. At the same time, because of the blended mode of instruction of the course, a considerable amount of data was produced and collected in virtual spaces, such as the online course platform (CourseSites), and in other social media used by the research participants to communicate among themselves, like Facebook and WhatsApp.

4.4.3.1 Negotiating access

Clearance and access to the course were granted by the General Director of the ICELT centre in an expedited manner and without any major restrictions. Both included access to the selected research setting and the course resources, such as official documents and course-related documents, including candidates’ lesson planners, tasks and essays, as well as the tutors’ feedback, mark sheets and reports on assessed work. At the same time, the institution intervened to facilitate my access to the school venues where the candidates worked. It is important to say that without this intervention such access would have been unlikely in many instances, given the existing restrictions in some of these schools. Finally, informed consent was obtained from all tutors and candidates without any incentive, force, or coercion, and with the option to withdraw at any time (see Appendix 1).

Despite having been granted clearance and access to the course by the general director of the ICELT centre, I met with the administrator and the main tutor of the course to brief them about my research project and seek their consent. Showing respect and giving them their rightful place had a positive effect that eventually translated into further access, although it also had some side effects, as will be referred to in what follows.
4.4.3.2 Introduction in the field

At the beginning of the course, the main course tutor introduced me to the candidates and explained my presence in the course to them. The tutor talked about my research project in laudatory terms, which not only legitimised de facto my participation in the course but also gave me a place within it. However, as I learned later, the tutors’ comments about my research contributed to creating the perception in some candidates that I was associated in some fashion with the tutors and/or the institution. This explains why in our first conversations the candidates generally referred to their experience in the course fundamentally in favourable terms, even though their behaviour expressed opposite feelings and emotions (e.g., anxiety and fear) (see p. 200).

As the data shows, the candidates eventually started to see me as an independent agent, without any association to the academic staff or the institution and, at the same time, their testimony about their experience in the course also started to be perceptibly more open and honest (see e.g., Chapter Seven).

4.4.3.3 Being part of the culture of the course

Being part of the culture of the course implied important challenges and tensions. Challenges in terms of gaining and maintaining an insider status to produce more reliable data. Tensions because of the risk of over-identification with the research participants or of inadequate management of my presence in the field.

In both cases, I implemented a series of strategies that helped me keep a balance in my positioning in the course, although this was not always successful. Regarding gaining and maintaining insider status, I instrumented a set of strategies to gain and maintain rapport and trust with the research participants. In the case of the tensions, I kept a permanent reflexive attitude, to mitigate and/or soften the impact and effect of my presence in the field.

Besides reflexivity, the strategies I implemented were related to a) ‘pragmatic’ aspects of self-representation such as the way I dressed (e.g., dressing smart casual as most of the candidates in the course); b) proxemic behaviour (e.g., keeping a horizontal, social and personal distance with the research participants); c) non-verbal communication (e.g., being aware of my non-verbal expressions, trying to maintain a neutral posture); d) my public interventions in course events, such as inputs sessions, teaching practices, feedback sessions that I tried to keep to the minimum; e) my personal relationship with the tutors (e.g., acknowledging their authority, particularly in
public) and with the candidates in the course (e.g., making myself available to the candidates as an academic resource, as I mentioned earlier). I also set aside at least two long periods for emotional detachment during fieldwork to release stress and maintain a positive attitude.

4.4.3.4 Leaving the field

Richards (2003, p. 128) points out that at one point during fieldwork, researchers are frequently faced with the question of how and when their studies should be concluded. On the other hand, other authors, such as van den Scott (2018), question if leaving the field is even a real possibility, given the emotional investment that researchers commonly have while conducting fieldwork, particularly as novice researchers (e.g., undertaking PhD studies).

Regarding this phase in my study, I have to admit that I have ambivalent feelings. On the one hand, the formal end of fieldwork was determined by the end of the course itself. In this sense, I formally left the field immediately after the last input session took place on 7 June 2017. However, it is also true that if the field is conceptualised more broadly, i.e., not only as a physical or temporal place but also as a social, cultural, mental, and emotional place, it is possible to say that in one way or another, I never left the field where I conducted my research.

Since the formal end of the course and up to this writing, I have maintained communication with most of the research participants, including the course candidates, course tutors, and course administrators at the Cambridge English authorised centre where I conducted this study.

4.4.4 The research participants

This study focused in large part on the discourse and the discursive practices of three tutors and eight candidates in one iteration of the ICELT course. However, data was produced with at least two other categories of participants: a) those directly involved in the particular iteration of the course researched (other course candidates, course administrators, the course assessor, and the authorities in the educational setting of each course candidate), and b) those participants who were not directly involved with the particular iteration of the course researched but who were familiar either with the ICELT course (former course candidates, course managers, course importers, and course critics) or with the ELT context where this study took place (mostly researchers), as described in Table 4.1:
Table 4.1 Summary of Research Participants (General)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course tutors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course candidates (Group 1)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course candidates (Group 2)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course candidates (Group 3)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course assessor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School authorities</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former course candidates</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course managers at Cambridge English (UK)*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course managers at Cambridge English (Mexico)*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course importers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course critics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Spoke in a personal capacity

4.4.4.1 Course tutors

The iteration of the ICELT course researched was taught by four tutors. Three of them were in charge of teaching the on-site input sessions and marking and providing feedback on the candidates’ assessment components, including the candidates’ assessed teaching practice, language tasks, methodology assignments and peer observations. The other tutor (Tutor 4) was in charge of teaching the online input sessions.

Tutor 1 was appointed as the main course tutor, which implied that, in general, he was the main responsible for assigning the course work among the tutors, as well as the effective curriculum delivery, the achievement of the course goals and learning outcomes. At the same time, he was responsible for filling in and sending the official documents of the course to Cambridge English. Finally, he had a key role in the development of a positive environment in the course.

All tutors in the course were Mexican English language teachers, with a similar level of academic background (postgraduate degrees) but different years of professional experience (ranging between 15 and 45 years at the time of the course). They all had been trained at one of the first bi-national English language centres to be founded in Mexico, mentioned in Chapter Two (see p. 15). Finally, all fulfilled other functions in relation to the Cambridge English teaching qualifications,
such as ICELT moderators, CELTA & DELTA Assessors, or Oral Examination Team Leaders (see table 4.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Educational background</th>
<th>Years of Professional Experience in ELT</th>
<th>Tears of Experience ICELT tutor</th>
<th>Area of expertise in ELT/ELTE</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor 1 Male</td>
<td>MA in Education</td>
<td>26 years</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Curriculum Design</td>
<td>ICELT Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Main course</td>
<td>BA in ELT Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DELTA Local Tutor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tutor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor 2 Female</td>
<td>PGCert Delta</td>
<td>45 years</td>
<td>23 years</td>
<td>Young Learners</td>
<td>Cambridge English Oral Examination Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(COTE/ICELT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor 3 Female</td>
<td>MSc in TESOL Delta</td>
<td>19 years</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>CELTA</td>
<td>CELTA tutor, ELT textbook editor / writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor 4 Male</td>
<td>MA in TESOL</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Academic Administration</td>
<td>CELTA &amp; Delta Assessor, ICELT Moderator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA in English Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 2 Summary of the Course tutors’ profile

4.4.4.2 Course candidates

Twenty-six candidates started the course, even though only nineteen finished it. From the original group, twenty candidates were female and only six were male, mostly in their mid-thirties. All of them were practising ELT teachers with an average teaching experience of thirteen years, whereas the candidate with more experience had forty-one years, and the candidate with less experience had four years at the start of the course. All course candidates had Spanish as their mother tongue, except one whose first language was English.

The process of selection of the eight research participants from the original pool of course candidates was gradual and painstaking, particularly because the decision-making process in the research had to be continuously adjusted to the emerging vicissitudes and contingencies, somehow expected in a course of this nature (e.g., candidates who dropped out of the course). Yet, having obtained informed consent from all course candidates, the main criterion that guided the selection of research participants for this study was their teaching context. The reason behind this criterion was a personal desire to explore the candidates’ experience in the course in a wide range of teaching/learning settings. Thus the final group of research participants included multiple and diverse contexts and different sectors (e.g., Public and private); at various levels (e.g., pre-
primary, primary, secondary and tertiary education) and different specialisms (e.g., General English, Literature, ESP, English as a medium of instruction, etc.). For reasons of space, I only included three candidates in this research as case studies (Victoria, Javier, and Mariana) (see Chapter Seven). The main criterion for their inclusion was 'representativeness', according to the assessment of their overall performance in the course made by the tutors in relation to three categories: ‘strong candidates’, ‘average candidates’ and weak candidates'. (See Table 4.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Educational background</th>
<th>Qualifications in ELT</th>
<th>Years of Professional Experience in ELT</th>
<th>Teaching context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>MA in Genomics</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>EMI – Elementary – 6th grade (private sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar</td>
<td>BA in Communication</td>
<td>Cambridge TKT (Modules 1-3)</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>General English – Pre-elementary (private sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camerina</td>
<td>PhD in History</td>
<td>Teacher’s Course</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>ESP – University – Undergraduate (private sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miranda</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Teacher’s Course</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Elementary – 4th grade (private sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier</td>
<td>BA in ELT</td>
<td>BA in ELT</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>Literature – High School – 7th grade (private school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliana</td>
<td>BA in Communication</td>
<td>Teacher’s Course / Cambridge TKT (Modules 1-3)</td>
<td>13 years</td>
<td>EMI – Elementary – 2nd grade (private sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Teacher’s Course / Cambridge TKT (Modules 1-3)</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>General English – Elementary – 5th grade (public sector)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariana</td>
<td>Certificate as Speech and Language Therapist</td>
<td>Teacher’s Course / Cambridge TKT (Modules 1-3)</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>General English – Pre-elementary (private sector)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 Summary of selected Course Candidates

* Fictitious names are used
4.4.5 Data production

Because this research aimed to generate a deep understanding of the ethos of one iteration of the ICELT course, the time frame of fieldwork was established around the length of the course itself. In this section, I will describe the organisation of the fieldwork and provide detail about the data production methods used in this research.

4.4.5.1 Organisation of fieldwork

Within the timeframe of the course (9 months), fieldwork was done in at least two phases: a ‘progressive focusing’ phase (the first half of the course), and a ‘falsifying’ phase (the second half of the course), preceded both by a piloting phase. These phases will be briefly described next:

4.4.5.1.1 Piloting phase

One month before the formal start of the course, I was allowed to observe two 5-hour input sessions in a different iteration of the course that at the time was in its final stage. I was also allowed to conduct four interviews with an equal number of course candidates from that same course. In terms of the observations, I used both sessions to try out different forms to manage practical aspects of fieldwork, such as timing; audio-recording; note-taking; seating, thinking; and observing unobtrusively, and so on. In terms of the interviews, I used the four instances to refine a protocol of three interrelated phases (before, during, and after correspondingly) originally designed during my postgraduate course (described in detail in Vargas-Gil, 2015).

While this period allowed me to get a taste of some basic practical aspects of fieldwork in an ICELT classroom environment, it was of little help in anticipating the multiple challenges that I would face during the actual iteration of the course. Among others, these challenges included the management of the following elements: my perspective and focus in both inside and outside the research settings; my everyday relationship with the research participants; my fieldwork identity; my everyday interventions; my ‘insideness’ and my eventual familiarity with the course and with the course participants; the effect I had on the course (and effect that the course had on me!); the need to (re) learn to observe and listen and talk in completely new ways; the importance of self-doubt; and then the topic of self-centeredness and over-reflexivity, among many others.

4.4.5.1.2 Bracketing
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At the time of the pilot phase, I also conducted an exercise of reflection to identify and counterbalance elements that could potentially influence my perspective during fieldwork, such as my personal experience, my personal agendas, and my ideas, or assumptions about the ICELT course, particularly given my condition of former candidate of the course. In terms of the latter, I produced a document where I described openly and honestly what I thought of the course at the time in terms of its positive and the non-positive elements (see Appendix 2). This helped me understand better what my opinion, pre-existing thoughts and beliefs were about the course so that I could ‘bracket them’ to conduct fieldwork with a more open mind.

4.4.5.1.3 Progressive focusing phase and falsification phase

Even though data were produced using the same methods throughout the study, the focus of attention in observations (and in other related data production methods) changed as the study progressed. This gave origin to at least two phases in the data collection process: a progressive focusing phase and a falsifying phase. In the case of the former (which took place during the first half of the course), I systematically adjusted my focus of attention (from a wide focus to a much narrower one), as repeated instances, concepts and ideas became apparent. In the latter phase (during the second half of the course), I purposefully focused my attention on instances that negated or in fact falsified (or contradicted) the same instances, concepts or ideas, identified and refined in the previous phase. This was done with the objective not only to further counterbalance my own bias but also to enrich the data produced.

4.4.5.2 Methods of data production

In this section, I will describe the methods of data production employed in fieldwork, including documentary research; research observations; research interviews and research diary.

4.4.5.2.1 Documentary research

Sets of documents were collected from three different groups of sources: Cambridge English; the Cambridge English Centre, and the Course itself.

4.4.5.2.1.1 Cambridge English documents

The first group is composed of the ‘official’ course documents and course-related documents produced by Cambridge English (See Table. 4.4):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Published Research (Studies in Language Testing; Research Notes, etc)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/research-notes/">http://www.cambridgeenglish.org/research-notes/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.5.2.1.2 Centre’s documents

The second group of documents is composed of the course-related and course-supported materials provided by the Cambridge English Centre in its online platform (see Table 4.5):
4.4.5.2.1.3 Course documents

The third group was composed of a set of course documents produced by the course tutors and the course candidates (see Table 4.6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Documents</td>
<td>Annotated peer observation reports; annotated lesson plans; annotated post-observation reflections; the report on assessed teaching; annotated course tasks and tasks’ mark sheets; methodology assignments and methodology assignments’ mark sheets; candidate record booklets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Tutors</td>
<td>Mails, class handouts; PowerPoint slides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Candidates</td>
<td>Mails; Facebook comments; WhatsApp chat exchanges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 6 Course documents

4.4.5.2.2 Research observations

In this section, I will describe with some detail the research settings, date and time of the observations carried out during fieldwork; their observational foci; the ‘mechanics’ of the observations and the observational strategies employed.
4.4.5.2.2.1 Research settings, date and time

The course was observed in its entirety, including the input sessions and the teaching practice observations of some candidates, along with the corresponding feedback sessions. In addition, the eight candidates selected for this study were also observed in an ordinary class once the course concluded.

It is important to mention that I wasn’t able to observe the pre-course interviews as was originally planned. More than a question of access, this was related to the organisation of the course itself—a topic worth exploring further.

- Research settings

As mentioned earlier, the Input sessions had two modes of delivery: on-site and on-line (see Table 6.2). In the case of the former, the sessions were held at the premises of the institution whereas the latter took place in the course online platform asynchronously. The teaching practice observations and the feedback sessions took place at the course candidate’s own teaching setting.

- Date & Time

The course started on October 28th, 2016 and concluded on July 7th 2017, i.e., roughly 9 months. The input sessions were held weekly (See Table 6.2) whereas the practice teaching observations of each candidate were held monthly during the second half of the course (starting in January/February). A summary of observations is detailed in Table 4.7 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Num. of Sessions</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Recorded Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Input sessions</td>
<td>Once a week (5hrs)</td>
<td>30 (21 on-site and 9 on-line)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>105*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Practices</td>
<td>Started in January/February</td>
<td>8 candidates were observed 4 times (32), and other 8 were observed twice (16). All course candidates were observed at least once (10).</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback sessions</td>
<td>After each observation</td>
<td>1 after each observation</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra class</td>
<td>Once</td>
<td>1 hour session</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* On-site input sessions

Table 4.7 Summary of Observations

4.4.5.2.2.2 Observational Foci
Throughout the course, I audio recorded and kept track of field events (i.e., input sessions, teaching practice observations and feedback sessions) as they happened, having a general focus of attention on, among others, the following aspects:

- The setting itself
- The research participants’ talk
- The research participants themselves (their relationships, interactions, and observational emotions)
- The research participants’ behaviour (times, events, etc.)
- The relationships among course content, tutors’ mediation and candidates’ response
- How the candidates’ participation was acknowledged, promoted, disregarded or discouraged (if)
- How course candidates reproduced, adapted, ‘faked’ or ignored the ICELT course’ teaching guidelines in their own teaching practices
- How they explained or justified their decisions
- Candidates’ forms of critical reflection, self-awareness, critical examination of course’ presuppositions, values, ideologies

This was the minimum core observational basis that I maintained throughout the course. However, as mentioned, above, as the course developed, I progressively started to adjust my focus of attention having in mind the research questions of the study, from a wide focus to a much narrower one, as repeated instances, concepts and ideas became apparent, particularly in on-site observations. This progressive focusing phase took place roughly during the first half of the course. At the same time, as more instances accumulated and specific topics started to become prominent, I felt the need to counterbalance them by centring my attention and documenting instances of their exact opposite. One example to illustrate this point is the topic of the apparent high level of anxiety that the participants started to develop on the very first day of the course. After noticing and registering instances that could potentially constitute a theme in itself during the analysis phase, I purposefully started to look for, centre my attention and follow up on instances where the course participants would seem calm or even joyful. This ‘falsifying’ phase took place during the second part of the course (see p. 196).

4.4.5.2.2.3 Mechanics of the observations

Generally, my observations were divided into four phases*:
• Before-the-event phase

Before the formal beginning of each session (in both input sessions and teaching practice observations), I observed, interacted and took mental notes of research participants’ corridor actions and comments. I saw these instances as very important and valuable sources of data because in those moments the research participants seemed to behave and talk more naturally and expressed their views more openly.

• During-the-event phase

During the observations of the different field events, I maintained a minimum intervention presence, keeping a horizontal, public and social distance (Hall 1966), always aware of my verbal and non-verbal communication (see ‘observational strategies’ below).

In each session, I audio recorded and took sketchy notes of field events in a discreet way keeping the observational foci referred to above.

• After-the-event phase

As in the case of the ‘before-the-event- phase’, after the end of each session, I paid careful attention to the actions and exchanges among research participants, as I considered them to be a rich source of data. At the same time, after each Teaching Practice Observation, including the corresponding feedback session, I informally approached the course tutor and the course candidate to inquire about their opinions of the practice class and the feedback gave/received. I also compiled the corresponding course documentation of each observation, including the annotated lesson plan, the annotated post-observation reflection, and the report on assessed teaching for analysis.

• Writing phase

Immediately after exiting the venue where the observation had taken place (usually within the first five minutes), I audio recorded or typed additional notes, trying to include actual words spoken, including quoting directly. This was done with the purpose of recording important details of the events while they were still fresh in my mind. Later that same day (and sometimes on the following day), I transformed those notes into field notes with more order and detail. Once at home, while the event was fresh in my mind, I used my sketchy notes and diverse textual and
audio data collected (such as handouts; class planners; written feedback; course formats, etc.) to produce an account of the day with the following purposes:

a. Describing / Narrating
   - the data produce, organising it and enriching it with detail

b. Reflecting on
   - What was observed
   - The act of observing as such
   - My own observing, answering questions such as what did I pay attention to? What was I not observing? Why?
   - Myself as an observer

c. Planning
   - Defining topics that needed further exploration
   - Planning for future observations

* In the case of on-line sessions, I produced the textual data of each lesson from the course once the system was closed as after this the course candidates were unable to add or modify their comments.

4.4.5.2.2.4 Observational Strategies

During the field observations, I kept, in general, a role of an open observer (i.e., with an open mind and an eye for the unexpected) in order to a) follow the flow of the events, b) develop an awareness of what was happening, and c) develop an eye for detail.

At the same time, I was particularly careful to carry out my observations in a discreet way and manage my note-taking in an unobtrusive and non-threatening manner. However, as the course progressed, I had to combine this with a more fully adopted role as participant-observer so that I could interact more closely with the ICELT candidates, gain and maintain their trust, and refine my own perspective. Maintaining this balance represented a constant challenge and it required the implementation of multiple strategies in terms of observational skills or interpersonal communication (focused listening, focused hearing, information checks, non-verbals, and so on).

With this same aim in mind, I also took the following actions:
• Taking the time to talk with every candidate regarding my presence in the field in order to fully inform them about the purpose of my research, answer any questions they had and obtain their consent.

• Finding the time and the occasion to get to know and mingle with every candidate during the breaks

• Taking part in some collaborative activities as “another candidate”

• Socialising in extra-curriculum activities with both tutors and candidates (important in the Mexican culture to gain and maintain anyone’s trust)

Finally, I think that the length of the course itself (9 months) helped me to consolidate my presence as established before the participants’ eyes, thus minimising the effects on the observed and making me gain insideness in the course.

4.4.5.2.3 Research interviews

*The interview is no mere question and answer routine – it is an interactional event*

Keith Richards (2003, p. 50)

During fieldwork, I also conducted an important number of interviews with at least three different groups of research participants (described below). These interviews were conducted in different ways (e.g., informal, conversational, unstructured, and in-depth interviewing) and therefore they required different types of intervention (casual-intervention, conversation-like, minimal-intervention, and dialogical interviewer’s participation, correspondingly). However, all interviews were conducted under two basic premises: a) to encourage research participants to talk at length, and (b) to consider each interview as a ‘single and unique’ exploratory event, and in this sense, ‘open to nuance and opportunity as the interview’ progressed (Richards 2003, p. 65).

In this section, I will describe aspects of general preparation of the interviews conducted, such as the ‘interviewee’s profile’ or the ‘interview questions’, as well as other important aspects such as the ‘interview settings’, the ‘interview setup’ and ‘the interviewees’. 
4.4.5.2.3.1 Interviewees’ Profile

Before each interview, I elaborated a personal profile of each research participant to be interviewed with the aim to inform my own perspective and that of the interview questions and probing, and with the specific objectives of a) helping to build rapport with the interviewee as soon as possible at the beginning of the interview; b) adding detail and nuance to questions asked, and c) considering my potential ‘taken for grantedness’, given my own situation as an ICELT graduate.

4.4.5.2.3.2 The interview questions

The interview questions and probes varied according to the type of interview conducted. In unstructured interviews, I prepared a checklist of topics in the form of general guidelines but I mostly focused on the participants’ answers and their language in order to follow up on that. In the case of more structured interviews, I followed a `progressive focussing` approach on the topics at hand as well as the structural basic order suggested by Richards (2003, p.72), keeping my intervention at a minimum level, even though always positive, to allow the interviewees to talk at length:

→Opening→Check/reflect→Following up→Probing→Structuring→

In the case of in-depth interviews, I paid special attention to the participant’s responses to ‘formulate appropriate probes, clarifications, and follow up questions’ (Mann 2016, p. 100). Finally, in the case of conversational interviews, I followed a more dialogic approach.

In all cases, special consideration was given to spoken words, paralanguage and body language due to the influence that these elements exercise in any conversation (Knapp, Hall & Horgan 2013), particularly in `active interviews´ (Mann, 2011 & 2016) where any response was likely to affect an already imbalanced and controlled process (Pardey, 2007).

4.4.5.2.3.3 The interview setting

In all the interviews conducted, I privileged the interviewees’ preference for the interview location and whenever this was possible, I paid special attention to the management of the practical aspects of the settings such as comfort, noise, seating, ventilation and lighting as well as an interview schedule.
4.4.5.2.3.4 The interview setup

I also paid special attention to the interview setup following a protocol consisted of three phases:

- ‘Before-the-interview phase’, which was centred on the ‘pragmatic’ aspects of the interview (invitation to participants to be interviewed; representation of the research project; general check-up; punctuality, and so on), aspects that I considered to be fundamental.

- ‘During-the-interview phase’, centred on what was said; the way things were said and the time in which they were said, including paralinguistic features as referred to above.

- ‘After-the-interview phase’, centred on what happened immediately after the interview was ‘formally’ finished as this was also an important source of data.

Immediately after each interview, I made notes, reflected and analysed the whole event, identifying points for future probing (interview content) as well as areas of improvement (interview technique).

4.4.5.2.3.5 Interviewees

The interviews in this study were conducted with at least three groups of interviewees, grouped according to their level of intervention. These groups are described below:

- First Group of interviewees

This group was composed of the eight-course candidates selected as the main focus of this study (See Table 4.3).

In the planning stage, I had projected to conduct at least three formal face-to-face interviews with each course candidate. However, due to time constraints imposed by the own demands of the course and the course candidates’ professional and personal commitments, it became increasingly apparent the impossibility to carry them out – at least as originally designed. At the same time, the format of formal interviews seemed untimely and potentially intimidating for the candidates. What I did then was to implement a more opportunistic approach – adopted mostly by chance. Having noticed that a group of course candidates arrived always in class on time and
in good spirits (unlike the rest of the candidates), I tried to find the reason behind their attitude. What I discovered was that to avoid the traffic at the peak time of the day, this group of candidates used to arrive at a nearby Café one hour before the start of the session. In the first opportunity I had, I dropped by the Café, ordered a coffee cup (even though I don’t drink coffee!) and met them casually. This encounter produced informal not-recorded conversations that led to unstructured recorded interviews on Skype, and later to in-depth face-to-face interviews. As a consequence of our exchanges, the communication between these course candidates and I became more casual and familiar in class and this, in turn, motivated other candidates to talk to me creating a sort of cascade effect.

The interviews were all conducted in the course candidate’s mother tongue, i.e., Spanish –except for one candidate whose first language was English and another candidate who preferred to use English to interact with me. This was done with three purposes in mind: build on the rapport already established; create a more intimate conversational and dialogical atmosphere between the interlocutors, and finally, enhance opportunities for the candidates to add more nuance and detail to their accounts. All interviews combined casual-intervention, conversation-like, minimal-intervention, and interviewer’s dialogical participation, and all adopted features of different types of interviews: informal interviewing, conversational interviewing, unstructured interviewing, and in-depth interviewing correspondingly. Finally, I attempted to hold the interviews evenly across the course, i.e., roughly in the beginning, in the middle and by the end, and around the course’s assessed components (e.g., after each PTO) (See Table 4.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>No. Sessions</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Recorded time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Informal, conversational, unstructured, in-depth like, telephone</td>
<td>Face to Face, Skype and Phone</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>168 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cesar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Informal, conversational, unstructured, in-depth like, Telephone</td>
<td>Face to Face, Skype and Phone</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>378 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camerina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Informal, conversational, unstructured, in-depth like, telephone</td>
<td>Face to Face, Skype and Phone</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>134 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liliana</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Informal, conversational, unstructured, in-depth like, telephone</td>
<td>Face to Face, Skype and Phone</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>390 mins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the end of the course, I conducted one one-hour focus group with the whole group of course candidates.

- **Second Group of interviewees**

The second group of interviewees was composed of the course tutors, the school authorities at each course candidate’s setting (first group) and other courses that offered an additional perspective. Overall, the number of instances, type and language were the same as in the previous group of research participants, except for the interview mode which was always face-to-face in the case of the course tutors and school authorities (See Table 4.9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>No. Sessions</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Overall Recorded time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Tutors (3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Informal, conversational, unstructured</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>1574 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School authorities (8)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>480 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Candidates (8)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Informal, conversational, unstructured</td>
<td>Face to Face, Skype and Phone</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>564 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2618 mins</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 9 Summary of Interviews (Second Group)

**Table 4. 8 Summary of Interviews (First Group)**
The third group of interviewees was composed of other stakeholders, such as the course administrator, the course assessor, the course adapters, former course candidates, course critics, and other Cambridge tutors that I considered could enrich the research perspective and analysis. (See Table 4.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>No. Sessions</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Overall Recorded time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>86 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Assessor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>In-depth like interview</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>197 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course adapters (2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>180 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former course candidates (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>360 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course critics (5)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>Spanish / English</td>
<td>570 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cambridge English tutors (4)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>Face to Face</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>240 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1633 (27 hrs)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Summary of Interviews (Third Group)

4.4.5.2.4 Research diary

Research diary is an umbrella term that includes the series of field notes, reflexive notes and, in fact, the research journal that I kept during fieldwork. As a whole, keeping this research diary helped me to reflect in a written form on a) my research as this was being developed, (b) myself in relation to the research process, and (c) the fact of keeping a diary and its general significance and limits for the overall research study.

In the case of field notes, these were created in a sketchy form during fieldwork to record events, behaviours, actions, instances of talk, and my thinking among other features of the observation, that I later used to complete a daily record of activities that informed my future analysis. Overall, I produced 96 entries which I wrote after each one of the course input sessions (30 entries) and the candidates’ class observations (66 entries) (see sample in Appendix 3).
In the case of reflexive notes, these were produced with the purpose of recording my thoughts during the day (and quite frequently during the night!), which I later used to articulate topics and themes to organise my thinking process (see sample in Appendix 4).

Finally, my research journal was kept as an outlet for my unfiltered thinking about my own research experience so that I could express myself freely and think without any kind of constraint, including concern for my own writing or the nature of my own opinions and ideas. Overall, I produced 44 entries, which I started to write from the first week of the course until the last week of fieldwork weekly (see Appendix 5).

### 4.4.5.2.5 Summary of data production

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of Data Collection</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>Time [hrs]</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documentary Research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Textual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Observations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio / textual / visual</td>
<td>105, 58, 29, 8</td>
<td>Online material (Syllabus, Course pre-tasks, Online sessions); Course documents (Lesson plans, tasks, essays, reports, class handouts, PowerPoint slides); Communication among research participants (mails, Facebook; WhatsApp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Input sessions</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Audio / textual / visual</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Teaching practices</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Audio / textual / visual</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Feedback sessions</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Audio / textual / visual</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Extra class</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Audio / textual / visual</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>32, 43, 27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- First Group</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Second Group</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Third Group</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Diary</td>
<td>Daily Record (96 entries)</td>
<td>Textual / Audio</td>
<td>Field notes, reflexive notes and research journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research Journal (44 entries)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reflexive Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11 Summary of data production
4.4.6 Data analysis

Even though the processes of progressive focusing and falsification conducted in the data production phase involved some kind of analytical activity, the data analysis phase of this research began, as such, at the end of the fieldwork. The main method of analysis in this phase was thematic analysis, largely based on the approach developed by Braun and Clarke (e.g., 2006, 2013 & 2019). The choice of this approach was based on the following reasons:

Firstly, I considered that this method offered the possibility of identifying, analysing and reporting basic patterns of meaning in the data in a flexible way (e.g., not tied to a particular theoretical framework), data-led (e.g., based predominantly on empirical evidence), and finally in a reflective way (e.g., acknowledging the active role of the researcher), which was consistent with my philosophical assumptions (see p. 46). At the same time, I considered that this method would allow me to answer the research questions of this study in an adequate way, i.e., in a direct, content-rich, and accessible way, dealing at the same time with complexity and ambiguity. Finally, I considered that this method would allow me to establish an empirically-based minimum interpretation from which I could develop sounder, future analyses at other levels (e.g., at a critical level).

Regarding the choice of approach to thematic analysis, I chose the version developed by Braun and Clarke over other versions of thematic analysis such as, for example, coding-reliability thematic analysis (e.g., Boyatzis 1998; Joffe 2011; Guest, MacQueen & Namey, 2012 ), or code-book thematic analysis (e.g., Smith & Firth 2011; Gale, Heath, Cameron, Rashid & Redwood 2013; Ritchie, Lewis, Nicholls & Ormston 2013), due to their emphasis on the active role of the researcher, and thus on reflexivity, above questions of method or procedure, which was also consistent with my own epistemological and methodological perspective and preferences. However, it is important to mention that the thematic analysis version used in this study includes elements that are not contained in their version, such as a falsification phase.

In what follows, I will describe briefly the different stages, considerations, and procedures of my analytic process, including the transcription phase and the procedure of the reflexive thematic analysis.

4.4.6.1 Transcription phase

Considering the amount of spoken data produced during fieldwork and to optimise the transcription process with which I started the analysis phase (Gumperz & Berenz 1993), I decided
to transcribe only part of the corpus of the data produced, whereas others parts were summarised and then partially transcribed, only if deemed relevant for the analysis. In this sense, I only transcribed in its entirety the course sessions and the interviews with the tutors and the candidates whereas the rest of the data were summarised and then selectively transcribed, or only summarised. See Table 4.12 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of data production</th>
<th>Type of event</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Overall recorded hours</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation (Table 4.7)</td>
<td>Input sessions</td>
<td>Course candidates / students</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Full transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations (Table 4.7)</td>
<td>Feedback sessions</td>
<td>Course tutors and candidates</td>
<td>English / Spanish</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Summary / partial transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations (Table 4.7)</td>
<td>Extra class</td>
<td>Course candidates / students</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews - First Group (Table 4.8)</td>
<td>Informal, conversational, unstructured, in-depth like, telephone</td>
<td>Course candidates</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Full transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews - Second Group (Table 4.9)</td>
<td>Informal, conversational, semi-structures, unstructured, in-depth like, telephone</td>
<td>Course tutors</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Summary / partial transcription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews – Second Group (Table 4.9)</td>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
<td>School authorities and other candidates</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews – Third group</td>
<td>Unstructured, in-depth like interview</td>
<td>Course administrators, course assessor, course adapters, former, course candidates, course critics, other Cambridge tutors</td>
<td>Spanish / English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 Summary of the data corpus of spoken data produced during fieldwork

The process that I followed to transcribe the spoken data was divided into three phases, described in what follows:

1. Familiarisation. Before transcribing each item, I used to read the field notes and diary notes produced in fieldwork related to it so that I could activate schemata about the context where the recording had taken place. I would then play the recording and listen
to it once in its entirety, attempting to get the gist of the data, but also paying attention to relevant details for the transcription process, taking sketchy notes on them. Finally, I would pause the recording each hour, take a 5-minute break, and then continue listening until the end.

2. The Transcription process. In this phase, I would play the recording again, typing up every word verbatim in the language in which it had been produced, adding other sounds of naturally occurring talk only when relevant, and occasionally fixing little grammar mistakes, broken sentences, as well as long paragraphs to improve readability. To transcribe the audio text I used Express Scribe pro, which is a conventional professional audio player software, easy to operate and customise. In terms of the transcription system, I adapted Braun and Clarke’s transcription notation system for orthographic transcription (Appendix 6) given its practicality (e.g., it is easy to understand, learn and use), clarity (e.g., each transcription convention is clearly defined), and finally, its capacity of representation, which focuses and highlights the propositional information expressed or communicated in a relatively fully manner.

3. Finishing touches. As the last step, I used to play the recording again and listen to it along with the transcripts to correct typos and omissions.

Finally, regarding translation, texts transcribed from their original in Spanish were translated into English only if they were going to be included in the analysis chapters of this study.

4.4.6.2 Reflexive thematic analysis

Once transcribed, the textual data were coded and then categorised to identify, analyse and report patterned meanings across the data sets related to the research questions of this study. The data were analysed in relation to three analytical dimensions: ICELT ‘on paper’ (fundamentally, the course documents. See Chapter Five), ICELT ‘as instrumented’ (fundamentally, aspects of the tutors’ mediation through their discursive instructional practices. See Chapter Six), and ‘experiences in ICELT’ (in general, the candidates’ perceptions of their own experience in the course. See Chapter Seven). As mentioned above, I followed the thematic analysis approach put forth by Braun and Clarke (2006, 2013 & 2019), including the falsification phase, which was all organised around the following steps:

1. Familiarising with the data and identifying items of interest
2. Generating codes
3. Generating themes
4. Reviewing potential themes
5. Defining and naming your themes
6. Falsifying phase
7. Producing the report

As can be seen, the falsifying phase, not present in the original six-step model (Braun and Clarke 2006, 2013), or its later version (2019), took place once the positive themes had been defined, running counter to them, offering nuance and detail of them, and/or effectively giving origin to opposing themes.

Even though systematic, the analytical process was not straightforward but rather recursive, and inevitably, ‘messy, creative and interpretative’ (Braun and Clarke 2018).

In what follows, I will describe briefly each one of these steps:

1. **Familiarising with the data and identifying items of interest**

This phase was designed for the familiarisation of the researchers with the items of a given data set. Among other things, this implied reading and re-reading each one of the items actively, analytically and critically, noting things of interest and being as inclusive as possible. The stated aim in this phase is to become intimately familiar with the content of the data and to start treating data as data, as opposed to as information (Braun, Clarke & Weate, P. 2016, p. 9).

Considering that I had produced and transcribed the data myself and that, in this sense, I already had been through two levels of immersion with the data, I started this phase by brainstorming what I knew about each item and the general context in which it had been produced, to bracket such knowledge and look at the data with *fresh eyes*. This helped me to add detail to the knowledge I had about each item and/or note new things about it.

As recommended by Braun and Clarke (2006), I took mostly sketchy notes about my *noticings*.

2. **Generating codes**

According to Braun and Clarke (2006, 2013 & 2019), in the second phase of the thematic analysis process, researchers are expected to go through each data item and generate codes in relation to
its content in an inclusive, comprehensive and systematic way. These codes are considered to be the building blocks of the analysis that create ‘solid foundations for theme development’ (Braun, Clarke & Weate 2016, p. 9). At the end of the process, researchers are expected to compile and collate such codes in preparation for the next step.

In this approach, a code is conceptualised as a pithy label that captures the content and the analytical relevance of a segment of data. Codes are said to be semantic, (i.e., reporting on explicitly-stated meanings), or latent, (i.e., reporting on underlying meaning), according to the level of description and/or interpretation of the data (Ibid). As commented by Braun and Clarke, the test of a good code is when it stands by itself and that when read, evokes the content of the data without reading it.

Following these guidelines and conceptualisations, I coded the data directly on the transcripts at three different levels, combining the use of semantic codes (first level) and then more abstract codes (second and third levels) (Appendix 7). I mostly coded the data deductively, i.e., driven by the content itself, using in each case the texts’ language. I went through this process in a systematic, cyclic and iterative way, reading line by line each one of the items and taking notes of relevant aspects of the data and the decision-making process to use them as a reference in the following phase. Overall, the codes were produced in reference to the research questions of the study. (See p. 55).

Finally, I compiled and collated the codes produced along with the data relevant to them. For this purpose, I used a computer-assisted qualitative data analysis software program (CAQDAS), called MAXQDA (Appendix 8).

3. Generating themes

According to Braun and Clarke, the phase of generating themes involves the identification of broader patterns of meaning across the data sets using the codes produced in the previous phase. These authors maintain that themes are, precisely, ‘patterns of meaning, underpinned by a central organising concept – a share core idea (which) provide a framework for organising and reporting the researcher’s analytical observations’ (2016, p1).

In this phase, I listed and organised the codes on thematic maps to identify potential themes at three different levels: subthemes, themes and overarching themes. For this process, I used a mind mapping and brainstorming application called XMind that allowed me to visualise, arrange and expand clusters of themes. The criteria that guided me in the production of the candidate themes
were their prominence and prevalence across the data, i.e., their relevance concerning the research questions of the study and their frequency within the dataset.

This notion can be illustrated with Figure 4.3 below, which portrays part of the thematic map of what eventually would become Theme 12: ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’ (see p. 198). This theme eventually captured and described the tone and specific content of the warnings made to the candidates about failing the course if they did not follow the established guidelines and procedures. During my analytical process, this theme was identified as prominent because it expressed the content of what would be identified as one of the predominant discursive practices of the course, which directly related to research question 2.5 (see p. 55). In turn, this theme was eventually identified as prevalent, because the expressions of these warnings are recurrent across the data (see Figure 4.3).

![Thematic map of the development of Theme 12: ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’](image)

**Figure 4.3 Thematic map of the development of Theme 12: ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’**

4. **Reviewing potential themes**

For Braun, Clarke & Weate (2016, p.12), reviewing the provisional themes produced during the previous phase involves looking at the coded data and then going back to the whole data set to make sure two things are met: firstly, that the analysis fitted well with the data and the data have
not been misrepresented, inadvertently, through poor coding and, secondly, that the story that was developed is a compelling and coherent way of addressing the study’s research question. For this purpose, in my research I reviewed the candidate themes having as a guideline the following questions proposed by the same authors (Ibid):

a. Does each theme have a central organising concept so that all the data and codes cohere around a single key analytic point?

b. Is the central organising concept of each theme distinct?

c. What are the relationships, interconnections and boundaries between the themes?

d. Do the themes together tell a coherent and compelling story of the data, that addresses your research question?

During the reviewing process, the candidate themes were merged, refined or discarded.

5. Defining and naming your themes

Following Braun and Clarke’s model, in this phase of the analysis, I defined and named each theme a) thinking through the nuance and the specificity of each one of them and then b) organising them into a coherent and consistent account (Braun and Clarke 2006).

To reduce bias in naming each theme, I used the texts’ language, and whenever this was appropriate, I included verbatim quotes. This is illustrated in Figure 4.4, which features the thematic map of the further development of Theme 12: ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’: 
6. Falsifying phase

Intending to improve the consistency of the themes produced in my analytical process, I sought to falsify all themes and subthemes produced. For this purpose, I followed the same steps outlined above (phases 1 to 5), but with a focus precisely on data that falsified or ran counter to the themes already generated, i.e., in a top-down, deductive way.

In general, this process allowed me to identify patterns of meaning that I had not produced up to that point in my analysis, which helped me to add nuance and detail to my overall research account. This can be illustrated with Theme 12: ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’, referred to above, which captured and described the warnings made to the candidates by the tutors about failing the course if they did not follow the established guidelines and procedures. In falsifying this theme, I identified expressions of discourse opposing but related to those warnings, not seen before, that sought to mitigate and reduced their expression and impact, and that at the same time, were also prevalent in the data. Eventually, these expressions gave origin to Sub-theme 12.3 ‘[But] take it easy because otherwise you’ll go crazy, huh?’ which ended up enriching the substance of the theme, making it more consistent and, at the same time, presenting a richer description of the theme and the discursive practices in the course.
Table 4.13 below, features the themes where the falsifying analytical process gave origin to counter sub-themes, as was particularly the case in the section that includes the predominant discursive practices in Chapter Six:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Sub-themes</th>
<th>Counter sub-themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 12: ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’</td>
<td>Sub-theme 12.1: ‘You are likely to fail!’ Sub-theme 12.2: ‘Shaking... yeeeh!’</td>
<td>Sub-theme 12.3: ‘[But] take it easy because otherwise you’ll go crazy, huh?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 14: ‘No pain no gain’</td>
<td>Sub-theme 14.1: ‘God, when is this ending?’ Sub-theme 14.2: ‘You are not enjoying the course?’</td>
<td>Sub-theme 14.3: ‘Help, support and encouragement Sub-theme 14.4: ‘[But] embrace it, live it and enjoy it because one day you won’t have it’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13 Themes, subthemes and counter sub-themes of section 6.7 Predominant discursive practices

7. Producing the report

The last phase of my analytical process was the production of the analysis report, presented in Chapters Five, Six, and Seven of this study. As I mentioned at the beginning of this section, each chapter corresponds to a different analytical dimension: ICELT ‘on paper’ (Chapter Five), ICELT ‘as implemented’ (Chapter Six) and ‘experiences in ICELT’ (Chapter Seven). The data presentation strategy employed was thematic, structured around the data and organised around the research questions and sub-questions of this study. Each theme includes examples of data that normally follow a Telling-Showing sequence. At the beginning of each section, I present an analytic claim which summarises the main findings described in such a section. Finally, in Chapter Eight, all findings are discussed convergently, and also in relation to the literature of three theoretical-problematic areas: ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’, ‘the marketisation of teacher education’, and ‘epistemological decolonisation’

4.3 Ethical considerations
4.3.1 General considerations

Research in this study was conducted under the guidelines set out by the Research Code of Practice of the University of Warwick (2015), and the ‘Recommendations on Good Practice in Applied Linguistics’ of the British Association for Applied Linguistics (2016), as stipulated and approved by the Centre for Applied Linguistics’ Graduate Progress Committee at the University of Warwick (see Appendix 1). In this sense, among other things, research participants were informed, personally and in detail, of the nature, purpose, and procedures of the study. At the same time, all research participants were asked to sign a ‘Participation Consent Form’ (Appendix 1) that informed participants, among other things, that their real names would be kept confidential and that they would be referred to by fictional names in the study and other forms of dissemination. It also considered their consent to a) be interviewed; b) have their interview audio-recorded, c) be observed taking and giving classes; d) have their participations audio-recorded, and e) participate in follow-up activities. It also informed them of their right to 1) stop the recording at any time, 2) validate the data collected and analysed, 3) withdraw at any time without giving any reason or suffering any penalty. Finally, the data produced in this study in the form of field notes, texts and artefacts (course documents, educational materials, samples of schoolwork, photographs, and etcetera) and the audio recording files from class observations and interviews were stored securely.

4.3.2 Ethical issues

During the immersion in the field, I was able to establish a considerable level of rapport, trust, and some sense of ‘intimacy’ with the research participants. While this contributed to enhancing the candidates’ openness and, arguably, transparency in their responses in our exchanges, it also helped to create the conditions for sensitive information to be disclosed, seen, and known. Even though informed consent was obtained from the participants, the potential disclosure of such information seems to be in tension with the guiding principle of ensuring ‘the dignity, rights, safety and well-being of all involved in research’ (University of Warwick, 2015, p. 2). In this sense, I decided to keep such information private and not to use it in this or any other future research.

4.6 Chapter summary

This chapter provided a general account of the research approach employed in this study, including a description, explanation and justification of my philosophical assumptions, the
research design of the study and the research methods used. It also included a section on the ethical considerations that guided this research.

Regarding my philosophical assumptions, I referred to critical realism (CR) and notions on error and illusion drawn from Edgar Morin’s conception of complex thought as the two main sources that informed my ontological, epistemological, and methodological stance and decisions. In terms of the research design of the study, I described the rationale behind my choice of a qualitative approach, emphasising its methodological openness and flexibility and its suitability for in-depth inquiries of persons, peoples or cultures in discrete settings. I also referred to the different research strategies that I employed during fieldwork to ensure the integrity of my research such as prolonged time in the field, triangulation, thick description, falsification, and reflection and reflexivity. Finally, concerning the research process and methods used in my research, I provided an account of both aspects, including the research aims, the research questions, the research setting, the research participants, as well as the research processes, such as the data production phase and the data analysis phase, along with a detail description of the methods used in each phase.
CHAPTER FIVE: FINDINGS (1): The ICELT course on paper

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of my analytic process in relation to the first research questions of this study: (1) What are the fundamental characteristics of ICELT according to course documents and course-related documents?, and the related research sub-questions (1.1) How is ICELT represented overall?, (1.2) What are the ends of the course?, and (1.3) What are the distinctive components of the course? As was referred to in Chapter Four, these questions aim to understand better the ethos of the course as expressed in course documents.

To answer these questions, I analysed thematically official course documents (e.g., the course syllabus and the assessment guidelines) and course-related documents (e.g., the textual content of the course website, among others). The result of my analytic process is presented in three sections related to the three research sub-questions referred to above (see Table 5.1). The titles of each section feature the overarching theme, main themes and sub-themes generated in the analysis of the data.

Structure of the chapter

After this introduction, the second section of this chapter (5.2) presents an overview of the general characteristics of the course, including a brief description of the mode of delivery, the course units, the assessment components, and the moderation and certification process as described in the official course documents. The following three sections (5.3 to 5.5) present the findings from my analytic process. At the beginning of each section, I present a research claim, summarising the main findings in that section. Finally, each section contains relevant data extracts to illustrate its content.

At the end of the chapter, I comment on some tensions that will be considered in more detail in the discussion chapter where they will be considered convergently.

5.2 An overview of the ICELT course
This section presents an overview of the general characteristics of the ICELT course as they are described in the course syllabus (UCLES 2015) and the course website (UCLES 2020) including the mode of delivery. Course units, course assessment components, and the moderation process.

5.2.1 General characteristics of the course

As an in-service course-based qualification, ICELT is delivered by individual centres according to a programme provided by Cambridge Assessment English (UCLES 2015). This programme, followed by all centres, includes the course content, the course structure and the assessment criteria. In turn, each centre determines how the course is delivered according to the requirements and parameters set by Cambridge.

5.2.1.1 Mode of delivery

The ICELT course is divided into two modules: *Language for teachers* (component one) and *Teaching and methodology* (components two and three). The modules can be taken together or separately as stand-alone courses. There are two modes of delivery: face-to-face and blended (face-to-face with distance learning support). Both options entail overall 120 hours of instruction, including input, tutorial support and feedback, and between 150 and 300 hours of personal study, including reading, research, lesson preparation and assignment preparation to complete both modules.

5.2.1.2 Course units

The syllabus is divided into seven units:

1. Language Knowledge and Awareness
2. The Background to Teaching and Learning English
3. Resources and Materials
4. Planning and Management of Teaching and Learning
5. Evaluation, Monitoring and Assessment
6. Professional Development
7. Language for Teachers

5.2.1.3 Course assessment components
The course combines assessed and non-assessed components. The assessment components include four language tasks that candidates are required to complete (Component one: language for teachers); four assessed teaching practices that candidates are required to plan, teach and evaluate (Component two: teaching), and four methodology assignments that candidates are required to write (Component three: methodology). The non-assessed component consists of eight directed observation tasks that require that the candidates observe peers or other experienced teachers.

Each component is assessed and awarded an individual grade which contributes to an overall grade of pass, merit, or distinction.

5.2.1.4 Moderation process

The assessment components are assessed internally by the tutors of the institute where the iteration of the course takes place, and moderated externally, commonly by another course tutor from another authorised centre. Samples of the coursework of the candidates are submitted for further moderation to Cambridge Assessment English.

5.2.1.5 Certification process

According to the course assessment guidelines (UCLES 2015), once the samples of the coursework of the candidates and the report of the moderator are received and reviewed, a final decision concerning the award of grades is made by the chief moderators of the course, confirming the grade awarded or referring pieces of work to be amended and resubmitted by the candidates. On average, this process takes between six to nine months.

Overarching themes, themes, and sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Overarching theme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.3 The overall representation of ICELT</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.1 Theme 1: A highly respected qualification</td>
<td>5.3.1.1 Sub-theme 1.1: ‘Our internationally recognised teaching qualifications’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.1.2 Sub-theme 1.2: ‘My Cambridge English teaching qualification’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3.1.3 Sub-theme 1.3: ‘Our qualifications and courses are developed by experts’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 The promise of ICELT</td>
<td>5.4.1 Overarching theme 1: The development of the course candidates as experienced English language teachers</td>
<td>5.4.1.1 Theme 2: Developing the professional language competence of the course candidates</td>
<td>5.4.1.1.1 Sub-theme 2.1 Develop your language knowledge and awareness! 5.4.1.1.2 Sub-theme 2.2 Improve your use of language in class!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.1.2 Theme 3: Improving the teaching knowledge, skills, and practice of the course candidates</td>
<td>5.4.1.2.1 Sub-theme 3.1 Develop your understanding of English language learning! 5.4.1.2.2 Sub-theme 3.2 Develop your teaching skills and practice!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.1.3 Theme 4: Enhancing the professional development of the course candidates</td>
<td>5.4.1.3.1 Sub-theme 4.1 Boost your professional development in the course! 5.4.1.3.2 Sub-theme 4.2 Plan your professional development after the course!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 The flavour of ICELT</td>
<td>5.5.1 Overarching theme: Distinctive components of ICELT</td>
<td>5.5.1.1 Theme 5: Adapted to you!</td>
<td>5.5.1.1.1 Sub-theme 5.1 ‘... because ICELT is an in-service teaching qualification’ 5.5.1.1.2 Sub-theme 5.2 ‘Develop your teaching in your classroom’ 5.5.1.1.3 Sub-theme 5.3 ‘Does our assessment candidates’ needs?’ 5.5.1.1.4 Sub-theme 5.4 Designed to help teachers develop in the context within which they are currently working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5.1.2 Theme 6: Teaching and learning in the classroom!</td>
<td>5.5.1.2.1 Sub-theme 6.1 Teaching as classroom teaching 5.5.1.2.2 Sub-theme 6.2 Classrooms as institutional classrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3 The overall representation of ICELT

This section presents the results of my analysis concerning the first research sub-question of this study: ‘How is ICELT represented overall?’ The section is formed by one single theme and three subthemes. The theme, called ‘A highly respected course’, refers to the way, thematically identified, in which ICELT is most prominently represented in the data. The three sub-themes offer detail in how this representation is realised. The first sub-theme called: ‘Our internationally recognised teaching qualification’, describes different ways in which the course is self-positioned in the data in relation to the overall representation of the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications, i.e., as part of them. The second sub-theme called ‘My Cambridge English teaching Qualification’ describes different ways in which the name of the University of Cambridge is used to position the course. Finally, the third sub-theme called: ‘Our qualifications and courses are
developed by experts’, illustrates examples of brand positioning strategies used to represent the course.

In general, as indicated by the names of the theme and sub-theme in this section, my first analytic claim is that ICELT is represented most prominently in the data as ‘a highly respected qualification’ and that this representation is realised through self-definitions, uses of the name of the University of Cambridge and brand positioning strategies.

5.3.1 Theme 1: A highly respected course

As mentioned above, the most prominent way in which ICELT is referred to and represented in the course documents is as ‘a highly respected course’. My analytic process indicates that this representation is articulated with respect to the Cambridge Assessment English Teacher Training Programme (www.cambridgeenglish.org) and, more generally, in relation to the University of Cambridge, as will be described next:

5.3.1.1 Subtheme 1.1: ‘Our internationally recognised teaching qualifications’

As my analysis indicates, ICELT is commonly represented in the data in relation to the Cambridge Assessment English teaching qualifications, i.e., as part of them. The representation of both in the data is frequently articulated in a laudatory tone such as ‘internationally recognised’, as in “Our internationally recognised teaching qualifications provide a route into the English language teaching profession...” (UCLES 2016, p. 2), or ‘highly respected’, as in “[The ICELT course is] a highly respected qualification from Cambridge English” (UCLES 2019a, p. 2), and also, ‘industry-leading’ or ‘world-leading’, as in ‘[Cambridge English] provide[s] industry-leading English teaching qualifications that prove what teachers of English can do’ (UCLES 2019a).

One of the most common characterisations of the Cambridge English teaching qualifications (including the ICELT course) in the data is as the ‘international quality standard’. The following extract from the course website features one example that illustrates how this notion is expressed in the data:

1 [The Cambridge English] teaching qualifications are recognised around the world as the international quality standard [emphasis added]

2 (UCLES 2020)
As the extract above, many samples contained in the data are expressed in the passive voice, (e.g., ‘are recognised as…’) commonly with hyperbolic or self-laudatory language (e.g., ‘…the international quality standard’).

5.3.1.2 Subtheme 1.2: ‘My Cambridge English teaching qualification’

Another prominent way in which the ICELT course is commonly represented in the data is by associating it with the name of the University of Cambridge, using the contracted name ‘Cambridge’. Such association takes place mostly at a labelling or branding level. In this case, the name of the teaching course, and other related academic products and services, are commonly linked in the data to the word ‘Cambridge’ to form a noun phrase which is used to name instances, processes or agents. Some examples are: *Cambridge English teaching qualifications*, as in ‘[the] Cambridge English teaching qualifications have achieved wide recognition (…)’ (UCLES 2015b, p. 2), *Cambridge English Teaching Framework*, as in ‘[ICELT is] mapped to the Cambridge English Teaching Framework (UCLES 2018, p. 22), *Cambridge Assessment English* as in ‘The Cambridge Assessment English Approach to Teacher Professional Development” (UCLES 2018b, p. 2) (emphasis added) and so on. One example that illustrates how this noun phrase is particularly used in the data can be found in a promotional video on the course website. The video features a teacher who narrates the influence that the ICELT course has had on her teaching and the changes that she has been through professionally since she took the ICELT course. At one point in the video (min 2.03), the teacher refers to the ICELT qualification in the following terms:

1. I wasn’t sure I’d have the skills to help all my students
2. succeed (but) my *Cambridge English Teaching qualification*
3. gave me the knowledge and confidence [to do it] (...)
4. [emphasis added].

(UCLes_video_teaching-qualifications_2020)
5.3.1.3 Sub-theme 1.3: ‘Our qualifications and courses are developed by experts’

Another way in which the ICELT course and the other teaching qualifications from Cambridge Assessment English are represented in the data is by the use of different brand positioning strategies, i.e., strategies to position an intended perception of the brand in the consumer’s mind (Sengrupta 2005, p. 19). In my analysis, I identified at least three positioning strategies: those based on arguments of ‘expertise’, those based on arguments of ‘quality’, and those based on arguments of ‘standards’. In what follows, I will present one example identified in the data of each strategy:

- **Expert-based positioning**

The extract below features one example of the course being positioned as an academic product generated by ‘experts’ in the field:

> Our qualifications and courses are comprehensively researched and developed by experts. They reflect and encourage best practice in teaching and teacher training, responding to changing contexts and the opportunities offered by new technologies [emphasis added]

(UCLES 2016b, p. 3)

- **Quality-based positioning**

The following extract features one example of the course being positioned as a high-quality academic product:
Standards-based positioning

The extract below features one example of the course being positioned in relation to high standards:

1. [The Cambridge English qualifications] are designed to improve both language proficiency and methodological competences to the highest standards [emphasis added]

(UCLES 2016, p. 2)

Other segments in the data refer to concepts such as “substantial body of information” (UCLES 2015b, p. 2), or “leading-edge research” (UCLES 2019a) in association with the design of the teaching qualifications offered by Cambridge English (including the ICELT course).

5.3.1.4 Theme summary

In summary, this theme described different ways in which the ICELT course is explicitly positioned in the data. The content of the theme was presented in three sections that corresponded to the different types of positioning identified in the course documents. As was described, the representation of the course in the course documents and course-related documents is realised through self-characterisations, uses of the name of the University of Cambridge and the use of marketing strategies.

Even though prominent, this theme is less prevalent in the course documents than the two other themes described in this chapter.
5.4 The promise of ICELT

This section presents the results of my analytic process regarding the second research sub-question of this study (‘What are the ends of the course?’) The term ‘ends of the course’ is used in my analysis as a more general synonym of ‘course’s goals’ or ‘course’s desired results’ (Postman 1996). In this sense, the focus of the analysis was the content that in these documents referred (explicitly or implicitly) to the end of the course, expressed in the form of course goals, course stated aims, intended results of learning, or any other similar content, such as ‘performance statements’ from the course assessment rubrics. In a way, considered as a whole, these ends express the promise of the course.

The section is formed by one overarching theme and three themes that attempt to capture and describe the ends of ICELT and the content of the areas where these ends are realised, as they are expressed in the course documents.

The overarching theme, called ‘the development of the course candidates as experienced English language teachers’, introduces the overall end of ICELT identified in the data. The main themes, called: ‘Developing the professional language competence of the course candidates’, ‘Improving
the teaching knowledge, skills, and practice of the course candidates’, and ‘Enhancing the professional development of the course candidates’, describe how this end is articulated in the data as well as the areas where is intended to be realised in the course. Finally, the subthemes describe the specific content and aims (and somehow the complexity) of each area. The exclamation points added to some of the titles of the subthemes attempt to convey the tone in which the related content is expressed in the data.

Thus articulated, my second analytic claim is then that the overall end of ICELT is ‘the development of the course candidates as experienced English language teachers’ and that, as indicated in the name of the themes that form it, this development encompasses three thematic areas: ‘professional language competence’; ‘teaching knowledge, skills and practice’, and ‘professional development’. At the same, as will be seen, even though the content of each area was frequently expressed with generic language, it refers in reality to a particular way of understanding such areas, entails specific goals, and has particular foci.

5.4.1 Overarching Theme: the development of the course candidates as experienced English language teachers

As mentioned above, this overarching theme is formed by three themes (themes 2, 3 and 4) that describe the main aims, areas and content of ICELT identified in the data and from which the overall end of the course was thematically derived, as described in what follows:

5.4.1.1 Theme 2: Developing the professional language competence of the course candidates

This theme describes the first area of development of the course candidates as experienced English language teachers identified in the data: their professional language competence. The theme is formed by two sub-themes that have language as their focus and that, at the same time, summarise the aims of the course related to this area and which are contained in two units of the ICELT program: ‘Language knowledge and awareness’ (Unit 1) and ‘language for teachers’ (Unit 7), correspondingly (see p. 90). Even though these course units refer to two separate fields, I will show how these areas inter-relate thematically and end up representing different aspects of the same domain in the data, namely: the professional language competence of the teachers.
After describing the results of my analysis in relation to the aims contained in each one of these sub-themes, I will mention the common elements that these areas possess to form the basis of the theme.

5.4.1.1.1. Sub-theme 2.1: Develop your language knowledge and awareness!

The first sub-theme that forms the substance of this theme refers to the first aim identified in relation to this area: the development of the language knowledge and awareness of the candidates in the course (henceforth LKA).

According to the course documents, this area represents ‘the linguistic basis on which teachers develop their personal understanding of teaching and learning’ (UCLES 2014, p. 8). As such, LKA is conceptualised in the data as an area of knowledge and competence that refer to at least three interrelated domains: 1) language analysis for classroom purposes, 2) terminology for describing language, and 3) reference materials for language knowledge and awareness (UCLES 2014, p. 8), although thematically, the first domain (language analysis) is the most prominent and prevalent in the data.

Expressed in these terms, the development of this area is articulated in the course syllabus as one of the main goals of the course. This notion is expressed in the course syllabus in the following terms:

1  [The ICET programme] is designed to enable candidates to extend their knowledge and awareness of those aspects of language which are relevant to their professional practice’ (UCLES 2015, p. 2).

As one of the main domains of LKA, language analysis is commonly referred to in the data as analysis of ‘spoken and written language form, meaning and use at [a] sentence, word and discourse level’ (UCLES 2014, p.14). Thus understood, this concept is consistently present across the data, particularly in the assessment components of the course. The language tasks (component one), for example, are fundamentally language analysis tasks that include topics such as ‘focus on the learner’s spoken language’, ‘focus on the learner’s written language’, and ‘focus on the teacher’s language’. As specified in the syllabus, in these tasks the candidates are required to develop their KLA by selecting samples of classroom language and analysing them in terms of accuracy, ‘showing various aspects of language (e.g., grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, function, discourse, style)’ (UCLES 2015, p. 25).
In this sense, LKA and in particular, language analysis, constitute one of the main areas through which candidates meet the overall end of the course, developing as experienced English language teachers.

The nature of the development of the KLA of the candidates will be the specific focus of Theme 7 (See p. 123) later in the study. At the same time, its potential tensions will be briefly mentioned at the end of this section, and a more thorough discussion about this topic will be carried out in the discussion chapter.

I will now describe the second sub-area of ‘professional language competence’

5.4.1.1.2 Sub-theme 2.2: Improve your use of language in class!

The second thematic sub-area of professional language competence has as aim the improvement of the course candidates’ use of language in class. The content of this sub-area in the data is in large part linked to the unit of the course ‘language for teachers’ (Unit 7) (henceforth LFT).

The candidates’ use of language is frequently referred to in the data as an ability to use English effectively and appropriately in their work or, rather, as their professional competence in speaking, writing, reading and listening to English, and using spoken and written English in the classroom (see UCLES 2015, p. 14). Thus defined, the aim of the course articulated around this area seeks to improve the course candidates’ knowledge and use of language in class. As stated in the following data extract, ICELT is said to enable candidates to:

1. extend their knowledge and understanding of language required for their professional role,
2. and improve their ability to use English both generally and for classroom purposes

(UCLES 2015, p. 2)

In general terms, I identified in my analysis four sets of abilities in teacher’s language use: the ‘fluent and accurate’ use of classroom language; the use of language to provide ‘accurate examples’ or models; the ability to identify whether the learner’s output is ‘accurate’ or not in terms of ‘form, meaning, use and pronunciation’; and finally, the ability to communicate with other professionals (Cf. UCLES 2018, pp. 7-8)

Despite the rather evident strong focus across the data on the grammatical accuracy in the candidates’ use of language, it is important to mention that the course assessment rubrics also
consider other categories that measure the linguistic growth and proficiency of the candidates such as ‘range and flexibility’, ‘pronunciation’ and ‘audience awareness’ (UCLES, n.d.). Finally, as in the case of LKA, the area of language for teachers, or language ability, is an element that is consistently present across the data and in all the assessment components of the course. As such, it also constitutes a fundamental element for both, the theme under discussion and the overarching theme that expresses the overall end of the course.

5.4.1.3 Theme summary

In summary, the course data supports the view that the overall end of ICELT (i.e., the development of course candidates as experienced English teachers, is first realised through the area of professional language competence, understood as both the development of the candidates’ language knowledge and awareness and the candidates’ improvement of their use of language in class.

In this sense, even though ‘language knowledge and awareness’ and ‘the use of teachers’ language in class’ refer to two separate fields, both areas can be linked thematically in ICELT. On the one hand, both areas have language as their focus. At the same time, both areas analytically represent different aspects of the same domain, namely: the professional language competence of teachers (the former, mostly in conceptual terms, and the latter, mostly in practical terms). Finally, the analytic findings show a prevalence across the data of an analytic focus on the internal relations of language (Fairclough 2003), i.e., on the grammatical, lexical and semantic relations of text (both spoken and written) and on the four skills of language which, in turn, give the notion of ‘professional language competence’ its predominant meaning in the course program (UCLES 2015).

This topic will be further referred to in Theme 7 (p. 123).

5.4.1.2 Theme 3: Improving the teaching knowledge, skills, and practice of the course candidates

This theme describes the aims and content identified in the data of what constitutes the second (thematic) area of development in ICELT: ‘Teaching knowledge, skills and practice’. As such, this theme refers, in large part, to the content in four units of the syllabus that have ‘teaching’ as their focus: ‘The background to teaching and learning English’ (Unit 2); ‘Resources and materials’ (Unit
This theme is composed of two interdependent sub-themes that form the substance of the analysis: ‘Develop your understanding of English language learning!’ and ‘Develop your teaching skills and practice!’ The former refers to the development of the candidates’ background (theoretical) knowledge of English language learning with a practical orientation, whereas the latter refers to the development of the candidates’ English language teaching skills and practice with an orientation towards an informed practice.

After summarising the results of my analysis in relation to the aims expressed in the areas covered in each subtheme, I will comment briefly on the common elements that these areas possess in relation to the main theme.

5.4.1.2.1 Sub-theme 3.1: Develop your understanding of English language learning!

As mentioned above, this subtheme refers to the background knowledge of English language learning and teaching (henceforth BK) that candidates are expected to develop during the course. According to the course documents, this is an essential area in ICELT because is said to provide course candidates with a strong basis for development. In the data, BK is referred to as ‘a conceptual and theoretical basis’ to help course candidates ‘develop their personal understandings of teaching and learning’ (UCLES 2014, p. 2).

The data in this subtheme was coded and categorised in two areas: ‘learning theory’ and ‘learner development and motivation’. Thematically, ‘learning theory refers (mostly) to the following topic areas: general learning theories; theories, concepts and research of first and second language learning, and language teaching approaches and methodologies, whereas ‘learner development and motivation’, largely refers to awareness of learner needs, literacy development in first and second/additional languages, understanding of learners’ motivations and expectations, and awareness of learners’ learning styles and preferences.

Thus conceptualised, BK essentially means a) knowledge of how languages are learnt (according to theory), and b) knowledge of who the language learner is (also according to theory), both with an orientation towards teaching, i.e., to inform the teaching practice of the candidates.
These two senses are clearly expressed in the data in both learning outcomes statements and performance statements. For example, when background knowledge is understood as ‘learning theory’, the course documents express this concept in relation to the topics of this domain. The following data extract features a learning outcome which states that successful candidates are expected to be able to:

1. understand how learners learn first and second/additional languages and apply this understanding to planning and teaching

(UCLES 2015, p.2)

When background knowledge is understood in the course texts as ‘learners’ development and motivation’, different instances in the data express explicitly the notion that successful candidates are expected to show awareness and sensitivity to differences of their learners and also to:

1. Identify learning objectives appropriate to the needs, age and ability level of the group
2. Select and/or adapt materials and/or activities suitable for learners and the lesson
3. Objectives
4. [and]
5. Maintain discipline showing sensitivity to individual needs

(UCLES, n. d., p.3)

Even though theoretical, each example is oriented towards practice. The practical orientation of this area will be expressed more clearly in the teaching practice component of the course presented in the next sub-theme.

5.4.1.2.2 Sub-theme 3.2: Develop your teaching skills and practice!

This sub-theme summarises the aims and content identified in the data concerning the area of teaching skills and practice that candidates are expected to develop in the course. Once the theme was identified, the data were recoded into three interrelated categories of teaching practice: ‘planning teaching’, ‘managing teaching’, and ‘self-assessment of teaching’. Overall, these three categories describe the thematic teaching cycle followed in ICELT in relation to this area of development.

The overall stated aim related to this area postulates that the course will enable candidates to develop their teaching skills and practice. This is expressed in the course documents as ‘consolidate and refine planning and (...) practical classroom skills [of the candidates in the
course]’ (UCLES 2015, p. 2). At the same time, candidates are expected to meet specific goals within the aforementioned categories (‘planning teaching’, ‘managing teaching’, and ‘self-assessment of teaching’), particularly in their assessed teaching practices, as described schematically below:

**Categories of teaching practice**

- Planning teaching

Thematically, this category refers in the data to the following elements of class/course planning: organisational principles (identification of learners needs, goals/aims setting, staging and timing, selecting activities/group dynamics/materials, anticipating potential difficulties/solutions, etc.); lesson/series of lessons templates/frameworks, and lesson/series of lessons focus (commonly discrete language items or skills-building work).

Accordingly, in their assessed teaching practices, candidates are expected to understand and apply such organisation principles; know and select an appropriate lesson’s templates and/or frameworks, and then select a lesson focus according to the learner(s)’ needs and context and the demands of the corresponding syllabus (UCLES 2015, p. 11). As portrayed below, at pass level, successful candidates were expected to be able to:

a. understand the different organisational principles which teachers use to plan individual lessons or a series of lessons

b. select appropriately using these principles and plan lessons or schemes of work according to the needs and contexts of specific groups of learners and the demands of syllabuses

c. plan lessons appropriately with specific regard to: establishing aims and objectives; ways of focusing on and practising specific language items and skills; anticipating difficulties; staging and timing; ensuring variety and pace; selecting appropriate materials and resources; adopting appropriate teacher and learner roles (UCLES 2015, p.11)
In their assessed teaching practices, the class planning abilities of each candidate are assessed against this criterion in the form of performance statements that are either ticked off or crossed out in each observation (see appendix 9).

- Managing teaching

This category refers to the general concept of ‘classroom management’, defined in the literature as ‘the ways in which student behaviour, movement, interaction, etc., during a class is organized and controlled by the teacher (or sometimes by the learners themselves) to enable teaching to take place most effectively’ (Richards and Schmidt 2013, p. 81). Thematically, the content and aims identified in the data in relation to this category were coded and organised into five areas: ‘establishing and maintaining a constructive and safe learning environment’; ‘teaching learners’; ‘managing classroom activities’; ‘responding to learners’, and ‘providing feedback’. The content and aims were then categorised as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classroom management categories</th>
<th>Course’s intended results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Establishing and maintaining a constructive and safe learning environment | - establish rapport  
- foster a constructive and safe learning environment taking into account appropriate learner and teacher roles  
- maintain learners’ interest and involvement |
| Teaching learners | - teach in a way that encourages the development of learner autonomy  
- teach language items effectively  
- teach language skills appropriately and effectively including literacy where relevant  
- use appropriate aids, materials and resources (including the board) effectively  
- achieve learning objectives |
| Managing classroom activities | - set up and manage a range of classroom events  
- maintain learners’ interest and involvement  
- convey the meaning of new language with clear and appropriate context and check learners’ understanding of it |
| Responding to learners’ | - maintain discipline showing sensitivity to individual needs  
- help learners develop language accuracy  
- adapt plans and activities appropriately in response to the learners and to classroom contingencies  
- make appropriate use of learners’ first and other languages |
| Providing feedback | - monitor learners’ language performance and give appropriate feedback  
- identify errors and sensitively correct learners’ oral and written language when and where appropriate |

Table 5.2 Classroom management categories and course’s intended results of learning
Potentially, some of the intended results could be classified into more than one category. However, what seems to be relevant at this point is the fact that, regardless of how they are classified, each one of the 17 intended results of learning is used as a performance indicator, i.e., each one is considered and assessed individually in the candidates assessed teaching. In this sense, it can be argued that each one can be thought of as a discrete aim to be achieved. Finally, it is important to mention that the area of classroom procedures and techniques is implied in the learning outcomes of classroom management, as they are not mentioned nor assessed separately in the assessed teaching practices of the course candidates.

- Self-assessment of teaching

The last category identified in the data within this theme is related to the candidates’ ability to assess their own teaching. Thematically, the content in this category refers to the following elements: the candidates’ assessment of their own class planning and class delivery; the consideration of the feedback on teaching received from tutors, colleagues, and learners; reflection from the observation of classes of other candidates and teachers; and finally, goal setting for continuous development.

Accordingly, course candidates are expected to reflect on their teaching, reflect on the feedback received and implement changes in their teaching, in the light of this reflection, in the form of teaching goals. This is expressed in the data in the form of intended results of learning, as displayed in the extract below which states that during and by the end of the course successful candidates will be able to:

1. a. reflect critically on their plan, teaching and evaluation, and use of English
2. b. review and adapt their practice in the light of this reflection and of the views of tutors, colleagues and learners
3. c. set targets for on-going development (and where appropriate the next assessed lesson)

(UCLES, n. d., p.3)

Even though the specific meaning of the concepts contained in the intended results of learning displayed above is not defined in the data, it is possible to infer some of their basic meaning by considering the specific assessment criteria established in the course syllabus. ‘Reflect critically’, for example, could be defined, considering related categories contained in the assessment criteria such as 'the analysis and evaluation of the lesson'; the 'identification of successful and less successful aspects of the lesson', and the 'understanding of the underlying causes of these' (UCLES
Finally, as stated in the intended results of learning, the course candidates are expected to implement changes in their following assessed lessons based on that reflection, making the cycle recursive throughout the course as represented in Figure 5.3:

![Diagram of teaching cycle]

Figure 5.3 Teaching cycle followed by course candidates in their assessed teaching (produced by the thematic analysis of the data)

5.4.1.2.3 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the second area of professional competence identified in the data through which the overall end of the course is realised: ‘teaching knowledge, skills and practice’. As such, this area is conceptualised in two senses: as ‘candidates’ background knowledge of English language learning’ and as ‘candidates’ English language teaching skills and practice’. The relationship between these two areas is twofold: on the one hand, both areas have a clear practical orientation, which is said to be a distinctive feature of the Cambridge English teaching qualifications, as was referred to in the previous chapter (see e.g., Pulverness 2015). At the same time, both are interdependent because of the course orientation towards an informed practice. This is expressed in the course documents which assert that, as a practical course, ICELT supports candidates to reflect on their teaching and apply their learning in the classroom (see, UCLES 2019c).

5.4.1.3 Theme 4: Enhancing the professional development of the course candidates

This theme describes the third (and last) thematic area of development in the ICELT course: professional development (henceforth PD). This theme is formed by two sub-themes that describe and summarise the content and aims of this area identified in the data. These sub-themes are:
‘Boost your professional development in the course!’ and ‘Plan your professional development after the course!’ The former refers to the elements in the course that seek to further the development of the candidates as professionals during the course (but with a focus on future development), such as class observations, reflective practice and professional roles and values. The latter subtheme refers to the planning of the course candidates for their future continuing development. Even though there is a direct and obvious reference to Course Unit 6 ‘Professional Development’ (see UCLES 2015), the content and aims of this theme were thematically identified across the whole data set.

In ICELT, PD refers to areas of professional knowledge and competence that provide course candidates with opportunities to analyse and reflect on ‘their own strengths and development needs and plan for their future professional development in the light of this’ (UCLES 2015, p.13). In this sense, PD is considered a link between the ‘existing knowledge and awareness’ of the candidates and ‘their future aspirations’ (UCLES 2014, pp 8-9). Thus, the stated aim of the course related to this domain asserts that ICELT seeks to enable candidates to essentially ‘identify needs and opportunities to further their development as professionals’ (UCLES 2015, p. 2).

After describing the content and aims of each sub-theme, I will summarise the theme briefly.

5.4.1.3.1 Subtheme 4.1: Boost your professional development in the course!

As stated above, this sub-theme refers to three different but interrelated and sometimes overlapping areas of professional knowledge and competence that, as a general aim, seek to further the professional development of the candidates, as defined above, namely: class observations, reflective practice and professional roles and values. These areas are described briefly in what follows:

- Class observations

As referred to in 5.2, as part of the assessed and not assessed components of the course, ICELT candidates are required to be observed and also to observe teaching lessons from peers and then reflect on these observations for PD. In the case of the former, candidates are required to be observed, supervised, and then assessed four times by a course tutor. In the case of the latter, candidates are required to make direct observations of eight lessons of peers and/or other experienced teachers. In both cases, the objective in relation to this area is for candidates to
reflect on and receive feedback from those observations, and to develop from such feedback, “draw[ing] appropriate conclusions for their own practice” (UCLES 2015, p. 13).

- Reflective practice

As a thematically identified area, reflective practice takes place in the course in at least two forms: in self-assessed teaching (referred to in the previous theme) and in the assessed component of four methodology assignments (see p. 91). In the case of the latter, candidates are required to teach lessons and reflect on them considering different aspects of teaching and learning such as own teaching skills and practice in a lesson, planning beyond the lesson, supplementing materials, and learners and learning. Then the candidates write their reflections in an essay format that are assessed against specific criteria and through which they are expected to, among other things, develop their abilities to identify needs and opportunities for professional development.

- Professional roles and values

The professional development of the candidates in ICELT is also promoted through professional roles and values which candidates are expected to display and develop through the course assessed components. Such roles and values, contained tacitly in the course syllabus, are defined within this theme in relation to three interconnected (and overlapping) elements: the learner, the environment, and the teacher, as is represented in Table 5.3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The learner</th>
<th>The environment</th>
<th>The teacher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know the learner</td>
<td>Creating and maintaining a safe environment</td>
<td>Taking responsibility of own roles as teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being aware of the learner</td>
<td>Emotionally and physically safe learning environment</td>
<td>Reflecting on own teaching practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responding to the learner in a sensitive way</td>
<td>Creating and maintaining equal opportunities for everybody</td>
<td>Teamwork and collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in relation to: learners’ first language, educational and cultural background, stage of cognitive and emotional development, individual/group needs, motivations, learning styles/preferences, correction of their mistakes/errors, adaptation of class materials, autonomy, etc.

Table 5.3 Professional roles and values of candidates in ICELT
Each value, identified thematically in the data, is associated with a learning outcome(s) within the syllabus. The value of ‘teamwork and collaboration’, for example, can be linked to the learning outcome expressed in the following data extract:

1. [Successful candidates will show the ability to] listen to, learn from, share responsibility with, co-operate with and exchange views and ideas with others, including managers, tutors, colleagues and their own learners

   (UCLES 2015, p.13)

Other learning outcomes express values in a more direct way, such as the one that states that the course successful candidates will “demonstrate a commitment to equality of opportunity” (UCLES 2015, p.9).

Thus defined, ‘professional roles and values’ constitute the third area of professional knowledge and competence that furthers the professional development of the candidates in ICELT during the course.

5.4.1.3.2 Plan your professional development after the course!

This sub-theme describes and summarises the thematic content and aims of the second area of professional development identified in the data. As mentioned earlier, this subtheme is related to the ability of the candidates to further their professional development after the course, in the form of continuing professional development (henceforth CPD). As stated in the course documents, candidates are expected to plan their future professional development undertaking an analysis of their professional strengths and development needs at the time and plan for future professional development based on that. This notion is expressed in the following data extract:

1. a realistic analysis of their own strengths and development needs and plan[ing] for their further professional development in the light of this

   (UCLES 2015, p. 13)

According to the course data, this implies the following elements: candidates’ awareness of the existing options for CPD; candidates’ recognition of the importance of identifying their own needs and finally, candidates’ continuous assessment of their development as teachers in relation to ‘their career goals’ (UCLES 2014, p. 9). Based on this, candidates are expected to select and participate in professional development activities, both formally and informally.
Even though CPD is not included in any assessed component in the ICELT syllabus, the course itself is positioned as a form of continuing professional development within a wider professional path conceptualised in Cambridge English documents (see Figure 5.4).
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**Figure 5.4 Cambridge English Teacher Development Matrix: Courses, qualifications and resources (UCLES 2016, p. 6)**

Thus conceptualised, the course is clearly positioned as a stepping-stone from which candidates are expected to identify where they are in their development, as well as plan where they would like to be and identify what they can do to get there within that professional path (Ibid).

5.4.1.3.3 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the third area of development through which the overall aim of the course is realised: ‘Professional development’. As was seen, the theme is formed by two subthemes that show the way PD is promoted during the course (in the form of class observations, reflective practice, and professional roles and values centred on the learner, the learning environment and the teacher) and after the course, in the form of CPD within a professional path mapped to the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications (UCLES 2017b) and
the Cambridge English Teaching Framework (UCLES 2014). Accordingly, the overall aim within this area is to enable candidates to identify needs and opportunities during and after the course to further their development as professionals as conceptualised by Cambridge English.

5.4.1.4 Overarching theme summary

In summary, my analytic process produced an overarching theme that conceptualises the end of the course as ‘the development of the course candidates as experienced English language teachers’. This overarching theme is formed by three main themes that describe the areas where such development is intended to take place in the course, and six subthemes, that show their content, aims and foci (and somehow the complexity) of each area.

The areas of development identified in the data within each theme are professional language competence; teaching knowledge, skills, and practice; and professional development. As was described in the body of the report of my analysis, professional language competence encompasses two areas: ‘language knowledge and awareness’ and ‘use of teachers’ language in class’, with a predominant focus on grammatical analysis. In turn, teaching knowledge, skills, and practice encompasses the areas of ‘candidates’ background knowledge of English language learning’ and ‘candidates’ English language teaching skills and practice’ with a strong orientation towards an informed teaching practice. Finally, professional development, which is promoted during the course in the form of observations, reflective practice, and professional roles and values, and after the course, in the form of Continuous Professional Development within a professional path mapped to the Cambridge English Teaching Qualifications and the Cambridge English Teaching Framework.

Figure 5.5 Thematic map of section 5.4 ‘The promise of ICELT’
5.5 The flavour of ICELT

This section presents the result of my analysis in relation to the third research sub-question of this study (‘What are the distinctive components of the course?’). In answering this question, my analytic process generated one overarching theme and four themes that attempt to capture and describe such components. The overarching theme, called ‘Distinctive components of ICELT’, introduces the main themes of this section and talks about how this topic came about in the research process. The main themes called ‘Adapted to you!’; ‘Teaching and learning in the classroom!’; ‘Grammar, grammar, grammar and... skills!’ and ‘Teach the learners!’ present the distinctive central components identified in my analysis. ‘Adapted to you!’ seeks to convey the notion that, as expressed in the course documents, ICELT is adapted to the course candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs; ‘Teaching and learning in the classroom!’ attempts to express the notion that the classroom is the presupposed instructional context in ICELT; ‘Grammar, grammar, grammar and... skills!’ aims to convey the notion that a language systems and language skills-centred perspective of English language teaching is both prevalent and prominent in the data; finally, ‘Teach the learners!’ seeks to express the notion identified in the data of the prevalence of a learner-centred teaching perspective. As in the previous section, exclamation points have been added to the titles of the themes in an attempt to convey the tone in which the related content is expressed in the data. Taken as a whole, these elements represent the distinctive components, or the flavour, of the course expressed in the course documents and related documents. Hence the title of the section: ‘the flavour of ICELT’.

In this sense, my third analytic claim is that patterns of content identified in the data describe four distinctive characteristics of the course that are expressed in the form of four distinctive central components, namely: the adaptation of the course to the course candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs; a classroom-based presupposed instructional context in ICELT; a language systems and language skills-centred perspective of English language teaching; and finally, a learner-centred teaching perspective.

5.5.1 Overarching theme: Distinctive components of ICELT

As mentioned above, this overarching theme is formed by four themes (themes 5, 6, 7, and 8) that describe four distinctive components identified in the data which as a whole represent the ‘flavour’ of the course.
5.5.1.1 Theme 5: Adapted to you!

This theme describes the first distinctive component that I identified in my analysis, namely: the notion that ICELT is adapted to the course candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs. This notion is both prominent and prevalent. ‘Prominent’, because the adaptation of the course to the candidates is sometimes conceptualised in the data as an inherent (and therefore a defining) feature of the course, or even an attribute that communicates the value of the course. ‘Prevalent’, because, as will be seen later in the section, this notion is repeated consistently throughout the data set. In what follows I will present briefly each one of these expressions.

5.5.1.1.1 Sub-theme 5.1: ‘Because ICELT is an in-service teaching qualification’

The notion of the adaptability of ICELT to the candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs is sometimes conceptualised in the data as an inherent (and a defining) characteristic of the course given its design as an in-service teacher training program. This notion is consistently expressed across the data. The following example is taken from the Cambridge English Assessment website:

1 Because ICELT is an in-service teaching qualification, it can be adapted to [the course candidates’] specific needs and teaching context
2 (UCLES 2019c)

Whereas in this quote the notion of adaptability is hedged by the use of the modal verb can, the ICELT course is clearly said to possess it by virtue of its design as an in-service qualification.

5.5.1.1.2 Sub-theme 5.2: ‘Develop your teaching in your classroom’

At the same time, the notion of adaptability in ICELT is also expressed as an attribute that communicates the value proposition of the course, i.e., the promise of value to be delivered by a provider to her customers (Buttle 2009, p. 191). This was frequently found in the data. One example that illustrates this is expressed in the publicity used to attract new candidates to the course. On the cover of a leaflet from the course website, a call-to-action statement is used to invite prospective candidates to join ICELT referring explicitly to the notion of adaptability of the course to their teaching context. This call to action, which reads ‘Develop your teaching in your own classroom’ (see Fig. 5.6), is expressed as the value-creating benefit of the course, namely:
the possibility to develop course candidates’ teaching (arguably their teaching knowledge, skills and practice) with their own students in the very contexts where they work:

The intended meaning conveyed to prospective candidates by the statement on the leaflet is, arguably, that the course will be adapted to them and their teaching circumstance which, in turn, is the proposition of value to be delivered to them.

5.5.1.3.3 Sub-theme 5.3: ‘Does our assessment meet candidates’ needs...?’

In more general terms, the notion of adaptability to the needs of the candidates is conceived in the textual data of the course as one of the five essential principles of quality management (the principle of ‘Practicality’) that allegedly all Cambridge Assessment English teaching qualifications meet, including the ICELT course. This principle is articulated around the following question: ‘Does our assessment meet candidates’ needs within available resources” (Fig 5.7). In this sense, by fulfilling this principle, i.e., by being adapted to the course candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs, ICELT is showing, also, its quality value:
5.5.1.1.4 Sub-theme 5.4: ‘Designed to help teachers develop in the context within which they are currently working’

Finally, as one of the main characteristics, the notion of adaptability is mostly articulated in the course data in relation to three concepts: a) the professional development of the candidates, b) the course assessment components and c) the observations in the course, as will be described in what follows:

In terms of a) the professional development of the candidates, a common notion in the data conveys the idea that ICELT is particularly designed to help course candidates develop in their teaching contexts and/or classrooms and with their own students. This is made explicit, for example, in the course syllabus as portrayed in the following extract:

1. [C]ourse programmes are designed to help teachers develop in the context within which they are currently working – whether that context is teaching young learners or English for academic purposes or a range of ELT classes in different institutions.

   (UCLES 2015, p. 2)

Regarding b) the course assessment components, this is the area where perhaps it becomes clearer how the notion of adaptability in the course is realised. This is because all course assessed components (including the language tasks, the methodology assignments, and the candidates’ observations) have the course candidates’ own teaching contexts and/or their own learners as their analytic basis. One example that illustrates well this point is the methodology assignment related to ‘learners and learning’ (assignment 4) (see p. 90). In this assignment, candidates are required to write an essay with reference to a lesson they have taught. Candidates are asked to
describe and evaluate differences in their learners’ responses and to consider ways in which the quality of learning can be improved, thus including both elements: the candidates’ teaching contexts and their own learners.

Finally, the notion of the adaptability of the course is also mentioned in relation to c) the course observations. Such observations encompass both the assessed teaching practices of the candidates and their non-assessed observations of peers and/or other experienced teachers. In both cases, the notion of adaptability is made explicit, as it is featured in the following extract:

1 observed teaching practice takes place with [the course candidates’] own classes, with feedback [they] can implement
2 (UCLES 2019c)

This data extract adds the element of relevancy, as the course candidates are not only observed in their own classes but they are also provided with feedback that, as is expressed, they can immediately use. The notion of relevancy is also expressed in the case of the non-assessed observations that participants are required to make during the course. As is stated in the course syllabus, such observations of peers and/or experienced teachers ‘should be relevant to the candidate’s working context’ (UCLES 2015, p. 4), thus reinforcing, in an explicit manner, not only the adaptation to the candidates’ context but also the notion of relevance.

5.5.1.1.5 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the first distinguishing central element of the course: the notion that ICELT is adapted to the course candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs. This notion is expressed in the data in prominent and prevalent ways. The former (its prevalence) is related to the importance given to this notion in the data as an inherent characteristic of the course, an attribute that communicates its value proposition, or even a principle that shows its quality value. The latter (its prevalence) refers to the recurrence of this notion in the data, particularly around three concepts: the development of the candidates, the course assessment components, and the observations in the course.

5.5.1.2 Theme 6: Teaching and learning in the classroom!

This theme describes the second distinctive central component of ICELT that I identified in the data: a classroom-based teaching perspective, i.e., a mostly implicit perspective of English
language teaching and learning that has the ‘classroom (s)’ as its presupposed instructional context. This theme is presented in relation to three subthemes: ‘Teaching as classroom teaching’; ‘classrooms as institutional classrooms’, and ‘classroom-based teaching and learning practice’. Taken as a whole, these subthemes describe the content and the scope of the main theme.

5.5.1.2.1 Sub-theme 6.1: Teaching as classroom teaching

The first element of the classroom-based teaching perspective is the implicit notion, or presupposition, identified in the data is that the teaching practice of the candidates in ICELT takes place in (physical) classrooms and, consequently, that their professional development within the course (see subtheme 6.2) is classroom-based.

One of the expressions of this perspective is the use of the concept ‘classroom’ which is frequently expressed in terms of a generic concept or a superordinate term to which the rest of the related terms are subordinates. Examples of collocations frequently used in the data are ‘classroom materials’, ‘practical classroom skills’, ‘classroom-related assignments’, and ‘classroom management’, among others. In the course syllabus, for example, these concepts are used consistently in relation to three areas: course aims, syllabus content, and assessment components as described in the following three examples:

Example 1: course aims

The context of this example is the general aim of unit three ‘resources and materials’ where one sentence expresses that ICELT is designed to enable course candidates to work with classroom materials, as featured in the following extract:

1. [ICELT enable candidates to] develop their ability to use, evaluate and, where appropriate, adapt or create classroom materials [emphasis added]

(UCLFS 2015, p.2)

Example 2: syllabus content

The context of this example is the content of unit four ‘planning and management of teaching and learning’, which is organised around the management of teaching procedures and techniques. Among the topics covered in this unit are the management of ‘classroom events and discipline’; the arrangement of ‘space, furniture and equipment’, and the setup and management of ‘whole-
class work, pair work and groupwork’ (UCLES 2015, p. 11), concepts that imply the notion of classrooms or physical classroom spaces.

**Example 3: assessment components**

Finally, the concept of ‘classroom’ is explicitly mentioned in the assessment criteria used in the assessed teaching practice of the course (component two). These criteria, which consist of a checklist of 36 items contained in four categories, evaluate teaching skills that, as in the previous example, imply the notion of classrooms or physical classroom spaces. Category number two, called ‘classroom teaching skills’, for example, evaluates skills such as ‘maintain[ing] discipline showing sensitivity to individual needs’, ‘monitor[ing] learners language performance (...)’ or ‘adopt[ing] plans and activities appropriately in response to (...) classroom contingencies’ (UCLES n. d., p. 2).

Similar examples in the data implied other elements, as will be described in the following sub-section.

**5.5.1.2.2 Sub-theme 6.2: Classrooms as institutional classrooms**

The second presupposition identified in the data concerning the classroom-based teaching perspective identified in this theme is the presupposition that the classrooms of the candidates are fundamentally institutional classrooms, i.e., that their classrooms are part of a formal educational institution. This presupposition can be inferred from the use of concepts in the data that refer to formal academic settings, such as, ‘groups organised by age/level’ (UCLES 2016, p. 20) ‘teaching programmes’ (e.g., ‘Implementing teaching programmes to meet the needs of learners in a given context’) (UCLES 2015, p. 34), or ‘learners’, ‘colleagues’, or ‘employers’ (e.g., “At Pass level, the candidate can (...) review and adapt their practice in the light of this reflection and of the views of tutors, colleagues and learners”) (UCLES 2015, p. 31), etc.

Another example contained in the data that illustrates this presupposition well is the concept of ‘working with people’ which is related to at least three interrelated categories: a) professional roles of the course candidates, b) professional relationships of the course candidates, and c) course candidates’ care of learners within their assumed educational institution. The content in each one of these categories presupposes the notion of institutional classrooms. *Professional roles*, for example, expresses the notion that the course candidates are expected to be ‘aware of the different roles they may play in their professional lives as teacher[s], colleague[s], group-
leader[s] and employee[s]’ (UCLES 2015, p. 13). The concept of professional relationships contains the notion that candidates are expected to ‘listen to, learn from, share responsibility with, co-operate with and exchange views and ideas with others, including managers, tutors, colleagues and their own learners’ (Ibid). Other instances in the data related, for example, to the concept of caring, establish that candidates are expected to be responsible regarding ‘the welfare, health, safety and supervision’ of their learners (Ibid).

Considered as a whole, these examples support the claim made in this theme because the concepts presented refer to organised academic settings.

5.5.1.2.3 Sub-theme 6.3: Classroom-based teaching and learning practice

The third subtheme describes the classroom-based orientation of the teaching practice of the candidates in the course. This orientation is particularly evident precisely in the practical component of ICELT (component two: teaching) and, to a lesser degree, in the classroom-related assignments (component three: methodology). In the case of the former, as mentioned earlier (see p. 91), candidates are expected to plan, teach and evaluate four lessons. The planning phase, for example, requires candidates to consider (in advance) elements that are typical, even though not exclusive, of classroom-based teaching settings such as the ‘specification of aims’ and ‘specification of learning objectives’, or the ‘description’ of ‘planned procedures’, ‘timing’, ‘pace’, ‘transition between stages’ and ‘interaction patterns’, etc. (Cf. UCLES 2015, p.31). A more exclusive element of classroom-based teaching settings is the criteria checklist against which course candidates are assessed as it considers classroom-based areas such as ‘classroom teaching skills’ (Cf. UCLES n. d., p. 2). Besides the teaching assessed practices, candidates are asked to complete four assignments linked to their classroom-based practice. Assignment 1: ‘evaluation of teaching’, for example, requires candidates to evaluate their teaching with reference to ‘classroom management’ and other classroom-related categories or items. In this way, during ICELT, candidates are expected to plan, teach, reflect, and write about their practice from a classroom-based teaching perspective.

The learning aspect in the title of this subtheme refers mostly to the learning that students do during the candidates’ teaching practice in the course which, for logical implication, is also assumed to be also classroom-based. However, this aspect is not immediately evident in the data and a different type of analysis (other than thematic) would be required to describe it.
5.5.1.2.4 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the second distinctive central component of ICELT identified in the course documents: the preponderance in ICELT of a classroom-based perspective of English language teaching. Such a perspective is present in the data, to a great extent, in an implicit way. However, it was possible to thematically identify some of its main features: the assumption that the teaching of the course candidates takes place in physical classrooms; the assumption that such classrooms are institutional classrooms, and finally, the conceptualization of the teaching practice of the candidates in the course as classroom-based practice. Taken as a whole, these elements contribute to outline one important element of the predominant teaching perspective in ICELT, namely, its classroom-based nature

5.5.1.3 Theme 7: Grammar, grammar, grammar and... skills!

This theme describes the third distinctive component of ICELT identified in the data: a language systems and language skills-centred perspective of English language teaching. As in 5.5.1.1, this theme is both prevalent and prominent in the data. Prevalent, because this element is present throughout the ICELT syllabus and related course documents explicitly and implicitly. Prominent because such a perspective constitutes one of the central elements around which teaching is structured and organised in ICELT. In what follows, I will briefly mention how the rationale for teaching language systems and language skills is referred to in the data. I will then present the theme in relation to the assessment components of the course, namely: the course language tasks, the course teaching practice, and the course methodology assignments to illustrate its scope and focus. Finally, I will summarise the content of the theme.

5.5.1.3.1 Sub-theme 7.1: Rationale for teaching language systems and language skills

Language systems and language skills are both conceptualised in the data as key knowledge and skills in English language learning and, consequently, their teaching is advocated (see UCLES 2015b). In the case of the former, the course documents mention that explicit attention to language systems in the classroom enhances language learning. This notion, which is articulated in the data in the context of the description of the rationale for its inclusion in the Cambridge English teaching qualifications, is expressed as follows:
It is widely recognised that second/foreign language learning in the classroom is enhanced by explicit attention to language systems

(UCLES 2015b, p.3)

At the same time, language skills work is also described as a relevant factor for ‘effective’ language learning, as featured in the following extract:

...it is [also] generally accepted that language use is best promoted by skills development, and that knowledge of language systems alone is not sufficient (Ibid)

Even though the application of these two elements in ICELT is not always explicit, their presence in the data is clear and distinct. This presence is perhaps clearer in the course assessment components where these two elements constitute central concepts around which this part of the course is organised as will be shown in what follows.

5.5.1.3.2 Sub-theme 7.2: ‘Identify and correct grammatical errors’

The prevalence of a language systems/language skills-centred perspective of English language teaching in the course assessment components is first manifested in the language tasks’ component (component one: language for teachers), where this perspective is frequently referred to. As described earlier in this chapter, this component is composed of four tasks that have language as their main analytic focus. Three of them (tasks no. 2 to 4), require course candidates to analyse discrete samples of students’ or teachers’ language (spoken and written), aiming to illustrate categories of a language system (grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, function, or discourse). Task 2: learners’ spoken language, for example, requires candidates to analyse ‘accurate as well as inaccurate’ discrete samples of students’ spoken language in class (UCLES 2015, p.22). At the same time, task 3; learners’ written language, requires candidates to ‘identify and correct’ grammatical errors in the learners’ written work and provide appropriate feedback (Op cit., p. 23). All these tasks require candidates to show aspects of language systems and, even though the specifications of the tasks don’t indicate the use of any specific method or technique of language analysis, the analytic focus on language systems is maintained throughout the tasks.

5.5.1.3.3 Sub-theme 7.3: ‘Each lesson should have a different language/skills focus’
This distinctive component is also present in the supervised and assessed teaching practice (component two: teaching) where candidates are asked to teach and evaluate language-based and skills-based lessons. As is mentioned in the course syllabus, each lesson to be taught by the course candidates during this assessed component is required to have ‘a different language/skills focus as a main/subsidiary aim’ [emphasis added] (UCLES 2015, p. 15).

At the same time, different aims across the course syllabus related to planning and teaching within the course also refer explicitly to this perspective. Some examples are the understanding of concepts and terminology used to describe ‘form and meaning in language and language use’; the application of this understanding to ‘planning and teaching language skills and specific language items’ (unit 1); the understanding of ‘the principles of planning programmes and schemes of work for teaching language skills and specific language items’ (unit 2); the use, adaptation, or creation of resources and materials ‘for teaching skills and specific language items’ (Unit 3); planning lessons with specific regard to ‘ways of focusing on and practising specific language items and skills’ (Unit 4), and the candidates’ self-evaluation of their planning and teaching in relation to ‘the achievement of objectives, the development of language skills [and] the teaching of specific language items...’ (Unit 6) (UCLES 2015, pp. 8-13).

Predictably, the assessment criteria for this component includes categories of teaching knowledge and skills, related to a language systems/language skills-centred perspective, that candidates are expected to display during their assessed teaching practice, such as: ‘teach language items effectively’, ‘help learners develop accuracy’, or ‘identify errors and sensitively correct learners’ oral and written language when and where appropriate’ (Ibid, p. 31).

5.5.1.3.4 Sub-theme 7.4: ‘Developed from a skills-based or a language-based lesson’

The third (and last) assessment component in ICELT, where the elements of this perspective are referred to is ‘component three: methodology’. As indicated at the beginning of this chapter (p. 90), this component requires course candidates to write four classroom-related assignments. According to the assignment specifications, two of these assignments (assignments 1 and 2) may be developed from ‘a skills or a language-based lesson’ taught by the course candidates. Even though this is the only direct reference to language systems or skills development in the methodology-assignments-related data, each assignment relates to syllabus content linked directly to these two concepts. For example, syllabus content in ‘4.1 Planning for teaching’, included in the syllabus focus of three assignments, refers to planning lessons with specific regard...
to establishing aims and objectives [and] ways of focusing on and practising specific language items and skills...’ [emphasis added] (UCLES 2015, p. 11).

It is important to mention that language systems and language skills are not the only focus in the assessment components but, as mentioned earlier, these two elements are central concepts around which such components are organised.

5.5.1.3.5 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the third distinctive component of the course: the notion that ICELT is structured and organised around, among other elements, a language systems/language skills-centred perspective of English language teaching. The elements of this perspective are present throughout the data in an explicit but also in an implicit way. However, for reasons of space, only the assessment components of the course were presented in this section to illustrate the scope and focus of the theme.

5.5.1.4 Theme 8: Teach the learners!

This theme describes the fourth (and last) distinctive component of ICELT identified in the data: a learner-centred teaching perspective. As in the previous themes, this theme is both prominent and prevalent. The theme is composed of four subthemes that describe different elements that constitute this perspective. The first subtheme, called ‘Understanding the learners’, describes the type of background knowledge that the candidates are expected to develop in ICELT in relation to their learners; the second subtheme, called ‘Facilitating the learners’ learning’, is concerned with different ways in which the course candidates in ICELT are expected to facilitate the learning process of their learners; the third sub-theme, called ‘Promoting learner autonomy’, talks about the way in which learner autonomy is referred to in the data, and finally, the fourth sub-theme, called ‘Following learner-centred teaching values’, describes some learner-centred values that candidates are expected to promote in their teaching in ICELT.

5.5.1.4.1 Sub-theme 8.1: Understanding the learners

The first constitutive element of the learner-centred teaching perspective of the course identified in the data is the background knowledge about the learners that course candidates are expected to develop in ICELT. In the data, this background knowledge is conceptualised as the
understanding of the candidates of a) their learners, b) their learners’ needs, and c) their learners’ contexts.

The first of these elements, the understanding of the candidates of their learners, is conceptualised in the data as the candidates’ knowledge and practical application for language learning and teaching of concepts such as ‘learning styles (e.g., visual, auditory, kinaesthetic), multiple intelligences, learning strategies, special needs, [and] affect’ (UCLES 2018, p.2). In addition, the candidates are also expected to understand and apply during the course concepts and theories concerning First Language Acquisition (FLA), Second Language Learning (SLL), and the roles that the learners’ first/other language(s) have in their English language learning development, among others.

The second element, the understanding of the candidates of their learners’ needs, is conceptualised in the data as the candidates’ knowledge of the ‘developmental, cognitive, social and affective needs’ of their learners (UCLES 2015, p. 10).

Finally, the third element, the understanding of the candidates of their learners’ contexts, refers not only to teaching and learning contexts such as ‘monolingual vs. multilingual classes, large classes, beginners vs. advanced learners, mixed-ability classes, etc.’ (UCLES 2018, p.2) but also to the social and cultural contexts of the learners. This is particularly evident in assignment 4: ‘learners and learning’, where candidates are required to consider ways in which, referring to their learners’ social and cultural contexts, their quality of learning can be improved (UCLES 2015, p.36).

These three types of understanding constitute then the background knowledge that candidates must have and show throughout the course in different assessed components and, as such, the first constitutive element of the learner-centred teaching perspective of the course.

5.5.1.4.2 Sub-theme 8.2: Facilitating the learning of the learners

The second constitutive element of the learner-centred teaching perspective of the course identified in the data refers to the interventions of the candidates in the course to facilitate the conditions and processes of/for the learning of their learners. Perhaps expectedly, many of such interventions have language as their main instrument. Some relevant examples are the adjustment of the candidates’ language to the level of the class in order to ‘use teacher-pupil interaction to facilitate the learner’s language development’ (UCLES 2015, p. 8), or the effective use of classroom language for different classroom events and situations, such as ‘introducing the topic of the lesson, instructions for activities, classroom management, explaining language,
helping learners with their problems in class, talking with learners about their progress, and so on (UCLES 2018, p. 7), and finally, the use of language to create or improve appropriate learning conditions such as ‘establish rapport and foster a constructive and an emotionally and physically safe learning environment’ (UCLES n. d., p. 2). Another type of intervention that the candidates are expected to perform to facilitate the learning of their learners in the course is conceptualised in the data as ‘responding to learners’. In the course documents, this concept refers fundamentally to the ability of the candidates to respond appropriately to the lesson’s flow and the responses of the learners. During their teaching practice in the course, for example, the candidates are evaluated against a criterion that establishes that teachers were able (or not) to ‘adapt plans and activities appropriately in response to the learners and to classroom contingencies’ during their lesson (UCLES n. d., p. 2).

This constitutive element is present across the data in at least three different phases: ‘planning’, ‘teaching’ and ‘assessment’, which makes it an even more salient aspect of the learner-centred teaching perspective in the course.

5.5.1.4.3 Sub-theme 8.3: Promoting learner autonomy

The third constitutive element is the promotion of learner autonomy. Even though this is perhaps a less prominent element, it is equally prevalent as in the case of the two previous elements.

In general, the promotion of learner autonomy is conceptualised in the data as a part of the background to teaching and learning in ICELT that the course candidates are expected to possess. This notion is expressed first in the course syllabus as a learning outcome. The learning outcome, or learning goal, states that successful candidates are expected to show that they are able to ‘make use of appropriate strategies to foster independent learning’ in their teaching (UCLES 2015, p. 9). The promotion of learner autonomy is also expressed in the data as a criterion to be ticked off on the tutors’ checklist while observing the candidates in their teaching practices. This criterion indicates straightforwardly that candidates are able to ‘teach in a way that encourages the development of learner autonomy’ (ICELT n. d., p. 2). Finally, some other domains in the syllabus that express this notion are concerned with the promotion of the candidates of their learners' autonomy through, for example, the use of digital resources or the use of assessment to inform learning (see UCLES 2018, particularly p. 4 & p. 7).

5.5.1.4.4 Sub-theme 8.4: Adopting learner-centred teaching values
The fourth and last constitutive element of the learner-centred teaching perspective in ICELT identified in the course documents has to do with the candidates’ adoption of learner-centred values in their teaching. Such values are expressed in the data mostly as learning goals that candidates must meet. Examples of these values are: a positive attitude towards the educational and cultural backgrounds of the learners; ‘commitment to equality of opportunity’; and the ability to work with people, as well as listening to, learning from, and sharing responsibility with others, and co-operating with and exchanging views and ideas with others, etc. (UCLES 2015, p. 13). One teaching value that clearly illustrates the learner-centredness of such principles is expressed in the data as the understanding of the candidates of their responsibility to care for their learners. In the data, this value is articulated as the understanding of the candidates of ‘their responsibility concerning the welfare, health, safety and supervision of [their] learners (…)’ (Ibid).

Other values identified in the data are perhaps less centred only on the candidates’ learners. One example is the commitment that course candidates are expected to have in relation to their ‘professional, social and moral responsibilities’ as teachers within their school/educational institute and in the ‘modern world’ (UCLES 2018, p. 10) which could be considered as more professional and institutional-centred values.

5.5.1.4.5 Theme summary

In summary, this theme described the fourth distinctive component of ICELT identified in the data: a learner-centred teaching perspective. As was described, the content of the theme is expressed in the data through four subthemes that show different aspects of this perspective such as the background knowledge that the candidates are expected to develop in ICELT; the different ways in which they are expected to facilitate the learning process of their learners; the way in which learner autonomy is referred to in the data, and finally, some learner-centred values that candidates are expected to promote in their teaching in ICELT.

5.5.1.5 Overarching theme summary

In summary, my analytic process produced an overarching theme that described the distinctive components of ICELT. Each one of these components is expressed as a main theme which, in turn, is formed by subthemes or subsections that offer more detail of their specific content. Taken as a whole, these elements help to understand what can be conceptualised as ‘the flavour of the course’, i.e., distinctive components of its character. These components are a) the notion expressed in the documents that ICELT is adapted to the course candidates, their teaching
contexts and their specific needs (Theme 4), b) a classroom-based teaching perspective (Theme 5), c) a language systems and language skills-centred perspective of English language teaching (Theme 6), and d) a learner-centred teaching perspective (Theme 7). At the same time, the subthemes or subsections that form the substances of each theme contribute to explore in more detail the specific content of each theme.

**Thematic map**

![Thematic map](image)

Figure 5.8 Thematic map of section 5.5 ‘The flavour of ICELT’

### 5.6 Chapter summary

This chapter presented the results of the first part of my analytic process: a reflexive thematic analysis of course documents in relation to the first research question of this study: (1) What are the fundamental characteristics of ICELT according to course documents and course-related documents?, and three related research sub-questions: (1.1) How is ICELT represented overall?, (1.2) What are the ends of the course?, and (1.3) What are the distinctive components of the course? In focusing on the documents of the course, this chapter privileged, in a sense, the perspective of the producers of the course.

The content of the chapter was divided into three sections organised around overarching themes and main themes. The content of each section addressed one research sub-question in relation to different aspects of the course, namely: the overall representation of the course, the ends of the course, and the distinctive components of the course, respectively (See Table 5.1).
In relation to the representation of the course (p. 93), my analysis indicated that ICELT is self-represented (or self-positioned) most prominently in the data as ‘a highly respected course’ (e.g., as ‘the international quality standard’). As indicated in the chapter, this representation is expressed through at least three forms: self-definition, use of the name of the University of Cambridge, and through brand positioning strategies. The thematic link and tensions between such representation and the discursive practices in the iteration of the course researched will be presented in the next chapter (Chapter Six). At the same time, such representation will be discussed in relation to the literature on ‘the marketisation of English Language Teacher Education’ in the discussion chapter (Chapter Eight).

Regarding the ends of the course (p. 99), my analytic process identified the overall aim of ICELT as ‘the development of the course candidates as (experienced) English language teachers’. As was detailed in the report of my analysis, such development is intended to be realised through three areas: professional language competence, teaching knowledge, skills and practice, and continuous professional development, all of which refer, in turn, to particular areas of knowledge and competence domains, as well as, specific analytic foci.

Tensions between specific content in these areas of professional development and the experience of some candidates in the course will be mentioned in the next two chapters and addressed in more detail in the discussion chapter (Chapter eight), particularly in relation to the theoretical perspective of ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’.

Finally, regarding the distinctive components of the course (p. 115), my analysis generated four themes that attempt to capture and describe such elements. As indicated in the report of my analysis, these components were expressed in the following notions: 1) that ICELT is adapted to the course candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs; 2) that ‘the classroom’ is the presupposed instructional context in ICELT; 3) that a language systems and language skills-centred perspective of English language teaching are both prevalent and prominent in the data, and finally, 4) that a learner-centred teaching perspective is prevalent in the data. As was suggested in the body of my report, taken as a whole, these elements represent the ‘the flavour’ of the course.

As in the previous case, despite their conceptual and theoretical richness (as described in the corresponding section), such components presupposed instructional contexts and practices that were not necessarily appropriate to all candidates and teaching contexts. Some of the tensions created between these elements and different aspects of the mediation of the tutors and the
experience of the candidates in the course researched will be described in the next chapter and then, considered in the discussion chapter of this study in relation to the literature of ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’ and ‘epistemological decolonisation’
CHAPTER SIX: FINDINGS (2): ICELT as implemented

6.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the second part of my analytic process: the analysis of the data produced during fieldwork in the iteration of the ICELT course researched. The analysis was conducted in relation to the second research question of this study: (2) What is particular in the way the course is implemented? As the question indicates, my analysis focused on the aspects of ‘implementation’ of the course and, in this sense, it privileged the ‘implementers’ perspective (e.g., the perspective of the course tutors).

The data sets analysed included textual, aural, visual, animated, graphic, and photographic data produced during fieldwork.

The chapter is divided into six sections. The second section after this introduction presents a brief overview of the general characteristics of the iteration of the course research such as information about the mode of delivery, input sessions and assessment components. The rest of the sections are organised around overarching themes, themes and sub-themes whose content addresses different sub-questions of this study. These sections are presided by a table that presents an overview of the content in each section (see Table 6.2 below).

As in the previous chapter, exclamation points have been added to some of the titles of the themes to convey the tone in which the related content is expressed in the data. Each section contains discourse extracts and graphic data that illustrate the content of each main theme and subthemes. A bilingual version (Spanish-English) of the extracts originally produced in Spanish is included. Keywords and sometimes the wording itself have been preserved unchanged from the original data with the intention of reflecting as best as possible the semantic meaning of the implementers’ discourse.

At the end of the chapter, I will summarise the content of the overarching themes and themes presented and comment on some tensions that will be considered in more detail in the discussion chapter where they will be examined convergently.
6.2 An overview of the course researched

This section presents a brief overview of the main characteristics of the iteration of the course researched including a brief description of the mode of delivery, the input sessions, the lecture organisation, the assessment components, and the moderation and the certification process.

6.2.1 General characteristics of the course

In general, the iteration of the course researched followed the course programme provided by Cambridge Assessment English, including the course content, the course structure and the assessment criteria (see p. 91). However, the actual delivery of the course researched was designed by the Centre following the requirements and parameters set by Cambridge. These were some of its main characteristics:

6.2.1.1 Mode of delivery: blended version

The mode of delivery of the course was 'blended', combining both face-to-face and distance learning support.

6.2.1.2 Input sessions

The course included 150 hours of instruction through both on-site input sessions (100 hours) and on-line input sessions (50 hours).

6.2.1.2.1 Face-to-face input sessions

The face-to-face sessions took place at the centre’s premises. The duration of each session was five hours and the sessions were held every Friday for ten months.

6.2.1.2.2 Online input sessions

The online sessions took place at the centre’s virtual learning website. The sessions were asynchronous, remaining available in the system for one week. Besides texts, each session contained audio and video content.
6.2.1.2.3 Content distribution

The content of the programme was distributed across thirty sessions. The content of each session cross-referred to the units of the official course syllabus provided by Cambridge Assessment English, as is indicated in Table 6.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Session</th>
<th>Mode (*)</th>
<th>Content (Session topics)</th>
<th>Unit of reference in the Syllabus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Introduction to the course’ and ‘Classroom Management’</td>
<td>6.2, 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCT 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Developing Receptive Skills (Reading and Listening)’ and ‘Pre, While and Post framework’</td>
<td>2.1, 6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV 04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Website Orientation</td>
<td>6.2, 2.3, 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Planning for Teaching 1 (Lesson plan)’ and ‘Language in the Classroom’</td>
<td>1.2, 4.2, 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>‘Focus on Observations and Instruments for self-assessment’</td>
<td>2.2, 4.4, 4.4, 5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOV 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Presentations (C1-1) and ‘Academic Writing’</td>
<td>7.1, 7.2, 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC 02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 7</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>‘Language awareness: parts of speech and sentences structure’</td>
<td>4.2, 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEC 03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Staging Lessons (PPP)’ and ‘Analysing language for presentations’</td>
<td>2.2, 6.1, 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 9</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>‘Language awareness: time, tense and aspect’</td>
<td>4.4, 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAN 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Text-Based / Guided discovery’ and ‘Teaching vocabulary (pre-teach and post-teach)’</td>
<td>4.4, 7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 11</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>‘Acquisition and Learning’</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Planning for Teaching 2 (Unit planning), and ‘Phonology 1’</td>
<td>7.3, 2.1, 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Controlled vs communicative activities’ and ‘Oral Correction and feedback’</td>
<td>4.4, 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEB 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHRISTMAS BREAK**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Feb 25, Mar 11</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>‘Methods and Approaches – historical overview, theories of learning’</td>
<td>4.2, 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mar 10</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Needs Analysis’ and ‘Evaluating Course Books and other didactic material’</td>
<td>4.4, 5.2, 7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mar 17</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Teaching different age learners’ and ‘Role play, simulation and drama’</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mar 24</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Developing Speaking skills and Teaching productive skills (framework)’</td>
<td>2.1, 6.1, 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mar 25, Apr 8</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>‘Language Awareness: Modality’</td>
<td>7.3, 2.1, 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Apr 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Language awareness: Futurity’</td>
<td>1.1, 6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EASTER BREAK</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Apr 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Developing Writing skills and teaching writing’ and ‘Error correction and feedback of written work’</td>
<td>4.4, 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Apr 29, May 13</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>Classroom Action Research</td>
<td>3.1, 3.2, 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>May 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Phonology 2’ and ‘Varieties of English / Style and register’</td>
<td>4.2, 5.1, 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>May 19</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Framework review and other frameworks (e.g. TTT, TBL, ARC)’</td>
<td>4.4, 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>May 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Exploring video in the classroom’ and ‘Story telling’</td>
<td>2.4, 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Jun 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Mixed-ability classes and large groups’</td>
<td>4.4, 2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Jun 3, Jun 17</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>‘Learning styles, training, and motivation’</td>
<td>4.4, 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Jun 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Paradigms in Education’</td>
<td>4.1, 5.1, 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Jun 17, Jul 1</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>‘Evaluation, Assessment and Testing’</td>
<td>5.2, 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Jun 30</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Syllabus Design’ and ‘The Lexical Approach’</td>
<td>4.4, 5.2, 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Jul 7</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘Dictation’, ‘Continuous Professional Development’ and ‘Course round-up and feedback’</td>
<td>6.1, 6.2, 6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sessions not marked were held on-site*

Table 6.1 Course schedule (adapted from the course timetable grid)
6.2.1.3 Course assessment components

The course assessment components were the ones established by Cambridge (see p. 91) which included four language tasks (component 1); four assessed observations (component 2), and four methodology assignments (component 3) in addition to eight non-assessed directed observations.

The moderation and the certification process were the ones established in the course syllabus (see p. 92).

Overarching themes, themes, and sub-themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Overarching theme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Subthemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.3 Representation of the ICELT course in the course researched</td>
<td>6.3.1 Overarching theme: The Cambridge ICELTs</td>
<td>6.3.1.1 Theme 1: 'It's not us... It's Cambridge!'</td>
<td>6.3.1.1.1 Sub-theme 1.1: An authoritative entity 6.3.1.1.2 Sub-theme 1.2: Polysemic Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3.1.2 Theme 2: 'A difficult but rewarding course'</td>
<td>6.3.1.2.1 Sub-theme 2.1: 'This very important worldwide-recognised teaching qualification' 6.3.1.2.2 Sub-theme 2.2: 'In ICELT we are looking at all the essential elements in ELT'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3.1.3 Theme 3: 'Not anymore what it used to be'</td>
<td>6.3.1.3.1 Sub-theme 3.1: 'One size fits all' 6.3.1.3.2 Sub-theme 3.2: 'Where is the development?' 6.3.1.3.3 Sub-theme 3.3: 'It's because we consume'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 The representation of the course tutors</td>
<td>6.4.1 Theme 4: 'Tutors are essential in ICELT'</td>
<td>6.4.1.1 Sub-theme 4.1: 'We know what Cambridge wants'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5 The ends of ICELT in the iteration of the course researched</td>
<td>6.5.1 Overarching theme: The ends of the course as explicit aims</td>
<td>6.5.1.1 Theme 5: Helping course candidates to develop as English language teachers</td>
<td>6.5.1.1.1 Sub-theme 1.1: A similar (but different) professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.1.2 Theme 6: Making teachers better</td>
<td>6.5.1.2.1 Sub-theme 6.1: Having course candidates adopt a theory informed practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.1.2.2 Sub-theme 6.2: Making course candidates step out of their comfort zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.1.2.3 Sub-theme 6.3: Transforming course candidates into professional teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.2 Overarching Theme: The ends of the course as implicit aims</td>
<td>6.5.2.1 Theme 7: ‘And then one day you’ll be doing the Delta’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.2.1.1 Sub-theme 7.1: CPD as Cambridge English CPD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.2.1.2 Sub-theme 7.2: Standardisation of the Cambridge CELTA-ICELT-Delta program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.2.1.3 Sub-theme 7.3: A steppingstone to Delta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.2.1.4 Sub-theme 7.4: Succeed in the field of TESOL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.3 Overarching Theme: the ends of the course as de facto aims</td>
<td>6.5.3.1 Theme 8: Helping course candidates to get the ICELT certificate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.3.1.1 Sub-theme 8.1: The tutors are here to help you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5.3.1.2 Sub-theme 8.2: Surprise, surprise! We have already seen all these topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 The operationalisation of the distinctive components of ICELT in the iteration of the course researched</td>
<td>6.6.1 Overarching Theme: Assessment, assessment, assessment</td>
<td>6.6.1.1 Theme 9: Tell me, how do we manage to adapt ICELT for all of them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.1.1.1 Sub-theme 9.1: ‘A mirror of own teaching’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.6.1.1.2 Sub-theme: 9.2: ‘Planned according to the group’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the iteration of the course researched</td>
<td>6.6.1.1.2 Sub-theme: 9.2: ‘Planned according to the group’ 6.6.1.1.3 Sub-theme 9.3: ‘You will be required to plan, teach and evaluate four lessons’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1.2 Theme 10: ‘You cannot focus only on grammar, grammar, grammar… what about skills?’</td>
<td>6.4.1.2.1 Sub-theme 10.1: ‘So we first have to go into accuracy’ 6.4.1.2.2 Sub-theme 10.2: ‘Form should be covered’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6.1.3 Theme 11: ‘Who learns?… The students!’</td>
<td>6.6.1.3.1 Sub-theme 11.1: Get to know your learners, then teach them 6.6.1.3.2 Sub-theme 11.2: ‘You have to find a way to let your students work more autonomously’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7 Predominant discursive practices</td>
<td>6.7.1 Overarching Theme: A strict pedagogy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1.1 Theme 12: ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’</td>
<td>6.7.1.1.1. Sub-theme 12.1: ‘You are likely to fail!’ 6.7.1.1.2 Sub-theme 12.2: ‘Shaking?… yeeeeeah!’ 6.7.1.1.3 Sub-theme 12.3: ‘[But] take it easy because otherwise you’ll go crazy, huh?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1.2 Theme 13: Do as I do</td>
<td>6.7.1.2.1 Sub-theme 13.1: ‘A demonstration of how your PTOs must be taught’ 6.7.1.2.2 Sub-theme 13.2: ‘Dominate the theory and techniques first’ 6.7.1.2.3 Sub-theme 13.3: ‘Is that penalised?’ 6.7.1.2.4 Sub-theme 13.4: ‘But it’s not compulsory’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 Representation of the ICELT course in the course researched

This section presents the result of my analytic process in relation to the second research question of this study: (2) What is particular in the way the course is implemented? and in reference to the sub-question (2.1) How is ICELT represented in one iteration of the course? As referred to in Table 6.2 above, my analytic process produced one overarching theme and three themes that attempt to capture and describe relevant aspects of the discursive representation of ICELT in the documents of the iteration of the course researched produced by the authorised centre and the tutors’ talk contained in the data. In general, my analysis identified different discursive representations expressed in the data in the form of implicit representations, explicit representations, and private representations.

In this sense, my analytic claim (fourth in this study) is that the course was represented in the data in varied, complex and seemingly conflicting but not mutually exclusive ways, which were thematically categorised as implicit representations, explicit representations, and private representations, correspondingly.

6.3.1 Overarching theme: The Cambridge ICELTs
This overarching theme is composed of three themes that describe different aspects of the discursive representation of the ICELT in the iteration of the course researched. This representation is both prevalent and prominent in the data. Prevalent, because the references to the course as such (either explicit or implicit, or even private) are constant in the data. Prominent, because such references served as part of the background context in which discourse was produced in the course.

The first theme, called ‘It’s not us... it’s Cambridge!’, describes how the name of the University of Cambridge was most prominently used in the course and how such use contributed, in an implicit way, to the overall representation of the course. The second theme, called ‘A difficult but rewarding course’, describes some ways in which ICELT was most prominently referred to and explicitly represented in the course researched, particularly in the documents used in the course and the discourse of the tutors. Finally, the third theme called ‘It’s not anymore what it used to be’, contains a thematic summary of the criticism of the course made by the tutors which presents a different representation of the course from the one featured in the first two themes. In a sense, such representation could be conceptualised as a ‘private representation’, because the ideas expressed about the course by the tutors were not expressed publicly (i.e., to the course candidates) given precisely their critical character.

As a whole, these three themes show different aspects of what can be seen as a complex representation of ICELT in the iteration of the course researched that, in turn, constitutes a fundamental element of the ethos of the course.

6.3.1.1 Theme 1: ‘It’s not us... it’s Cambridge!’

This theme describes the way in which the name of the University of Cambridge, or simply ‘Cambridge’ was used in relation to the course in the iteration of the course researched to position it. The theme is composed of two sub-themes: ‘An authoritative entity’ and ‘Polysemic Cambridge’ which describe the implicit and the explicit representations of ‘Cambridge’ in the data, correspondingly. As their titles indicate, the two sub-subthemes describe contemporaneous uses of the name of ‘Cambridge’. After presenting some relevant examples in each case, I will summarise the content of the theme.

6.3.1.1.1 Sub-theme 1.1: An authoritative entity
As in the course documents (Chapter Five), in the iteration of the course researched the prestige and authority of the University of Cambridge were used to position the course discursively. However, in contrast to the course documents, in the iteration of the course researched the authority of ‘Cambridge’ is not explicitly affirmed, but implicitly presupposed. One example that illustrates this type of representation was identified in a text from the centre’s website of the course targeting prospective candidates. The text lists, among other elements, the moderation and assessment of the course by the University of Cambridge as one of the main reasons for the characterisation of the course as ‘an excellent TELF qualification’:

1 ICELT is an excellent TELF qualification because of the following:
2 (...) [It is] [m]oderated and assessed by the University of Cambridge

(Centre’s website of the course 2016)

Other references in the data where the authority of ‘Cambridge’ is assumed are perhaps less obvious, even though its expression is constant in the data. In all these references the names ‘University of Cambridge’, ‘Cambridge English’, ‘Cambridge ESOL’, or simply ‘Cambridge’ are used indistinctively (as shown in the data extract above) to refer to the ICELT course or the entity that administers it (Cambridge Assessment English). For example, in the glossary section of the course handbook produced by the Centre, the moderator of the course is defined as a ‘University of Cambridge representative who will come to check the course (during the last two weeks)’ (Centre’s Course Handbook, 2014, p. 125). In the same document, in the section where the procedure for record-keeping and filing is explained, the document establishes that the course portfolio containing the assessment component tasks of the candidates will be either kept by the Centre or sent to ‘Cambridge’ as established by the ‘Cambridge regulations’ (Ibid, p. 5). Finally, in the section devoted to describing the assessment components of the course, part of the rationale provided for the language tasks is that ‘Cambridge would like to see that [the candidates] are capable of analysing language’ (p. 8), confirming the explicitly presupposed authority of Cambridge.

In a sense, the uses of the name of ‘Cambridge’ reinforced, at a discourse level, the association of the course with the University of Cambridge and, implicitly, with the social status and prestige of the University of Cambridge.

6.3.1.1.2 Sub-theme 1.2: Polysemic Cambridge
Implicitly, the name of ‘Cambridge’ is referred to in the data in at least three different senses: as the overall course producer, as the course assessor, and as the course accreditation body. Being contemporaneous, the different uses of the Cambridge name constituted a single discursive representation, polysemic and omni-semantic in nature. In what follows, I will describe briefly each one of these senses:

- As the overall course producer

One of the most prevalent representations of ‘Cambridge’ in the data is as the overall producer of the course, i.e., as the producer not only of the course syllabus (including the assessment components) but also of ‘all rules and restrictions of the course’ (Course’ learner contract, 2016).

Thus represented, the name of ‘Cambridge’ became particularly prominent in the iteration of the course researched because of the central role that the assessment components originally had in the course documents (see Chapter Five), and also for the special emphasis that the tutors put on the course’s guidelines, including the assessment criteria, and its strict adherence in the iteration of the course researched, as is expressed by the main course tutor in the following extract:

1  T1: So one important thing that we are going to see later
2  today hopefully is to stick (to) and to strictly
3  and to strictly follow the guidelines from Cambridge so
4  you cover all the aspects that are required

(Tutor1_inputssession08_20/01/2017)

In a sense, the representation of Cambridge Assessment English as the overall course producer became implicit in the everyday discourse of both tutors and course candidates who devoted an important amount of time to the input sessions of the course not only to see what the assessment guidelines stated but also to clarify their meaning or to determine ‘what Cambridge wanted’ (see e. g. p. 176), as expressed in the data extract below. The context of the exchange is the revision of the specifics for the third assessed teaching practice (a skills-based class) between the tutor and the course candidates:
It is relevant to note that the data show that, as was the case in the extract above, the candidates were constantly praised by the course tutors when they asked questions related to the specifics of the course guidelines which, in turn, reinforced the representation of Cambridge Assessment English as the overall course producer.

- As the course assessor

Another prevalent representation of ‘Cambridge’ in the data is as the assessor of the course, particularly in terms of the assessment of the progress and achievement of the candidates in the course. Even though the course tutors evaluated and marked the assessment components, 'Cambridge' was said to accept or reject the marking of the course tutors. One example from the data that illustrates this portrays one tutor referring explicitly to this function while the candidates were reading the task specifications of one of the methodology assignments:

After expressing this, the tutor related different cases in which, in previous iterations of the course, marked assignments had been sent back to the candidates to be amended and resubmitted, thus reaffirming the representation of ‘Cambridge’ as the course assessor. According to the field data, references to such representation were prevalent in the course, both in written and spoken form.
As the course accreditation body

The last prevalent representation of ‘Cambridge’, identified in the data, is as the accreditation body of the course. As the data show, the course candidates were constantly reminded of the fact that ‘Cambridge’ would issue their certificates after having followed an exhaustive process. According to the main course tutor, this process would include both a visit by an external moderator appointed by ‘Cambridge’, who would verify that ‘all of the regulations had been followed’, and also a physical revision of their course portfolios that would be conducted in the offices of Cambridge Assessment English. As described by the main course tutor, the portfolio of each candidate would contain their assessment components, together with a four-page individual report with the general comments of the course tutors and the course moderator, detailing their performance, ‘assignment by assignment [and] component by component’. In a more detailed account of this process, the main course tutor expressed that, besides being exhaustive, the process was likely to be a lengthy one, as featured in the following extract:

1. T1: Over there [referring to Cambridge Assessment English], there is another person that
2. is called the chief moderator (.). And he checks ehh all the
3. reports and the portfolios ((pause)) If he believes that
4. everything is okay he goes to a meeting
5. D: Oh my God!
6. T1: in which they authorise the certificates (.), but that can
7. take as an average six months from the moment that
8. the documents are sent.
9. CCs: Six months??
10. T1: Six months as an average (.). Sometimes it could be nine
11. Months (.). Sometimes it could be less (.). What is the order
12. they follow over there? I will never know

(Tutor1_inpsession25_02/07/2017)

As expressed earlier, the different uses of the Cambridge name described above were expressed contemporaneously, which gradually gave the term not only a polysemic content but also made it omnipresent at a discursive level.

6.3.1.1.3 Theme summary

In summary, this theme described and provided samples identified in the data of different ways in which the name of the University of Cambridge was most prominently used in the iteration of the course researched in relation to the representation of the course as a whole. As was noted
above, the different uses of ‘Cambridge’ in the course constituted a single discursive representation, polysemic and omni-semantic in nature and, in this sense, omni-present.

6.3.1.2 Theme 2: ‘A difficult but rewarding course’

As mentioned above, this theme describes some ways in which the ICELT course as such was most prominently referred to and represented explicitly in the course researched. After presenting some relevant examples, I will describe some of the reasons given by the tutors to refer to the course in the way they did, and the conditions they considered necessary to exist for the course to remain faithful to its representation. This will provide further insight into the explicit representations of ICELT in the iteration of the course researched. I will then summarise the content of the theme.

6.3.1.2.1 Sub-theme 2.1: ‘This very important worldwide-recognised teaching qualification’

In general terms, the ICELT course as such was consistently referred to and represented in the course researched in at least three relatively different but interrelated ways: a) as a recognised in-service teacher training qualification (in consonance with the ‘self-definition’ expressed in the official course documents); b) as a difficult but rewarding course, and finally, c) as a professional transformative experience. Whereas these forms are expressed across the data, the examples in this section are taken from early exchanges where they were more clearly articulated.

In the case of a) as ‘a recognised qualification’, ICELT was commonly featured in a celebratory tone as an internationally prestigious course, echoing the self-definition of the course contained in the official course documents (described in Chapter Five). One example that illustrates this case is expressed in the course’s welcome letter in the following terms:

1 We are very pleased to have you as part of our preparation courses towards this very
2 important and worldwide-recognised teaching qualification [emphasis added]

(Course_welcomeletter_2016)

Other similar terms that were also used to refer to this course were: ‘high-quality in-service training’ (Course’s learner contract, 2016), ‘internationally-recognised in-service training for
teachers of English’ (Course’s welcome letter, 2016) and ‘internationally recognized and highly respected certificate’ (Centre’s course’s website).

In the case of b) as a difficult but rewarding course, ICELT was characterised by the course tutors as an intensive learning experience that would make the course candidates grow as teachers. One example that illustrates this discursive sense is expressed below in an exchange where the main course tutor referred to the ‘demanding’ nature of the course before the introduction of an activity aimed to find out what the course candidates knew about ICELT:

1  T1:  I think that during the uhh selection process you were interview [sic] and you were told about how difficult demanding and exhausting this course is (.). Yes?
4  CCs:  Yes!
5  T1:  But you were also told that is a very interesting challenging and ehh very nice course that will change your I hope your perspective about teaching

(Tutor1_inputsession1_28/10/2016)

In the data, the terms ‘difficulty’ and ‘rewarding’ are commonly used together and their use as discreet concepts in relation to the course is rare.

In the case of c) as a professional transformative experience, ICELT is featured in the data as a catalyst in the professional lives of the candidates. The following data extract, taken from an informal conversation between the main course tutor and the course candidates during a session recess, expresses this notion clearly. In the exchange the tutor is comparing the different Cambridge English teaching qualifications and refers to ICELT in the following terms:

1  T1:  ICELT is the course ((pause)) It’s a course someone once said it and I agree that changes your life as a teacher (.)
3  and sometimes even as a person (...)it opens up the world
4  to you (...) it teaches you the new there is out there

(Tutor1_inputsession15_10/03/2017)

The transformative nature of the course is frequently extended to the candidates’ own life and the course is commonly conceptualised in the data in terms of a ‘life-changing’ experience. Other references and representations of the course contained in the data are related to the ‘Cambridge’ name as was seen in the previous theme.
6.3.1.2.2 Sub-theme 2.2: In ICELT we are looking at all the essential elements of ELT

In different exchanges I had with the tutors during the course, I asked them to elaborate further on their references to the ICELT course in class. I intended to understand better the reasoning behind their representations of the course. As the title of this sub-theme suggests, the tutors coincided in expressing different reasons to substantiate their characterisation of the course. In what follows, I will present some of these reasons categorised thematically into two groups: exogenous (when it refers mostly to an external cause or effect) and endogenous (when it refers to an internal origin or effect).

- **Exogenous reasons**

In terms of the exogenous category, all course tutors coincided in expressing the notion that being a course of/sanctioned by ‘Cambridge’ implied to have at least three elements. Each one of these elements was discussed at length with the tutors but for reasons of focus and space, I will only enunciate them here and refer to extracts that illustrate their content: a) ‘good’ regulations, b) access to sound methodological principles in teaching (also conceptualised by the course tutors as ‘the Cambridge best practices’, and c) a program which covered ‘all essential elements in ELT’. At the same time, the main course tutor (himself an ICELT moderator), manifested that the Centre had managed to put together a version of the course that was particularly ‘exhaustive’, ‘integrated’, and ‘well-timed’ compared to other versions of ICELT delivered by other centres (Tutor1_interview_13/07/2017).

- **Endogenous reasons**

In terms of the endogenous category, the tutors coincided in pointing out two reasons for referring to the course in the way they did it in class: the intrinsic value of being a ‘difficult’ course and the practical effects that the course had on the candidates’ professional development. Regarding the former, two of the course tutors coincided that the ‘difficult’, ‘demanding’, and ‘exhaustive’ nature of ICELT was in itself something ‘positive’ because it could help to instil in the candidates important ‘values’ (such as ‘responsibility’, ‘dedication’, and ‘discipline’) that they would later transmit to their students (Tutor1_interview_13/07/2017). Regarding the latter, all the course tutors concurred in expressing that ICELT constituted a path to the professionalisation of the candidates that put them in contact with the latest developments in ELT and helped them work better with what was clearly assumed to be a central element in the course candidates’
teaching contexts: the textbook. As in the previous case, these two aspects were talked over extensively with the course tutors and as such will be referred to later in this study.

Even though the link between the course’s representations and the reasons given to substantiate such representations is not completely clear, it is possible to argue that the exogenous reasons mentioned by the course tutors correspond to the benefits of a recognised in-service teacher training qualification (the first discursive sense) and that the endogenous reasons seem to touch both on ‘a difficult but rewarding course’, and ‘a professional transformative experience’, correspondingly, i.e., the second and third discursive senses of the representations of the course referred to above.

6.3.1.2.3 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described three ways in which the ICELT course as such was most prominently referred to and represented explicitly during the course researched. At the same time, I briefly mentioned some of the reasons given by the tutors to refer to the course in the way they did in order to gain further insight into their ideas and opinions.

6.3.1.3 Theme 3: ‘It’s not anymore what it used to be’

This theme contains a thematic summary of the criticism of ICELT expressed by the tutors. As mentioned earlier, this perspective on the course could be well conceptualised as a ‘private representation’ because the ideas expressed were not made public but communicated in one-on-one conversations throughout the iteration of the course researched, particularly within the falsification phase of research (as described in 4.6). Even though the opinions of the tutors on the course seem to be expressed categorically, they are the result of a dialogic process where trust-building played an important role for the tutors to feel comfortable enough to express their ideas to me as the researcher.

The theme is composed of three sub-subthemes called ‘One size fits all’, which refers to criticism of the ICELT program, ‘Where is the development?’ which refers to criticism of the academic management of the course, and finally ‘It’s because we consume’, which refers to some causes identified by the tutors in their discourse. It is important to mention that the tutors were also ICELT moderators which explains, in part, the general perspective that they adopted when expressing their opinions (e.g., generalising rather than referring only to the ICELT course at the
Centre). Each sub-subtheme contains relevant examples from the data to illustrate its content. At the end of the theme, I will summarise the content.

Finally, as was referred to in Chapter Four, for ethical reasons, sensitive criticism expressed in the data was not considered for this analysis. However, what is represented here constitutes an interesting (and complex) source of data because, among other things, it shows part of the discursive background that informs the ideas and opinions that the tutors felt confident to express to me in the conversations we had during the course.

6.3.1.3.1 Sub-theme 3.1: ‘One size fits all’

The first area of the ICELT course where the criticism of the tutors was most prominently focused on was the course program, particularly on what has been identified in this study as one of the distinctive central components of the course, namely: the adaptation of the course to the course candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs (see p. 99). In general, all tutors coincided in expressing that, even though this principle was partially realised, what prevailed in the course was a one-size-fits-all approach that did not account for all candidates and contexts. This notion is clearly expressed in the data extract shown below where course tutor 2 also asserts that it would be necessary to find a way to make the course instruction correspond to the candidates:
In addition to this, another tutor commented that ICELT didn’t contemplate conducting any kind of research by the tutors to determine the needs of the candidates to ‘make [the] program more appropriate to them’. For this purpose, she suggested the implementation of a diagnostic practice teaching observation (PTO) along with a needs analysis questionnaire in the course (Tutor3_interview_12/07/2017).

The tutors also referred to other distinguishing central elements, such as the grammar-based approach to language (identified in See 5.5.1.3. See p. 123), stating that perhaps there was too much focus on ‘language awareness’ in the course and that even though this topic was necessary, particularly to complete the written assignments of the course, the inclusion of other topics in the course would undoubtedly enrich it by being more in line with what the candidates really wanted and actually did in their classes (Tutor2_interview_12/07/2017).

6.3.1.3.2 Sub-theme 3.2: ‘Where is the development?’

Another area where the criticism of the tutors was most prominently focused on was the area of academic management, especially in terms of the delivery of the course as such. In a sense, the criticism expressed by them was fundamentally self-criticism, even though they also referred to
courses in other institutions that they had got to know first-hand in their capacity as ICELT course moderators. In what follows, I will refer to only three aspects of the delivery of the course where there was agreement among all or almost all of the tutors: the timetable of the course; the performance of the tutors in the course, and the design of the course.

- The academic administrative timetable of the ICELT courses

According to the course tutors, the administrative timetable of the course was a constant cause of concern in ICELT courses in Mexico (including the course researched), especially regarding the delay with which the assessed teaching practices and the written assignments used to be conducted and marked, sometimes by the end of the course, and in the most extreme cases, up to one year after the course had formally finished. In one of our conversations concerning this topic, the main course tutor expressed the following:

T1: Este entonces sí todo lo van a hacer al final y a la carrera pues obviamente ¿dónde está el desarrollo? ¿dónde está el coucheo? ¿dónde está el scaffolding ((pausa)) que es el espíritu del curso? Si todo se lo van a regresar al final ¿dónde está que puedan ver su errores en el ensayo anterior para no repetirlos? El C1-4 es muy parecido al C1-2 (.) Si no les han regresado el C1-2 pues ¿cómo van a hacer el C1-4 bien? Entonces pues es un desastre, aquí en México es un desastre (.) Y ese está pasando (...) en todos lados.

So if everything is going to be done at the end and in a rush obviously where is the development? Where is the coaching? Where is the scaffolding ((pause)) which is the spirit of the course? If everything is going to be returned at the end where is [the assignment] so that they can see their mistakes in the previous essay so as not to repeat them? (.) The C1-4 is very similar to the C1-2 (.). If they have not received back the C1-2 then how are they going to do well the C1-4 well? So it is a disaster here in Mexico it is a disaster (.) And that is happening in (...) everywhere.

(Tutor1_interview_20/06/2017)

- The performance of the tutors in class

Another aspect pointed out by the tutors as problematic was the performance of the tutors in the course which, according to them tended to be uneven, i.e., not at the same quality level, in particular in relation to the input sessions delivery and the level of personalisation with the candidates. The tutors coincided in recognising that such asymmetry had a major impact on the progress of the candidates in the course and on the quality of ICELT as a whole. Some of the tutors believed that this was the unavoidable expression of the work overload of the course tutors, whereas another tutor maintained that it was more the expression of the lack of attention and
interest by Cambridge English to oversee in earnest the iterations of the course, particularly in Mexico.

- The design of the course

Another aspect considered problematic of ICELT by the course tutors was the very design of the course which, in their opinion, in many aspects conflicted with the principles of the course and even with their principles, as tutors. This notion was clearly expressed by tutor 3 who referred to the tension between efficiency and effectiveness in her intervention in the course:

T3: [¿]uiero ser una tutora eficiente que de una instrucción clara y precisa a ellos para que entonces ellos puedan llegar implementarla en sus salones (.) pero ¿qué tan efectiva es? (.¡) Si estamos contando que Yolanda da primarias Enrique, da universidad ¿no? Rodolfo está en una escuela de idiomas y Rogelio está en primarias y no se (pause) pues no no es tan efectiva porque todos necesitan cosas diferentes y no se las estamos dando lo que realmente necesitan

[I] want to be an efficient tutor who has a clear and precise instruction that reaches [the candidates] clearly and precisely so that they can go back and implement it in their classrooms (.) but how effective is it? (.) If we are saying that Yolanda teaches at a primary level Enrique teaches at a university level right? Rodolfo is in a language school and Rogelio is in an elementary school I don't know ((pause)) well it seems that is not so effective because everyone needs different things and we are not providing them with what they really need

(Tutor3_interview_12/07/2017)

Along with their criticism of the course, the tutors coincided in expressing scepticism not only about the possibility of change in relation to the problems they had identified but particularly in their possibilities to effect such change, not just as course tutors but even as course moderators.

6.3.1.3.3 Sub-theme 3.3: ‘It’s because we consume’

Digging deeper into their criticism of the course, the tutors pointed out some reasons that, according to them, were behind some of the problematic aspects of ICELT to which they had referred. In what follows, I will present a thematic summary of their comments, categorised into three groups, according to the theoretical dimension they touch upon economic reasons, cultural reasons and geopolitical reasons. Briefly:
• The predominance of economic reasons

According to the course tutors, the economic interest around the ICELT course tended to prevail over the academic interest, notably in terms of the distribution of financial resources for running the course. The tutors mentioned they thought this affected the administration and operation (and even the design) of the course. For them, this would explain the origin of different issues such as the composition of the candidature (e.g., pre-service candidates accepted into the course); the number of tutors in each iteration of the course (up to nine in some iterations), or the course oversight of Cambridge English Assessment (e.g., the moderation of the courses were conducted by course tutors of different institutions that would be later moderated by the tutors who had just been assessed by them), among others.

• Lack of theoretical and methodological independence

Two of the tutors referred to a lack of theoretical and methodological independence in language teacher education and the absence of any proper response, claiming that ‘Mexico [sic] has never been a country where we challenge’ or ‘question’ (Tutor1_interview_20/06/20170). One of the tutors claimed that being compelled to follow a fixed syllabus in ICELT was an expression of Mexico’s dependency. She then expressed that instead of producing new content tutors and teachers in Mexico consume it. She said it in the following terms:

T3: México está en la periferia (.) se escucha feo pero está en la periferia de los que importan consumen reproducen lo que viene del centro ((pausa)) creo nosotros estamos en eso (.) si nosotros somos parte de eso (.) nosotros consumimos

Mexico is on the periphery (.) it sounds ugly but it is on the periphery of those who import consume reproduce what comes from the centre ((pause)) I think we are in that (.) yes we are part of that (.) we consume

Tutor3_interview_20170126

• Commoditisation of teacher education

Finally, even though it was prompted by my line of questioning and use of language, all tutors acknowledge the existence of an ‘establishment’ in language teacher education and used this concept to discuss the causes behind the issues identified in the ICELT course. The following data extract portraits the moment when I introduced this notion in one of the exchanges with the tutors and the tutor reference to the commoditisation of teacher education:
Similar exchanges contained in the data referred to the notion of an ‘establishment’ from different perspectives and attitudes. However, what remains relatively unchanged is precisely the conceptualisation of international players, agencies or groups of interest as, precisely, an ‘establishment’.

6.3.1.3.4 Theme summary

In summary, this theme offered a thematic overview of the criticism of ICELT expressed by the course tutors. As was described, this criticism was focused on two main areas: the ICELT program and the academic management of the course. In addition to this, I included a thematic summary of the insights of the tutors into the general causes behind some of the problematic aspects of the course referred to by them and described in the previous two sections of the theme.

6.3.1.4 Overarching theme summary

Overall, my analysis generated three themes that captured and described different aspects of how the ICELT course was most prominently represented in the data, including the criticism of the tutors on the course.
The first theme, called ‘It’s not us... It’s Cambridge! (implicit representation)’, referred to the polysemic and omni-semantic nature of the use of the concept of ‘Cambridge’ in the course in relation to the general representation of ICERT. Discursively, such use contributed to reinforce, among other things, the authority of ICERT in the course, making it appear natural or commonsensical.

The second theme called ‘A difficult but rewarding course’ described some prominent and prevalent ways in which ICERT was explicitly referred to in the course (as a recognised in-service teacher training qualification, as a difficult but rewarding course, and as a professional and life transformative experience). This theme also included a thematic summary of the reasons given by the tutors to refer to the course in the way they did (e.g., ‘good’ regulations, ‘the Cambridge best practices’, a program which covered ‘all essential elements in ELT’, and so on), as well as some sine qua non-conditions they thought were necessary for the course to maintain its integrity (e.g., the administration of the course, the course tutors themselves, and the course candidates).

Finally, the third overarching theme called ‘Not anymore what it used to be’, summarised the criticism of the course expressed by the tutors in one-to-one conversations. As was seen, this perspective was in tension and conflict with different aspects of the representation of the ICERT expressed in the course documents and also by them during the sessions. Such criticism expressed a different type of representation of the course and offered, at the same time, more complex insight into the thinking of the tutors.

![Thematic map](image)

Figure 6.1 Thematic map of section 6.3: ‘Representation of the ICERT course in the course researched’
6.4 The representation of the course tutors

This section presents the result of my analytic process in relation to the second research question of this study (2) ‘What is particular in one iteration of ICELT’?, and with reference to one research sub-question: (2.4) How do the course tutors position themselves in relation to the course and the participants?

My analytic process produced one theme that describes the positioning of the tutors in the course, particularly in terms of their interaction with the candidates during the face-to-face input sessions.

Regarding this topic, my analytic claim (fifth in this study) is that the data show that the tutors represented their general role in the course as mediators between ‘Cambridge’ and the candidates and that this representation was expressed verbally, through the use of different forms of appeal, and also non-verbally, through the control of the talking time in the sessions of the course and a proxemic behaviour described as consistently ‘dominant’, ‘self-confident’, and ‘in control’.

6.4.1 Theme 4: ‘Tutors are essential in ICELT’

This theme describes aspects of the verbal and non-verbal positioning of the tutors in the course researched. The title of the theme attempts to capture the way in which the tutors characterised their general role in the course. The theme is composed of two sub-themes. The first theme, called ‘We know what Cambridge wants’, looks at the verbal representation of the tutors of their role in the course (briefly referred to in 6.3.4). The second sub-theme, called ‘Consistently dominant, self-confident, and in control’, looks at aspects of the non-verbal communication of the tutors in the on-site input sessions of the course, such as their proxemic behaviour and their talking time, as they were identified in the data.

6.4.1.1 Sub-theme 4.1: ‘We know what Cambridge wants’

Parallel to the discursive prominence of the names of ‘Cambridge’ and ‘ICELT’ (p. 140) in the course, the tutors positioned their role as mediators between the candidates and ‘Cambridge’, particularly in relation to the course’s assessment components. Thematically such mediation was expressed in the data in at least three forms: by appealing to their credibility; by giving ‘expert’
detailed guidelines, and by appealing to the candidates’ emotions. I will comment briefly on each one of them:

- **Appealing to their credibility**

According to my analysis, one of the most prevalent ways in which the tutors positioned their role in the course was by appealing to their credibility as knowers of the course, especially of the course guidelines. The following data excerpt exemplifies how this notion was expressed in the course. The context of the exchange is the review of the specifications of one of the methodology assignments:

1. T: I’m going to be repeating this again and pay attention to what we say ok? (.). It’s really important, listen: *No es Capricho*’ [it’s not a whim]. I want you to understand this ok? (.). It’s that we know what Cambridge asks for and if we do not fulfil the requirements from Cambridge they will send back the papers [emphasis added]

   (Tutor2_inputsession13_24/02/2017)

This type of appeals (the ‘we-really-know-what-Cambridge-wants’ type of appeal) was a constant during the course, particularly when setting the language tasks and methodology assignments, and also after marking them.

- **Giving ‘expert’ detailed guidelines**

As the data show, the tutors also positioned their role as mediators in the course by providing ‘expert’ detailed guidelines to the candidates in each assessment component. As mentioned earlier, the tutors devoted an important amount of time in the course to determine and clarify the meaning of the assessment guidelines of each component and then, to provide support to the candidates to complete them. According to the course data, the candidates were constantly reminded of the importance of following such guidelines, as described in the following data extract. The context of the exchange is the setup of one of the Methodology assignments (Assignment 2: Planning beyond the lesson):
Appealing to the course candidates’ emotions

The last prevalent way identified in the data in which the tutors positioned their role in the course was by appealing to the course candidates’ emotions, especially their angst. While this type of appeal has been identified in my analysis as a theme in its own right (see p. 196), the following example illustrates the nature of this positioning in the course. The text extract featured in this example was identified in an email that the main course tutor sent to the course candidates after marking one of their assignments:

As the extract shows, the course tutor seems to link following his guidelines with a passing grade in the assignment. He then warns the candidates about following these guidelines if they want to continue receiving support from him. This kind of appeal is common in the data and as such, will be referred to in some detail in 6.7 (see p. 196).

6.4.1.2 Sub-theme 4.2: ‘Consistently dominant, self-confident, and in control’

Regarding the non-verbal communication of the tutors in the on-site input sessions of the course, one aspect particularly significant identified in the data is their proxemic behaviour, i.e., the use that the tutors made of their personal space and physical posture in relation to the candidates and the physical space of the session room.
In general terms, such behaviour appears characterised in the data as consistently ‘dominant’, ‘self-confident’, and ‘in control’. Figure 6.2 below features one example of my field notes that characterises the observable behaviour displayed by the tutors in one class task as ‘confident but authoritative’.

![Figure 6.2 Screenshot of my field notes - Session 17 / 24th March 2017](image)

In general, such behaviour contributed to reaffirm the positionality of the tutors in the session room, as will be briefly described in what follows:

According to my observations, in terms of the use of their physical space, the tutors usually positioned themselves at the front of the session room facing the candidates, who would normally sit in a horseshoe arrangement, remaining in a standing position and maintaining a vertical public distance with them, as portrayed in Fig 6.3. In this way, the tutors’ use of their personal space would convey a degree of centrality and certain dominance (or sub-ordinance) between them and the candidates during the sessions. At the same time, even though their physical posture was usually friendly, it remained aloof which would only reaffirm their already established authority and status in the session’s room and conversational turn-takings, as depicted in Fig 6.4
Figure 6. 3 Blueprint drawing of the session room (Session 15, 10 March 2017)
It is important to mention that, as the data show, the tutors were normally accessible and willing to answer the candidates’ questions throughout the course. Yet, in general terms, the relationship between the tutors and the candidates remained clearly demarcated, as is expressed, in part, by the use of their personal space and physical posture recorded in the data.

• Tutors’ talking time

Another element identified in the data, related to the non-verbal positioning of the tutors is their talking time in class, i.e., the amount of time that each tutor took to hold the floor during the on-site input sessions. As such, this factor contributed to reaffirm the positionality of the tutors in the course. In what follows, I will describe briefly the result of my analytic process in relation to this aspect:

As the data show, in general, the talking time spent by each one of the tutors in the course sessions was significantly higher than the talking time spent by the candidates. As can be seen in Table 6.3 this was the case in all on-site input sessions but one: Session 27, devoted to the topic of ‘Paradigms in Education’, which was the only input session whose content didn’t have a direct link with the assessment components.

At the same time, Table 6.4 shows the detail of the overall talking time spent by one single tutor (Tutor no. 2) in the on-site input sessions she led during the course. As can be seen, this tutor spent 63% of the session time lecturing (presenting information, asking questions, giving instructions, and commenting on the answers of the candidates) whereas the candidates had
roughly the 37% of the remaining talking time in the sessions (in this case, making/answering questions, reporting results of group discussions in open class feedback, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
<th>ST (mins)</th>
<th>STT (mins)</th>
<th>TTT (mins)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutor 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3190</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>1332</td>
<td>64.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>63.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutor 3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>54.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ST = Session Time  
STT = Session Talking Time  
TTT = Tutor’s Talking Time

Table 6. 3 Average of the Tutors’ Talking Time (TTT) in the on-site input sessions during the course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>ST (mins)</th>
<th>STT (mins)</th>
<th>TTT (min)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Developing receptive skills</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>54.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Controlled vs communicative activities</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Oral correction and feedback</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>54.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teaching different age learners</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Role play, simulation, drama</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>68.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Developing writing skills</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>62.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Error correction and feedback</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>51.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>63.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ST = Session Time  
STT = Session Talking Time  
TTT = Tutor’s Talking Time

Table 6. 4 Tutor no. 2’s Talking Time in the on-site input sessions during the course

This pattern was relatively the same in each session, which not only indicates an uneven (general) distribution of the turns, but it also suggests an uneven distribution of the session’s conversation as such (topics, ideas, and opinions) in the course.

6.4.1.3 Theme summary

In summary, my analytic process generated one theme that captured and described aspects of the verbal and non-verbal positioning of the tutors in the course. The theme described how the tutors positioned their role in the course as mediators between ‘Cambridge’ and the candidates and then, it described their proxemic behaviour and talking time in the on-site input sessions. As was mentioned, both forms contributed, among other things, to affirm the authority of the tutors in the course.
6.5 The ends of ICELT in the iteration of the course researched

This section presents the results of my analysis concerning the second research question of this study ('What is particular in the way the course is implemented?') and, specifically, to research sub-question 2.2: ‘How are the ends of ICELT expressed in one iteration of the course?’ My analytic process produced three overarching themes that attempt to capture and describe relevant aspects of how such ends were expressed in the iteration of the ICELT course researched. The first overarching theme, called ‘the ends of the course as explicit aims’, groups together, as its name indicates, the aims of the course that were explicitly referred to in the data. In turn, the second overarching theme, named ‘the ends of the course as implicit aims’, describes aims that were expressed in a more implicit way. Finally, the third overarching theme, called ‘the ends of the course as de facto aims’, describes one aim that was expressed in a more latent and yet prevalent way.

In general, my analysis indicates that whereas the ‘explicit aims’ were in line with the official aims of the course, the ‘implicit’ and the ‘de facto’ aims differed and contrasted with them. In this sense, my sixth analytic claim is that within the context of the iteration of the course researched, the ends of course were expressed in the data as explicit, implicit and de facto aims, in line (to a certain extent) with the official ends of the course (as described in 5.4. See P. 99) but also beyond them and, in some cases, in contrast to and/or conflict with them.

In what follows then, I will present the results of my analytic process in the form of three overarching themes and four main themes (and subthemes) that form their substance. Each subtheme contains relevant extracts from the data that illustrate the content of each one of them.

6.5.1 Overarching theme: the ends of the course as explicit aims

This overarching theme is composed of two themes that describe the aims of the course that were explicitly referred to as such in the iteration of the course researched. The first theme, called ‘helping course candidates to develop as English language teachers’, identifies the general aim of the course and its corresponding sub-aims. The second theme, called ‘making teachers better’ describes three forms, also expressed in the data, by which the course candidates were expected to improve through the course. The titles of both themes express formal aims, i.e., broad aims that the course explicitly aimed at, whereas the sub-aims (or sub-sections) referred to in the text
express substantive aims, i.e., aims through which the formal aim is realised (as defined by Parfit 1984).

6.5.1.1 Theme 5: Helping course candidates to develop as English language teachers

This theme describes one of the main aims of the ICELT course expressed in the data explicitly. After presenting it, I will comment briefly on the similarities and differences between these aims and the general course aim of the course identified in the official course documents (described in 5.4.1. See p. 100). I will then summarise the content of the theme.

6.5.1.1.1 Sub-theme 5.1 A similar (but different) professional development

Many instances in the data express the notion that the general aim of the course was to help course candidates to develop professionally as English language teachers. As stated, this aim clearly coincides with the general end of ICELT identified in the official course documents (i.e., ‘the development of the course candidates as experienced English teachers). However, even though similar, the end of the course was formulated in slightly different terms by the course tutors and in the documents of the course:

- The formulation by the course tutors

In the case of the tutors of the course, they all coincided in expressing that one of the main aims of the course was to bring the candidates closer to the latest developments in ELT. The main course tutor indicated, for example, that the main aim of the course was for the candidates to develop as more modern, more equipped and reflective teachers. He expressed this notion in the following terms:

T1: [El objetivo principal del curso es] desarrollarse como un maestro más moderno más actualizado con más herramientas para poder enseñar mejor y bueno (.) y sobre todo [con] capacidad de reflexión de autoevaluación

[The main aim of the course is] to develop [the candidates] as more modern up-to-date teachers with more tools to teach better and well (. ) above all [with] capacity for reflection [and] self-evaluation.

(Tutor1_interview_13/07/2017)
Formulation in the documents of the course produced by the Centre

In the documents of the course produced by the centre, the professional development of the candidates in the course was said to be met through the development of the knowledge and skills of the candidates in areas such as professional language competence, teaching knowledge, skills and practice, and assessment and evaluation. The following extract from the Centre’s course website expresses this notion in the following terms:

As can be seen, this formulation coincides in form and content with the ends expressed in the official course documents (see p. 100), even though it adds a new element: teaching methods for the classroom.

In addition, in the course documents each one of these areas links to more specific aims (or sub-aims) that are also explicitly referred to in multiple instances in the data as shown in Table 6.5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of development</th>
<th>Specific aims (examples)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language awareness &amp; language use in the classroom</td>
<td>“[T]o develop professional language and communication skills in English” (Centre’s Course Handbook, p. 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning teaching &amp; teaching methods for the classroom</td>
<td>“[T]o show (...) what [course candidates] are capable of doing and what [they] HAVE been working on and with [in the course]” (Ibid, p. 20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and evaluation</td>
<td>“[T]o identify and account for individual differences and achievement of learners” (Ibid, p. 108)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5 Examples of sub-aims by area in ICELT (as expressed in the iteration of the course researched)

Overall, as can be seen, the general aim and sub-aims described above coincide (perhaps expectedly) with the general end and aims previously identified in the official course documents.
(e.g., both seek to develop the course candidates as English language teachers). However, they also differ in important, even though subtle ways, such as a) the way in which the general aim and sub-aims are articulated in each data set (e.g., the aims in the course researched seem to be slightly more articulated around the assessment components to which they are linked, rather than around the content units) (Cf. Centre 2014, p. 9); b) the language used to express such aims is frequently less formal than in the official documents, and c) the target candidature implied in each case, etc. Regarding the latter, for example, the course researched was open not only to ‘experienced teachers’ (as established in the official syllabus) but also to new teachers, i.e., teachers who were ‘setting out on a career in teaching English as a Foreign Language’ (Welcome letter, p.2).

These slight differences show the beginning of a pattern that will become clearer in the following themes.

6.5.1.1.2 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described one of the general aims and corresponding sub-aims of the course that were thematically identified in the data. In turn, some differences between the course official documents and the data set from the iteration of the course researched have been referred to, adding extra elements to the description of the general aim of the course.

6.5.1.2 Theme 6: Making teachers better

This theme describes the other general aim frequently referred to in the data in an explicit way, namely: ‘Making teachers better’ ‘in’ and ‘by’ the course. This notion is constantly referred to in the data, mostly by the course tutors, and particularly during the on-site input sessions and in the different (formal and less formal) conversations I had with them. As was identified in the data, the improvement of the candidates in the course is said to take place in at least three different ways: by having the candidates adopt a theory-informed practice; by making them step out of their comfort zone, and by transforming them into professional teachers.

In what follows, I will describe each one of these ways briefly:

6.5.1.2.1 Sub-theme 6.1: Having course candidates adopt a theory-informed practice
Many instances in the data refer to the improvement of teachers in ICELT through their adoption of a theory-informed practice. Specifically, ICELT was said to have as an aim to help course candidates to join theory and practice, to use theory to name what they did in their classrooms, and then to reflect on it. This notion was expressed by one of the course tutors when I asked her to comment on what the ICELT course was for her in general and how it helped the candidates:

T2: [Como candidato] el ICELT te ayuda mucho a poner junto la teoría con la práctica (.) a darles nombre a tus conocimientos (.) te enseña a hacer te enseña a ver la teoría de lo que tú estás haciendo bien o estás haciendo mal

[As a candidate] ICELT helps you a lot to put together theory with practice (.) to name what you know (.) it teaches you to teach, it teaches you to see the theory behind of what you are doing right or what you are doing wrong

(Tutor2_interview_22/07/2017)

The notion of being able to ‘name what you know’, or ‘what you do’, is particularly prevalent in the data since it was constantly referred to by the course tutors and later, by the course candidates.

6.5.1.2.2 Sub-theme 6.2: Making course candidates step out of their comfort zone

Another way in which the improvement of the teachers in ICELT was said to be promoted in the course was by making course candidates step out of their comfort zone. This notion was frequently referred to in different instances during the course by the tutors. The notion was first expressed by the main course tutor in the context of the presentation of the assessment components of the course, arguably, as a way of appeasing the increasing signs of uneasiness of the candidates as the session was being unfolded:

1 T: You are already good teachers (.) that’s for sure (.) but the idea is to move you from your comfort zone and make you suffer a little bit
2 ((General laughter))
3 4
5 T: in order to become even better teachers

[Tutor1_inputsession01_28/10/2016]
When I asked him to elaborate further on this notion, the main course tutor told me that the course candidates needed to be forced to leave their comfort zones in order to become better teachers. He said it in the following terms:

T1: [L]os tienes que forzar a abandonar su zona de confort para tratar nuevas cosas para volverse mejores maestros  [Y]ou have to force [the course candidates] to leave their comfort zone to try new things to become better teachers

(Tutor1_interview_28/10/2016)

Both data extracts introduce one notion that was repeated many times as the course unfolded: the belief that pressure enhances learning. This notion will be referred to later in the chapter (see p. 196).

6.5.1.2.3 Sub-theme 6.3: Transforming course candidates into professional teachers

A third way in which ICELT was said to improve course candidates in the course was by transforming them into professional teachers. This notion was expressed to me by the main course tutor in the context of a conversation about the aim of the course:

T1: [E]l ICELT es el curso que te hace un maestro profesional  [T]he ICELT is the course that makes you a professional teacher

(Tutor1_interview_22/07/2017)

Even though this statement was later nuanced, affirming that if the course candidates were already professional ICELT would make them ‘even more professional’, many instances in the data refer to this notion in unequivocal terms. For example, this same notion was expressed by another tutor to whom I also explicitly asked what the aims of ICELT were:

T3: El ICELT hace a los candidatos más organizados (. ) más responsables y profesionales  ICELT makes course candidates more organised (. ) more responsible and professional

(Tutor3_interview_12/07/2017)
The notion that ICELT would help the candidates become ‘professional’ or ‘more professional’ expressed by the course tutors seems to suggest that the tutors had assumed that the candidates lacked this condition, or that if they possessed it, it was potentially in need of improvement. In either case, the notion that the candidates had some sort of deficit in terms of 'professionalism' that needed to be addressed seems to be implied.

Even though each one of the forms described above potentially constitutes an aim in itself, they are all samples of specific ways in which the improvement of the course candidates was said to take place in the course.

6.5.1.2.4 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the second way in which the aims of ICELT were explicitly expressed in the course, namely: as formal aims. As was seen, this theme is formed by three subthemes (or sub-sections) that captured and described its specific content, i.e., three prominent and prevalent ways in which is expressed in the data that the course candidates would improve during the course.

6.5.2 Overarching theme: the ends of the course as implicit aims

This overarching theme is composed of one single theme that describes one of the general aims of the course that was expressed in an implicit way during the iteration of the course researched. The theme, called ‘And then one day you´ll be doing the DELTA…’ expresses the notion that an additional and also prominent aim of the course researched was to prepare the course candidates for the Cambridge DELTA course. This theme is formed by four sub-themes that describe the way in which this aim was expressed in the data.

6.5.2.1 Theme 7: ‘And then one day you´ll be doing the DELTA…’

The notion that the course had as one of its aims to prepare course candidates for the Cambridge DELTA course was not immediately apparent in the data. This is because even though this notion was made explicit on some occasions during the course researched, as will be referred to later in the theme, this aim remained expressed mostly implicitly in the data. It only became apparent relatively late in my analytic process after the cross-analysis of three salient elements: the conceptualisation in the data of Continuous Professional Development in terms of the Teacher Development program of Cambridge English; the process of standardisation of the teaching
qualifications of Cambridge English (CELTA-ICELT-DELTA) that took place at the Centre at the time of the course, and finally, the discursive positioning of the ICETL course as a stepping stone to the DELTA course (and beyond!) expressed in the course. Each one of these elements will be described in what follows.

6.5.2.1.1 Sub-theme 7.1: CPD as Cambridge English CPD

The first element that substantiates the notion that the course aimed to prepare candidates for the DELTA course is the conceptualisation of continuous professional development in the course in relation to the Teacher Development program of Cambridge English to which the ICETL course belonged (UCLES 2016). As was seen earlier, this notion is also identified in the course official documents (see p. 96). One example that illustrates this reference is expressed in the following exchange between the main course tutor and one candidate. The context of the exchange is an inquiry made by the tutor into the past training experiences of the course candidates during one of the input sessions of the course. Standing by the classroom whiteboard, and having as a reference a sketchy version of the Cambridge English Teacher Development Matrix (Figure 6.5), the tutor began to draw parallel lines between such matrix and the course candidates´ training experiences as they were referring to them. In one instance, the tutor not only diminishes the candidate’s past training experience but he fundamentally seems to privilege the ICETL course over it:

1 T: (...) and your previous training?
2 S: I (.). I (.). I’ve taken [a] teacher’s course
3 T: Where?
4 S: Where? ((pause)) Well ((pause)) in the Institute*
5 T: in the [Inst]?
6 S: well in high school I also
7 T: No, It’s okay ((murmuring))
8 S: ((unintelligible))
9 T: Don’t worry (.). You are already enrolled here
10 S: Yes
11 T: so it doesn’t matter (.). anymore

*Pseudonym

(Tutor1_inputsession04_18/11/2016)
Even though this specific kind of conversational exchange is not frequent in the data, the discursive positioning of the Teacher Development program of Cambridge English as the referent of CPD par excellence is rather recurrent and salient in the data.

6.5.2.1.2 Sub-theme 7.2: Standardisation of the Cambridge CELTA-ICELT-DELTA program

The second element identified in the data that substantiates the notion that the course aimed to prepare candidates for the DELTA course is the process of standardisation of the Cambridge English teaching qualifications undertaken at the centre where the researched ICELT course took place. According to the General Director of the centre, such a process consisted of ‘the homogenisation of the CELTA, the ICELT, and the DELTA courses’ which implied, among other things, ‘a major overhaul’ of the ICELT course (interview, 17 July 2017). Some of the changes implemented were, according to him, the suppression of certain topics/input sessions that were not aligned with the DELTA syllabus in the ICELT program (e.g., the topic of ‘discipline in the classroom’ was eliminated, fundamentally ‘because Celta and DELTA are for adults’, which, according to him, made the topic ‘less relevant’. Another change was the design of the lesson plan...
to a ‘CELTA-DELTA format’ with new sections, such as the anticipation of ‘possible problems and solutions’, ‘just like in DELTA’ (see Appendix 10). A comment made by one of the course tutors in relation to the ‘homogenisation’ of these courses expresses not only her agreement with such changes but perhaps her potential internalisation of them:

6.5.2.1.3 Sub-theme 7.3: A steppingstone to DELTA

The third and last element identified in the data in relation to the articulation of this theme was the constant references made by the course tutors to the DELTA course. In the data, such references often adapt the form of ‘added-value creation’, i.e., increasing the existing perceived value from customers (Chernatony, Harris, and Dall’Olmo Riley 2000). In this case, this was expressed by making the DELTA desirable to the course candidates and, at the same time, positioning the ICELT course as a steppingstone to this course (and beyond!). Figure 6.6 below, portrays such a positionality. The slide comes from a PowerPoint presentation which was available to the candidates on the course website, where ICELT is positioned as a ‘developmental course’ between the Cambridge ‘CELTA’ and ‘DELTA’ courses:

{Tutor3_interview_12/07/2017}
Another example identified in that data that portrays this notion comes from a conversation between the tutor and the course candidates. The exchange took place when the whole class had returned from a diploma’s delivery ceremony of DELTA certificates held at the centre’s facilities and to which all candidates had been invited. In the exchange, the tutor expresses that the purpose of having invited them had been for them to know that DELTA was the next step for them. She expressed this notion in the following terms:

```
T3: The whole point you know of (.) of (.) of inviting you was
just for you to realise that you can do it (.) that you
can do it! Exactly! (.) I mean (.) ICERT of course you
will do it (.) coz you’re already here, right? ((pause))You
can go through all the process and one day you’ll doing
CRA:AM [Certificate of Advanced Methodology] and then one
day you’ll be doing DELTA ok? Yeah that’s what we want
right? [Looking at me] Right Ernesto?
Me: uh? ( . ) Yeah
((crosstalk))
T3: Ok (.) So it’s not just you know like the fact that you
are here [pointing at the floor] ‘here!’ Ok? (.)but
that one day you will be (.) [pointing at me] there!
```

(Tutor3_inputsession17_24/03/2017)

Other references to the DELTA course in the data are more subtle -and perhaps less structured- but still, relatively frequent. However, these references by themselves are insufficient to substantiate the notion expressed by the theme, namely: that one of the aims of the course was to prepare course candidates for the DELTA course. It is not until all contextual elements are considered together that it is possible to distinguish a fully realised theme in the data (Clarke and Braun 2013).
6.5.2.1.4 Sub-theme 7.4: Succeed in the field of TESOL

Another implicit aim identified in the data that, for reasons of space, I cannot develop here, is contained in the notion that the course provided the candidates with ‘all they need[ed] to succeed in the field of TESOL’ (Course’s website 2017). Even though this notion is not prevalent, it is salient because it expresses an implicit aim that arguably the course as such is intended to fulfil, namely: to help candidates get validated as members of the TESOL community.

6.5.2.1.5 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the main implicit aim of the course thematically identified in the data, namely: to prepare the course candidates for the Cambridge DELTA course. Even though this aim was difficult to identify at the beginning of my analysis, it became manifest with the consideration of the three contextual elements, as described above. Finally, another implicit aim identified in the data was also referred to.

6.5.3 Overarching theme: the ends of the course as de facto aims

This overarching theme is formed by one single theme that describes the last main aim identified in the data, namely: to help the course candidates to get their certificates of completion of the course. I have characterised this aim as ‘de facto’ because its ‘reality’ can be inferred from the data, even though this aim was not expressed nor acknowledged as such in the course. As can be expected, the identification of this aim was not immediate, but it was produced by the cross-analysis of different contextual elements which will be discussed in what follows.

6.5.3.1 Theme 8: Helping course candidates to get the ICELT certificate

As is indicated by its title, this theme expresses the notion that another main aim in the course researched was to help the participants to complete the course and get their certificates. As mentioned above, the identification of this aim in the data was conducted at a latent level rather than a semantic level. This involved the consideration of different contextual elements which form the substance of two subthemes. The first subtheme, called ‘The tutors are here to help you’, refers to the expressions of help and support made by the tutors to the candidates during the
course. The second theme, called ‘Surprise, surprise! We have already seen all these topics’, refers to the ways in which this support was offered.

6.5.3.1.1 Sub-theme 8.1: The tutors are here to help you

The expressions of help and support to the candidates are constant in the data, particularly in the Centre’s course documents and in the speech of the tutors. One data extract that talks about the tutors’ role notes that: ‘[t]he tutors are approaching the course with a collaborative attitude’ (Learner Contract, p. 3). Another instance expresses unambiguously that ‘[the tutors’] aim principally is to give [the course candidates] maximum help and support during the course’ (Welcome Letter, p. 4). A different instance in the data simply expresses that: ‘[the tutors] are here to help you’ (Centre 2014, p. 8). As has been mentioned already, the course tutors reproduced these same expressions throughout the course, making explicit their roles in ICELT as facilitators.

6.5.3.1.2 Sub-theme 8.2: Surprise, surprise! We have already seen all these topics

The other contextual element identified in the data were the different forms in which the help and support from the tutors were provided during the course, particularly in relation to the assessment components. In what follows, I will describe the three most prominent and prevalent forms identified in the data: the time of the input sessions spent on assessment procedures (that, at the same time, constituted a source of concern for the candidates); the close relationship between the input sessions’ content and the assessment components, and finally, the extra guidelines to complete the assessment components provided to the candidates by the course tutors. Briefly:

- Time of the input sessions spent on assessment procedures

According to the main course tutor, the substantial amount of time allocated in the course schedule for administrative matters had the expressed purpose of helping the course candidates to complete their assessment components. Among other things, such time was devoted to explain and clarify doubts in relation to the assessment components’ guidelines, the assessment criteria for each component and the resolution of the course candidates’ doubts in relation to the procedures to follow in each case, etc.) (See Appendix 11).
According to the data, as the course progressed, considerably more time was spent on administrative matters than the one that had originally been planned for this purpose, partly because of the importance that the assessment components themselves had in the course, as will be seen in more detail in 6.6.

- The relation between the input sessions’ content – assessment components

Another element identified in the data that had the expressed purpose of helping the course candidates to complete the assessment components of the course was the alignment identified in the content of the input sessions of the course and the topics of the assessment components, i.e., the teaching practice observations (PTOs) and the course essays (the language tasks and the methodology assignments). In the case of the former, for example, the data indicates that each input session included a *demo class* that the course candidates were expected to take as a model for their assessed practices. In the case of the latter, the content of the input session was said to serve as a basis for each essay. The following exchange between the main course tutor and the course candidates illustrates this point. The context of the exchange is the discussion of the specifics of ‘Assignment 1: Evaluation of teaching’. In this assignment, the candidates were required to evaluate their teaching with reference to the topic of classroom management and other classroom-related categories or items. In the exchange the course tutor tells the candidates that all the topics related to this assignment had already been seen in class and that, in this sense, they were unlikely to fail:

1 T: What is this assignment about?
2 S: Methodology
3 T: Yes but what is the title of the assignment? ‘Evaluation of teaching’. So what are you going to evaluate?
4 N: your own teaching
5 T: What aspects are you going to evaluate?
6 [reading from the guidelines] the achievement of your learning objectives (.), design and implementation of tasks and activities (.), classroom management (.), teachers’ and learner language ((pause))
7 T: Surprise, surprise! We have already seen all these topics (.).
8 so it is impossible for you to fail.

Extra help: ‘friendly guidelines’

Another element identified in the data that expresses the way in which the help and support from the course tutors took place in the iteration of the course researched was the delivery to the
course candidates of extra guidelines for every course assignment. Overall, the so-called ‘friendly guidelines’ provided a short version of the official guidelines in the form of a template that the course candidates were expected to follow when writing the course assignments, i.e., the language tasks, and the methodology assignments (see Appendix 12). The main course tutor explained the rationale behind these guidelines in the following terms:

1 T: So I’m giving you my famous guidelines now for your eyes
2 Only
3 (General laughter))
4 This is among us ((whispering)) This is not allowed by
5 Cambridge because he [sic] believes is too much support
6 (General laughter))
7 T: Yes but I want to make a deal with you (.). If you receive
8 this plus my explanation plus the guidelines plus
9 (unintelligible)) that [your assignments] won’t be a
10 Resubmission (.). Is that a deal?
11 CCs: Yes!
12 T: ((adopting a more serious tone)) This is important (.). We
13 try to help you as much as we can ok?

(Tutor1_inputsession04_18/11/2017)

Given the fact that the so-called ‘friendly guidelines’ were in fact ‘authorised’ by Cambridge Assessment English, it is possible to think that the tutor essentially adopted an ironic tone in this exchange. However, at the same time, it is also possible to think that the friendly guidelines are likely to have constituted perhaps ‘too much support’ for the candidates as stated by the main course tutor.

6.5.3.1.3 Theme summary

In summary, this theme described the last main aim identified in the data, namely: to help course candidates to get their certificates. This theme was expressed in the data in a de facto way, which means that its identification was inferred from different contextual elements which were categorised, described and commented on above.

6.5.4 Overarching themes summary

In summary, my analytic process generated three overarching themes and four themes that attempt to capture and describe relevant aspects of the way in which the ends of the course were expressed in the iteration of the course researched. Each theme is formed by different subthemes or sub-sections that help to organise the content of each theme. The first two themes, ‘Helping
course candidates to develop as English language teachers’ and ‘Making teachers better’ captured and described the aims of the course that were expressed in the data in an explicit way. The third theme, ‘And then one day you’ll be doing the DELTA...’, showed the main aim (and sub-aims) identified in the data that was expressed in an implicit way, as well as the contextual elements from which such aim was derived. Finally, the fourth theme, ‘Helping course candidates to get the ICELT certificate’, described a practical, or a rather pragmatic aim, expressed in the data in a de facto way, i.e., actually existing but not articulated nor acknowledged as such in the course researched. The overarching themes, themes and subthemes (or sub-sections) of this section are summarised in Figure 6.7 below:

Figure 6.7 Thematic map of section 6.5: ‘The ends of ICELT in the iteration of the course researched’

6.6 The operationalisation of the distinctive components of ICELT in the iteration of the course researched

This section presents the result of my analytic process regarding the second research question of this study (‘What is particular in the way the course is implemented?’) and, specifically, in relation to the research sub-question 2.3 ‘How are the distinctive components of ICELT operationalised in one iteration of the course?’ The section is composed of one overarching theme and three themes
that attempt to describe how each distinctive component (identified in 5.5. See p. 115) was operationalised in the course researched. It also aims to describe the tensions, constraints and also spaces for manoeuvre that were captured in the data.

My analytic claim related to this topic (seventh claim) is, precisely, that the operationalisation of the distinctive components was thematically expressed in the iteration of the course researched primarily through the assessment components, and also through the input sessions and the observations, even though it was not always fully realised nor free from tensions or constraints as will be seen in what follows.

6.6.1 Overarching theme: Assessment, assessment, assessment!

The overarching theme presented in this section is composed of three themes that describe different aspects identified in the data of the operationalisation of the distinctive components of ICELT in the course researched. The name of this overarching theme attempts to express the prominence that the assessment components had in this process, even though they were not the only element through which this process was realised. In turn, the names of the themes (‘Tell me, how do we manage to adapt ICELT for all of them?’; ‘You cannot focus only on grammar, grammar, grammar... what about skills?’ and ‘Who learns?... The students!’ correspondingly), express, in a sense, the tensions identified in the operationalisation of each element.

In what follows then, I will present the themes and subthemes that express salient aspects of the data in relation to the operationalisation of the fundamentals of the course identified in my analysis of the course official documents.

6.6.1.1 Theme 9: ‘Tell me, how do we manage to adapt ICELT for all of them?’

As the data indicate, the notion that the course was adapted to the candidates, their teaching contexts and specific needs was recurrent in the data of the course researched. Different instances in the data explicitly refer to this principle stating that, for example, ‘the ICELT course [was] designed to reflect [the course candidates’] specific needs and working context’ (Centre’s course website 2017). However, the actual implementation or operationalisation of this principle was complex and difficult. In what follows, I will present salient aspects of this process identified in the data in three elements of the course where the operationalisation of this principle was
consistently expressed: the peer observations, the input sessions and the assessment components, correspondingly.

6.6.1.1.1 Sub-theme 9.1: ‘A mirror of your own teaching’

According to my analysis, one element in the course where the notion of the adaptation of ICELT to the course candidates was consistently expressed and operationalised was the peer observation tasks, where the expression of this principle was prominent and prevalent. As was described earlier, in this component the candidates were required to conduct eight non-assessed directed observations of fellow teachers, and then reflect on their own teaching experience in the light of their observations. The following extract illustrates the way in which this principle was operationalised in the course. The extract features some questions that were asked to the candidates to prompt them to reflect on their teaching practice and context in one of the observations tasks:

1 Using this observed lesson as a mirror of your own teaching, what comments can you make about teaching receptive skills in your classes? Is there anything you would want to change, experiment with, how could you go about doing so? What aspects would you like to develop in the future?

(Course_peerobservationtask7_2017)

The data also show that, in the feedback of the peer observations tasks provided to the candidates, the course tutors frequently required them to expand on their answers to provide more detailed information about their contexts in their reflections. The following extract illustrates this pattern. The extract features a comment written by a tutor on the candidate’s reflection, suggesting that she elaborated more on her description of her teaching practice and context:

1 Elaborating more on this information would have been desirable, because the reader does not know how you develop receptive skills in your students.

(Victoria_peerobservationtask7_2017)
Even though the focus and process to conduct each observation was ‘directed’, i.e., pre-established, the overall objective in each case was for the course candidates to explore further their contexts and students in order to gain insights ‘into new teaching ideas, classroom techniques’ and, at the same time, ‘observe [their] students and [see] how they respond and work’ (Course administrator_interview_07/07/2017).

6.6.1.1.2 Sub-theme: 9.2: ‘Planned according to the group’

Another component of the course where the notion of the adaptation of ICELT to the course candidates was expressed was the on-site and on-line input sessions. Even though these sessions were delivered following a fixed syllabus (see p. 134), such sessions were said to have been planned ‘according to [the] group’ (Centre’s course website 2017), i.e., in relation to the course candidates and their teaching contexts. As the data show, some candidates expressed that topics seen during the course sessions corresponded with their teaching contexts and/or their interests. However, the data also indicate that for many candidates such correspondence was less obvious and, in some instances, even conflicting. A case in point was the topic area of language systems, particularly grammar. As will be seen later in the chapter, this area represented the main topic or focus of an important number of sessions even though in the teaching practice of many candidates this element constituted a peripheral (or inexistent) aspect. This was the case of, for example, Javier, Mariana, Juan, Miranda, Dona, and Cesar, among others, who taught English through other approaches or methods, such as songs and role-plays, subject-content, or even literature, with little grammar work or not grammar focus at all.

Three case studies, presented in Chapter Seven of this study, document different tensions between some topic areas or content of the course and the teaching contexts of different candidates.
6.6.1.1.3 Sub-theme 9.3: ‘You will be required to plan, teach and evaluate four lessons’

The principle of adaptation to the candidates is also recurrent in the assessment components of the course. As the data indicates, almost all language tasks and methodology assignments (components 1 and 3), as well as the practical teaching observations (Component 2) required that the course candidates took their learners as the basis for their analysis. However, the data indicate that different circumstances complicated the operationalisation of this principle.

One circumstance was related to the fact that not all candidates were assessed teaching their groups because some of them used borrowed groups in their assessed observations. Another circumstance was that some candidates expressed being unfamiliar or uncomfortable using the required teaching frameworks and the language focus in some of their teaching practices. Finally, as indicated on the data, the lack of any provision in the course for them to conduct serious research on the candidates’ teaching contexts (as referred to in p. 150 by the tutors themselves) made it difficult for them to get to know the candidates or their contexts well. This notion was expressed by one tutor who told me that she felt the adaptation of the course to the course candidates represented not only an open challenge for them but that she felt there was little she could do about it, particularly considering the varied nature of the candidates and their contexts in the course. She expressed it in the following terms

"Si tu población varía tanto ¿no? De Javier o Mariana a Mario y Daniela (. ) ¿cómo logramos adaptar ICELT para todos ellos? (. ) No hay mucho que podamos hacer"

If your population varies so much right? From Javier or Mariana to Mario and Daniela (. ) how do we manage to adapt ICELT for all of them? (. ) There’s not much we can do about it.

*pseudonyms are used

(Tutor3_interview_12/07/2017)

The other two candidates in the course expressed a similar feeling when asked about this principle in our conversations.

6.6.1.1.4 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described some relevant aspects of the way in which the operationalisation of the principle of adaptation of the course to the course candidates was operationalised in the course researched. As was shown, the data support the view that this
6.6.1.2 Theme 10: ‘You cannot focus only on grammar, grammar, grammar... what about skills?’

This theme describes relevant aspects of the way in which the third distinguishing central element of ICELT (a perspective of English language teaching and learning centred on language systems and language skills) (henceforth ‘a LS/LS perspective’) was operationalised in the iteration of the course researched. As the title of this theme suggests, the predominance of such perspective, identified originally in the official course documents (see p. 100), was maintained in the course researched, even though with some distinguishing characteristics. Overall, these characteristics were a) an emphasis on the use of a LS/LS perspective, and in particular on the use of a grammatical analytic focus, and b) an ‘active’ use of specific procedures (e.g., teaching frameworks for language teaching) with such a focus. These two characteristics will be described in two sub-themes, called ‘So we first have to go into accuracy’ and ‘Form should be covered’, correspondingly.

6.6.1.2.1 Sub-theme 10.1: ‘So we first have to go into accuracy’

The emphasis on the use of a LS/LS perspective and, in particular, on the use of a grammatical analytic focus, is expressed in the data in a prominent and prevalent way. The following examples illustrate such emphasis. The examples are related to the distribution of class topics in the course, the content of the input sessions, and the tutors’ talk in relation to the assessment components.

- Distribution of class topics in the course

The thematic emphasis of a LS/LS perspective in the course is first expressed in the distribution of class topics in the course programme, particularly in terms of the number of input sessions with a direct focus on language systems and language skills. As is shown in Table 6.6 below, twelve out of the thirty input sessions of the course had an explicit focus on either language systems or language skills (nine sessions, on language systems, and three sessions on language skills). Thematicallly, the number of input sessions with such a focus is higher because other five sessions had this same focus, despite the fact that their title does not indicate it (e.g., Session 16: ‘Role
plays, simulation and drama’ or Session 24: ‘Exploiting video in the classroom’ had both a language systems/language skills focus).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Session</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Language awareness: parts of speech and sentences structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Staging Lessons (PPP) / Analysing language for presentations (MPF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Language awareness: time, tense and aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Text-Based / Guided discovery / Teaching Vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Phonology 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Controlled vs. communicative activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Developing Speaking skills and Teaching productive skills (framework)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Language Awareness: Modality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>On-line</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Language awareness: Futurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Developing Writing skills and teaching writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>- Phonology 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>On-site</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>- The Lexical Approach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Table 6. 6 Input sessions of the course devoted explicitly to language systems and language skills

The manifest imbalance in the course program between the focus on language systems and language skills was addressed by the main course tutor, who early in the course suggested to the candidates the inclusion of skills work as ‘subsidiary aims’ in at least each assessed observation. The tutor expressed it in the following terms:

1 T: If your main aim [in the assessed teaching observation] is a system (.), it is convenient that you establish a sub-aim skills to balance the lesson (.). You cannot focus only on grammar grammar and grammar (pause)) what about skills?

(Tutor1_inputsession04_18/11/2016)

Even though the tutor’s advice seemed to accomplish its communicative purpose, i.e., express the need for a balance of the Language Systems/ Language Skills focus, at the same time it represents a tacit recognition of the prominence of a LS/LS perspective in the course.

- Content of input sessions on language systems

In turn, the emphasis on the use of a grammatical analytic focus is expressed in the content of the input sessions, particularly those with a focus on language systems (Sessions 7, 9, 18 and 19).
Figure 6.9 below features samples tasks that the course candidates were required to do in different sessions:

**Session 7 - Task 4: Simple Sentence Analysis**

**Simple Sentence Analysis**

If this item does not open automatically you can [open Simple Sentence Analysis here]

A. For this task, match the words with their definition and give an example of each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adverbial</td>
<td>A. Words that show what the sentence is about</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Complement</td>
<td>B. Clause element that typically expresses an action or state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Verb</td>
<td>C. Give further information or completes what is said about some other element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Object</td>
<td>D. Add extra information about time, manner or place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Subject</td>
<td>E. Identifies who or what is affected by the action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers and letters are NOT in the right order, so match them and then post it on the discussion forum. When you post, solve differences in the examples provided by your peers. They will be different. But see if the examples apply to the categories. Your tutor will monitor this forum and reply as needed.

* Vocabulary: Adverb Language
* Past, Grammar for English Language, Teachers
* Learn Pracical English Usage

**Session 9 - Task 3: Different tenses, aspects, times and different meanings**

**Different tenses, aspects, times and different meanings**

If this item does not open automatically you can [open Different tenses, aspects, times and different meanings here]

For this task, read the following sentences and discuss the difference in meaning between the next pairs of sentences. Does the change in tense, aspect or time have an impact on meaning?

1. a. Jo Thornley runs her own plumbing business.
    b. Jo Thornley ran her own plumbing business.
2. a. I was a French teacher.
    b. I am a French teacher.
3. a. Jo Thornley runs her own plumbing business.
    b. Jo Thornley is running her own plumbing business.
4. a. Their heating isn’t working.
    b. Their heating doesn’t work.
5. a. I’m very proud of what I achieve.
    b. I’m very proud of what I’ve achieved.
6. a. I’ve taken an apprentice.
    b. I took on an apprentice.
7. a. I trained as a plumber.
    b. I was training as a plumber.
8. a. I’d become very unhappy.
    b. I became very unhappy.
Session 18 - Task 5: Modality and Form

This is a quick simple task to complete: what are the different rules of form for modal verbs in comparison to full lexical verbs? Come up with a list and compare them with examples, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODAL VERBS</th>
<th>FULL VERBS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are always followed by a bare infinitive</td>
<td>can be followed by other verb forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You can go now.</td>
<td>I want to go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*I can to go / going now.</td>
<td>I dread going.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Share your list on the forums and discuss please :) Your tutor will monitor the conversation :)

Figure 6. 9 Screenshots of grammar-focused online sessions’ tasks

The same focus can be observed in most of the on-site input sessions devoted to teaching methodology (sessions 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, 16, 20, 23, 24 and 29) (see Table 6.2) where, as the data show, there was an implicit and explicit predominance of a focus on grammar.

- Tutors’ talk in relation to the assessment components

The emphasis on the use of a grammatical analytic focus is also expressed in the tutors’ talk during the input sessions. These expressions are frequent in the data and are usually communicated in a directive manner. The following data extract illustrates this. The extract features an exchange between one tutor and the candidates in a session held just before the second round of assessed teaching observations. In the exchange the course tutor stresses the importance of oral grammar drills to develop students’ speaking accuracy, thus reinforcing the already established grammatical analytic focus:

1  T2: Drills are very important (.). Why are they important?
2  Because the students develop accuracy (.)
3  We need the students to develop accuracy before
4  they use or develop fluency (.). How can they develop fluency
5  if they cannot structure correctly? (.). They would be
6  producing a lot of mistakes (.). Is that what we want?
7  CCs: No! o! (.). no
8  T2: So we first have to go into accuracy and later on into?
9  CCs: Fluency!
10 T2: Very Good!

(Tutor2_inputsession13_24/02/2017)
Similar extracts in the data express the same emphasis on grammatical analysis. As my analysis indicates, this emphasis was not only interpreted by many candidates as a directive to be followed ‘to the letter’ but fundamentally as a decisive factor in getting a passing grade or a failing grade in the course (see e.g., p. 239).

6.6.1.2.2 Sub-theme 10.2: ‘Form should be covered’

As mentioned earlier, the second distinguishing characteristic in the operationalisation of the LS/LS perspective in the course was the ‘active’ use of specific procedures with this perspective and focus. One example of such procedures were the teaching frameworks used in the assessed teaching practices, all of which included a language focus with focus-on-form tasks. This was the case even with speaking skills lesson frameworks where ‘form’ was required to be covered, as is expressed in the following extract which features the suggested procedure in a productive skills lesson:

This is not a language focus stage as in a traditional grammar lesson. However, the T [teacher] should plan carefully how to cover specific features of the language: meaning, pronunciation, form or appropriacy.

[Handout5_inputsession17_24/03/2017]

---

**Figure 6. 10 Class handout of a speaking skills lesson’s framework**
Overall, the introduction of such lesson frameworks represented not only a reinforcement of the predominance of a LS/LS focus, and in particular of a grammatical analytic focus, as was referred to above. It also represented the introduction of specific procedures for language teaching with such a focus. Its use, even though suggested, was de facto required, as is expressed by the tutor in the following exchange in a Q & A session on the course’s assessed teaching observations:

1 M: I think I have the last question ((pause)) for the PTO3 we have to do productive skills
2 T3: Aha
3 M: and we decide either writing or speaking
4 T3: Yes?
5 M: Okay. I think that my question is (. ) Do we need to follow this framework? [the productive skills framework seen in the session]
6 T3: Yes!

(Tutor3_inputsession17_24/03/2017)

Even though this exchange refers to the third practice teaching observation (PTO3), the data indicate that the requirement to use specific teaching frameworks was constant throughout the course.

6.6.1.2.3 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the results of my analytic process in relation to the operationalisation in the course researched of the third distinctive component of ICELT, conceptualised as ‘a perspective of English language teaching and learning centred on language systems and language skills’. As was described, the predominance of such perspective was maintained in the course researched, even though with elements of its own, such as an overemphasis on a grammatical analytic focus, and the active use of specific procedures for language teaching with a grammar focus (e.g., teaching frameworks).

In terms of the candidates’ response to such perspective whereas some candidates appreciated it, as they felt that it improved their teaching practice, others rejected it, terming it as ‘unnatural’ or simply ‘unsuitable’ or ‘incompatible with their own teaching practices (see different examples on 7.3 p. 245).

6.6.1.3 Theme 11: ‘Who learns?... The students!’
This theme describes relevant aspects of the way in which the fourth distinguishing central element of ICELT, conceptualised in this study as a learner-centred teaching perspective (see p. 126), was operationalised in the iteration of the course researched.

The theme is composed of two subthemes. The first subtheme called ‘Get to know your learners, then teach them’, describes the operationalisation of this perspective in relation to the adoption of an informed teaching practice by the candidates to facilitate the learning process of their learners. The second sub-theme called ‘You have to find a way to let your students work more autonomously’, describes the operationalisation of this perspective in relation to the topic of learner autonomy.

In general, as the title of this theme suggests, the expression of this perspective is prominent and prevalent in the data.

6.6.1.3.1 Sub-theme 11.1: ‘Get to know your learners, then teach them’

As an informed practice, the learned-centred teaching perspective promoted in the course is a recurrent theme across the data. However, it is perhaps in the assessment components of the course where this pattern is more salient. This is particularly the case of the assessed teaching practices. During the class planning stage, for example, the candidates were required to research the cognitive, linguistic and affective development of their learners and then, in the class planning phase, consider this information in relation to the main aim, the objectives of each stage, class tasks and materials of each lesson. Figure 6.11 below features the description of a class profile made by one candidate for her practice teaching number three (a skills-based lesson):

All of the students tested at A1 (CEFR) when they started the program. Although they are now in English 5, they have only had about fifty-five hours of real class time. They are all visual learners with strong kinesthetic attributes.

All six learners studied in the public school system and are generally the first members of their family to go to university. All work and have many responsibilities (young children...). They generally study little on their own, which has become a real problem as we try to advance.

The six students can be broken into three groups based on their levels, linguistic and affective needs.  (23 years old) and  (28 years old) are classic “good” students.  is a lawyer and  studied law at the UNAM. They like English and find the class easy, but they participate actively. They need to be challenged so that they do not just become tutors for their classmates and feel that they are learning something.

 (41 years old) and  (45 years old) had negative experiences with English in the past. When they started the class, they were convinced that they could never learn the language. They are motivated and positive, even though the subject is often difficult for them. I always try to design classes and activities that demonstrate that they can indeed learn English if they do their part.

 and  (21 years) are good friends. Serious and steady,  is motivated and tries to use English as much as possible though he has been less assiduous this semester. Creative and quirky,  is sometimes temperamental and suffers from crises of self-confidence. They can learn more quickly than their older classmates, even if they have real problems studying outside the classroom. They need a lot of encouragement and support but also clear rules
This same pattern was identified in the feedback received by the candidates on their assessed teaching practices where, as the data indicate, the tutors commonly focused their attention on the general or specific aspects of the implementation of a learned-centred teaching perspective.

The extract below shows the comments made by the main course tutor on the implementation of this perspective in one class. The data extract features an example of post-lesson positive feedback. This exchange took place after the second assessed teaching practice of the candidate.

The extract reproduces the first remarks made by the course tutor in relation to the candidate’s performance in class:

```
1  T1: Your implementation was generally speaking excellent (.) In
2  many aspects in many many aspects (.) So for example very
3  good control of the group (.) good use of ICQs [Instruction
4  Checking questions] (.) variety of activities (.) well done
5  adjusting the language to the students’ level (.) effective
6  Monitoring (.) good CCQs [Comprehension checking questions]
7  very well done on modelling and correcting pronunciation (.)
8  those fillers with TFR [Total Physical Response]
9  activities so students who had very short attention span (.)
10 you had to move them from time to time so they keep
11 interested and involved in the lesson (.) good use of the
12 Board (.) good ability to adapt your lesson and not use
13 appendix “a” (.) good instructions for the production (.)
```

Whilst the attention of the tutor’s feedback is placed on different aspects of management of learning, it is also evident his attention on the candidate’s interventions to facilitate the learning progress of her learners and, in this sense, on a learner-centred teaching perspective. This focus is recurrent across the feedback data and together with learner autonomy, it represented one of the main foci in this kind of exchanges.

6.6.1.3.2 Sub-theme 11.2: ‘You have to find a way to let your students work more autonomously’

The other recurrent pattern identified in the data concerning the operationalisation of the learner-centred teaching perspective in the course is learner autonomy. As in the previous case, the expression of this theme is prominent and prevalent in the data and, in at least two instances, learner autonomy is even conceptualised as the main aim of teaching in the course. The following extract features one of these instances. The context of the exchange is a post-lesson feedback session where the tutor elicits from a candidate, who had just observed, the benefits of guided
discovery activities in relation to ‘autonomy’. After this, the tutor expresses that ‘learner autonomy’ is, in the end, what should be sought:

1 T3:  Ok so (pause) benefits? Tell me (…)
2 M:  Student centred
3 T3:  Exactly (.) who thinks?
4 M:  the students
5 T3:  who does?
6 M:  The students
7 T3:  who applies?
8 M:  the students
9 T3:  Hopefully who learns?
10 ((General laughter))
11 T:  And of course all that contributes to autonomy (.) At the
12 end of the day that’s what we want.

(Mario_feedbacksession_pto1_27/01/2017)

Thematically, the concept of learner autonomy is expressed in the data in at least two ways: as an open reflection task and as corrective feedback to be implemented to promote autonomy in class. In the case of the former conceptualisation (as an open reflection), the concept of learner autonomy was the main focus in at least one of the peer observation tasks in the course (peer observation 8) where candidates were required to observe their peers teaching a class, and then, reflect on the decisions made and on who had made those decisions. The explicit purpose behind this task was to make the course candidates aware of the value of letting their students take an active role in the decision-making process of their learning. Figure 6.12 below features some of the questions that course candidates were asked to focus their attention on during this observation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observe the lesson from the points of view of the questions in the list. As responses write T (teacher), S (student) or TS (a mixture) next to the questions. Don't be concerned to capture every instance - a rough indication is adequate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Who chose the aims?
2. Who chose the language / skills focus?
3. Who chose the topics / and activities?
4. Who chose and prepared the materials?
5. Who chose the seating arrangements?
6. Who wrote on the board?
7. Who cleaned the board?
8. Whom did the students speak to?
9. Who created the pairs / groups?
10. Who decided when to stop an activity?
11. Who operated the equipment?
12. Who decided which questions or problems in the lesson were explored?
13. Who chose the vocabulary to be learnt?
14. Who gave meaning for words

(Figure 6.12 Screenshot of a fragment of Peer Observation Task 8: Learner’s Autonomy)
In terms of the latter conceptualisation), as corrective feedback, learner autonomy was constantly referred to by the tutors in the post-class feedback sessions. The data extract below features one exchange where this concept is explicitly mentioned by the tutor in the form of corrective feedback during a feedback session after a class where the candidate had maintained a relatively high level of control over her students. In this exchange, the tutor tells the candidate that it is important to find a balance between the control of the class by her and the autonomy of her students:

1 T3: The challenge of planning so thoroughly is (.) what would be
2 V: the challenge?
3 T3: that nothing happens according to the plan
4 T3: No! (.) it does
5 V: so what would be the challenge then?
6 T3: is how to give space and freedom (.) because when we plan
7 so thoroughly what happens? Who wants to have the control?
8 V: Me
9 T3: Yes (.) so you have to find your balance (.) you have to work
10 on that (.) you are there for them ((pause)) You already
11 control a lot (.) You have to find a way to let them
12 work more autonomously
13 V: autonomously
14 T3: you need to learn to trust your students ((pause)) you still
15 have the control of what is happening ()

(Victoria_feedbacksession_pto2_15/03/2017)

The reference made by the tutor to the candidate in this exchange about ceding control without losing it seems to reflect one of the main tensions between the two forms of conceptualising learner autonomy referred to above, i.e., as an open reflection and as a more controlled, teaching interventions in class. This tension became more apparent with candidates who did not necessarily promote learner autonomy in their teaching contexts or who promoted it in a different way (see Chapter Seven).

6.6.1.3.3 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the result of my analysis regarding the operationalisation of the fourth distinguishing central element of ICELT identified in the data, namely: a learner-centred teaching perspective. As was referred to in the body of the report of the results of my analysis, the operationalisation of such perspective in the course was realised through different components in the course such as the input sessions, some methodology assignments, the course
candidates’ assessed teaching practice and the post-lesson feedback sessions, where this perspective was most prominently expressed.

As was shown, this perspective was rich in content and, as such, represented a major focal point in the course. However, it also contained dimensions and elements in tension. One of the most important was the concept of teacher autonomy which was not necessarily a priority in the teaching context and cultures of all candidates, nor was conceptualised in the same way by all candidates, as will be seen in Chapter Seven.

6.6.1.4 Overarching theme summary

In summary, my analytic process generated an overarching theme and three themes that captured and described relevant aspects of the way in which the distinctive components of ICELT (identified in 5.5. See p. 115) were operationalised in the course researched. Each theme described one element. The theme called ‘Tell me, how do we manage to adapt ICELT for all of them?’ described relevant aspects of the adaptation of the course to the course candidates, their teaching contexts, and their specific needs (the first distinguishing central element). As was shown, the data supported the view that such adaptation was expressed through the assessment components, the input sessions, and the peer observation tasks, even though it was not always fully accomplished nor was it free from tensions.

The theme called ‘You cannot focus only on grammar, grammar, grammar... what about skills?’ described aspects of the operationalisation in the course researched of ‘a perspective of English language teaching and learning centred on language systems and language skills’. As the report of my analysis showed, the predominance of such perspective established in the course official documents was not only maintained in the course researched, but it was done with an overemphasis on both a grammatical analytic focus and the use of specific procedures for this purpose, such as Language systems and language-based teaching frameworks.

Finally, the theme called ‘Who learns?... The students!’ described aspects of the operationalisation of the learner-centred teaching perspective identified in the data, particularly in the post-lesson feedback sessions. As was shown, this perspective was rich in content, however, it also contained dimensions and elements in tension with the candidates’ teaching contexts and cultures. One of these elements in tension was the concept of learner autonomy which was not necessarily used in different teaching contexts nor understood in the same terms in which was conceptualised in the course.
6.7 Predominant discursive practices

6.7.1 Overarching theme: A strict pedagogy

This overarching theme is composed of three themes that describe predominant discursive practices produced by the tutors in their interaction with the candidates during the face-to-face input sessions in the iteration of the course researched. The term 'discursive practices' is understood here as ‘recurring episodes of face-to-face interaction (...) that have social and cultural significance to a community of speakers’ (Young 2009, p.1). Thus understood, these discursive practices offer insight into relevant features of the instructional practices used in the course, and of the discursive context in which the tutors and the candidates positioned themselves and interacted with each other.

The title of the overarching theme attempts to capture and describe the general tone of these exchanges and, in more general terms, the character of the instructional practices in the course. In turn, the first theme, called ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’ describes the first predominant discursive practice, identified in the data, expressed in the form of warnings
about ‘failing the course’ that the candidates received on a constant basis throughout the course. It also describes other interrelated but opposed discourses (identified in the falsification phase) that mitigated and, in a sense, reduced the impact of such warnings.

The second theme, called ‘Do as I do’, describes the second predominant discursive practice identified in the data and expressed in the notion that the candidates were required to follow the tutors’ guidelines and adapt their instructional practices to perform well in the course. It also describes some rhetorical strategies and other related but opposed discourses (identified in the falsification phase) that produced a discursive counterweight and opened some ‘spaces for manoeuvre’ to the candidates (Jiménez Raya, Lamb & Vieira 2007).

The third theme, entitled ‘No pain no gain’, describes the articulation, expression and justification of a predominant discursive practice expressed in the notion that given the ‘difficult, demanding and exhausting nature of the course’, pain and stress were normal and necessary (See 148). It also describes other expressions and practices that co-existed and counterweighted the main discursive practice and the rhetorical strategies through which it was expressed. Finally, this theme includes a brief description of the tutors’ personal views on stress where all coincided in expressing not only a positive view regarding stress but also in attributing to the candidates some degree of responsibility in the stress they felt.

Finally, the last section, called ‘You have been the best group ever!’ refers to the final message pronounced by the main course tutor to the candidates at the end of the course, praising them for their general performance in the course.

The themes are composed of different sub-themes that refer to different types of discourse: a) discourse from the tutors’ instructional practices, b) discourse from the candidates’ responses to such instructional practices identified in the data, and 3) opposed discourse identified in the falsification phase that mitigated and reduced the expression and impact of the main discourses.

Concerning this topic, my analytic claim (eighth in this study) is that three discursive practices predominated in the interactions recorded in the data between the tutors and the candidates during the course, offering insight into the instructional practices used in the course and also into the way in which the tutors and the candidates positioned themselves and interacted with each other in the course.
6.7.1.1 Theme 12: ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’

This theme describes the first predominant discursive practice identified in my analysis: the warnings made to the candidates in the form of admonitions about ‘failing the course’ and the general response of the candidates to them. It also describes other opposed but interrelated discourses. This theme has been identified as predominant because such admonitions are consistently present throughout the data and because of its link with the assessment components, a fundamental element in the course (see p. 179). In what follows, I will describe such discursive practice in relation to their prevalence, prominence and antinomic nature, correspondingly.

6.7.1.1.1. Sub-theme 12.1: ‘You are likely to fail!’

As the data show, during the course, the candidates were constantly warned about being recorded as ‘withdrawn’ from the course, i.e., about failing the course. Such warnings were made in the form of written and spoken admonitions. In the case of the former, many documents of the course, including personal communication such as emails, memos, and so on, have some reference to this notion. In the case of the latter, it is particularly in the tutors’ discourse in on-site input sessions and in individual feedback sessions recorded in the data where this notion is commonly expressed.

In terms of their content, these warnings are concerned fundamentally with administrative matters and academic matters. In the case of the former, the warnings referred to aspects related to failing to meet the course regulations, such as attendance and punctuality, submission deadlines, or administrative procedures, etc. In the case of the latter, the warnings referred to matters particularly related to the assessment components.

- Warning on administrative matters

The following data extract contained in a document of the course illustrates one example of the warnings made in relation to administrative regulations of the course. The extract comes from the Centre’s course handbook:
Other extracts in the data expressed the same notion in a slightly less direct way. As a way to reinforce their mandatory character, it was said that all rules and restrictions in the course had been set by ‘Cambridge’, and that, for this reason, both the tutors and course the candidates were ‘expected to follow them’, as was established in a contract that the candidates were asked to sign at the beginning of the course. For some candidates, this contract represented in itself a form of warning.

- Warning on academic matters

In the case of the expressions of these warnings referring to academic matters, the data show that the candidates were frequently advised to follow the tutors’ guidelines to write the assignments of the course and to plan and teach their assessed lessons. One example that illustrates these discursive warnings comes from the Centre’s course website where the candidates were warned to follow the course guidelines in relation to the assessed teaching observations:

1. PTOs [Practice Teaching Observations] have a specific process and [SIC] series of steps to follow.
2. If you don’t follow these carefully, you will probably fail!!! :( *

*exclamation marks and emoticon in original

(Center_Course_website_2016)

In the case of the spoken discourse recorded in the data these warnings tend to be more subtle, particularly in the later phases of the course where the word ‘fail’, for example, was gradually substituted by the terms ‘re-submission’ and ‘get penalised’. Yet the expression of these warnings remained constant, including in the candidates’ spoken data.

6.7.1.1.2 Sub-theme 12.2: ‘Shaking... yeeeh! ’
As my analysis of the data shows, one of the most prevalent responses from the candidates to the tutors’ discursive warnings were expressions of fear. Even though fear is a complex emotion, difficult to describe (Ekman and Friesen 2003), its expression in the course was constant and rather linguistically and behaviourally apparent throughout the course. The following data extract features one of the first articulations of this emotion recorded in the data. The exchange took place at the end of the first on-site input session:

1 T: Ok I hope that after this session you are motivated and
2 ((unintelligible))
3 M: [Talking among the candidates] Scared?
4 A: Shaking?
5 J: (in a concerned tone) yeeeah!

(Tutor1_inputsession10_28/10/2016)

Behaviourally, this emotion was communicated particularly through non-verbal expressions, such as body language, gestures and facial expressions showing signs of fear, as I referred it on my fieldwork notes in a consistent way. The following data extract illustrates one instance where I expressed with certain detail the way in which I perceived this emotion was expressed by the candidates in one of the on-site input sessions:

1 As the candidates stood up and started to leave the room for the recess, I could
2 recognise clear signs of fear in most of them - from slight to extreme fear!: e.g. open mouth
3 with tense, raised and straightened lips (Ana, Victoria, and Camerina*). I saw some
4 candidates rubbing their necks and others trying to regain their composure (e.g. Javier). In
5 one of them, I was even able to see the veins in his tensed neck!
6 [...] It’s been really painful to observe and register all this.

*Pseudonyms are used

(Researcher_fieldworkdiary_19/05/2017)

Even though significant, fear was not the only prevalent and prominent emotion expressed by the candidates in the course, as will be referred to in the following two themes.

6.7.1.1.3 Sub-theme 12.3: ‘[But] take it easy because otherwise you’ll go crazy, huh?’

Although the expressions of the discourse referred to above were prevalent and prominent in the data, this discourse co-existed with other opposed less prevalent but interrelated discourses which mitigated and reduced its expression and impact. These discourses were a) the tutors’
support on assessment components; b) the tutors’ expressions of encouragement, and c) the tutors’ creation of decision-making spaces for the candidates. I will refer to each one of them briefly in what follows:

- The tutors’ support on assessment components

As was described earlier in this study (6.4. See p. 157), the tutors offered constant help and support in different forms to the candidates, from the pre-established time slots in the input sessions devoted to set the course assignments (including special workshops on ‘How to’ work on the language tasks and methodology assignments), up to the elaboration of ‘friendly guidelines’ which provided the candidates with a template to be followed in order to successfully complete the course assignments (Appendix 10). Another recurrent form of help and support was the pre-observation tips given to the candidates in each input session to help them to perform well in their teaching practice observations and ‘impress the observer’, among other forms.

- The tutors’ expressions of encouragement

Another discourse, that co-existed and mitigated the warnings made to the candidates about failing the course were the expressions of encouragement from the tutors. Articulated in different forms and tones, such expressions clearly sought to comfort the candidates or simply calm them down. The following extract illustrates the latter. The exchange took place in one on-site input session, halfway through the course. In the exchange, the course tutor seems to have noticed clear signs of tension in some candidates before the formal beginning of the session. In a pacifying tone, she addresses the course candidates in the following terms:

1 T: Everybody is under pressure and the (. ) we are just starting
2 [the session] so take it easy ok?
3 ((Nervous laughter))
4 T: For God’s sake (. ) I’m just going to be setting another (. )
5 the second thing you have to submit
6 The Cl-1
7 V: Take it easy take it easy
8 ((Nervous laughter))
9 S: Well we are kind of half way (. ) by the end of March becau...
10 T: Take it easy! (. ) Take it easy because otherwise you’ll go
crazy eh?
11 CCG: More? (. ) more?
12 ((crosstalk))
13 T: You have to take it easy! ([pause]) it’s not difficult
14 ((Nervous laughter))
15 T: It’s demanding but it’s not difficult

(Tutor2_inputsession13_24/02/2017)
The tutors’ creation of decision-making spaces for the candidates

Even though limited in number and scope, the tutors’ creation of decision-making spaces for the candidates in the course constituted another expression of discourse that co-existed with the main discourses. I characterised these spaces as limited because they were few and without exception, circumscribed to aspects of the efficient transmission of knowledge in the classroom. One example that illustrates these spaces was a debate set by the main course tutor concerning the use of textbooks in the classroom. This debate took place in the input session devoted precisely to the topic of evaluating course books and other didactic material (Session 15). After the debate, led by the candidates, the main course tutor made some final remarks expressing that textbooks should be used wisely in the classroom and that the candidates would have to decide how to use them:

```
T: So the use of textbooks in the classroom has been and is a controversial issue but in my personal opinion—the conclusion of this nice debate—is to use the coursebook wisely and supplement it in accordance with the needs and characteristics of your students including your own creativity and your own preferences, and taking into account the policy of your institution. So you decide!
```

Later, in that same session, the tutor told the candidates that it was also up to them the use of textbooks in their remaining assessed teaching practices.

In general terms, all discourses described in this theme co-existed together during the course, even though they don’t have the same level of prevalence or prominence in the data, being the dominant discourse the warnings about failing the course.

6.7.1.1.4 Theme summary

In summary, this theme has described the first predominant discursive practice identified in the data expressed in the form of warnings to the candidates about ‘failing the course’ and other opposed but interrelated discourses identified in the falsification phase. As was mentioned in the body of the text, these discursive practices formed part of the discursive context in which the tutors and the candidates positioned themselves and interacted with each other and, in this sense, they constitute a core element in the ethos of the iteration of the course researched.
6.7.1.2 Theme 13: Do as I do

This theme describes the second predominant discursive practice identified in the data, expressed in the notion that the candidates required to follow the tutors’ guidelines in order to perform well in the course. It also describes some arguments or appeals used by the tutors to reinforce this notion as well as the general response from the candidates. Finally, it describes some related but opposed discourses that opened some spaces for manoeuvre to the candidates in the course.

Correspondingly, the theme is divided into four sub-themes that address each one of these elements.

6.7.1.2.1 Sub-theme 13.1: ‘A demonstration of how your PTOs must be taught’

The notion that the candidates required to follow the tutors’ guidelines in order to perform well in the course was a central element in the discourse of the instructional practices of the tutors, particularly in relation to the assessment components, i.e., the course assignments and the assessed teaching practices.

- Course assignments

Regarding the assignments of the course, i.e., the language tasks and the methodology assignments, the data indicate that, for example, the tutors devoted an important amount of their instruction reviewing, clarifying and making detailed recommendations to the candidates on how to complete their essays, particularly in terms of the form and the content of the texts.

In the case of the former (the form of the texts), the data indicate that the tutors frequently included in their feedback on the assignments of the candidates detailed and lengthy indications on aspects of the content organisation of the texts, word limit, font size, style, type and spacing, and number and style of references, etc. In terms of the latter (the content of the texts), the recommendations made by the tutors commonly included indications on how to write the (pre-established) sections of the assignments, etc. The following example contained in the data illustrates this point. In the exchange, the tutor is talking about the elements that the candidates must include in the introduction of an assignment. The context of the exchange is the setting up of the language task 2 entitled ‘Focus on the learner’s spoken language’:
After this comment, the tutor assured the course candidates that by following her instructions, they would produce ‘a good paper, a passing paper’ (Tutor2_inputsession13_24/03/2017).

This kind of comments contained in the data is somehow consistent with the tutors’ appeal to their credibility as ‘knowers’ of what ‘Cambridge’ really wanted (See p. 157). In this same sense, as is indicated in the data, depending on whether the candidates followed these pieces of advice or not, the tutors would often either praise or reprimand them. In the same way, the personal opinions that the tutors expressed about the candidates, in the 1-to-1 conversations I had with them, frequently focused on how well the candidates had or hadn’t done what they had asked the candidates to do in the ‘exact’ way they had asked them to do it, as was explicitly mentioned by them.

- Practice teaching observations

In the case of the assessed teaching practices, the notion that the candidates required to follow the tutors’ guidelines in order to perform well in the course was expressed in a more direct way. As the data show, the tutors were commonly emphatic in asserting that the candidates were required to plan and teach their practices according to the guidelines and provisions they had already been provided with or were going to be provided throughout the course, such as the adoption of a given lesson focus (e.g., grammar); a given lesson framework (e.g., ‘presentation, practice, production’), a pre-established lesson plan format (referred to in the data as a ‘professional lesson plan’) (see Appendix 10) and all the specifics given to them during the demo classes in the on-site input sessions. The following data extract features this notion in relation to the demo classes in the course. The context of the exchange is the presentation of the tutor of a text-based lesson framework:

1  T2: In the introduction you just have to tell me what the main
2   objective is and the contents (.). The rest we don’t need
3   It (.). This is something you have to bear in mind ok?
4   I think that I told you this before ((pause)) if you do
5   something else [other than this] bueno
6   ¿qué les puedo decir? [well, what can I say?] I’ll kill you!

(Tutor2_inputsession13_24/03/2017)
Deductive and inductive demo classes

My analysis shows that the ‘demo’ classes adopted two general forms: deductive and inductive. In deductive presentations, the course candidates were given stage-by-stage / procedure-by-procedure guidelines that they analysed and practised together with the tutor in class. One example of this form of deductive instruction is illustrated in the following data extract where the tutor reviews with the candidates the steps to give task instructions:

In turn, in inductive presentations, the course tutors gave demo classes, generally to show how to teach a class using a given lesson framework. As showed in the data, the demonstrations commonly followed this pattern: After the demo class, the tutors would elicit from the candidates the different stages and procedures presented. Then, the tutors and the candidates would analyse and practice such procedures so that the candidates could internalise them. In the data extract
below, the course tutor elicits from the candidates the steps for analysis of vocabulary in class which she has just presented. The extract is relatively long but is presented in its entirety given its illustrative value:

My analysis shows that the candidates were repeatedly told that the procedures presented were only ‘suggested’. However, as the data also indicate, the candidates were told on different occasions that they were going to be evaluated based on what they have been taught in the course. At the same time, different candidates expressed that they believed that following the
tutors’ guidelines was not only mandatory but a decisive factor in getting a passing grade in the course.

6.7.1.2.2 Sub-theme 13.2: ‘Dominate the theory and techniques first’

The expressions of the notion that the candidates required to follow the tutors’ guidelines to perform well in the course were frequently accompanied by different arguments or rhetorical appeals used by the tutors to reinforce or emphasise them. In my analysis, I categorised these arguments into three sub-themes: ‘Satisfying the criteria of Cambridge’, ‘Professional improvement’, and ‘Dissent in ICELT’. In what follows, I will refer to each one of them and offer one example to illustrate their use:

- Satisfying the criteria of Cambridge

One appeal commonly used by the tutors to persuade the candidates to follow their guidelines was expressed with the argument that these guidelines were aligned with and conducive to the fulfilment of the requirements ‘set by Cambridge’, whose authority in the course had already been established (See 6.3 p. 140). As the data indicate, this argument was commonly used in conjunction with the tutors’ appeal to their credibility as ‘knowers’ of the criteria set by Cambridge (as referred to in 6.4.1.1 p. 157). The following data extract illustrates the expression of this notion. The context in which this statement was made was the presentation of the topic of ‘communicative activities in controlled practise’ by the main course tutor:

1  T:  We have to remember that we are taking a course and that
2  we are being marked according to what we are learning in
3  the course and according to the requirements set by the
4  institution that is really (...) or that make the course  [This
5  is why] we are guiding you step by step step by step in
6  order for you to fulfil the requirements set by Cambridge

(Tutor1_inputsession13_24/02/2017)

- Professional improvement

Another argument used by the tutors was expressed in the notion that more than working towards passing the course, the candidates were learning and improving as a direct consequence of the course. Even though this argument is less frequent in the data, it was consistently used by the tutors throughout the course. The data extract below features one of the instances where this
The context of the quote is the explanation of the guidelines of the methodology assignment no. 3 called ‘Evaluating and supplementing materials’:

Given that almost all instances recorded in the data containing this notion were expressed in similar contexts (e.g., when the tutors provided the general guidelines for the language tasks or the methodology assignments), is possible to argue that this appeal was used as a rhetorical strategy to appease the stress that the candidates commonly showed during these events.

- **Dissent in ICELT**

The last argument identified in the data was expressed as a recommendation made to the candidates to adopt a pragmatic stance when working on the assessment components. This appeal was expressed both explicitly and implicitly. One example recorded in the data illustrates this recommendation in relation to the methodology assignments. In this exchange, the main course tutor suggested that the candidates avoid expressing disagreement in ICELT, in particular with the ideas expressed by the authors in the textbooks used as core literature. The context of the exchange is a discussion about the use of quotes in the methodology assignments:

In a casual conversation during recess that same day, I asked the tutor to elaborate on this notion. He told me that candidates in ICELT were at a stage of development in which for them it was
better to dominate the existing theory and techniques first, before questioning such theory and techniques (Research Journal, 18 November entry).

6.7.1.2.3 Sub-theme 13.3: ‘Is that penalised?’

As my analysis shows, the general response from the candidates to these discourses and rhetorical strategies was not homogenous nor fixed but diverse and changing throughout the course. The case studies included in this study (see Chapter Seven) refer to some aspects of the response of three candidates. However, in my analysis, I identified three overarching patterns of response that I coded according to the linguistic function they fulfilled: ‘asking questions’, ‘expressing frustration’ and ‘accepting changes’, as described briefly in what follows:

- Asking questions

One of the general ways in which the candidates responded to the discourse and rhetorical strategies used in the instructional practices described in this theme was by asking questions to the tutors, particularly concerning the assessment components. As the data show, this was done on a constant basis throughout the course by most of the candidates (e.g., at the beginning of each session, during the session recesses, in open session, and by the end of each input session), and by different means (e.g., face to face, by mail, by text messages, or by phone, as referred to me by the main course tutor). Most of the questions recorded in the data are related to ‘technical’ or ‘formal’ aspects of the assessment components, particularly in terms of what the candidates were allowed and not allowed to do. The following data extract illustrates one example of such questions. The context of the exchange was the discussion in the session about simplifying language in class:

```
1 V: I have a question
2 T1: Yes?
3 V: I'm a very (. ) I use my hand naturally when I speak (. )
4 Is that penalised when you are doing your PTO [practice teaching observation]?
5 T1: No! on the contrary (. ) on the contrary (. ) Remember what we
6 saw when we saw classroom management (. ) that body language
7 and gestures is [sic] part of your communication in the
8 classroom ok?
9 V: Ok!

(Tutor1_inputsession6_02/12/2016)
```
The extract also expresses the level of concern and apprehension that some candidates showed about the evaluation of their own performance in the assessment components (in this case, ‘the strongest candidate’, according to the course tutors. See 7.2).

- Expressing frustration

Another general response to the discourse of the instructional practice described in this theme was the feeling of frustration expressed by the candidates throughout the course. The expression of this feeling is particularly prevalent in the data among the candidates who dropped out of the course (almost 27% of the original cohort) and who mentioned ‘feeling frustrated’ and other related concepts such as ‘confusion’, ‘stress’ and ‘anger’, as the main reasons for quitting the course. The following data extract illustrates the expression of this feeling. The extract features part of the reflection made by one candidate after dropping out of the course. The context of the exchange is one of the interviews I had with him one week after had left the course.

```
M: The course was good in terms of learning strategies but it was quite difficult in terms of the essays (...) The tutors were quite rigorous in their comments and the whole situation was quite frustrating and I know it was a portfolio course I mean we were supposed to produce a portfolio but [the process of] writing the essays was brutal above all the C1 [the language tasks] the whole part of language analysis it was like too much
```

(Mario_interview_09/07/2017)

- Accepting changes

My analysis shows that, as the course progressed, the signs of frustration expressed by many candidates were substituted by expressions of satisfaction and sense of achievement, particularly after the candidates implemented the changes suggested by the tutors and started to receive the results of their assessment components with passing grades (see e.g., Chapter Seven). One example that illustrates the transition between these two phases is contained in Figure 6.20 below. The extract features the opinion of one candidate, expressed in the candidates’ group chat, who seems to come to terms with the notion that “feeling frustrated and confused” was an ‘essential part’ of the course but that, by following the feedback from the tutors, she could ‘prepare [better] the upcoming assignments’:
6.7.1.2.4 Sub-theme 13.4 But it’s not compulsory

As in the first case, the predominant discourse described in this theme co-existed with other opposing but interrelated discourses that produced a discursive counterweight and that, in this case, opened some spaces for the candidates to express some ideas and take some decisions.

The opposed discourses identified in the data were classified into two areas of intervention: modifications and changes made by the candidates and promoted by the tutors, and innovations introduced by the candidates and allowed by the tutors.

In terms of the former, even though limited, that data contain some instances where the tutors encouraged the candidates to make modifications and changes in the procedures of some assessed teaching practices. The following data extract captures one example that illustrates well this type of affordances. The context of the exchange is the discussion in class of the way in which the vocabulary presentation should be conducted in the second assessed teaching practice of the course based on language systems:

```
1   T: Now for your PTO2 [Practice Teaching Observation 2] we all
2     [referring to the course tutors] agreed that if you teach
3     pronunciation in the classroom how wonderful! but it’s not
4     compulsory ok? (.). As long as there is language analysis (.).
5     I mean for teaching purposes you need it in your plan (.). If
6     you show it to your learners that is up to you
```

(Tutor3 inputsession17_24/03/2017)
Whereas this and other similar examples in the data may seem limited in scope, for some candidates who had been struggling with this topic, it represented a true relief.

In terms of the innovations introduced by the candidates and allowed by the tutors, the data show that even though in a limited way, ‘novelty’ was allowed in some instances in the course, particularly in relation to the assessment components. One example that illustrates this point is contained in the following data extract which features a conversation between the main course tutor and one candidate about the submission of one of the assignments of the candidate. The context of the exchange is the discussion of the guidelines of the language task three, focused on the written language of the learner, where candidates were required to identify, correct and provide feedback on errors made by students on two written samples:

1. Tl: What correction code are you using [in Task 3]?
2. V: I created a correction code
3. Tl: Well if you created a correction code (…) based on ideas I got from correction books (…)
4. Tl: and also acknowledge the source (.) You have to say ‘taken from this book or (…)’
5. V: adapted from (…)
6. Tl: or ‘adapted from’ or ‘created by me’, right?

(Tutor1_inputsession23_19/05/2017)

Whereas the creativity of the candidate does not seem to be particularly celebrated by the tutor in the exchange, his acknowledgement of the fact that the candidate had created a correction code [on his second turn] seems to constitute tacit approval of her invention. Some other examples contained in data show a similar pattern, where innovation also seems to be accepted. Finally, other (not prevalent) examples in the data, show that the tutors allowed, or even encouraged, discussions and debates on different issues which, however, didn’t have a direct connexion with the assessment components of the course.

6.7.1.2.5 Theme summary

In summary, this theme described the second predominant discoursive practice identified in the data, expressed in the following elements: the notion that the candidates were required to follow the tutors’ guidelines and adapt their instructional practices in order to perform well in the course; some rhetorical strategies identified in the data that were employed by the tutors to reaffirm the
expression of such a notion; the response from the candidates to such discourse and finally, the opposed discourse identified in the falsification phase that opened some spaces for manoeuvre

6.7.1.3 Theme 14: ‘No pain no gain’

This theme describes the third predominant discursive practice identified in the data, expressed in the notion that pressure, stress, and anxiety were not only ‘normal’ but, in a sense, ‘necessary’ to complete the course and fulfil its ends. Even though this notion was articulated since the beginning of the course, it was expressed mostly in response to the candidates’ signs of stress. In this sense, I will invert the order of presentation from the two previous discursive practices. First, I will refer to such signs and describe them in relation to the sources to which they are thematically linked, and then, I will describe the discourse used by the tutors to persuade the candidates to accept the concomitant effects of the course, such as pressure, stress, and anxiety. I will also refer briefly to other expressions and actions identified in the data that counterbalanced such discourse. Finally, I will describe the tutors’ personal views on stress.

6.7.1.3.1 Sub-theme 14.1: ‘God, when is this ending?’

Like ‘fear’, ‘stress’ was a prevalent and prominent reaction of the candidates in the course. In a sense, the latter seemed to have been a by-product of the former, even though this is difficult to establish. Thematically, the candidates’ stress was expressed, for the most part, in relation to the interplay of four different sources: a) the assessment components; b) the course workload; c) the tensions produced between some of the assessed teaching practices and the teaching practices and contexts of the candidates, and d) the effects on the candidates of the combined expression of the predominant discursive practices. In what follows, I will briefly describe the general response of the candidates in relation to each one of these elements and include some examples to illustrate each case.

a) The assessment components

As my analysis shows, given their centrality in the course, the assessment components became a permanent source of pressure that turned quickly into stress for the candidates. The extract below shows a comment from my fieldwork diary where I referred to the expression of such stress in the candidates in the context of setting one of the assignments:
As has been the case every time an assignment is set, in this session the candidates showed clear signs of stress (particularly Camerina, Lily, Javier, and Bella). From the beginning of the session and even during the recess (and back in the session) the candidates did not stop asking questions on the logistics of the assignment, asking if this or that aspect was or was not allowed/penalised, what the consequences were for not meeting the deadlines, and then commenting on the tutors’ responses to them. Certainly, concerning.

(EV_journaldentry_17/02/2017)

This kind of notes, where the candidates’ stress is expressed in relation to the assessment components, is frequent in my field notes.

\textit{b) The course workload}

The course workload was the second source of the expressions of stress in the candidates identified in the data. As my analytic process show, during the course, the candidates had to deal with an important amount of work, particularly in three areas: the assessment components, the course online tasks, and the input information received from the on-site sessions of the course.

In the case of the assessment components, for example, the practice teaching observations cycle illustrates the amount of work that the candidates had to carry out and which represented, in general, an important source of stress. As is described in 5.2.1.3 (p. 92) the candidates were required to plan, teach, received feedback, and reflect on four different classes during the course. Table 6.7 and Figure 6.15, feature the protocol of the lesson planner that the candidates were required to follow to plan their assessed teaching practices and the detail of one section, correspondingly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section one</td>
<td>Lesson context and aims</td>
<td>In this section, the candidates are required to define and describe the class main aims and sub-aims, the lesson’s learning outcomes, and the context of the lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section two</td>
<td>Learners’ profile, Rationale and Timetable fit</td>
<td>In this section, the candidates need to describe in detail the profile of each learner, and the way in which the needs of the learners related to the aims, objectives, stages, activities, and materials of the lesson;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section three</td>
<td>Personal aims, Assumptions, Problems and Solutions’</td>
<td>In this section, the candidates are required to do three things: a) to define their personal objectives and strategies to follow in the lesson in relation to the feedback received in their previous teaching practices, b) to describe four assumptions in relation to what they thought their students knew, were familiar with, have experienced and have taught, and c) to anticipate at least five problems and solutions that their students may likely to have during the lesson in the areas of classroom management and classroom tasks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.7 Summary of the lesson planner’s sections of the protocol that the candidates were required to follow to plan their assessed teaching practices

| Section four | Target Language Analysis | In section four, the candidates have to analyse at least five discreet items of language to be taught in terms of meaning, form and pronunciation, and were required to include anticipated problems and solutions for each case, as well as questions to check their students’ comprehension |
| Section five | Resources and materials | In this section, the candidates need to describe the materials to be used in class and the rationale for their use. |
| Section six | Lesson stages, Objectives and Procedures’ | Finally, in this section six the candidates are required to describe their lesson’s stages for a 1-hour class, including the objectives, time, interaction pattern and procedures to be followed in each stage, activity by activity |

Figure 6.15 Screenshots of one candidate’s lesson planner of their Practical Teaching Observation 1 portraying one fragment of section six: ‘Lesson stages, Objectives and Procedures.

As mentioned above, after the planning stage, which according to some candidates, used to take them on average between two and three weeks to complete, the candidates were required to teach the planned lesson, receive feedback, and then submit a reflection based on the feedback received. The cycle for each teaching practice ended when the candidates received their final mark. As the data show, the cycle for each teaching practice represented a source of considerable
stress for the candidates, particularly because of the amount of work they were required to carry out to complete it.

Overall, the interplay of the assessment components, the course online tasks, and the input information of the course sessions contributed to the general stress felt by most of the candidates who, according to the data, expressed feeling overwhelmed by the course load throughout the course. One example that illustrates the expressions of stress identified in the data is represented in the following extract. The extract features a casual conversation among some candidates that took place during the recess in one of the input sessions of the course. In the exchange, the candidates coincide in expressing that they feel overwhelmed and at least one of them expresses that she wishes that the course ended:

```
1 M: I am about to give up my job to keep up with this
2 [the pace of the course]
3 *?: ((unintelligible)) yeah me too I am like I should quit my
4 job for a year at least
5 C: God! When is this ending?

*?: unidentified
```
(Ccs_casualconversation_Section20_28/04/2017)

c) The tensions produced between some of the course’s teaching practices and the candidates’ teaching practices and contexts

The third major source of stress for the candidates identified in the data were the tensions produced between some of the teaching practices promoted in the course and the teaching practices and contexts of different candidates. Some of these tensions have already been referred to in this study in relation to the operationalisation of the distinctive components of ICELT in the course (6.6. See p. 178). Some more detailed references regarding this topic will be described in the next chapter (Chapter Seven). However, another sector where this source of stress is clearly illustrated is among the candidates who dropped out of the course, most of whom referred to stress as the main reason for quitting the course, particularly in relation to the teaching practices.

One example that depicts this kind of reaction is Juan whom I interviewed two times immediately after he dropped out of the course. In the first interview, Juan manifested that one of the main reasons for dropping out of the course had been the fact of being required to give classes to ‘large groups’ even though he only taught one-to-one classes. The candidate expressed this notion in the following terms:
Together with other issues, this tension led Juan to be the first out of seven candidates (almost one-third of the original cohort) to drop out of the course.

\textit{d) The effects on the candidates of the combined expression of the predominant discursive practices}

Finally, the fourth major source of stress for the candidates in the course identified in the data was the effect of the combined expression of the three predominant discourses practices, including the present one. As has been described, such practices were expressed in the data around fundamentally three themes: the warnings of ‘failing the course’; the demand to follow the tutors’ teaching instruction ‘to the letter’; and finally, the notion that pressure, stress, and anxiety were ‘normal’ and ‘necessary’ to complete the course and grow professionally, as will be seen in the next section.

6.7.1.3.2 Sub-theme 14.2: ‘You are not enjoying the course?’

As a response to the signs of stress of the candidates in the course, the tutors articulated a series of arguments that together conveyed the notion that stress was not only ‘normal’ but, in a sense, ‘necessary’ to complete the course and fulfil its ends. In my analysis, I categorised thematically the instances of these arguments identified in that data in three groups according to the central idea that expressed each one of them: ‘leaving one’s comfort zone’, ‘no pain no gain’, and ‘personal sacrifice’. In what follows, I will briefly refer to each one and provide one example:

- Leaving one’s comfort zone

The notion of leaving one’s comfort zone was frequently expressed in the course to convey the sense that the candidates needed to give up to what they felt was ‘safe’ or ‘at ease’ in their
teaching practice and accept the 'new' practices promoted in the course so that they could grow. Whilst difficult, stressful, and even painful, this change was said to be beneficial for the candidates. One example that expresses this notion is contained in the extract below that features the ways in which this notion was explicitly communicated by the course main tutor to the candidates in the input sessions. The context of the conversation is the discussion of the use of textbooks in the assessed teaching practices:

```
T: Another thing that I like about CELT is that we move you from your comfort zone (.) You cannot simply say anymore 'I have my textbook one or two handouts maybe and that's how I'm going to give my class' (.) No! We are forcing you to move from your comfort zone so that you can grow ((pause)) You are welcome!
```

(Tutor1_inputsession15_10/03/2017)

References to this notion in the data are not only common in relation to the candidates’ stress but also in classroom conversations among the candidates who reproduced this notion consistently throughout the course.

- No pain, no gain

The second argument identified in the data expressed by the tutors as a response to the candidates' signs of stress conveyed the notion that hard or painful work would bring a greater value reward. As the data show, this notion was sometimes communicated explicitly and some other times was expressed through the use of the phrase ‘No pain, no gain’, which the main course tutor referred to on different occasions as ‘our motto’. The data extract below features one exchange in which the tutor referred to this notion in such terms. The context of the conversation is the exchange of greetings at the beginning of one face to face session:

```
T1: Hello good afternoon! How have you been?
*: stressed! (...)D: super stressed! (...)I: very!
M: Depressed B: Sleepless (...)
T1: You are not enjoying the course?
((General laughter))
T1: Nobody is enjoying the course? Remember our motto
```
Personal sacrifice

The third notion consistently referred to in the data in response to the signs of stress of the candidates was the notion of ‘personal sacrifice’, expressed mostly as an appeal to the candidates to endure pain and deprivation in return for the promise for professional growth. This is the most prevalent notion in the data and is commonly expressed explicitly and openly. One example that illustrates how this notion was expressed in the course is contained in the following data extract.

The extract features an exchange between the tutor and the candidates that took place halfway through the course when many of the candidates were showing strong signs of anxiety and stress.

In this extract, the tutor calls the candidates to make ‘some’ sacrifices, just like she had done it as an ICELT candidate:

Besides the appeal to sacrifice, in the exchange portrayed above the tutor expresses the condition that if the candidates ‘really’ wanted to learn, they would have to sacrifice ‘something’. The expression of this kind of conditional is frequent in the data, even though most of them are not directly linked to the tutors’ appeals to sacrifice nor the stress from the candidates. However, they reinforced the notion that, at least at a discursive level, pressure, stress and anxiety were worth enduring in exchange for professional growth.

Other arguments

Even though less prevalent in the data, other arguments worth mentioning that were also expressed by the tutors in response to the stress of the candidates were predicated on the central
premise that by being in the course, the candidates were showing different attributes of professionalism such as 'genuine interest in self-development as teachers' (Course’s welcome letter), 'willingness to have an authentic professional development' (Course’s website) or 'membership to the TESOL community', thus indirectly reinforcing the notion of sacrifice.

6.7.1.3.3 Sub-theme 14.3: Help, support, and encouragement

The arguments described above, articulated by the tutors as a response to the stress of the candidates in the course, co-existed with other expressions and actions that not only mitigated the effects of such stress but also counterbalanced such arguments. Among others, some of these expressions and actions were: the consistent help and support offered to the candidates by the tutors, particularly in relation to the assessment components; their frequent expressions of encouragement; the spaces provided to the candidates to express their ideas and opinions about different not-assessed aspects of the course, the dialogic spaces created by the tutors for the candidates to debate their ideas about a given topic, and some less formal or informal moments during the input session that helped the candidates to release some of the accumulated stress.

Even though some of these practices are not prevalent in the data, they offer some nuance to the description of the discursive practice identified in this theme.

6.7.1.3.4 Sub-theme 14.4: ‘[But] embrace it, live it and enjoy it because one day you won't have it’

Throughout the course, I talked extensively with the tutors about their perspectives on the topic of the candidates’ stress. I did it because, after the observation of the first session of the course, I realised that this could be a theme in my research study, and this is why I explored further the tutors’ personal view on it.

Overall, all tutors expressed, in a relatively consistent way, a positive view of the nature and the role of stress in the candidates’ learning process. At the same time, they all coincided in attributing to the candidates implicit and explicit responsibility in the stress they felt. In what follows, I will mention briefly some ideas that summarise the general opinions of the tutors on stress:

For all tutors, stress was, in part, unavoidable given the design of the course and the timetable established to complete it. They also coincided in expressing that even though it was not 'ideal',
the ICELT candidates used to meet the course’s targets better when they were under pressure. One of the tutors went even further expressing that perhaps this was the only way candidates would value the course (Tutor1_interview_19/05/2017). Other tutor suggested that the Cambridge courses were for masochists and those who took the course were also masochists, thus suggesting that they probably enjoy it (Tutor2_interview_28/04/2017). Finally, another tutor wondered whether the signs of stress of the candidates were genuine, adding that the candidates knew beforehand the demanding nature of the course and that, in this sense, there was no reason for them to complain but enjoy it. She expressed this idea in the following terms:

I3: No quiero minimizar lo que los candidatos sienten pero me parece que hay un drama exagerado tras del ‘no duermo’ del ‘no esto’ del ‘no lo otro’ (.)pues si pero a ver ¿no sabías? Porque se te informó de la naturaleza exigente del curso ¿sabes? Entonces ‘embrace it’ vive lo y disfrútalo porque un día no lo vas a tener

I do not want to minimise what the candidates feel but it seems to me that there is an exaggerated drama with the ‘I don’t sleep’ ‘I don’t this’ ‘I don’t that’ (.). well but let’s see didn’t you know? Because the candidates were informed about the demanding nature of the course you know? So I say to them ‘embrace it’ live it and enjoy it because one day you won’t have it.

(Tutor3_interview_26/05/2017)

During her visit to the Centre, the external moderator of the course expressed a similar notion about stress in ICELT, stating in an open session that even though it was true that the course was, in general, a ‘living hell’, at least the candidates could take solace in the fact that their particular iteration of the course had only lasted nine months and that, in that sense, they had been put through that hell relatively quickly in comparison to other iterations (Moderator_Session29_30/06/2017).

6.7.1.3.5 Theme summary

In summary, this theme described the third predominant discursive practice identified in the data, expressed in the notion that pressure, stress, and anxiety were ‘normal’ and ‘necessary’ to complete the course and fulfil its ends. Given that this notion was articulated mostly in response to the candidates’ signs of stress, I first described such signs and then, I described the arguments that formed this notion and that were used by the tutors to persuade the candidates to accept the concomitant effects of such stress. At the same time, I also referred briefly to the expressions...
and actions that during the course counterbalanced such strategies. Finally, this theme also
described the general views of the tutors on stress. As was described, all tutors coincided not only
in expressing a positive view of stress but also in attributing to the candidates some degree of
responsibility in the stress they felt.

6.7.1.4 ‘You have been the best group ever!’

Towards the end of the course, the main course tutor addressed the candidates to deliver a final
message. Among other things, he told them that, as a group, they had been the best teachers he
had ever worked with in his twelve-year career as an ICELT tutor. He then referred to them as very
‘inquisitive’, ‘committed’ and ‘reliable’ candidates and wished them the best in their professional
careers. He expressed this notion in the following terms:

T1: Les quiero decir que después de doce años de experiencia de ser tutor de ICELT ustedes han sido el mejor de los mejores grupos que me ha tocado (.). Son gente muy cumplida muy comprometida muy preguntona pero los prefiero así que una gente que no se involucra que no le pone ganas (.). Algunos de ustedes se han estresado de más pero también los prefiero así porque hay gente que no se preocupa (.). Ahora sí que les vale entonces ¡muchas gracias! Muchas gracias porque hemos trabajado creo que muy padre (.). Yo estoy muy orgulloso de ustedes, de su trabajo, de las maravillas que están haciendo (.). ¡Bien hecho!

I want to tell you that after twelve years of experience as an ICELT tutor you have been the best group that I have ever had (.). You are very reliable candidates very committed very inquisitive but I prefer you like that than people who do not get involved, who do give their best (.). Some of you have become more stressed than really necessary but I also prefer you that way because there are people who don’t care who don’t give a rat’s ass so thank you very much! Thank you very much because we have worked together very well (.). I am very proud of you, of your work, of the wonders you have done (.). Well done!

(Tutor1_Session29_30/06/2017)

Whilst the candidates were praised many times throughout the course, this occasion stands out
for contrasting in tone and content with the main discourses described in this chapter. The
contrast and late expression of such recognition seem to suggest that the candidates were fully
recognised until they have met all the criteria established in the course.

6.7.1.5 Overarching theme summary
In summary, my analytic process generated an overarching theme and three themes that described aspects of three predominant discursive practices produced by the tutors during the face to face input sessions in the iteration of the course researched.

The first theme called ‘You will be recorded as withdrawn from the course’, described the warnings about failing the course that the candidates received on a constant basis during the course as well as the discourses that, at the same time, attempted to mitigate the effect that such warnings had on the candidates. It also described the general response from the candidates. As was described, such warnings are not only prevalent but also prominent in the data, mostly because of their link to the assessment components of the course.

The following theme called ‘Do as I do’, described the second predominant discursive practice identified in my analytic process, expressed in the notion that the candidates needed to follow the tutors’ guidelines and adapt their instructional practices to complete the assessment components. It also described the rhetorical strategies that the tutors resorted to persuade the candidates to comply with their guidelines. Finally, I referred briefly to the opposite but related discourses that opened some spaces for manoeuvre to the candidates during the course.

Finally, the theme called ‘No pain no gain’, described the third discursive practice identified in the data, expressed in the notion that pressure, stress and anxiety were normal and necessary to perform well in the course. As was described, this discourse was articulated as a direct response to the candidates’ signs of stress and, in this sense, it represented a form of appeal to persuade the candidates to accept it. At the same time, I referred to the expressions and actions that counterbalanced this discourse and the tutors’ personal views on stress.

In the last section, I referred briefly to the final message delivered by the main tutor where, according to my analysis, he recognised the candidates as professionals for the first time during the course. As was expressed, this suggests that the candidates were fully recognised as professionals only when they met the criteria established in the course.
6.8 Chapter summary

This chapter presented the results of the second part of my analysis in this study: a reflexive thematic analysis of the data collected during fieldwork in the iteration of the course researched. The analysis was conducted in relation to the second research question of this study: ‘what is particular in the way the course is implemented?’ As was mentioned in the introduction, this chapter focused on the aspects of the implementation of the course and, in this sense, it privileged the perspective of the course tutors.

The content of the chapter was organised in four sections in relation to the following topics: a) aspects of the representation of the course, particularly the representation of ICELT in the course (RSQ 2.1); b) ways in which the ends of ICELT were expressed in the course researched (RSQ 2.2); c) ways in which the distinctive components of ICELT were operationalised in the course (RSQ 2.3); d) aspects of the representation of the tutors (RSQ 2.4), and finally, e) a thematic description of three predominant discursive practices (RQ 2.5), correspondingly.

a) Aspects of representation of ICELT in the course

Concerning the representation of ICELT in the course, I identified three different types of representations in the data: implicit, explicit and private. As was described in the body of my analysis, in the case of the implicit representation, ICELT was represented through a polysemic and omni-semantic use of the name ‘Cambridge’. In the case of the explicit representation, ICELT was
portrayed not only as a ‘recognised in-service teacher training qualification’, echoing the representation identified in the official course documents, but also as a difficult course, and a professional and a life-transformative experience. Finally, as was described in my analysis, in one-to-one conversations the tutors expressed strong criticism of the course, which portrayed a different representation from the one expressed to the candidates publicly.

While complex, and seemingly contradictory, the representation of ICELT in the course not only contributed to establishing the discursive authority of the course as such it also strengthened the tutors’ discursive practices in the course.

b) Expression of the ends of ICELT in the course researched

Regarding the expression of the ends of ICELT in the course researched, my analysis showed that such ends were expressed in the data in at least three ways: as ‘explicit aims’, as ‘implicit aims’, and as ‘de facto aims’. As was described in the text of my report, the first set of aims were aligned with the official aims of the course identified in Chapter Five (see p. 99), while the ‘de facto’ aims went beyond such aims, potentially contrasting and conflicting with them.

c) Operationalisation of the distinctive components in the course researched

Concerning the ways identified in which the distinctive components of ICELT were operationalised in the course researched, my analytic process showed that in general such operationalisation was expressed in the data mainly through the assessment components, the input sessions and the directed observations, even though sometimes it was not fully realised nor was free from tensions or constraints (or some spaces and opportunities for manoeuvre).

Some of the most significant tensions related to such operationalisation identified in the data were a) the discrepancy between some of the content and focus of the course and the realities and teaching practices of some candidates, b) the overemphasis of a grammatical analytic focus and the mandatory use of specific procedures for this purpose (e.g., teaching frameworks) that, as the data showed, were not appropriate for some candidates’ teaching contexts and practices, and finally, c) the excessive attention identified in the data that the tutors paid on the assessment criteria in detriment of the attention on the teaching circumstances of the candidates, including their teaching contexts and teaching cultures.

d) Tutors’ positioning
In relation to the tutors’ representation, my analytic process identified in the data different aspects of the tutors’ discursive verbal and non-verbal representation, particularly regarding the representation of their role in the course, and also their non-verbal positioning in the course’s sessions. According to my analysis, the tutors represented their general role in the course as mediators between ‘Cambridge’ and the candidates through the use of different forms of appeal, from a position of authority and through the control of the talking time in the sessions of the course and a proxemic behaviour described as consistently “dominant”, “self-confident”, and “in control”.

As I mentioned in the summary of the corresponding theme, the tutors’ representation in the sessions reinforced the general representation of ICELT in the course, and it also laid the ground for their discourses.

e) Predominant discursive practices

The last section described relevant aspects of three predominant discursive practices identified in the data. As was referred to in my report, such practices were identified and categorised within three themes: a) the expression of warnings to the candidates about their failure in the course; b) the notion that the candidates were required to follow the tutors’ guidelines and adapt their instructional practices to perform well in the course, and c) the notion that pressure, stress, and anxiety were ‘normal’ and ‘necessary’ to complete the course and fulfil its ends. To add nuance and detail to the description of each main discourse, opposing but interrelated (not prevalent) discursive practices identified in the falsification phase of this study were also commented on in each case. Lastly, I included in the report of my analysis a reference to the message pronounced by the main course tutor to the candidates at the end of the course where he praised them for their general performance in the course and characterised them as ‘the best group of candidates he had ever had’. Considered as a whole, these discursive practices offered insight into the particular instructional practices used in the course and also of the way in which the tutors and the candidates positioned themselves and interacted with each other in the course.

The main findings of my analysis reported in this chapter, including the identified tensions, will be discussed in the discussion section in relation to the findings of the other two chapters of my analysis and also in relation to the theoretical discussion of ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’, ‘the marketisation of teacher education’, and ‘epistemological decolonisation.’
CHAPTER SEVEN: FINDINGS (3):
Experiences in ICELT

7.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the result of the third part of my analytic process: the analysis of data related to the experience of three candidates in the course. The results are presented in the form of individual case studies. Each case study is divided into six sections which contextualise and describe different aspects of the data in relation to a) each candidate’s background, b) the tutors’ perceptions of them and their performance in the course, and c) the candidates´ feelings and perceptions of their experience in the course. Specifically, the first section introduces the content of the corresponding case study. The second section describes the candidates’ professional background and their motivation for taking the course. The third section describes the candidates' teaching context. The fourth section describes the way in which the tutors perceived the candidates’ performance in the course, making emphasis on the feedback they provided on the candidates’ performance in the assessment components. The fifth section describes how the case candidates express and conceptualise their own experience in the course in relation to their feelings and perceptions. The last section summarises the content of each case study.

As in the previous two chapters, each case study includes relevant data extracts that illustrate prominent and prevalent patterns of content identified in the data. In general, keywords (and sometimes the wording itself) have been kept unchanged from the original data with the aim to reflect as best as possible the original texts’ language and the ‘intended’ meaning of the texts’ authors whose perspective is privileged in this chapter.

The candidates portrayed in the three cases presented here are part of a larger group of candidates on whom I focused my attention during fieldwork (see p. 59) but that for reasons of space I cannot include them here. The main criterion used for the inclusion of each one of the candidates in this study was ‘representativeness’, according to the assessment of their overall performance in the course made by the tutors in relation to three categories: ‘strong candidates’, ‘average candidates’ and weak candidates’.

Considered as a whole, the content of this chapter attempts to address and respond to the fourth research question of this study: ‘How do candidates express their own experience in ICELT in one
iteration of the course?’, and the corresponding research sub-questions: ‘how do they express their experience in the course in relation to their feelings?’, and ‘how do they express their experience in the course in relation to their perceptions?’.

As indicated by my analytic process, all three candidates referred to their overall experience in ICELT as an ‘intense experience’, even though the ‘intensity’ of such experience was conceptualised and expressed in different ways and with different tones by each candidate.

The most common emotion among the case candidates identified in the data was stress, and all of them expressed feelings of frustration and conflict with different aspects of what has been identified in this study as the ‘ends of ICELT’; the ‘distinguishing central elements’ of the course and the main discursive practices. However, each candidate also expressed a sense of accomplishment and pride, particularly towards the end of the course.

Regarding the perception of their experience in the course, all three candidates coincided in expressing strong criticism of different aspects of the instructional practices used in the course, even though they all also expressed positive views of their experience in it.

Finally, as the data show, all candidates adopted a ‘pragmatic’ attitude as a practical strategy to stay in the course and complete the assessment components’ tasks.

In this sense, my research claim concerning the candidates’ experience in the course is that, according to my analytic process, all candidates expressed that the course was an intense experience for them. In terms of their emotions, the most prominent feeling identified in the data was stress, even though each one of the candidates displayed a set of mixed emotions that followed a unique trajectory. Regarding their general perception of their experience in the course, each one of them expressed a different perspective, even though they all coincided in raising critical points about different aspects of the course. Finally, they all adopted a pragmatic strategy in order to complete the course and get their certificates.

The specifics of each case will be presented in what follows:
7.2 Victoria

| Case 1 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Candidate**   | Victoria         |
| **Age**         | 32              |
| **Gender**      | F               |
| **Nationality** | Mexican         |
| **Type of performer in the course according to the tutors** | ‘Strong candidate’ |
| **Educational background** | BA and an MA in Biology and Genomics / self-taught English teacher |
| **Professional background** | 7 years of teaching experience at elementary level (3rd, 4th and 6th graders) |
| **Cultural background** | Worked at mother’s bilingual elementary school in her hometown, in the southwest of Mexico |
| **Teaching context** | Prestigious bilingual school (pre-school to senior high school), located in the Mexico City metropolitan area, part of an international network of Catholic educational institutions. |
| **Approach to English language teaching** | Immersion in the content of subject-specific knowledge and literature in English |
| **School’s overall aim in the English classroom** | More than teaching the English language only, help students “to develop as persons”, through “habits formation”, and personalised engagement with them inside and outside the classroom |
| **Motivation for taking the ICETL course** | To consolidate her teaching knowledge and practice through formal teaching training |
| **Level of participation in the course** | One of the most participative candidates in the group |

Table 7.1 Victoria’s personal profile

7.2.1 Introduction

Victoria was one of the first candidates on whom I focused my attention during fieldwork. I did it motivated, in part, by the tutors’ comments who referred to her as one of the ‘strongest candidates’ in the course, although I also followed my research intuition. Victoria was a Mexican English teacher, with seven years of experience at an elementary school level, particularly with 3rd, 4th and 6th graders. As the data show, she was one of the most participative candidates in the input sessions. In general terms, I can characterise my (professional) relationship with her as ‘very good’ and, from the beginning of fieldwork, she was always open to talk about the course and her experience in it. As time went by, our relationship grew stronger and Victoria became particularly candid and straightforward when expressing her ideas and feelings.

7.2.2 Victoria’s background
According to her testimony, Victoria’s incursion into the field of English Language Teaching was ‘unintended’. Even though her mother owned and managed a bilingual elementary school in her hometown, in the southwest of Mexico, and despite her wishes for Victoria to become a teacher, she never really considered becoming one. In fact, she confessed to me that from a very young age she developed ‘a feeling of repudiation’ towards the idea of teaching. For this reason, instead of the teaching profession, she decided to pursue a career in Natural Science. This decision made her go to Mexico City to study for a BA and an MA in Biology and Genomics, respectively. However, one day, while she was on a holiday in her hometown, her mother asked her to fill in for a teacher who was on sick leave. According to her own account, once in the classroom, it didn’t take much for her to realise that teaching was her true calling. Victoria described this feeling in the following terms:

V: Dando clases me di cuenta que era feliz (...) resalta que aquí [en el colegio] que dije que nunca quería estar soy feliz (...) y me gusta y se me da y lo hago y lo entiendo

Whilst I was teaching I realised that I was happy (...) it turns out to be that there, a place [in which] I said I never wanted to be, I was happy (...) and I like[d] it and it came naturally to me and I was able to do it and I understood it [well]

(Victoria_interview_17/03/2017)

Since then, Victoria became a member of the academic staff at her mother’s elementary school, fundamentally as a self-taught teacher. According to her, she acquired the fundamentals of teaching by her own teaching practice and by observing and talking to other teachers whom she admired. Yet, after some time, she felt the need to consolidate her teaching knowledge and practice through formal teaching training. This was the reason that made her decide to move back to Mexico City to take the ICELT course at the ICELT authorised language centre, given the prestige of both, Cambridge as ‘an authority in languages and teacher training’ and the centre as a ‘serious institution’. 
7.2.3 Victoria’s teaching context

The institution where Victoria started to work was a prestigious bilingual school, located in the Mexico City metropolitan area, which was part of an international network of Catholic educational institutions. Its academic offer included educational programs from pre-school to senior high school. In the interview I had with the school principal, she told me that the mission of the school was to educate ‘complete human beings’, with ‘strong moral and religious values’, ‘affective and effective leadership’, and a sense of ‘justice and love in accordance to the principles of Christian humanism’ (interview 28/03/2017). To achieve this goal, the educational system was organised around the following elements: a competency-based learning model; bilingual education (Spanish and English); information and communications technologies (ICTs); strict discipline and positive habits formation and differentiated instruction.

Figure 7.1 Different aspects of the bilingual elementary school in the southwest of Mexico where Victoria began her teaching career and taught for seven years
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When I asked the school principal about the ‘bilingual education’ component, she described it in terms of a process of academic immersion in the content of subject-specific knowledge and literature in English. She pointed me to the school’s website where this notion is described in the following terms:

**Being bilingual means more than learning grammar rules.** The type of English learning in our school is achieved by presenting academic content in English in different subjects (...) In elementary school, our students discover the English language through the power of literature (emphasis in the original).

(School_victoria_website_2017)

Victoria’s own teaching beliefs and practice seemed to have embraced -and fully adhered to- the school’s mission. As she expressed it to me, she saw her role in the classroom not so much in terms of ‘teaching the English language only’, but rather in terms of helping her students ‘to develop as persons’, through ‘habits formation’, and personalised engagement with them inside and outside the classroom (interview 17/03/2017). During one of our conversations, she expressed this notion in the following terms:

V: No solo me interesa enseñar el idioma (...) a mí me interesa fundamentalmente la parte formativa (...) la parte de acompañamiento y la parte humanística

I am not only interested in teaching the language (...) I am fundamentally interested in the part of development (...) in the part of the engagement with [my students] and the humanistic part

(Victoria_interview_17/03/2017)
For her assessed teaching practices, Victoria taught a group of 3rd graders, composed of thirty-one male students who were, as referred to by her, English basic users, or A2 level English language students, according to the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR).

7.2.4 The tutors’ perceptions of Victoria and her performance in the course

7.2.4.1 Overall perception

As was referred to above, the data indicate that the consensus among the tutors about Victoria and her performance in the course was that, by the course’s standards and assessment criteria, she had been one of the strongest candidates in the course – if not the strongest. For the main course tutor (Tutor 1), for example, Victoria was a ‘very perfectionist, very picky, very punctilious, and very annoying but very good candidate’. When I asked the tutor why he considered that Victoria was ‘annoying’, he mentioned that even though Victoria had been a very ‘committed candidate’ in the course and had done ‘everything’ the tutors had asked her to do, she was ‘muy cuestionadora’ [very inquisitive] in the input sessions (interview 13/07/2017). Another tutor (tutor no. 2) was emphatic in her assertion that Victoria had ‘developed herself a lot in the course’ and had ‘always said interesting and very good things’ during the input sessions. She also said that ‘theoretically speaking’ Victoria had been ‘very good’ (interview 22/07/2017). For the other tutor (Tutor 3), Victoria was ‘a great example to follow’, a teacher ‘who enjoy[ed] to the fullest everything she [did]’ inside and outside the classroom, ‘very detail-oriented’, ‘open to constructive criticism’ and who was ‘never afraid to try and to take risks’ (interview 12/07/2017).

7.2.4.2 Feedback on performance

In line with the general comments from the tutors, Victoria received positive feedback for her performance in the assessment components of the course, which was evaluated following the course assessment guidelines. For example, in terms of her assessed teaching practices, Victoria was commonly praised for her class planning skills in terms of her successful identification of ‘suitable main and sub aims’ appropriate to ‘the needs, age and ability level of the group’ (Observation report PTO2 15/03/2017); her realistic estimation of time for each stage and activity in the class (Observation report PTO3 29/05/2017), and her good sequence of the lessons, following ‘all the stages’ of the corresponding lesson framework (e.g., PPP or TBL). At the same
time, in terms of the areas of ‘Lesson evaluation and Use of English in the classroom’, Victoria was also frequently praised for the ‘continuous improvement’ that she had been able to make ‘through reflection on [her] planning, delivery and use of English’, stating that that had ‘contributed to a more efficient delivery’ (Ibid).

Regarding her areas of development (another way used in the course to refer to the candidates’ areas of improvement), Victoria was recommended to work further on different elements in relation to her classroom teaching skills, such as the improvement of ‘[her] instructions’, ‘the features of [her] language-focus analysis’, ‘[her] monitoring skills’ and her ‘teacher talking time’ in order to “keep it always low”.

However, as the data show, one aspect of her teaching practice on which the course tutors focused their attention in a more prominently was Victoria’s class control, i.e., the control that Victoria was perceived to have over her students in class in apparent detriment of their autonomy (in turn, a distinguishing central element in ICELT. See p. 128 & 192). The following data extract from the written feedback received by Victoria on her second assessed practice teaching observation illustrates this point:

Trust in your planning and your delivery (...) let [your] ss work more autonomously. Discipline is clearly not an issue and learners can work on their own, knowing that you’ll be there to help in case they need you (...) Use 'answer keys' (when applicable) to keep learners busy and focused. This will also help you minimize your presence, monitor more and promote autonomy

(Tutor3_observationreport_pto2_victoria_15/03/2017)

More informally, tutor no. 3 commented to me that Victoria was ‘very controlling’ and that it was necessary for her to ‘set her students free, to let them experience things for themselves’ and ‘to let go of the reins!’ (Interview 12/07/2017). In her Practice Teaching Observation no. 3, Victoria implemented a series of strategies to promote the autonomy of her students in class (e.g., guided discovery activities, answer keys, etc.), just as she was told. After this, the topic of ‘class control’ was never referred to again.

As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, in contrast to the tutors’ perception, for Victoria the ‘control of her class’ was closely related to ‘discipline’ and especially to ‘habit formation’ of her students –one of the main tenets of the school’s culture and also of Victoria’s teaching. In this sense, for her, ‘class control’ was not something negative. However, as the data indicate, this and other ‘differences of perspective’ remained unaddressed and therefore hidden, for the most part,
being only (partially) articulated by her in our one-to-one conversations, as will be described in the following section.

7.2.5 Victoria’s experience in the course

In contrast to the tutors’ perception, Victoria characterised her own experience in ICELT in somewhat ambivalent terms. On the one hand, she characterised it as ‘an emotional rollercoaster’ that had made her feel ‘happy’ but also ‘really drained and overloaded’ (Focus group 07/07/2017). At the same time, she referred to it as ‘an intellectual challenge’ with ‘lows and highs’ and elevated levels of stress which rather frequently had made her wish that the course ended (interview 17/03/2017). Simultaneously, as our (professional) relationship grew and Victoria began to talk in a more open way, she expressed a more critical stance on specific aspects of her experience in the course, even though she always maintained an overall positive attitude towards it.

In a sense, these characterisations show not only the ambivalence but also the intensity and certainly complexity of her experience in the course. In what follows, I will present some prominent aspects of such experience, as they were identified in my analysis of the data. These aspects are organised around the two main notions employed by Victoria to characterise her experience, namely: the notion of ‘emotional rollercoaster”, that I will use to refer to her most prominent feelings and emotions, and the notion of ‘intellectual challenge’, that I will use to describe the main themes identified in the data in relation to her discursively more rational perspective on relevant aspects of the course itself:

7.2.5.1 An emotional rollercoaster: Victoria’s prominent feelings and emotions in the course

As the data show, in terms of Victoria’s feelings and emotions, her experience in the course can be represented indeed as a ‘rollercoaster’ ride, with ups and downs, mood swings, and emotional changes. In what follows, I will describe briefly four of the most prominent feelings and emotions expressed discursively and behaviourally by Victoria throughout the course. The order in which they are presented corresponds to the order in which they became prominent in the course. The first, called ‘I’m nowhere near a good teacher’, refers to the sudden feeling of self-doubt that Victoria experienced, particularly during the first third of the course; the second, called ‘my class disappointed him’, refers to the hypersensitivity that Victoria developed towards the tutors’ opinions about her performance in the assessment components; the third, called ‘it takes us out
of our comfort zone’, refers to Victoria’s progressive use of some of the tutors’ main concepts, and the last one called ‘because I saw it this way in my ICET course!’ refers to Victoria’s gradual (re)empowerment in the course.

7.2.5.1.1 I’m nowhere near a good teacher

As the data show, one of the most prevalent and prominent feelings expressed by Victoria during the course was the feeling of self-doubt. Even though this feeling was shared by other candidates, Victoria was particularly outspoken about it. Towards the end of the course, she referred to the way in which suddenly and progressively her self-image had started to change since the beginning of the course, as portrayed in the following data extract. The context of the remark is a conversation among the candidates about their overall feelings and emotions in ICET:

1 V: Like I said (.). I thought that I was a good teacher but then I
2 came here and said ‘ok, I’m a decent teacher’ at least but then
3 I realised ‘no I’m nowhere near a good teacher’ (.). I understood
4 that I needed to do a lot of learning

(Victoria_groupconversation_30/06/2017)

When I asked her, later that day, to elaborate further on this comment, Victoria explained to me that her self-image had started to change and that she had felt ‘overpowered’ when she realised that she was not up to the level of the academic demands of the course given the ‘high academic demands from Cambridge’ (conversation 30/06/2017). Even though this feeling remained relatively constant until the end of the course, its expression was particularly apparent during the first third of the course.

7.2.5.1.2 My class disappointed him

Another prominent feeling identified in my analytic process was the hypersensitivity that Victoria (otherwise a seemingly assertive person) developed during the course towards the opinions of the tutors about her performance in the assessment components. The discursive manifestation of such feeling, certainly linked to her feeling of self-doubt described above, is constant in the data and is frequently expressed in terms of inadequacy, preoccupation with perfectionism, and/or emotional clinginess. One example that illustrates the expression of this feeling is portrayed in the data extract below. The context of the exchange is a conversation that I had with Victoria after the post-class feedback of her second practice teaching observation. In the extract,
Victoria refers to a side comment made by the main course tutor expressing that she seemed to have played safe in one of the class activities:

E: ¿Cómo estás? How are you?
V: Estoy destrozada (.) lloré I’m shattered (.) I cried
E: ¿Por qué? Why?
V: por el comentario for the comment
E: ¿por el comentario? for the comment?
V: si el comentario de que ‘I played safe’ porque quiere decir que la clase lo decepcionó yes the comment that ‘I played safe’ because it means that the class disappointed him
E: ¿podrías elaborar un poco más por favor? Could you please elaborate?
V: Siento que [al tutor] le importó mucho lo que el entendió como ‘playing safe’ (.). sí lo sentí super decepcionado de la clase (.). Así como ‘Ah pues ¿esto es lo que pudiste hacer? No pues no pasaste’ (.) ¿No sentiste que [el tutor] se fue molesto I feel that [the tutor] cared a lot about what he understood as ‘me playing safe’ (.) yes I feel he was super disappointed with the class (.) Like ‘Oh well this is what you were able to do? No you didn’t pass’ (.) Didn’t you feel that [the tutor] left annoying?

(Victoria_interview_17/03/2017)

My perception of the event referred to by Victoria in the extract was that the tutor had ‘left the room’ seemingly pleased with the observation and this was what I told Victoria. As indicated in the data, this assessed practice teaching finally received an overall ‘Merit’ grade, confirming the (mostly) positive feedback that Victoria had been given in the post-observation feedback session.

7.2.5.1.3 It takes us out of our comfort zone

Another pattern identified in my analytic process, associated with Victoria’s feelings and emotions in the course, is related to her use of some of the tutors’ main concepts or notions, particularly the ones expressed by them in their main discourses. Whereas this identification can be contested, as there is always the likelihood of simple coincidence in the expression of the same ideas, the identification of such a pattern remains reasonably valid given the simultaneous occurrence of the expressions. Some of the main concepts/notions identified in the data were: ‘leaving one’s comfort zone’; ‘experts know better’; or ‘before attempting to innovate, one needs to have well-established knowledge and guided practice first’, as is portrayed in the following data extract below. The context of the extract is a conversation I had with Victoria halfway through the course. The extract portrays her answer to my question about her perception of the opportunities to innovate in the course:
7.2.5.1.4 Because I saw it this way in my ICBLT course!

The last prominent feeling identified in my analysis is related to the process of Victoria’s empowerment (or re-empowerment) in the course. In general, such process started to be apparent at the beginning of the third part of the course when Victoria’s mood and attitude changed notably, both behaviourally and discursively, towards a more self-confident demeanour despite some occasional expressions of self-doubt and lack of confidence in her teaching, even towards the end of the course.

As my analysis indicates, behaviourally Victoria started to show a change in her general emotional mood after she received the results of her C3-3 (Methodology assignment) and C2-3 (assessed teaching practice) components. A note in my research diary recorded this event in the following terms:

Discursively, in one of our casual conversations, Victoria referred to this topic stating that, at that moment, she felt she had (re)gained self-confidence in making decisions in the classroom in terms of the Practice teaching observations (PTOs), and also in her teaching practice, as depicted in the following data extract:
Considered as a whole, the prominent feelings and emotions identified in the data seem to outline a process or a *path* that describes the emotional development of Victoria throughout the course (from self-doubt and hypersensitivity towards the tutors’ opinions to Victoria’s identification, or ‘internalisation’, of the main concepts used by the tutors, and then to her (re) empowerment). However, it is important to consider that even though sequential, the expression of these feelings was not linear nor fully consistent.

In the case of the expression of her ideas, Victoria was more outspoken and also more critical, as will be described in the following section.

### 7.2.5.2 An intellectual challenge: Victoria’s perspective on relevant aspects of the course

In different conversations throughout the course, I asked Victoria to talk freely about her experience in ICELT. In these exchanges, Victoria talked at length about different aspects of it. Altogether, we talked for about four and a half hours in different settings, from before-class conversations to coffee meetups and video chat conversations. In what follows, I will describe the three most prominent themes identified in my analysis of the data regarding her discursively more rational perception of her experience in relation to different aspects of the course. The first one entitled ‘Follow the instructions!’ describes her perception of the challenge that represented for her to follow the assessment components’ guidelines ‘to the letter’, as they had been explained by the tutors; the second one called ‘Not adapted to me!’ looks into her perception that the course had not been adapted to her teaching context, her needs nor the needs of her students and that, as a consequence, the tutors had never got to know her well as a teacher, and finally, the last one called ‘In conflict with my professional growth’ talks about her view that the course’s grading criteria (or rather, their application) had been in conflict with her professional growth:
7.2.5.2.1 ‘Follow the instructions!’

One of the main themes in Victoria’s references about her experience in the course was related to the challenge that for her represented to follow the guidelines of the assessment components ‘to the letter’ as these had been explained by the tutors. For her, this represented a constant source of ‘concern’ and ‘stress’. ‘Concern’ because, in her perception, following the guidelines in such a way was a decisive factor in getting a passing grade or a failing grade in the course. As she expressed it:

> Following the guidelines also represented a source of ‘stress’ because, for Victoria, there were too many requirements to meet. She expressed it as follows: ‘they ask for so many things that I’m always worried about not complying’ (interview 17/03/2017).

At the same time, even though Victoria acknowledged that the candidates had received adequate support from the tutors in the course in the form of, for example, ‘extra guidelines’ and ‘comments’ to carry out the assignments (that for her constituted the ‘perfect recipe’ for the completion of the assignments (interview 19/05/2017), she expressed that such support entailed a downside. According to her, instead of focusing on content, she had focused more on fulfilling the requirements of the components. For her, this had a negative effect on her learning experience. She expressed it in the following terms:

> The most important thing [in the course] is to follow the methodology they ask for in the approach they ask for (.). just as they ask you to without wanting to be spontaneous or creative (.). Whenever I’ve done what they have told me just as they’ve told me I mean almost as a check list: ‘I did this? I did this? I did this?’ ‘Is it in the order they told me?’ ‘Yes? Ok!’ I have always got good marks!

(Victoria_interview_17/03/2017)
It is important to emphasise that none of these remarks seems to have been originally articulated as a criticism of the course (as it is suggested by Victoria’s choice of words such as, for example, her use of I-statements or the lack of modal verbs to express obligation), but mostly as an expression of prominent aspects of her experience in the course, and of what she is likely to have perceived as a natural state of affairs in the course.

7.2.5.2.2 ‘Not adapted to me!’

Another main theme identified in Victoria’s talk regarding her experience in the course was related to her perception that the course had not been adapted to her teaching context, her needs or the needs of her students and that, as a consequence, the tutors had never got to know her well as a teacher. Victoria expressed this notion towards the end of the course in the context of a conversation about the ‘strengths’ and ‘areas of development’ of ICELT. When addressing the latter aspect, she mentioned that she would have liked the course to be designed for young learners’ teaching contexts because this was her teaching context as well as the context of the majority of the candidates in the course. She expressed this notion as follows:

(Victoria_interview_19/05/2017)

(Victoria_interview_16/06/2017)
After this, Victoria mentioned some learning factors that, in her opinion, made such learning contexts different, such as the time that the students take to complete the class tasks or the time that they take to process information (particularly new information) in each case. For her, in the course, such aspects had been considered only from adult learners’ perspective. When I asked her to elaborate on this notion, Victoria told me that she thought the course could have included content, proper demo classes, lesson frameworks and examples particularly designed to teach young learners in accordance with the teaching contexts of many candidates in the course. Probing even further, I asked her if she believed then that the course had not been adapted to her and her teaching context. She replied that she thought that it had not been so and that the exact opposite had been rather the case. Victoria expressed it in the following terms:

V: [El curso] No estuvo adaptado [para mí] (.) Fue lo opuesto (.) es más bien: ‘yo te doy esto (.) pongo dentro de tu práctica diaria’ ‘aplicalo y sobre eso creo’ [The course] was not adapted [to me] (.) It was the opposite (.) it is rather: ‘I give you this (.) put it into your daily practice’ ‘apply it and grow from that’

(Victoria_interview_16/06/2017)

As a result of this, Victoria thought that the course tutors had never really got to know her well (as a teacher) nor her teaching needs. She expressed this notion in a rather strong tone:

T3: Tanto pregonan [los tutores] que necesitas ver quién es son tus alumnos y que conozcas a tus alumnos pero tu también como tutor de ICEL T (. . ) conoce a tus alumnos y sus necesidades! Tu como tutor de ICEL pregonas que conozcas a nuestros alumnos pero tú no conoces nuestras necesidades [The tutors] preach to us that we need to see who our students are and that we have to get to know our students but you as an ICEL tutor (. . ) get to know your own students and their needs! You as an ICEL tutor preach to us that we need to get to know our students but you do not know our needs!

(Victoria_interview_16/06/2017)

Something important to note is that, despite her criticism, Victoria always referred to the tutors in a positive way both in personal and academic terms, which in a sense helps to circumscribe further her opinions.

7.2.5.2.3 ‘In conflict with my professional growth!’
Another main theme identified in the analysis of my conversations with Victoria is related to her view that the course’s grading criteria (or rather, their application) were in conflict with her professional growth. Victoria referred to this notion on a relatively constant basis during our conversations throughout the course. Such frequency can be explained, in part, for the prominence that the assessment components themselves had in the course (as referred to in 6.6.1. See p. 180), and also for the personal importance that for Victoria had the marks obtained. As she expressed it, the marks obtained mattered a lot to her because they not only reflected her performance in the course but had an impact on her own ‘public image’.

Despite having expressed on different occasions that the course had helped her to strengthen different aspects of her teaching practice (such as the confidence to experience with different teaching techniques, improve her assessment skills or, as mentioned earlier, gain much more confidence in making teaching decisions, Victoria thought that her professional growth in the course had been affected by the fact that the main focus in the assessment of the course’s components had been centred more on form than on substance. One expression of this, according to her, was the attention given by the tutors to the ‘mistakes’ in the candidates’ performance in their assessed teaching practices. Victoria expressed this notion in the following terms:

V: [En las observaciones evaluadas] cuentan mucho los errores en [el uso de] interaction patterns (.) que no te pases de tiempo en cada actividad etc etc (.) para mí esta en conflicto con mi crecimiento profesional

[In the assessed observations] the mistakes count a lot, [for example] in [the use of] interaction patterns (.) in the time that one spends in each activity, etc etc (.) for me this is in conflict with my professional growth

(Victoria_conversation_28/04/2017)

For Victoria, this had led her to focus fundamentally on formal and procedural aspects of the assessment components rather than in their content. As she put it:

V: Esto me frustra mucho porque digo: ‘chín a veces estoy más preocupada por poner el formato o con seguir los procedimientos (.) con el párrafo perfecto [en los ensayos] o con el interaction pattern correcto [en las observaciones de clase] que en contenido (.) que esforzándome en contenido

This frustrates me a lot because I say: ‘(expletive!)’ sometimes I am more worried about the format or [about] following the required procedures (.) about writing the perfect paragraph [in the essays] or setting the right interaction pattern [in the assessed teaching practices] than on the content (.) than about focusing my attention on content

(Victoria_conversation_28/04/2017)
Elaborating further on this notion, Victoria asserted that if the assessment criteria were different, perhaps she would be teaching with more freedom, which in turn would have made her grow in the course more ‘in relation to what [she used to do] every day’ and not in relation to what the tutors were ‘telling [her] to do’ (conversation 28/04/2017). Towards the end of the course, she expressed this same notion but with a more reflective tone:

V: Hubiera sido muy diferente si hubiera tomado el curso sin pensar en mis calificaciones (.). Nuestra preocupación siempre fue cumplir con lo que te pedían para los assignments y las observaciones y con esa preocupación te pierdes de muchas cosas porque solo estabamos pensando: ‘tengo que encontrar el quote’ ‘esto no me sirve’ ‘no me sirve’ ‘esto sí’ (.). No sé a lo mejor fui yo

It would have been very different if I had taken the course without thinking about what grade I would get (.). Our concern was always to comply with what we were asked for in the assignments and the observations and with that in mind one misses many things because we were just thinking ‘I have to find the quote’ ‘this doesn’t work for me’ ‘this doesn’t work for me’ ‘this does’ (.). I don’t know maybe it was just me

(Victoria_interview_21/06/2017)

As was mentioned above, the expression of these ideas was relatively contemporaneous with the expression of her feelings and emotions, which seems to shows that, in a sense, her experience in the course was indeed an emotional rollercoaster and an intellectual challenge, all at once.

7.2.6 Case study summary

In summary, my analytic process produced a research account that attempted to capture and describe relevant aspects of Victoria’s experience in the course, emphasising her perspective, but also including the tutors’ perspective and my own, as the researcher.

In general, as was described in the body of my report, Victoria referred to her experience in the course in ambivalent terms, characterising it as an emotional ‘rollercoaster’ and as an intellectual challenge’ with highs and lows and constant tensions (p. 234).

Regarding the expression of Victoria’s feelings, one relevant element identified in my analytic process was the path or trajectory that such expression seemed to have followed: from her feelings of self-doubt to her hypersensitivity to the tutors’ opinions, and her identification with the tutors’ discourse to her re-empowerment. Even though such expression is not linear nor fully
consistent in the data, its identification offers insight into the process of Victoria's emotional
response in the course.

In terms of Victoria's perceptions of her own experience in the course, one interesting aspect
identified in the data and consigned in my report was Victoria’s reference to some of the main
tensions described in Chapter Six (p. 179) concerning the operationalisation in the course of the
distinguishing central elements of ICELT. However, despite her critical stance, as was referred to
in the text of her account, Victoria was unlikely to have had the intention of articulating her
perceptions in such terms. Conversely, different instances in the data seem to suggest that
Victoria adopted a more practical approach, as is expressed by a comment made by her towards
the end of the course in relation to the purpose of ICELT:

V: Creo que el propósito del curso es muy claro: enseñar la metodología y las técnicas de enseñanza de Cambridge (.) Y Cambridge dice: ‘esto es lo que les vamos a enseñar’ (.) ‘Si no te gusta ¿por qué estás aquí?’ (.) y en mi caso ¡me encanta! I believe that the purpose of the course is very clear: to teach the methodology and teaching techniques of Cambridge (.) And Cambridge says: ‘this is what we are going to teach you’ (.) ‘If you don’t like it why are you here?’ (.) and in my case I love it!

(Victoria_interview_21/06/2017)
7.3 Javier

| Case 2 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Candidate** | Javier |
| **Age** | Early thirties |
| **Gender** | M |
| **Nationality** | South American |
| **Type of performer in the course according to the tutors** | ‘Average candidate’ |
| **Educational background** | BA in English Language Teaching |
| **Professional background** | 10 years of professional experience teaching mainly adults |
| **Cultural background** | Had been living in Mexico for two years and was planning to enrol in an MA in Applied Linguistics |
| **Teaching context** | Private co-educational bilingual institution (pre-primary, primary, junior high and high school), located in an affluent neighbourhood in the South of Mexico City. |
| **Approach to English language teaching** | Inquiry-based and student-centred in the form of projects led by the students; ‘hard CLIIL [Content and Language Integrated Learning]’ (with almost half of the curriculum taught in English) and ‘Language Arts’ (a student- and response-centred approach to literature-based teaching) and ‘Use of English’ besides the promotion of a bilingual environment for the students to communicate in English with their teachers and among themselves on a regular basis with the aim of “making English part of their daily life” |
| **School’s overall aim in the English classroom** | To develop the students’ communicative competence which, in turn, was sought to be achieved through the development of their “cognitive, social and cultural skills” in the target language. |
| **Motivation for taking the ICETL course** | was asked to take the ICETL course by the school authorities as part of the institution’s strategy to certify its academic staff |
| **Level of participation in the course** | Discreet and mostly limited to answering only direct questions |

Table 7. 2 Javier’s personal profile

7.3.1 Introduction

Javier was another candidate on whom I focused my attention during fieldwork. I did it because early in the course I learned that he was the only candidate in the group that taught English through Langue Arts (a student- and response-centred approach to literature-based teaching), and I felt curious to know more about him. He also was the only candidate in the course who held a Bachelor’s degree in English Language Teaching. At the same time, near halfway through the course, the tutors coincided in characterising Javier as a rather ‘average’ candidate who was having a hard time adjusting himself to the course, which in a sense made me feel even more
curious, so I kept my focus on him. Javier was an English language teacher in his early thirties, with 10 years of professional experience teaching mainly adults, and who had been living in Mexico City for two years at the time of the course. As the data indicate, in contrast to Victoria, his participation in class during the course was discreet and mostly limited to answering only direct questions. At the same time, as in Victoria’s case, my (professional) relationship with him could be characterised as ‘very good’ which contributed to the amount and quality of talk during our conversations, helping to create the conditions for Javier to talk openly (and in his case, to a great extent, critically) about his experience in the course and the course as such.

7.3.2 Javier’s background and motivation for taking the course

According to his testimony, Javier decided to become a language teacher because of the admiration he had for his English teachers in Middle school. According to him, his teachers always showed professional behaviour and their classes were ‘always interesting and fun’. This was because, in contrast to classes from other subjects, his teachers commonly included stimulating elements that made them so, such as extra material (e.g., visuals, handouts, and audios) and different class interaction patterns (such as pair work and group work), among other elements. At the same time, Javier commented to me that the difficulties that he had been through when learning the language had made him sensitive to other people’s learning needs. These two elements motivated him to study for a BA degree in Spanish and English Language Teaching in his home state and to seek a postgraduate program in the nation’s capital. This took him to Mexico City where he started to work as an English teacher so that he could afford to pay for his future studies. However, in his new job, he was asked to take the ICELT course by the school authorities as part of the institution’s strategy to certify its academic staff. As the academic coordinator of the school mentioned to me in the interview we had, the goal of the institution for taking the course was twofold: on the one hand, to obtain a ‘prestigious international ELT qualification’ and, at the same time, to ‘upgrade’ the teaching knowledge and skills of the academic staff with ‘the latest there [was] in terms of teaching knowledge, methodologies and all that’ (interview 05/07/2017). Even though a little bit reluctant at first, Javier started the ICELT course with enthusiasm and expectation, just like the rest of the course candidates.

7.3.3 Javier’s teaching context

The school where Javier worked was a private co-educational bilingual institution located in the South of Mexico City. The school offered different schooling including pre-primary, primary, junior high and high school. This institution was part of a prestigious international organization that
provided the academic curriculum to its affiliated schools around the world. According to the school principal, such a curriculum had as its main aim to help students ‘make practical connections between their studies and the real world’, teaching students to ‘think critically and independently’ and to ‘inquiry systematically and logically’. As he explained to me, the curriculum was underpinned by and organised around four pillars: constructionism, inquiry, internationalism, and transdisciplinarity (interview 05/07/2017). For its part, the institution’s website represented the school as an ‘Educational Community’, whose core values were ‘social awareness’, ‘respect, responsibility and honesty’, and whose educational mission was expressed in terms of supporting their students to develop their skills, knowledge, and values in order to ‘successfully face the challenges of today’s world’ (school’s website 2017).

7.3.3.1 Bilingual Education

Like many private schools in Mexico, the institution where Javier worked was bilingual (Spanish and English). According to the Academic Coordinator of the program (herself an ICELT course candidate in the iteration of the course researched), the general aim of the program was to develop the students’ communicative competence which, in turn, was sought to be achieved
through the development of their ‘cognitive, social and cultural skills’ in the target language. Correspondingly, the institution’s English language curriculum was composed of three strands: ‘Hard CLIL [Content and Language Integrated Learning]’ (with almost half of the curriculum taught in English); ‘Language Arts’ and ‘Use of English’ beside the promotion of a bilingual environment for the students to communicate in English with their teachers and among themselves on a regular basis with the aim of ‘making English part of their daily life’.

7.3.3.2 Javier’s English language instruction

- Focus on content

As commented by Javier, in line with the school’s program, the focus in his classes was not on language (e.g., on grammar) but subject content. For him, language constituted a tool to explore the content of different topics. As he told me:

1  J: English is just another tool for [my] students to produce in class. Language as such is a means to get to other topics.

(Javier_interview_24/05/2017)

- Methodology

According to Javier, the methodology used by the institution was inquiry-based and student-centred in the form of projects led by the students. As I was able to see in the observation that I made in one of his classes (independent of the ICELT’s observations), such methodology was specially designed to promote learner autonomy. Javier described it in the following way:

1  J: We give [the students] inquiry questions and they have to work individually in pairs or in groups to look for the answers by themselves and then they receive and give feedback to each other’s projects (.) and then I give them my feedback but this is done without pressure so that they have plenty of time to organize ideas reflect and discuss

(Javier_interview_21/03/2017)

Finally, Javier commented to me that the class discussions focused mostly on the practical implications of the class topic of the day, in line with the main aim of the school’s curriculum
which emphasised the ‘practical connections’ between the students’ learning process and ‘the real world’, as referred to above.

7.3.4 The tutors’ perceptions of Javier and his performance in the course

7.3.4.1 Overall perception

As was mentioned earlier, Javier was regarded by the tutors as a rather ‘average candidate’. One tutor even singled him out as ‘the most average candidate [in the course]’ (tutor 3, interview 12/07/2017). As expressed by the tutors, in part, Javier was thought to have been somehow ‘complacent’ in the course, doing only what was necessary to ‘tick the boxes’ in order to satisfy them. However, they also acknowledged that Javier had had difficulties at the beginning of the course but that he had managed to adapt himself to its demands and finally, pass the course.

In separate conversations, I asked the tutors to elaborate on this point. In general, they all coincided in saying that Javier had had a hard time understanding the logic of the course and, in particular, of the course’s tasks. According to them, among other reasons, Javier’s own academic background and even his teaching context had contributed to it. The main course tutor expressed, for example, that Javier had been educated in a context where Cambridge English, as an institution, was likely to have been absent and that this lack of exposure to certain methods and methodologies could have made it more difficult for him to understand the course’s tasks. At the same time, he expressed that Javier had the ‘disadvantage’ of working at a school where students lacked discipline and ‘[did] whatever they want [ed]’ (interview 13/07/2017). Another reason expressed by the tutors was that Javier was not an ‘English teacher per se’ because he did not teach ‘English per se’ what seemed to imply that he lacked some teaching fundamentals to teach general English (Tutor 3, interview 12/07/2017). However, as mentioned above, they all recognised Javier’s effort to cope with the demands of the course’s assessment components and for this reason, they all expressed that they felt proud of him and proud of themselves.

7.3.4.2. Feedback on performance

Like with all other candidates, Javier’s performance in each assessment component was evaluated and commented on according to the course’s assessment criteria (e.g. see Appendix 9). In the case of his assessed teaching practice (Component 2), for example, two areas that received special
attention from the tutors throughout the course were Javier’s lesson design and lesson implementation. As the data indicate, one aspect in which the tutors made particular emphasis in such areas was the need for Javier to set the lesson objectives and the main foci of his teaching practices in relation to language systems (e.g., grammar), or language skills-building. Concomitantly, he was required to use the pre-established lesson frameworks and to design the class tasks in accordance with them. The following data extract from a conversation between Javier and one of the tutors illustrates this point. The context of the exchange is the post-lesson feedback session after his first teaching practice observation (PTO1). The excerpt portrays a rather harsh exchange where the course tutor admonishes Javier for not setting the main lesson objective and the main lesson focus around receptive skills-building as such but instead, around subject content (in this case, a literary-based analysis of an audio excerpt from Shakespeare’s Macbeth):

1 T: Tell me which was the main objective of your lesson?
2 J: Uh to help students recognise how a drama works and [what] is composed of
3 T: Ok (.) and what was the main objective for the PTO1 (Practice Teaching Observation 1)?
4 (pause)
5 T: Ehh no the main objective would be that one get students practice this uh just topic
6 (pause)
7 T: But I mean in the ICELT course we do not focus on literature so that couldn’t be the main objective of the ICELT Course for [the] PTO1
8 J: Umm
9 T: Which was the main objective for the PTO1 in the ICELT (course)?
10 J: To put to uuh to
11 T: What did they [the other tutors] tell you to practice?
12 J: To put students to practice this (pointing to his class plan)
13 T: Did they tell you to do that?
14 (pause)
15 T: What did they tell you [that] you have to do?
16 J: Well for this one they told me that (pause) it was a listening or reading skills class
17 T: Ok then so what did you have to do (.) what was your main objective?
18 J: Ah! Ok to work on listening skills
19 T: Receptive skills! Ok? (.) Your main objective of the class was developing either listening or reading skills (.) That’s the main Objective (.) Your secondary objective can be drama or anything [else] (.) Your main objective was developing listening and reading ok?
20 J: Okay

(Tutor2_postclassfeedback_pto1_javier_02/02/2017)
In his subsequent practice teaching observations, Javier set the lesson objectives and implemented the corresponding teaching frameworks as he had been instructed to. Once he did this, he then received further indications (in the form of both spoken and written feedback) to improve aspects of lesson stages and discrete class tasks of his assessed teaching practice, such as covering in more consistent way aspects of ‘form and also meaning and pronunciation’ (Observation report PTO4 22/06/2017), among other aspects. In turn, Javier was most prominently praised for his ‘range of classroom teaching skills’ which helped him to manage the classroom events ‘appropriately’ throughout his assessed teaching practices, such as ‘voice projection, nomination, praising of students’ work, encouraging them to work using the target language, and good elicitation techniques’ (Observation report PTO3 24/05/2017). Another area where Javier was most prominently praised was Lesson evaluation, as he was consistently recognised to have ‘reflected critically’ about the lesson, ‘based on feedback received’ from the tutors (Observation report PTO2 21/03/2017), and to have implemented the corresponding changes.

In terms of the other assessment components (Language tasks and Methodology assignments), the tutors provided Javier with detailed feedback for each essay in the form of both, a paragraph-by-paragraph annotated version of the original essay and an assignment mark sheet, which included fourteen items to be ticked off, as well as general and specific comments, outlining ‘strengths’ and ‘areas for development’ (see Appendix 9). The tutors' evaluation and comments of his essays followed the course assessment criteria for each case. Overall, he was required to amend and resubmit most of his essays. In a sense, this was not uncommon in the course, because as the data indicate, all the candidates were also asked to resubmit some (or in some cases, the majority) of their essays. As my analytic process shows, the feedback general comments received by Javier tended to emphasise most prominently, in general, the need for Javier to strictly adhere to the assessment guidelines (Methodology assignment mark sheet C3.1 21/07/2017) and, in particular, the improvement of formal aspects of his writings, such as cohesion and coherence, use of language, or citations, such as the number of citations used in each essay, among others.

7.3.5 Javier’s experience in the course

As the data show, during the course, I talked to Javier extensively (around seven and half hours overall) about his experience in the course as he was living it. The format of our exchanges ran the gamut from casual conversations, particularly during the break time in the course’s input sessions, to video chat conversations and coffee meetups which, in general, took place after each one of his practice teaching observations. Like in Victoria’s case, Javier characterised his overall
experience in the course as a ‘roller coaster’ (interview 23/05/2017). However, unlike Victoria, Javier expressed his feelings and emotions in openly unfavourable terms. At the same time, he was unequivocal in expressing a critical perspective of different aspects of the course, even though publicly he maintained a positive, pragmatic attitude throughout the course, as was correctly identified by the tutors.

Considered as a whole, these elements offer a snapshot of Javier’s experience in ICELT, making apparent its intensive and complex character. In what follows, I will describe briefly relevant aspects, identified thematically in my analysis, of such elements, namely: Javier’s prominent and prevalent feelings throughout the course, his perceptions about some essential aspects of his learning experience, and his description of the attitude that he adopted during the course.

7.3.5.1 Javier’s prominent and prevalent feelings in the course

As mentioned above, during our conversations, Javier was categorical in expressing his dissatisfaction with the course while managing to maintain, simultaneously, an overall (pragmatic) positive attitude. Among the various feelings and emotions expressed by Javier, three were particularly prominent and prevalent: ‘stress’, ‘anger’, and ‘disappointment’ (as referred to by Javier himself). In what follows, I will refer briefly to each one of them, illustrating their expression with extracts drawn from the data:

7.3.5.1.1 Stress

As my analysis shows, stress was one of the most prominent and prevalent feelings experimented on by Javier in the course. Like most of the candidates, Javier felt under considerable pressure since the beginning of the course, and like in many cases, such pressure turned quickly into stress. In Javier’s case, the first signs of stress became apparent when he received the grades and feedback from his first assignments (most of them with low or failing marks), making him feel unable to cope with the demands of the assessment components. But even when Javier managed to obtain better grades (mostly towards the end of the course), the pressure and stress remained constant, given the interplay of multiple factors, such as what he referred to as the ‘heavy load’ from his job and from the course itself.

The following extract illustrates the way in which Javier conceptualised his stress in the course and, at the same time, expresses the (potential) cathartic effect that our conversations had on
him. The context of the data extract is a conversation I had with Javier after his third assessed teaching practice:

J: Yo estoy haciendo un gran esfuerzo [en mi trabajo] (...) tengo una carga muy llena durante toda la semana enseñando horas y horas etc exigencias y bla bla bla y [luego en el curso] los viernes vienes a unas sesiones que son larguísimas y luego la presión de que tienes que entregar no sé cuánto cuántos essays y que te regresan el trabajo con un montón de correcciones (...) ¡Todo eso genera muchísima presión y stress!

I am making a great effort [in my job] (...) I have a very heavy load throughout the week teaching hours and hours etc [meeting] deadlines and blah blah blah and [then in the course] on Fridays we have very long course sessions [in the course] and then the pressure of submitting I do not know how many essays and then they return your essays with tons of corrections (...) All this generates a lot of pressure and stress!

(Javier_interview_24/05/2017)

As referred to in 6.7 (p. 196), stress was identified in the data as one of the most prevalent feelings or emotions experienced by the candidates in the course. However, the data suggest that each candidate lived it and expressed it in different ways and modes (e.g., mostly verbally, symbolically, or behaviourally). In the case of Javier, as shown in the extract above, his expressions were, for the most part, particularly outspoken and direct.

7.3.5.1.2 Anger

As mentioned earlier, the second most prevalent feeling identified in the data that Javier expressed during the course was anger. As the data indicate, Javier expressed this feeling fundamentally (but not only) in relation to what he perceived to be a lack of consideration, and sometimes belittlement, of his academic background and also of his teaching experience by the tutors. The following data extract portrays one example in which Javier refers to this feeling in relation to the former aspect (his academic background) after receiving feedback on his second practice observation, at a time when he had already received feedback on, at least, the first round of all his assessment components.
Javier also expressed anger in the course with respect to the feedback he received from the tutors, especially during the first half of the course, as he believed that the comments on his work were not balanced.

As the course progressed, Javier’s expressions of anger were less prevalent, while the expressions of a new feeling (disappointment) started to creep up, as will be described in the following section.

7.3.5.1.3 Disappointment

Another prominent emotion expressed by Javier was disappointment. The expression of this emotion was particularly prominent during the second half of the course and it was mostly related to what Javier conceptualised as the course’s ‘unfulfilled promises’, i.e., ‘the gap between the [course] promises and the reality’ in terms of the product and academic services provided in the course, from ‘the online component’ (a component of the course questioned by different candidates) to the input sessions. Javier rationalised his disappointment with this aspect of the course in the following terms:

According to the data, Javier also referred to his disappointment concerning the discrepancy he felt there was in the course regarding the standards set for both tutors and candidates. For
example, Javier expressed that the tutors placed especial emphasis on the spelling mistakes in the candidates’ essays while their input session’s didactic material contained multiple ‘spelling and grammar mistakes’, etc.

In general, the expression of Javier’s feelings and emotions, as they were identified in the data, seemed to have followed a relatively clear path, from pressure and stress to anger and disappointment. In turn, as the data also indicate, Javier developed simultaneously a (mostly) critical perspective on his experience in the course and the course as such, even though publicly he kept a positive, seemingly pragmatic attitude throughout the course, as will be seen in the following two sections.

7.3.5.2 Javier’s perceptions about some essential aspects of his learning experience in the course

As my analysis indicates, Javier talked at length about various aspects of his experience. First in a rather cautious way, sometimes even expressing signs of guilt and shame. But as the course and our conversations developed, Javier started to reflect more thoughtfully on his learning experience in the course and adopted a more critical perspective. In what follows, I will describe three prominent themes identified in my analytic process of the data which summarise some of the most prominent and prevalent perceptions that Javier had about his learning experience and the course as such, as will be described briefly in what follows.

The first theme, called ‘They don’t see my true teaching’ describes Javier’s perception that the focus of the tutors in the course was centred on the fulfilment of the course’s grading criteria rather than on the ‘reality’ of his teaching practice and context. The second theme, called ‘Against my beliefs’, describes Javier’s perception of the inconsistency between the teaching principles and practices promoted in the course and his own teaching beliefs and practices. Finally, the last theme, entitled ‘Not for autonomy’, describes Javier’s perception that the teaching practices in CELT not only discouraged learner autonomy but that they promoted student’s repetition of the class content, thus also inhibiting their creativity.

7.3.5.2.1 ‘They don’t see my true teaching’

As referred to above, the first prominent and recurrent theme identified in the data is related to Javier’s perception that the main focus of the tutors in the course (including their foci in the input
sessions and the assessment components) was centred on the fulfilment of the grading criteria of the course rather than on looking at the ‘reality’ of his teaching practice and context. In the case of the tutors’ focus in relation to the assessed teaching practices, for example, Javier commented that none of them had made a ‘conscious effort’ to ‘explore [his] teaching practice [or his] context’, but that they were instead concerned essentially with the strict implementation of the course’s pre-established ‘teaching frameworks’ (interview 24/05/2017). According to Javier, as a consequence of this approach, his teaching practice (his ‘true teaching’), including his students, had remained overlooked. In a conversation that took place after his third practice teaching observation, Javier expressed such a notion in the following terms:

J: A veces pienso que no debería esperar el reconocimiento de alguien que no está en condiciones de reconocerme porque [los tutores] no ven mi verdadera enseñanza (. . .) no la ven (. . .) ni siquiera están realmente interesados en mis alumnos y seguramente si los ven los criticarán también (. . .) Creo que están imaginando quiénes son mis alumnos porque no solo los ignoran sino que no me preguntan quiénes son y por qué hago lo que hago y qué estrategias están detrás [de lo que hago] (. . .) No veo que profundicen en eso (. . .) solo se detienen en lo que les digo en el plan de clase pero eso es muy poco (. . .) Deberían ser un poco más curiosos

Sometimes I think that I should not expect recognition from someone who is not in the position to recognize me because [The tutors] don’t see my true teaching (. . .) they don’t look at it (. . .) they are not even really interested in my students and surely if they see them they will criticize them too (. . .) I think they are imagining who my students are because they not only ignore them but they do not ask me who they are and why I do what I do and what strategies are behind [what I do] (. . .) I don’t see that they go deeper into that, they only stop at what I tell them in the class plan but that’s very little (. . .) They should be a bit more curious

(Javier_interview_24/05/2017)

As stated by Javier, such an approach eventually led him to ask his students to ‘follow him’ and to just ‘play along’ with whatever he would ask them to do during the assessed teaching practices. In exchange, he promised to give them good marks (interview 24/05/2017). According to him, despite the fact that his students did their part ‘playing along’ during the class observations, they expressed to him later that they had felt either bored (wondering, for example, what the purpose of studying a grammar point had been), or amused (observing their teacher setting activities extraneous to their learning practice, such as choral repetition, and wondering ‘what the heck [was] the teacher doing’).

As can be seen, Javier shared Victoria’s perception that there was a lack of correspondence between the perspective of the course and their teaching contexts. However, while Victoria
referred to this lack of correspondence in relation to the 'needs' of her teaching context, Javier went further in pointing out the lack of acknowledgement of the very existence of his teaching and learning culture, i.e., his ‘true teaching’, even during the assessed teaching practices.

7.3.5.2.2 ‘Against my beliefs’

Another prominent theme identified in the data is related to Javier’s perception of the inconsistency, or opposition, between the teaching fundamentals and practices promoted in the course and his own teaching beliefs and practice. As the data show, Javier used three terms to talk about such an inconsistency: ‘conflicted’, ‘unnatural’ and ‘not for me’, as described briefly in what follows:

- **Conflicted**

Regarding this concept, Javier expressed that he felt conflicted in the course because he believed that the teaching methodologies promoted in ICELT were both ‘limited’, in the sense that candidates were allowed to use only certain teaching models in their practices, and ‘limiting’, in as much as candidates did not have too much leeway in their implementation. At the same time, he also mentioned that he believed that such methodologies were ‘far’ from what he was commonly used to doing in his teaching practice and from what he had learned during his studies at the university (Interview 24/05/2017).

- **Unnatural**

Javier also manifested that some of the teaching frameworks promoted in the course, such as PPP [Presentation, Practice, Production] were ‘unnatural’ or unsuitable for his teaching practice because, in his classes, he did not focus his students’ attention on language (especially not from a grammatical perspective) but on content, in accordance to the principles of his subject matter (Language Arts) (Interview 24/05/2017).

- **Not for me**

Finally, as the data indicate, despite his open criticism of the teaching principles and practices promoted in the course, Javier recognised that such practices contained some positive elements such as helping teachers to improve their students’ pronunciation by focusing their work on some suprasegmental features of pronunciation (such as intonation, stress, or connected speech), or
improving the organisation of their classes, for example, in terms of the ‘activity timing’ by implementing a step-by-step class planning as promoted by the tutors. However, throughout our conversations, Javier remained adamant in maintaining that such teaching practices were incompatible with his own. As he put it when referring to the latter element:

7.3.5.2.3 ‘Not for autonomy’

Another main theme identified in the data is related to Javier’s perception that the teaching methodology promoted in the course not only discouraged learner autonomy but that the teaching practices he was expected to implement in the classroom fomented ‘the repetition of class content’ among the students.

In terms of the former point (the discouragement of students’ autonomy), Javier argued that within the step-by-step-class-planning approach promoted in the course for the assessed teaching practices, it was inconceivable to let students decide what to do in class (interview 26/06/2017). For Javier, such an approach not only prevented learner autonomy from taking place but represented the exact opposite of one of the key characteristics of his teaching practice, namely: student-led inquiry-based learning, as was referred to earlier in this chapter.

In terms of the latter point (the promotion of students’ repetition of the class content), Javier maintained that some principles assumed by the teaching frameworks in the course left little
space for learner autonomy, such as ‘expecting the students to learn [the class content] in a single class’, ‘showing clear evidence’ that the students had ‘assimilated the class content’, or timing the class activities, among others (interview 26/06/2017).

In one of our conversations, Javier summarised this theme while commenting on his students’ behaviour in one of his practice teaching observations. On that occasion, his students had been particularly ‘restless and hard to teach’, as I characterised it on my fieldwork notes. According to Javier, such behaviour had been the expression of the ‘clash’ between these two teaching cultures in relation to learner autonomy. He expressed it in the following terms:

(Javier_interview_21/03/2017)

```
1 J: The expressions of indiscipline that you saw were rather
2 expressions of nervousness boredom frustration because
3 the students were not engaged in class because of the
4 [teaching] framework employed (. ) Somehow they don't like
5 this kind of class, they can't stand being with the teacher
6 for the whole class with a teacher saying: now we go here
7 now we go there now this (. ) In a sense they find this
8 monotonous [and] this is what makes these two school cultures
9 clash
```

Even though Javier’s perceptions about his learning experience and the course as such kept a markedly critical tone, publicly he maintained a generally positive, pragmatic attitude that he developed throughout the course, as will be described briefly in the next section.

7.3.5.3 Javier’s pragmatic attitude

As mentioned above, despite his critical perspective (expressed mostly in private), Javier adopted a practical or pragmatic attitude in public that helped him to stay positive and on task, and eventually complete the course. Even though Javier adopted this attitude early in the course, in reality, it developed over time, as will be referred to briefly in what follows:

As the data indicate, after receiving the feedback from his first assessment components and in a moment when he had started to show the first signs of stress, Javier expressed that he thought that the key in the course was to ‘stay flexible’ and to ‘do what the tutors ask[ed] for’ (interview 02/02/2017). Later in the course, Javier summarised this notion in the following terms:
However, as the data also show, the path followed by Javier was not free from tensions and, throughout the course, he struggled to keep a balance between his emotions, his criticism, and his pragmatism. In one instance, for example, after his second practice teaching observation, Javier refrained from criticising the tutors, even though he had just affirmed that what he had been asked to implement contradicted his own beliefs. On a different occasion, after his third practice teaching observation, Javier expressed his frustration for being told that there was always something wrong with his performance in class, wondering if that were really the case.

Towards the end of the course, Javier expressed that he had realised that his performance in the assessment components was less important than acting on whatever the tutors’ comments were on such performance and adjust accordingly: ‘I take notes [on what the tutors say], reflect on it and I implement [the corresponding] changes’ (interview 20/06/2017).

In the last interview that I had with Javier, once he had already been given the (passing) mark of all his assessment components, I asked him what his overall view of his experience in the course was. Javier took a deep breath and made a long pause before he told me that, for him, the course had been a success. He then elaborated on his answer:

In summary, as in the previous case study, this research account attempted to capture and describe relevant aspects of Javier’s experience in the course, giving special prominence to his perspective, but including the tutors’ and my own, as the researcher.
As was described in the body of the report, in contrast to Victoria, Javier referred to his overall experience in the course in critical terms, even though publicly he maintained a positive (pragmatic) attitude throughout the course.

Regarding his feelings, the data showed a clear path or trajectory from pressure and stress to anger and disappointment. As was referred to earlier, most of such feelings were expressed by Javier in relation to the results of his performance in the assessment components and tensions with different aspects of the course, such as what he perceived to be a lack of consideration (and sometimes belittlement) of his academic background and teaching experience, as well as the ‘gap’ between the ‘promises’ of the course and the ‘reality’ of its delivery.

In relation to his perception of his experience in the course, Javier raised strong criticism of different aspects of the course, particularly what has been identified in this study as two core elements in ICELT, namely: the principle of adaptation of the course to the candidates and their teaching contexts and their specific needs, and the learner-centred teaching perspective. In both cases, Javier saw a clear mismatch between the course’s contents and perspective and his own teaching context, and even his teaching beliefs. Yet, as was mentioned earlier, Javier kept a positive attitude and by the end of the course expressed that the course had been a successful experience for him because he had managed to make progress under very difficult conditions.
7.4 Mariana

| Case 3 |
|---|---|
| Candidate | Mariana |
| Age | 40 |
| Gender | F |
| Nationality | Mexican |
| Type of performer in the course according to the tutors | ‘Weak candidate’ |
| Educational background | BA in Early Childhood educator and Certificate as a speaking and learning disorder therapist |
| Professional background | 17 years as a pre-school teacher (K1, K2, K3) |
| Cultural background | Started to work in a kindergarten in Mexico City where, according to her account, she learned the principle of making school a second home for her students. |
| Teaching context | Prestigious bi-cultural school in Mexico City (kindergarten through senior high school) |
| Approach to English language teaching | Inquiry-based organised around ‘big questions’ that the students were required to discuss, and answer through collaborative teamwork conducted in the target language and supported by (mostly) digital didactic materials and resources |
| School’s overall aim in the English classroom | English was a complementary discipline to an academic programme that seek to promote the students’ personal growth through “the awareness of their person and their social and natural environment”, “the development of their individual, social and physical competences” and “the exercise of values such as honesty, respect, and order” |
| Motivation for taking the ICELT course | 1) wanted to “refresh [her] perspective about teaching” and 2) was required to take (and pass) the course by the authorities at her school as the school board at her institution wanted the English academic staff to be certified by ‘Cambridge’ |
| Level of participation in the course | Participated actively only in the first input sessions. As the course progressed, her participation started to be more discreet and, by the end, she limited herself to respond mostly to direct questions asked by the tutors. |

Table 7.3 Mariana’s personal profile

7.4.1 Introduction

Mariana was another teacher on whom I focused my attention during fieldwork, even though she was not part of the original group of candidates whom I concentrated on at the beginning of the course. However, I started to follow her trajectory in the course closely once the tutors singled her out as a ‘weak candidate’, right after the first round of assessment components.

Mariana was a Mexican teacher with almost 17 years of professional experience. At the time of the course, she was working for a prestigious bi-cultural school in Mexico City. As the data
indicate, during the course, Mariana participated actively only in the first input sessions. As the course progressed, her participation started to be more discreet and, by the end, she limited herself to respond mostly to direct questions asked by the tutors. In general terms, my (professional) relationship with her stayed friendly and approachable throughout the course.

7.4.2 Mariana’s background and motivation for taking the course

According to her testimony, besides her passion for the English language, Mariana became an English language teacher as a natural consequence of the development of her teaching practice and professional interest as a licensed Early Childhood educator and a speaking and learning disorder therapist. In terms of her activity as a language teacher, Mariana started to work in a kindergarten in Mexico City where, according to her account, she learned the principle of making school a second home for her students. Besides that, with the financial support of the school, she completed her initial Language teacher training in an institution where she met the person who later became her mentor. As expressed by Mariana, her mentor was the first person to make her feel ‘proud and passionate [about] being an English teacher’ (Interview 25/11/2016), a feeling that only grew stronger with each passing year.

In terms of her motivation to take the course, Mariana expressed two different reasons. On the one hand, at the beginning of the course, she commented to me that she had decided to take the ICELT course because she wanted to ‘refresh [her] perspective about teaching’ as she believed that, as doctors do, teachers ‘need[ed] to be updated permanently’ (interview 25/11/2016). On the other hand, however, towards the end of the course, in the context of a casual conversation before an input session towards the end of the course, Mariana revealed to me that she had been required to take (and pass) the course by the authorities at her school. She mentioned that, like in the case of Javier’s academic authorities, the school board at her institution wanted the English academic staff to be certified by ‘Cambridge’. She expressed this notion in the following terms:
As stated by Mariana, the prospect of losing her job, added an extra layer of pressure on her but also, an extra motivation to do her best.

7.4.3 Mariana’s teaching context

As mentioned above, the school where Mariana worked was a prestigious bicultural educational institution located in the Mexico City metropolitan area. According to its Academic Director, the institution had been founded in the early seventies by immigrants from an East Asian country that wanted its community to maintain its ethnic and cultural identity while embracing the Mexican culture. Since its foundation the school paid special attention to the academic quality of its teaching and, for this reason, it eventually became a central institution in the academic life of the community of that country in Mexico and, in general, in the private education sector in Mexico City as a whole.

According to its website, the mission of the institution was to provide its students with a comprehensive education through a cutting-edge, multicultural and international educational model with an emphasis on the cultural exchange between Mexico and that country. As referred to by the institute’s academic director, such education had as its main aim to promote the students’ personal growth through ‘the awareness of their person and their social and natural environment’, ‘the development of their individual, social and physical competencies’ and ‘the exercise of values such as honesty, respect, and order’ (interview 29/05/2017). The academic program included different disciplines that complimented the education model, such as computer...
studies, physical education, music, and the teaching of both that country’s mother tongue and the English language.

Figure 7.4 Different aspects of the bicultural institution where Mariana worked at the time of the course (images taken from the institution’s website and used with the consent of copyright holders)

7.4.3.1 English language teaching

In the case of the English language teaching component, the school’s approach to learning was inquiry-based. As Mariana described it to me, such an approach was organised around ‘big questions’ that the students were required to discuss, and answer through collaborative teamwork conducted in the target language and supported by (mostly) digital didactic materials and resources. Among others, such materials included e-learning hardware (e.g., smart whiteboards), e-learning software (e.g., learning apps), and virtual learning platforms. The curriculum and didactic material were adapted from a British provider and the classes were mostly based on such elements.

Given the regulations set for the course by the ICELT authorised language centre, in order to be observed and assessed candidates were required to teach elementary (or upper) level students only. For this reason, despite having teaching experience only with kindergarten level students, Mariana was required to teach first graders for her assessed teaching practices. As can be
anticipated, this had an impact on her performance in the course and as such, represented a special challenge for her, as will be described in the next section.

7.4.4 The tutors’ perceptions of Mariana and her performance in the course

7.4.4.1 Overall perception

As was mentioned above, after the first round of the assessment components, the tutors coincided in characterising Mariana as a ‘weak candidate’, or even a ‘very weak candidate’. As the data indicate, the tutors maintained this perception throughout the course. However, in her last practice teaching observation (PTO 4), that perception changed, as will be seen later in the section.

In general terms, Mariana was characterised as a ‘weak candidate’ because of her performance and the difficulties she had had coping with the demands of the assessment components. Some tutors held her responsible for that because they thought that she had not paid too much attention in the input sessions nor that had she understood well the feedback given to her work by them. One tutor even mentioned that Mariana had acted in a somewhat self-willed manner. She expressed it in the following terms:

T2: Siento que [Mariana] no ponía mucha atención [en las sesiones] (.) como que estaba pero no estaba en la clase y este no entendía muy bien las explicaciones que le dábamos y en lugar de preguntarte hacia las cosas como ella sentía que eran

I feel that [Mariana] did not pay much attention to what we said [in the input sessions] (.) She was there but at the same time it was as if she weren’t and she did not understand very well the explanations we gave her and instead of asking for clarification she completed the course assignments as she pleased

(Tutor2_interview_mariana_22/072017)

7.4.4.2 Feedback on performance

Overall, the type of feedback that Mariana received was, as with the rest of the candidates, corrective and remedial, fundamentally informing her what the tutors’ assessment of her work had been and also, what changes she needed to implement.
With respect to the methodology assignments (Component three), Mariana was required to resubmit all her essays. However, she implemented the indicated changes by the tutors and was then praised by them. As the data indicate, Mariana received complimentary comments for presenting the improved version of her essays in, for example, ‘language that [was] sufficiently clear and accurate’, with an ‘adequate text organisation and, that included ‘all expected sections’ (Methodology assignment mark sheet C3.2 16/08/2017), thus meeting the minimum requirements for the assignment. However, at the same time, she was also frequently urged to develop further those same changes, stating that, for example, she needed to ‘elaborate [further] her ideas, arguments and planning choices’, ‘justify[ing] them with suitable quotes’ and improv[ing] them with ‘editing work’ (Methodology assignment mark sheet C3.1 28/02/2017).

Similarly, in the case of the language tasks (Component one), Mariana was also required to resubmit most of her assignments, and the feedback she received on her improved work was also, for the most part, relatively positive. However, as a consequence of having resubmitted most of her written work, the marks she received were also low, as in the previous case.

Finally, in the last assessment component (Component two: Teaching), Mariana also received positive and negative feedback, even though the latter prevailed over the former, with the exception of the last assessed teaching practice.

In terms of her teaching strengths, Mariana was specially commended by the tutors for her teaching skills. In particular, she was praised for being able to establish and maintain, for example, ‘adequate rapport with [her] students’ (Observation report PTO1 05/02/2017), ‘variety of activities and interaction patterns’ and ‘discipline showing sensitivity to individual needs’ (Observation report PTO2 30/03/2017).

Regarding the areas of development of her teaching, the tutors expressed the need for Mariana to improve her overall approach to planning, which in itself constituted a fundamental element of the component. The tutors made special emphasis on the following elements: her selection of ‘lesson aims’, her identification of a ‘language focus’, her identification of ‘tasks’ from ‘coursebooks’ in line with the language focus chosen, and finally her implementation of an ‘appropriate framework’ to teach such language. The following data extract illustrates the feedback that the tutors gave to Mariana regarding this aspect of her teaching practice. The extract was taken from the practice teaching observation report of Mariana’s second observation:

...
As the data indicate, for Mariana it turned out to be particularly challenging to act on the feedback received in this component. According to her testimony, she found it particularly complex and difficult to plan her lessons following the lesson planning format provided by the tutors as well as to implement her lesson plan using the pre-established teaching frameworks in the course. All this added an extra element of pressure to Mariana towards the final assessed observation which, as established in the course assessment criteria, was decisive for her final grade, as will be referred to in the following section.

7.4.4.2.1 Mariana’s Practice Teaching Observation four (PTO 4)

As was established in the course’s guidelines, for reasons of evaluation standards, the ‘strongest’ and the ‘weakest’ candidates in the course were required to have extra moderation in their assessment components. This was the reason why Mariana’s final teaching practice (PTO 4) was observed by the external course moderator, besides the main course tutor and I, as the researcher.

According to my field notes, Mariana’s practice teaching lesson that day was not significantly different from her previous lessons, particularly in terms of delivery. However, as was informed to the candidate later in the feedback session, her class was awarded a “Merit” grade in what appeared to be a different application of the assessment criteria.

Regarding this point, the external moderator told me later that day that the tutor had not evaluated Mariana’s class ‘against her lesson plan. She explained to me that a young learners’ class could not be ‘assessed against frameworks for teaching adults’ (conversation 03/07/2017). She then asserted that putting the course’s pre-established teaching framework aside, Mariana’s class had been a very good lesson. The external moderator expressed this notion in the following way:
She then expressed to me that the ICELT course did not have any provision for teaching or assessing in young learners' teaching contexts and that the tutors had to adapt themselves to candidates in such teaching contexts, as had been the case in Mariana’s last practice teaching observation, even though not in her first three assessed observations nor in the case of the other candidates in the course who taught in such teaching contexts.

7.4.5 Mariana’s experience in the course

In contrast to the case of the previous two candidates, the opportunities and time to talk with Mariana during the course were limited (amounting to three hours overall). The main reason was the busy schedule that Mariana kept in her double role as a teacher and as a single mother of two children. However, during our exchanges, Mariana was always open and willing to talk, all of which made it possible to explore in some depth her feelings and perceptions of her experience in the course. Our exchanges took place in the Centre’s premises and more informally at her school, after each one of her assessed teaching observations.

In what follows, I will briefly describe her most prominent and prevalent feelings and her perceptions about the course and her experience in the course.

7.4.5.1 Mariana’s prominent and prevalent feelings in the course

Like many candidates, the most prominent and prevalent feeling experienced by Mariana in the course was stress, which was manifested in different ways as described briefly below:

As was referred to earlier, Mariana started the course under considerable pressure because of the possibility of losing her job if she did not obtain a passing grade. The fact of being a single mother of two children who, as a perk of Mariana’s employment, attended the same school where
she worked, only added more tension to an already stressful situation. As the course progressed
and Mariana started to receive feedback and the grades from the assessment components, her
stress manifested in the form of anxiety and frustration, and then panic. The following extract
portrays the expression of such feelings. The context of the conversation is Mariana´s roundup of
her experience in the course during the last session of the course:

1  M:  During the course I was really in [a] panic because I
2  Knew if I didn´t get a `pass´ like everything would finish
3  there no? (.!)So I was really really really stressed!

(Mariana_interview_07/07/2017)

According to my field notes, Mariana was indeed one of the candidates who consistently showed
clear signs of stress during the input sessions (as described in p. 213). By the end of the course,
after receiving the grade of her last practice teaching observation (PTO 4), Mariana finally showed
some relief expressing that she felt as if she had just `finished a race´.

7.4.5.2 Mariana´s perceptions about essential aspects of her
learning experience in the course

As indicated above, Mariana´s perception of her experience in the course was, for the most part,
positive. At the same time, she also expressed some critical points about the course as such. In
what follows, I will briefly describe the thematic content identified in my analysis of these two
perspectives, including a reference to the form in which Mariana´s criticism was expressed.

7.4.5.2.1 Positive aspects

In terms of the positive aspects of her experience, Mariana considered that she had learned `a lot´
in the course and that such learning had been expressed fundamentally in two ways: as an
improvement of her teaching and as personal growth as a teacher who promoted the students´
autonomy. In terms of the former element (the improvement of her teaching), Mariana expressed
this notion in the following way. The context of the exchange was the conversation I had with
Mariana in the last session of the course referred to above:
In terms of the former element (her growth as a teacher), Mariana expressed this perception in the context of the same conversation as follows:

1 M: I think I have grown as a teacher that promotes autonomy (.) independence in a way that my students still will do what they have to do at their pace.

(Mariana_interview_07/07/2017)

As the data indicate, both notions were expressed consistently in the different conversations I had with Mariana, as well as in the focus group sessions conducted by the tutors and the external moderator towards the end of the course, correspondingly.

7.4.5.2.2 Criticism (content)

Regarding her criticism of the course, Mariana expressed some discontent (even though mildly) with respect to the general discrepancy that she perceived there was between the course and her teaching context. This critique somehow echoed Victoria’s and Javier’s perception of this same aspect of the course, but its content differed in tone and intensity. According to my analysis, Mariana’s criticism was expressed in relation to three general elements: the input sessions’ content, the feedback that she received from the tutors, and the expectations that she perceived the tutors had about her work. I will refer briefly to each one of them in what follows:

- Input sessions’ content

In terms of the input sessions’ content, Mariana expressed consistently throughout our conversations that she thought that some of such content was not ‘useful’ for her or her learners. She expressed that the main reason was that her context was ‘totally different’ and that some activities could not ‘be adapted’. When I asked Mariana, in the conversation mentioned above, if
there was anything that she would change in ICELT, she referred to the input session’s content in the following terms:

1  E:   Is there anything you would change about the course?
2  M:   I don’t like to be in a comfort zone but ((pause)) I feel
3       like it was too much effort for many many many things that
4       I’m not going to implement with my pre-school students

(Mariana_interview_29/052017)

• Feedback received from tutors

In terms of the feedback she received on her assessment components from the tutors, Mariana expressed that she thought that sometimes such feedback was not clear, and also that following such feedback was the decisive factor in receiving a passing grade. She expressed this notion in the context of the same conversation referred to above as follows:

1  M:   I think sometimes [the tutors] were not clear enough in
2       their feedback and sometimes maybe it’s just me but if
3       you didn’t do what you were told to do your grade became
4       lower and lower and lower

(Mariana_interview_07/07/2017)

• Tutors’ expectation of her work

Finally, regarding the tutors’ expectations of her work, Mariana expressed that she felt that the tutors had judged her work with a standard that did not correspond to her teaching context, i.e., a young learners’ context. She expressed this notion to me and also to other candidates in the course. The following extract illustrates one of those occasions. The context of the extract is a post-feedback informal conversation that we had after her third assessed teaching observation:

1  M:   Evidently I’m not going to give the results that you can
2       observe with high school learners because my students are
3       very young students but they are doing things well little
4       by little [but] it is just a personal opinion.

(Mariana_postfeedbackconversation_pto3_29/05/2017)

In the last session of the course, I asked Mariana if she had ever raised any of these points with the tutors. After hesitating for a moment, Mariana told me that she had not done it because she
was unsure about whether discussing those issues was ‘acceptable’ in the course, adding that she had focused her attention rather on doing things as she had been told.

7.4.5.2.3 Criticism (pragmatism)

Besides the aforementioned elements, Mariana’s criticism was characterised for being expressed in a particularly cautious manner. This pattern can be seen in, for example, a different extract which all hedging language such as ‘I don’t like to be in a comfort zone but…’; ‘…maybe it’s just me’, or ‘…[but] it is just a personal opinion’. Whereas the use of such language can be attributed to Mariana’s own personality (e.g., her shyness), the effect of the course on her self-confidence is also likely to have played a role, as it is suggested by, among other things, the significant decrease in her participation in class as the course moved along.

One instance that illustrates the potential effect that the course had on Mariana’s self-confidence is expressed in the dialogue that took place between her and the external moderator during the feedback session of her last assessed teaching practice (PTO 4). In the exchange, Mariana seems to downplay her performance in class, despite the highly commending comments expressed by the moderator. The exchange is portrayed in its entirety in what follows:

1  EM:    I was very surprised with the result[ of your class]
2        because we discussed before we see someone
3        we discuss her progress and I know that
4        in particular this component has not been an easy one
5        for you (.) it’s been a rocky start and you know but
6  M:     it’s been difficult very difficult
7  EM:    How do you feel now?
8  M:     Now I feel like I have a little more practice so even
9        though it was not it was difficult still but it was not
10       so difficult as the first time
11  EM:    So if you could tell to your tutor from where you started
12       to now how much have you advanced?
13  M:     I started from cero
14  EM:    and now?
15  M:     Now I think I have [reached] a sixth seventh [level]
16  EM:    Give yourself some credit because what you showed us was
17        beautiful (.) It was a beautiful class (.) It was pitched at
18        the level of your students there was not waste of time (.)
19        Yes there were some subtleties yes your tutor and the
20        transitions and the activities but it was so well
21        orchestrated you know? (.) And the way you managed these
22        kids (.) and the class management in general and how well you
23        had organised your sequence (.) As an observer I can tell
24        you because you told us what they learned and what you
25        did what you set yourself to do (.)so give yourself
26        credit because it was a very nice class to observe
27        [Mariana breaks into tears]
7.4.6 Summary

In summary, as in the previous two case studies included in this chapter, the research account produced by my analytic process, presented in this section, aimed to capture and describe some prominent and prevalent aspects of Mariana’s experience in the course, emphasising her own perspective, but also including the tutors’ perspective and my own, as the researcher.

In general, as was expressed in the text, Mariana referred to her experience in the course in relatively positive terms, even though she also alluded to some tensions, and even expressed some criticism. Regarding the positive aspects of her experience, Mariana expressed that as a consequence of the course she had grown as a teacher, especially in terms of the promotion of learner autonomy, and that her teaching had improved considerably. In terms of the tensions referred to by Mariana in our conversations, perhaps the most pressing tension was the circumstance of having to teach a group of learners at a level at which she had never taught before (elementary level). Another important tension was the need imposed on her to use the teaching frameworks prescribed in the course (e.g., PPP) with her first graders in clear contrast to her teaching approach. Finally, regarding her criticism of the course, Mariana coincided with Victoria and Javier in referring to the general discrepancy that she perceived there was between the course and her teaching context.

Finally, as was described in this research account, Mariana tried her best to follow the tutors’ instructions and complete the assessment components of the course in the terms in which she had been told to do it in order to pass the ICELT course, just as did the rest of the candidates.

7.5 Chapter summary

This chapter presented the results of the third part of my analytic process: the analysis of the data produced during fieldwork around the experience of three candidates in the course researched and in relation to the fourth research question of this study: ‘How do candidates express their
own experience in ICELT in one iteration of the course?’, and the corresponding research sub-
questions: ‘how do they express their experience in the course in relation to their feelings?’, and
‘how do they express their experience in the course in relation to their perceptions?’.

This chapter was presented in the form of three separate case studies. Each one of them included
contextual information of each candidate in relation to their professional background and
motivation for taking the course, their teaching contexts, the tutors’ perception of their
performance in the course, and finally, the candidates’ testimony of their own experience in the
course, particularly regarding their feelings and perceptions.

As was described in each study case, by the end of the course the three candidates referred to
their overall experience in ICELT as an ‘intense experience’, even though each one conceptualised
such intensity in a different tone, namely: ‘ambivalent’ in the case of Victoria, ‘critical’ in the case
of Javier, and in relatively ‘positive’ terms in the case of Mariana. However, as the data showed,
the candidates experienced a complex mixture of different feelings and emotions throughout the
course.

In terms of their perceptions, all candidates coincided in expressing frustration with different
aspects of what has been identified in this study as the ends of ICELT (p. 99); the ‘distinguishing
central elements’ of the course (p. 115) and its main instructional practices (p. 179). One example
was the principle of adaptation of the course to the course candidates and their teaching contexts
and needs (p. 115). All candidates perceived that there had been a mismatch between the
teaching perspective and practices promoted in the course and their teaching contexts, practices,
and even beliefs. Some even expressed that their teaching contexts had been ignored (e.g.,
Victoria) or even belittled (e.g., Javier). Other tensions were related to the candidates’ perception
of the importance to follow the tutors’ instructions ‘to the letter’ to perform well in the course,
or the focus of the tutors on the assessment components. However, at the same time, all
candidates displayed some sense of pride and accomplishment, particularly towards the end of
the course, which only showed the complexity of their experience in the course.

In the end, as the data showed, all candidates adopted a ‘pragmatic’ attitude as a practical
strategy to successfully submit the assessment component tasks and complete the course.

The main findings and tensions in this chapter will be discussed in the following section in relation
to the main findings of the other two analysis chapters, particularly in relation to the predominant
discursive practices, where some prominent aspects of the tutors’ instructional practices were
identified. Then they will be considered altogether in relation to the theoretical discussion of ‘the
marketisation of teacher education’, ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’ and ‘epistemological decolonisation’.
CHAPTER EIGHT: Discussion

8.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to discuss the findings presented in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. For this purpose, I will first recall the research aims and questions that guided this study and present a summary of the methodological approach employed to answer these questions and meet the aims of this research. I will then discuss these findings convergently and critically, referring to previous research and theoretical conceptualisations, particularly in the areas of marketisation of teacher education, appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy, and epistemological decolonisation, and also with respect to the contribution of the present study to the extant literature.

To facilitate the discussion, the main findings from the three chapters will be grouped in four sub-sections, according to each one of the aspects of the ethos researched, namely: representation, ends, distinctive components, and prominent discursive practices (see Table 8.1). At the beginning of each section, the research questions and sub-questions, and the key findings across the chapters corresponding to each one of these aspects will be summarised and then discussed more broadly. Because of space limitations, the discussion will only focus on one contentious aspect or major tension identified in the findings in order to make better sense of them in relation to the main research questions of this study. Finally, the last section (section five) will discuss briefly some aspects of the research approach adopted and the research strategies employed in this project, highlighting their contribution to the literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of the ethos researched</th>
<th>Sections of reference</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.2.1 Representation</strong></td>
<td>5.3 The overall representation of ICfELT</td>
<td>Ideological functions of the representation of ICfELT: linguistic and discursive aspects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 Representation of the ICfELT course in the course researched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Case study 1: Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Case study 2: Javier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4 Case study 3: Mariana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8.2.2 Ends</strong></td>
<td>5.4 The promise of ICfELT</td>
<td>Implicit notions in the content of the areas of development through which the main end of the course was expected to be realised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5 The ends of ICfELT in the iteration of the course researched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Case study 1: Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Case study 2: Javier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4 Case study 3: Mariana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.1.1 Research aims and questions

This study set out to identify and explore aspects of the ethos of one iteration of the Cambridge ICELT course with the aim to develop a contextualised, minimal ideological understanding of the course. The aspects of the ethos researched included elements of representation, ends, distinctive components and prominent discursive practices as they were expressed in the data 'on paper', e.g., in course documents and course related-documents, 'as implemented', e.g., in the discursive implementation by the tutors, and finally, in the experience of the candidates in the context of one iteration of the course.

The research questions and sub-questions that arose out of the research focus and aim were as follows:

1. What are the fundamental characteristics of ICELT according to course documents and course-related documents?
   1.1 How is ICELT represented overall?
   1.2 What are the ends of the course?
   1.3 What are the distinctive components of the course?

2. What is particular in the way the course is implemented?
   2.1 How is ICELT represented in one iteration of the course?
   2.2 How are the ends of ICELT expressed in one iteration of the course?
   2.3 How are the distinctive components of ICELT operationalised in one iteration of the course?
2.4 How do the course tutors position themselves in relation to the course and the participants?
2.5 What are the most prominent discursive practices in the course?

3. How do candidates express their own experience in ICELT in one iteration of the course?
3.1 What feelings do participants express in relation to the course?
3.2 What perceptions do participants have of the course?
3.3 How (if at all) do candidates express agency?

8.1.2 Methodological approach

To answer these questions, I first conducted a series of interviews with administrators, tutors, and former candidates of the ICELT course in the U.K. and Mexico in order to inform my analytic perspective and gain background knowledge of the context in which I would conduct fieldwork. I then compiled and analysed course documents and course-related documents. Finally, I produced data in one iteration of the course in one language centre in Mexico for 9 months in at least two phases: phase one in which I produced data having the research questions in mind but in a relatively open way, i.e., with an 'open mind and an eye for the unexpected' (Richards 2003, p. 110), until some potential themes were identified (roughly during the first third of the course) and phase two in which I produced data with those themes in mind but also intentionally distancing myself from the data and seeking to falsify such themes (roughly from the first third of the course onwards). This research strategy was maintained during the analysis and writing up phases. The main methods of data production included documentary research, class observations, interviews, focus groups and a research diary. The data was analysed thematically drawing on reflexive thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006, 2013 & 2019). Findings related to the three main research questions and sub-questions of the study were organised and presented in each section in the form of analytic overarching themes, themes and sub-themes and then summarised in the form of research claims at the beginning of each section in Chapters Five, Six and Seven.

8.2 Convergent discussion of the findings

As mentioned above, in this section the findings will be discussed convergently and also critically, making reference to previous research and theoretical conceptualisations in the areas of marketisation of teacher education, appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy, and epistemological decolonisation, and also with respect to the contribution of the present study to the existing
literature. The section is divided into four sub-sections according to each one of the aspects of the ethos researched: representation, ends, distinctive components, and prominent discursive practices.

8.2.1 Representation

As referred to above, the first aspect of the ethos of the course analysed in this study was the representation of ICELT as it was identified in the course documents and the discourse of the tutors and the candidates produced in the classroom during the course. As was also mentioned, in each case the study of these elements was guided by a research question and a research sub-question, and the results were reported in different sections of Chapters Five, Six, and Seven. In this section, I will first summarise the main findings in relation to this topic, as reported in each chapter. Then, I will discuss these findings convergently, focusing my attention on the discursive functions that the representation of ICELT fulfilled in the iteration of the course researched and its possible relationships with the broader discursive context.

8.2.1.1 Summary of research questions and findings

Research sub-question 1.1 set out to answer how the ICELT course was represented in course documents and course-related documents. As reported in Chapter Five, the findings indicate that the course was represented most prominently in the data as a 'highly respected certification' and that this representation was largely based on self-definitions, uses of the name of the University of Cambridge, and brand positioning strategies. In turn, research sub-question 2.1 sought to answer how ICELT was represented in one iteration of the course. In this case, as is expressed in Chapter Six, the findings show that the course was represented in complex, varied and conflicting, but not necessarily mutually exclusive ways. In the report of the analysis, these representations were thematically categorised as implicit, explicit, and private representations. Finally, in relation to research sub-question 3.3 that sought to investigate the way in which, if at all, the candidates expressed agency in the course, the findings suggest that the representations of ICELT in the course were likely to have inhibited and, in one case stimulated, the expression of the candidates’ agency, as was described in Chapter Seven.

8.2.1.2 Discussion of the findings: Ideological functions of the representation of ICELT in the iteration of the course researched
One of the most interesting aspects of the representation of ICELT revealed by the findings is its own complexity, partly due to the multiplicity and polysemy of its different expressions. However, when the findings are considered in a convergent way, one aspect that becomes manifest in a particular way is the ideological functions that these representations fulfilled in the course. 'Ideology' is understood here as ‘material false consciousness’, i.e., conceptions and ideas that represent ‘imaginary relationships of individuals to their real conditions of existence’ which are expressed in concrete discursive practices (Althusser, Jameson & Brewster 2001, p. 109). I chose this conceptualisation because it considers ideology not only in theoretical terms, at a discourse level, but also in practical terms, accounting for the way in which discourses are materialised as well as the functions that they fulfil, as was done in this study.

In this section, I will discuss three ideological functions which have already been identified in the findings: positioning, legitimation and professional self-validation/devaluation.

8.2.1.2.1 Positioning

As the findings show, the first discursive function that the representation of ICELT fulfilled was precisely to position the course as an authoritative entity, e.g., as ‘a highly respected qualification’ (see p. 95). Positioning here is understood as *marketing positioning*, i.e., the intended place that a brand occupies in the minds of the customers (Sengupta 2005), in this case, the perception that the course was intended to occupy in the minds of the candidates. While this type of positioning has become increasingly common among educational institutions globally (Chapleo 2010; Cantwell & Kauppinen 2014; Slaughter & Rhoades 2004), its consideration in a broader context makes visible aspects of its ideological character, especially concerning the form of its expression and content, in at least two senses:

Firstly, it is possible to argue that the content of the representation of ICELT on course documents is largely rhetorical, i.e., not theoretical, or argumentative. This is likely to be a consequence of what can be perceived as the excessive use and reliance on marketing strategies to articulate the content of such representation. This is exemplified precisely by the use of marketing positioning strategies which, as was referred to in Chapter Five (see p. 97), were largely based on rhetorical devices such as the appeal to the authority and/or credibility of the course (*argumentum ad verecundiam*), or *ethos*, according to its original classical meaning (see Aristotle 2007 [350 BCE], pp. 28-111).
Secondly, as the findings show, the course is commonly represented with both concepts and discursive content borrowed from the economic world, particularly from the field of business, which inexorably entailed particular economic and cultural values. An example related to the former is the use of terms, or *keywords* (Holborow 2012), associated with pro-market ideologies (e.g., neoliberalism) (Mautner 2010) or words that commonly accompany the implementation of processes and procedures linked to these ideologies (Block & Gray 2015) such as, for example, ‘experts’, ‘quality’ or ‘highest standards’ (see p. 95), among others. As the findings show, in the case of the discursive content, the representations included frequent references to, for example, an aspirational language associated not only with an economic benefit but with implicit cultural notions and values such as possessing a ‘worldwide-recognised teaching qualification’ or being validated as ‘a member of the TESOL community’ (see p. 175) which, discursively, refer to the ‘sophistication of the West’ and the ‘idea of global mobility and universal stardom’ (Blommaert 2012, p. 62).

The ideological character of the representation of ICELT identified in the iteration of the course researched is consistent with predominant forms of institutional representation, particularly in higher education and further education in the global North identified in the literature that has researched and criticised not only the misleading aspects of their ideological character (e.g., their misrepresentation) but also, from a broader theoretical perspective, the ideological effects of the marketisation of education (e.g., the primacy of economic values over human values), and in particular of its commoditisation, i.e., treating education as a commodity associated with both economic gain (Chapleo 2010; Hemsley–Brown & Goonawardana 2007; Maringe & Gibbs 2009; and Temple & Shattock 2007), and an entrepreneurial culture (Cantwell & Kauppinen 2014; Münch 2014; Slaughter & Leslie 1997 2001; Slaughter & Rhoades 2004) or, as is conceptualised by Gray (2016, p. 91) ‘the entrepreneurial self’, actively promoted through the different representations of the ICELT course.

### 8.2.1.2.2 Legitimation

The second function of the representation of ICELT that becomes apparent when the findings are analysed convergently is the discursive legitimation of the content of the course. Legitimation is understood here as the explicit or implicit answer to the question of ‘why’ something should be done or ‘why’ it should be done in a certain way (van Leeuwen 2008, p. 94). This function was closely linked to the previous one and, in a sense, is derived from it.
As is shown in the findings, this function was largely fulfilled by the recurrent reference to the name of Cambridge in the course, in relation not only to the production of the content of the course (e.g., regarding the assessment criteria) but also to the implementation and evaluation of such content (e.g., in regards to the assessment of the candidates’ work in the course) (see p. 140), sometimes even referred to as the only appropriate reference source in the course (see p. 206).

Being an assumed authority figure, the concept of 'Cambridge', sometimes subjectified with the pronoun 'he', became not only the quintessential representation of the course but, at the same time, one of the main sources of its legitimacy. This coincides with van Leeuwen (2008 p. 106), who maintains that the reference to status is one of the sources of discursive legitimation.

Other forms of representation of ICELT contributed to legitimising not only the course content but also the teaching practices of the tutors in the course, fundamentally by referring to, for example, the purposeful and effective character of the course (e.g., as a ‘difficult, demanding, exhausting course’ that was going to change the tutors’ ‘perspective[s] about teaching’ and to the moral character of the course (e.g., as a transforming professional experience that was going to change the lives of the candidates in a professional and personal manner (see p. 147), which are also considered in the literature as sources of discursive legitimation (Fairclough 2009; Lin & Kubota, 2011; van Leeuwen, 2008).

Thus conceptualised, it is possible to argue that the original representation on the documents of the course was not only reproduced but also recreated ideologically to reaffirm and legitimise the authority of the course and its contents as well as the teleological and moral character of the teaching practices used in the course, broadly characterised as ‘a strict pedagogy’ (see p. 195).

8.2.1.2.3 Professional self-validation/devaluation

Finally, the most prominent function that the representation of ICELT fulfilled in the course, linked to the previous two functions, was to contribute to the sense of professional self-validation (or self-devaluation) of the candidates. Self-validation is understood here as ‘the feeling of having recognised, confirmed, or established one’s own worthiness or legitimacy’ (Merrian-Webster 2020), in this case in professional terms. Self-devaluation, in this context, means lessening one’s professional worth (Ibid).
As the findings show, during the course (particularly during the first two thirds), most candidates expressed signs of professional self-devaluation in relation to the course and, in an implicit way, in relation to its representation. This notion was clearly referred to by one of the strongest candidates in the course (Victoria), who mentioned that, since the beginning of the course, she had felt 'overpowered'. As she expressed it: '[Before I started the course] I thought that I was a good teacher, but then I came here and said 'ok, I’m a decent teacher', at least, but then I realised [that] no, I’m nowhere near a good teacher (...), adding that ‘the demand from Cambridge [was] so high that I simply felt overpowered’ (p. 235).

Besides the candidates who dropped out of the course, one example that captures, perhaps with certain dramatism, the feeling of self-devaluation that some candidates felt is Mariana’s reaction after her last teaching practice observation. As is described in the analysis chapter, even though she received highly laudatory comments on her performance in that class from the main course tutor and the course assessor, Mariana seemed to have downplayed her own performance by rejecting the compliments about her class and stating that she was not a good teacher because, as the tutors had told her, she still needed to improve a lot (pp. 273-74).

On the other hand, as the findings also show, the candidates expressed a sense of professional self-worth in relation to the course and their membership to it, particularly during the last third of the course. A case in point is again Victoria, who expressed a sense of re-empowerment, for example, in relation to having the possibility to make reference to her membership to ICELT in expressing and defending her ideas in exchanges with her academic coordinator (p. 238). A similar notion was expressed by a former candidate to the course who commented to me that one of the benefits of having taken ICELT had been that his hierarchical superiors were no longer in a position to question his methodological decisions in the classroom because he was 'authorised by Cambridge' to teach in the way he did it (Raul, personal communication, 24 May 2017). As shown in the findings, despite experimenting with mixed feelings about their experience in the course, some candidates expressed unambiguously their confidence in relation to the course and their professional development within it, given its 'international prestige' as well as the possibility of being in contact with 'the latest there was [in ELT] in terms of teaching knowledge, methodologies and all that'.

In general, as was described with some detail in the case studies, the experience of the candidates in the course combined feelings of disempowerment and re-empowerment that sometimes were expressed in the form of professional self-validation or self-devaluation in relation to the course
and its representation and, as was mentioned in the analysis chapter, in a proportional relationship to the fulfilment of the ends of the course (see Chapter Seven).

As was indicated in the chapter of the literature review of this research, different studies on the Cambridge English teaching qualifications have documented similar expressions of self-validation or self-devaluation among the candidates who take these courses (e.g., Delaney 2015; Green 2003; Lengeling 2010; Russell 2003; Phipps 2007 2010 2012; Valazza 2015; Watkins 2007). However, the relationship between these expressions and aspects of the representation of the course is only mentioned in passing (e.g., Watkins, Harris & Pulverness 2015, p. 319) and both expressions have been rarely (if ever), documented together. In any case, future research is required to improve understanding of the nature of the disempowerment and re-empowerment of the candidates in relation to this aspect.

8.2.1.3 Representation and ideology

The consideration of the functions of the representation of ICELT in the course allows us to have a better understanding of a) the self-representation of the course as ‘a highly respected certification’ (Chapter Five), b) the use of this representation in the course (Chapter Six), and c) the role that ideology played in such process (Chapter Six and Seven). In general, it is possible to argue that the representation of the course, even though complex, was fundamentally ideological in nature (e.g., not factual) and that fulfilled a fundamentally ideological function in the course (e.g., by legitimising the tutors’ practices or by serving as professional value criteria to value or devalue the candidates’ professional knowledge and practice).

Although a significant number of studies have addressed the role of market-oriented ideologies, such as neoliberalism, in the field of English language teaching in relation to, for example, aspects of cultural and linguistic imperialism (e.g., Phillipson, 1992 2009b), language policy (e.g., Hamid 2010; Park & Wee 2012; Sayer 2015), the labour market (e.g., Park 2011), the construction of identities (e.g., Chun 2016; Macleod 2013), the construction of subjects (e.g., Flores 2013), the development of the curricula in TESOL (e.g., Block, Gray and Holborow 2012), or the content in textbooks (e.g., Block 2010; Gray 2010a 2010b 2012 2013; Gray & Block 2014), the nature and functions of representations in marketised teacher training qualifications, such as ICELT, remains under-researched and under-theorised. An even less explored area is the role of such representations in the legitimisation of language policies and teacher education, particularly in
countries of the Global South. In this sense, the present study contributes not only to document a particular case but also to draw attention to the importance of this area of research.

8.2.2 Ends

The second aspect of the ethos of the ICELT course analysed in this study were the ends of the course, as they were expressed ‘on paper’, i.e., in the course documents and course-related documents, and ‘as implemented’, i.e., in the iteration of the course researched, including the tutors’ discourse and the response from the candidates. As with the previous aspect of the ethos discussed above, the findings in relation to this aspect of the course were reported and summarised in different sections in the analysis chapters of this study. In this section, I will first restate the summary of the main findings in relation to this topic as they were reported in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. Then, I will discuss further these findings in relation to three things: 1) the notions of 'language', 'teaching' and 'professional development' implicit in the content of the ends of the course; 2) some of the tensions generated in the course between such notions and the way they were understood in the institutional contexts of some candidates, and 3) some general effects of such tensions in the course (e.g., the imposition of a given model of professional development, among other things).

8.2.2.1 Summary of research questions and findings

In relation to the overall expression of the ends of the course ‘on paper’, the research sub-question 1.2 sought out to identify what these ends were and how they were expressed. As was reported in 5.4, the findings indicate that the overall end of the course expressed in the course documents was 'the development of the candidates as experienced English language teachers' and that this development was expected to take place in at least three areas: 'professional language competence', 'teaching knowledge, skills, and practice', and 'professional development'. The findings also indicate that while the content related to these areas was frequently expressed with generic language, in fact, it referred to a particular way of understanding these areas. In relation to the expression of the ends of the course in one iteration of the course (research question 2.2), the findings show that in the course researched the ends were expressed in the data as explicit, implicit and de facto aims, in line with the overall end of the course but also beyond such end and, in some cases, in opposition or conflict with some aspects of it (p. 164). Finally, the findings related to research questions 3.2 and 3.3, which sought out to understand the feelings and perceptions of candidates regarding their experience in the
course, reveal some major tensions between the ends of the course and the teaching practice in some institutions where the candidates worked.

8.2.2.2 Discussion of the findings: implicit notions of language, teaching and professional development

While the overall end of ICELT, thematically identified in this study, is consistent with the ends of this type of provision referred to in the literature (e.g., Osamwonyi 2016), the realisation of the specific aims and objectives of the program was in tension with the institutional teaching practices of some candidates. In this section, I will discuss further these tensions by considering convergently the findings summarised above. In particular, I will refer to the notions of ‘language’, ‘teaching’ and ‘professional development’ that can be inferred from the content of the three areas of development. I will also refer to the general effect that these notions had in the course, such as, for example, the imposition of a given perspective and the adoption of a pragmatic attitude by the candidates.

8.2.2.2.1 Implied notion of language

As the findings indicate, the first area of development in the course identified in the data was the area of professional language competence (see p. 100). As such, this area was largely articulated around the development of the language knowledge and awareness of the candidates (LKA), with a particular focus on the analysis of the internal relations of language. As was indicated in Chapter Six, this perspective of language was further reinforced during the course researched, particularly in terms of grammatical analysis of language at a word and a sentence level (see p. 184).

As was widely documented in the findings, even though the course documents stated that ICELT aimed, among other things, to develop the candidates’ knowledge and awareness of aspects of language that were relevant to their professional practice (see p. 101), this perspective was in conflict with the way in which language and language practice was conceptualised in different institutional settings where the candidates worked. An example documented in the findings was Victoria’s institution, whose bilingual model of immersion in the content of subject-specific knowledge and literature in English explicitly ruled out the use of grammatical approaches for language learning (see p. 231). Another example was Javier’s institution, whose bilingual program aimed to develop the communicative competence of students through a literary approach to language teaching (e.g., language arts) which did not include grammatical analysis of language.
nor skills-building work (see pp. 247-248). As indicated in the findings, this was also the case of other candidates whose institutions approached language teaching and learning mainly through methods based on subject content, role plays or songs, with little language work (if any) focused on grammar (see p. 188).

Regarding the candidates, the findings show that, while some of them expressed a neutral stance regarding this discrepancy, others expressed a sense of alienation from the course, referring to this perspective of language and language practice as ‘unnatural’, ‘inappropriate’ or simply ‘incompatible’ with the culture of language teaching and learning in their contexts (see p. 189). At the same time, some of them expressed frustration for having worked intensively in the course for something that they considered that would never implement in their teaching practice (e.g., p. 272).

Despite their prevalence, none of these tensions was articulated nor recognised publicly during the course what seems to offer support to the notion that the language teaching and learning priorities and needs of the candidates were not only presupposed but that in fact, a particular view of language and language practice was de facto imposed on the candidates in the course.

This coincides with the literature that has criticised more broadly the ideological and cultural imposition of a given view of language and language practice (e.g., Phillipson 1992; Pennycook, 1994; Canagarajah 1999) or that have questioned its ‘cultural appropriateness’ (e.g., Holliday 1994; Coleman, 1996; Ellis, 1996). At the same time, these findings support the theoretical studies that have criticised different forms of the notion of language and language practice identified in the data, broadly defined in the literature as ‘language as a system’ (McCarty & Clancy 2019), questioning its idealised nature (e.g., McCarthy and Carter 1994; Roberts and Cooke 2009), ideological character (e.g., Sewell 2013; Kramsch 2014, Canagarajah 2015), commoditisation (e.g., Gray 2016) and, regarding the ICELT course itself, its ‘narrow view of language’ and disregard in relation to ‘advances in our understanding of what constitutes language and communication’ (Parrot 2015, p. 209), despite its predominance and conventionality (as pointed out by Richards 2008).

8.2.2.2.2 Implied notion of teaching

The second area of development through which the general end of the course was expected to be realised was the area of ‘teaching knowledge, skills and practice’ which, as the findings also
indicate, generated tensions with the teaching practices of some institutions where the candidates worked.

As detailed in the analysis chapter, this area adopted the form of a teaching cycle that included at least three phases, namely: ‘planning teaching’, ‘managing teaching’, and ‘self-assessment of teaching’ (see p. 103). As is also mentioned in the findings, these areas were articulated around standards and performance indicators that established their scope, i.e., the de facto form, possibilities and limits of action in each phase (Freeman 2009). In what follows, I will address briefly these phases:

- **Planning and managing teaching**

With regard to the areas of ‘teaching planning’ and ‘managing teaching’, as the findings indicate, the candidates were expected to plan their teaching practices in the course conforming to certain organisational principles and in relation to 17 intended results of learning (p. 107), which were used during the course as performance indicators and, in this sense, as discrete aims to be met. Some of these organisational principles and parameters were: goal and objective setting; the organization of lessons in stages, the definition of procedures and timing of the activities in the lessons as well as the consideration of the practice of specific language items and skills, among other principles. As was documented in the findings, the fulfilment of each one of these objectives was taken very seriously in the course, which is corroborated by the special attention that each of these parameters received from the tutors, as well as by the difficult tensions that were generated when the candidates did not meet them (e. g., p. 250).

However, as the findings also show, the principles of teaching planning and managing established in the syllabus and enforced by the tutors in the course did not always reflect the teaching practices of the candidates and, on many occasions, were even opposed to them. One example of this was the fact that very few candidates (if any) planned their own lessons in the way or with the detail established in the course guidelines. At the same time, the principle of ‘teaching language items effectively’ or ‘teaching language skills appropriately’ (see Table 5.2), implied a de facto language/skills focus, as well as the use of language systems/language skills-based approaches that, as was referred to earlier, were not always suitable or relevant for the teaching practice of many candidates.

As in the case of the view of language and language practice, none of the tensions related to the teaching practice was recognised nor mitigated during the course. This led the candidates to the early adoption of a pragmatic approach, focusing their attention and efforts mostly in reproducing
‘to the letter’ the classroom routines taught in the course with the purpose of ‘ticking the box’ on the assessment checklist, regardless of their suitability or relevance for their teaching contexts. Some teachers, like Javier, even acknowledged having asked their students to simply “play along” during their teaching practices in exchange for good grades (see e.g., p. 256). Victoria summarised the adoption of this attitude by asserting that the most important thing in the course was ‘to follow instructions, to follow the methodology they ask for, with the approach they ask for, just as they ask you to’ (e.g., p. 239).

Thus considered, the findings related to the implied notion of teaching coincides with studies that have documented the imposition of top-down methodologies and the tensions it creates when the local perspectives and practices are disregarded (e.g., Clarke 2008; Canagarajah 2012; Park 2012; Sayer 2012), including the pragmatic attitudes adopted by students as survival strategies in such contexts (e.g., Moore, Edwards, Halpin, & George 2002; Block, Gray & Holborow 2012; Holliday 2016).

- Self-evaluation of teaching

With respect to the last phase of the teaching cycle, identified in my analysis as ‘self-evaluation of teaching’, as is described in the body of my report, the candidates were expected to reflect on their teaching practice and then implement the corresponding changes in their lessons, considering the feedback received. As the findings reveal, while some candidates found productive or interesting the experience of reflecting on their practice, some others considered this phase as part of a sometimes unfair (see e.g., p. 253) or merely bureaucratic (Came, personal communication) process of indoctrination (see Figure 6.23).

As was referred to in the literature review chapter, different studies have criticised this type of approaches to self-evaluation, particularly in terms of their scope, mostly limited to aspects of classroom actions (Jay & Johnson 2007), the efficient transmission of information (Zeichner and Liston 1996), technical effectiveness (Cruckshank & Applegate 1981) or problem-solving activities (Freeman 2016), as opposed to, for example, critical (Zeichner 1983 & 1996), deliberative enquiry-based (Edge 2011), practice and context-sensitive (Farrell 2015) or more dialogic, data-led and collaborative approaches (Mann & Walsh 2013 & 2017), and even beyond reflective practice (Bradbury, Frost & Kilminster 2010). Even though the perspective expressed by some candidates in relation to this aspect of the teaching practice in the course seems to be in line with some of this criticism, the reference in the findings to this aspect is limited and further work is required to establish any consistency between both perspectives.
As has been discussed, the findings related to the implied notion of teaching in the course add further credence to the criticism raised in the literature, in relation to the instrumental character, technocratic orientation, (e.g., in being based mostly on principles of efficiency, calculability, predictability and control of results) and deskilling nature (by transforming practitioners into implementers of pre-established methodologies and content) of the teaching practice offered in commercial teacher training courses, such as CELTA or ICELT, as referred to in the literature review of this study (e.g., see Gray & Block 2012; Block & Gray 2015). However, in contrast to this literature, this study has also shown that the teaching practice offered in the course is not necessarily reduced to this character (see e.g., p. 189). This suggests that more research is needed to account for the complexity and add nuance and detail to the general consideration of these courses in relation to this aspect of the course.

8.2.2.2.3 Implied notion of professional development

The third and final area of development in the course was precisely the area of ‘Professional development’ which aimed to enhance the professional development of the candidates in the course and after the course in the form of continuous professional development provision. As the findings show, this area was rich in terms of its theoretical content and also regarding the range of options it included, particularly in terms of the development of the candidates in the course, such as class observations, reflective practice and professional roles and values (see p. 111). However, as the findings also show, the development of the candidates after the course was conceptualised exclusively in reference to the Cambridge English Teacher Development framework (see p. 113), which turned the framework, and as a consequence also the provision of professional development in the course, into a self-contained and self-referenced form of professional development.

The findings indicate that during the iteration of the course researched, this way of understanding and referencing professional development was adopted and reinforced by the tutors who positioned ICELT not only as a preparatory step for the following course within the Cambridge English teaching development framework (e.g., the DELTA course) (see p. 170) but also as the only framework of reference for the professional development of the candidates, who were, in general, assumed to lack proper professionalism or who required to improve it (see e.g., p. 168).

Thus conceptualised, this approach to professional development matches what has been characterised in the literature as a deficit model of professional development. This is because
teachers’ previous knowledge and experience are not considered and teachers are seen as possessing an inherent form of professional deficiency that can be remedied or improved (Kennedy 2005) precisely through top-down approaches to teacher development (Farrell 2013; Cirocki & Farrell 2017) such as this particular model positioned as a universal form of professional development.

Thus expressed, these findings are in agreement and add empirical evidence to the literature produced in Latin America that has criticised the imposition of top-down models of professional development for English teachers, such as ICELT, which, in the view of different authors, tend to establish decontextualised standards in the form of general criteria (e.g., Torres-Rocha 2019, González 2009), with a disregard for local knowledge (e.g., González 2007) and disconnection from real contexts (Bremner 2020), as was documented in some cases in this research.

8.2.2.3 Ends, imposition and opposition

The convergent consideration of the ends of the course has enriched our understanding of the way in which these ends were expressed in the course documents and the iteration of the course researched, and the general and particular effects of such expression on the candidates.

As the findings originally indicated, the ends of the course presupposed a particular understanding of language, teaching and professional development in the different areas through which the general end of the course was realised. As it turned out, such an understanding was not only in tension but at times in contradiction with the teaching practices of some institutions where the candidates worked, which in turn were disregarded or seen as inherently deficient. Thus conceptualised, the establishment of the ends of the course represented an imposition, since they were neither theoretically justified, discussed nor agreed upon, nor were the tensions and contradictions these ends generated acknowledged. In this way, it is possible to consider the attitude adopted in general by the candidates as a form of defensive pragmatism, i.e., as a mechanism of defence before the imposition and their perception of the impossibility to change such imposition.

As mentioned in the literature review, although a significant number of studies have researched and theorised linguistic and methodological forms of imposition in the field of ELT (e.g., Phillipson 1992; Pennycook 1994; Holliday 1994; Canagarajah 1999), including the imposition of notions of professionalism as such (Adams 2012), this study adds empirical evidence to the discussion of two things in particular: 1) the internal and external contradictions between the ends of top-down in-
8.2.3 Distinctive components

The third aspect of the ethos researched in this study were the distinctive components of the course, i.e., the elements of the course that were identified as particularly prevalent and prominent in the data. As in the previous two cases, the findings related to this aspect of the course were reported and summarised in the analysis chapters of this study. In this section, after this introduction, I will restate the summary of the main findings related to this topic as they were reported in Chapters Five, Six and Seven, and then I will discuss the findings related to this area convergently, with a special focus on the tensions created in relation to the implementation of these components in the course as well as to their overall implications.

8.2.3.1 Summary of research questions and findings

As was expressed at the beginning of the chapter, research sub-question 1.3 sought to determine what the distinctive components of ICELT were, particularly 'on paper', i.e., as they were expressed in the course documents and course-related documents. As was documented in section 5.5 (p. 115), my analytic process identified four distinctive components: the principle of adaptation of the course to the course candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs; a classroom-based presupposed instructional context; a language systems and language skills-centred perspective of English language teaching; and finally, a learner-centred teaching perspective. In turn, research sub-question 2.3 attempted to identify how these components were operationalised in one iteration of ICELT. As is documented in section 6.6 (p. 179), the findings show that in the course researched these components were operationalised primarily through the assessment components, and also through the input sessions and the post-observation feedback sessions, although, as was also shown, such operationalisation was not always fully realised nor free from tensions. Finally, regarding the research questions 3.2 and 3.3, which in general sought out to understand the feelings and perceptions of the candidates...
about their experience in the course, the case studies offer detail of the particular experience of three candidates in the course in relation to these components.

8.2.3.2 Discussion of the findings: tensions between the content of these components and the teaching practice of some candidates

As was discussed in relation to the ends of the course, in the case of distinctive components of the course the findings show that there were tensions between the content of these components and the teaching practice of some candidates in the iteration of the course researched. In what follows, I will explore these tensions in more detail, considering in a convergent way each one of these components as well as their general implications.

8.2.3.2.1 Adaption of the course to the candidates, their context and their needs

As the findings show, the first and possibly the most prominent distinctive component of ICELT identified in my analytic process was the principle of adaptation of the course to the candidates, their teaching contexts, and their specific needs (see p. 116). However, as the findings also indicate, even though this principle was operationalised in some parts of the course, such as the peer observations tasks, its fulfilment was not always easy nor free from tensions. One example that illustrates this was the fact that, given the restrictions of the iteration of the course researched in terms of, for example, the minimum age of the students for the assessed observations, some teachers had to borrow groups from other teachers or other institutions to complete the assessment components of the course. This clearly compromised the principle of adaptation (e.g., Mariana. See p. 262).

Yet, the greatest tensions in relation to this principle in the course were generated by the existing discrepancy or gap between the candidates, their teaching contexts and their specific needs and, precisely, the other distinctive components of ICELT, namely: a classroom-based teaching perspective; a language systems/language skills-centred teaching perspective and finally, a learner-centred teaching perspective, as will be described briefly in what follows:

8.2.3.2.2 A classroom-based teaching perspective
Regarding the classroom-based teaching perspective used in the course, as shown in the findings, the assessment components assumed an instructional context based on a specific institutional classroom that did not always reflect the reality of the teaching contexts of the candidates in the course. An example of this were the candidates who taught business classes to executives in companies (including 1 to 1 courses). These classes usually took place at the corporate offices which bore little resemblance to the classroom assumed in ICETL (see p. 119). Some of these candidates expressed frustration for having to fulfil the requirement to complete their teaching practices in the course with groups of at least four students, as was required in the course. A case in point was Juan who, as a business class teacher with 25 years of experience in 1 to 1 teaching contexts, manifested that he felt like a ‘different person’ teaching large classes. As was reported, this was one of the reasons that eventually led him to drop out of the course (see p. 216)

These findings coincide with other authors who have also pointed out the existing discrepancies between the 'small, well-equipped classrooms' assumed in pedagogical approaches such as the communicative language teaching (CLT) (Copland, Garton, and Burns 2014), and the realities of classrooms in other local contexts (e.g., Mahboob & Elyas 2014; Barnawi & Ha 2015; Ramírez-Romero 2016; Kuchah & Shamim 2018)

8.2.3.2.3 A language systems/language skills-centred teaching perspective

In relation to the language systems/language skills-centred teaching perspective (see p. 123), as noted in the case of the ends of the course, in the course researched this perspective was in conflict with the way in which language and language work were conceptualised and carried out at different institutions of various candidates. As is evidenced in the case studies included in this study, many candidates approached language and language work in their teaching contexts in a way that not only differed from the perspective used in the course but that explicitly ruled it out (e.g., p. 231). However, as is also documented in the findings of this research, this discrepancy was not recognised nor addressed, so the candidates had to adapt teaching approaches with which they were not necessarily familiar and that did not correspond to their teaching practice, thus contradicting the principle of adaptability.

As the findings also indicate, the tutors themselves recognised the challenge that represented to consider different teaching circumstances and to cater to the diverse needs of all candidates in
the course (see p. 183), accepting that a one-size-fits-all approach prevailed in the course (see p. 150).

Thus conceptualised, these findings coincide and add empirical evidence to the literature that has argued that the adoption of a given perspective on language and language work implies the adoption of particular assumptions in relation to the way in which linguistic competence is developed, the way in which a second language is learned, the role of grammar in that learning, and the way in which that grammatical knowledge is developed or learned (e.g., Canagarajah 2016) and that, in this sense, different perspectives on language and language work involve and in fact require the use of different methods, materials and practices in the classroom (e.g., McCarthy & Carter 1994; McCarty & Clancy 2019). Thus conceptualised, this furthers the argument that ‘on paper’ and ‘in practice’ the ICELT course entailed a particular understanding of language which was imposed onto the candidates in the course without regard for their own understandings and preferences of language and language work.

8.2.3.2.4 A learner-centred teaching perspective

Finally, with regards to the student-centred teaching perspective used in the course, despite the theoretical richness of its foundations (Krahenbuhl 2016), reflected for example on the content of the course, the fulfilment of this principle was also in tension and opposition with the institutional teaching practices of different candidates. As referred to in the findings, in the case of Victoria, for example, the educational system of the bilingual school where she worked was organised around ‘strict discipline and positive habits formation (see p. 230), which implied a teacher-centred approach. As was documented, the contrast between these two approaches ended up generating multiple tensions that were resolved only when Victoria adopted the required approach (see p. 232).

Another example documented in the findings was the institution where Javier worked, which despite considering the student as the centre of instruction (see pp. 247-48), held a significantly different version of student-centred instruction, which also generated different tensions that ceased only when Javier changed his focus (pp. 250-51).

Finally, the other example documented in the findings was the institution where Mariana worked. As was described in the analysis chapter, this institution, founded by immigrants from an East Asian country with the expressed purpose of maintaining its ethnic and cultural identity in Mexico, embraced a teaching perspective centred on the teacher which fit their teaching practices and
Aims (see p. 264). As the findings show, during the course, Mariana was not only denied the option to use this perspective but in order to fulfil the requirements to pass the course, she was required to adopt a teaching perspective that was contrary to it.

Although the implementation of this perspective did not generate tensions with all candidates in the course, in very few cases reflected the teaching practices of such candidates and, in this sense, it hardly constituted an adaptation to them, their contexts and the needs of their students, as established by this principle.

8.2.3.3 General effects

As in the case of the ends of the course, the convergent consideration of the distinctive components of ICELT has helped us to improve our understanding of these components and of the tensions that their operationalisation produced in the iteration of the course investigated.

In general, the findings indicate that, despite the existence of some affordances, a given pedagogy was imposed on the candidates who were required to follow it in order to complete the assessment components, regardless of its relevance and correspondence with their teaching contexts and practices, and even correspondence with their personal beliefs.

Characterised in this way, the ends and distinctive components of the course contrast with a) the notion of culturally and contextually appropriate pedagogical practices, particularly in language teacher training programs (e.g., Holliday 1994; Golombek and Johnson 2019, Hayes 2019) and b) the principles of effective in-service teacher training programs which, as referred to in the literature review, advocate for acknowledging and building on the experience, beliefs and prior knowledge of teachers; positioning of the course as a non-deficit-oriented development activity, and avoiding methodological prescriptivism, among other practices (see p. 27).

From a more general perspective, the ends and distinctive components of the course also contrast with the literature that advocates for both professional teacher education models and forms of professional development founded on a holistic, bottom-up and democratic view of teacher development (e.g., Widdowson 1983, Richards 1989; Edge 2003; Johnson 2006; Burns 2005; Mann 2005; Richards 2008; Borg 2015; Borg & Albery 2015, Smith 2020). This perspective is commonly opposed to a vision of development based on training models which some authors associate with ‘inappropriate’ forms of teacher development that undervalues the nature of teaching and
teachers, reducing the former to a technology and the latter a little more than technicians (Richards 1989).

Other authors, mainly associated with the so-called southern epistemologies (e.g., Mignolo 2000; Quijano 2000; Grosfoguel 2000, 2005 & 2007; de Sousa 2014 & 2018), argue that, in general, Western top-down knowledges represent not only forms of imposition but also a form of epistemicide, that is, the destruction of knowledges and ways of knowing produced in the global South, which involves the disqualification of the discursive practices that don’t reproduce the cannon and also of the social agents who operate according to such knowledges/ways of knowing (de Sousa 2014, p. 153). Considered from this perspective, it is possible to argue that many of the characteristics of the ends and distinctive components of ICELT discussed above, and possibly the training model of professional development itself, represent a form of imposed pedagogy, anglocentric in nature (e.g., with claims of universality. See 8.2), that not only denies, excludes, and/or silences any other form of alternative pedagogy but also the candidates’ own epistemologies, as has been documented in some cases in the findings of this study.

Despite the existence of some literature in the field of English language teaching that adopts similar perspectives (e.g., Phillipson 1992 2009 2015a 2015b; Pennycook 1998; Pennycook and Makoni 2020; Canagarajah 1999; Braine 1999; Kumaravadivelu, 2012 & 2016; Mahboob 2019), including some initiatives that aim to decentre ELT (e.g., Smith 2018), more data-led contextualised research within this perspective is required, particularly in relation to dominant teacher training models.

8.2.4 Discursive practices

The fourth and last aspect of the ethos of ICELT researched in this study were prominent discursive practices identified in the data. As in the previous cases, the findings of my analytic process concerning this topic were reported in the analysis chapter. In this section, after this introduction, I will re-state the summary of the findings as they were reported in Chapter Six and then, I will discuss these findings convergently, in relation to the case studies reported in Chapter Seven and the discussion of the other aspects of the ethos included in this chapter as well as the relevant literature. In particular, in this section, I will discuss in more detail the conceptualisation of the identified discursive practices and the response from the candidates to them, particularly in relation to the concepts of pedagogical violence, epistemological violence and defensive pragmatism.
8.2.4.1 Summary of research questions and findings

As was mentioned early in this chapter, research sub-question 2.5 sought out to identify prominent discursive practices in the course. As the findings show, my analytic process identified three discursive practices which predominated in the interactions recorded between the tutors and the candidates during the iteration of the course researched.

Overall, these discursive practices offered a perspective of the main instructional practices used in the course by the tutors as well as of the ways in which the candidates responded to them.

As the findings also show, I characterised these practices in my analysis as a ‘strict pedagogy’, particularly given the level of demand and pressure that they put on the candidates. In turn, the response from the candidates to them was broadly characterised in my analysis as ‘pragmatic’, given the practical orientation of such response, i.e., given its goal-oriented nature, as opposed to a response guided by principles, ideas, or theories.

Finally, the cases studies featured in Chapter Seven offered detail of the responses of three candidates which, in turn, showed aspects of the complexity of their experience in the course.

8.2.4.2 Discussion of the findings: a reconceptualisation of the instructional practices and the response from the candidates to them

As the findings show, the discursive practices identified in the analysis of this study represent an important source of insight into the character, or ethos, of the course, particularly in terms of knowledge of the pedagogy used by the tutors in the course, that is, of their instructional principles and practices, as well as the response of the candidates to them. In this section, as referred to above, I will discuss further the original conceptualisation of both elements:

8.2.4.2.1 Reconceptualisation of the instructional practices used in the course

As mentioned above, the discursive practices identified in the course data were thematically characterised in my analysis as a ‘strict pedagogy’, mainly due to their ‘difficult, demanding, and exhausting’ nature, as described in 6.7.1. (p. 196). However, when these practices are considered
in light of the discussion of the other aspects of the ethos researched in this study, it becomes evident the limits of such characterisation as well as the need for its reconceptualisation:

The data show that, from the beginning of the course, the candidates were subjected to different sources of continuous emotional pressure which ended up producing a high level of stress in all of them (see p. 212). As was documented in my analysis, this eventually led to an important number of candidates (at least one-third of the original cohort) dropping out of the course. The sources of this pressure ran the gamut from warnings about failing the course (see p. 197) to the demand to follow the guidelines of the tutors ‘to the letter’, as well as to adapt the pre-established teaching practices of the course so that the candidates could perform well in the assessment components, although without taking into consideration their appropriacy to the teaching contexts of the candidates (p. 202). Other sources of stress documented in the data were the course work overload, the centrality of the evaluation components, and finally, the effect on the candidates of the predominant discursive practices.

Thus considered, the instructional practices used in the course constituted a continuous source of suffering and pain, and in this sense, a form of violence against the candidates, despite the tutors’ attempts to normalise them and/or mitigate their effect on them (see for example p. 216).

In this sense, these findings are consistent with concepts that describe institutionalised abuse in education such as pedagogical violence, which is defined in the literature as the infliction of physical, social, emotional, or psychological pains (including threats of pains) with the purpose of promoting certain desired learning in students (Matusov & Sullivan 2020, pp 438-39). The findings are also consistent with the concept of epistemological violence, in as much as the infliction of pain implied the imposition of a given pedagogy, including for example notions of language, teaching and professional development, as was referred to earlier in this chapter (p. 294).

In the literature, the concept of pedagogic violence has been understood as a form of symbolic violence, i.e., as a type of violence that is not necessarily physical, but linguistic (Žižek 2008) and paralinguistic (Dowding 2011), and through which forms of hierarchy and domination persist and are reproduced, as was documented in the course, for example, in relation to the representation of the tutors (see p. 157). According to Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992, p. 167), these forms are generally produced with the practical adaptation of those involved, but without their resistance or conscious recognition.
In turn, the concept of epistemological violence has been characterised in the field of education as a form of pedagogical violence, largely related to the exposure of students to painful ideas or learning activities (Matusov & Sullivan 2020), the disruption of the students’ dearest ideas (Lukianoff 2013), and/or their intentional humiliation to promote the desired learning (Infinito 2003). However, from a socio-historical perspective, the notion of epistemological violence is also conceptualised as an imposition of knowledge from the Global North to Global South (e.g., de Souza 2007; Grosfoguel, 2013) which has frequently led to the ‘murder of the knowledge systems’ that are produced locally i.e., to their epistemicide (de Souza 2014, p. 92).

De Souza notes that the Global South is not a geographical concept but rather ‘a metaphor for the human suffering caused by capitalism and colonialism on the global level, as well as for the resistance to overcoming or minimising such suffering’ (de Sousa 2016, p. 17), thus attempting to transcend socio-politically charged and sometimes simplified discourses about this topic. This author also mentions that colonialism is not only 'external' but also 'internal' and that is commonly expressed as ‘a very wide social grammar that permeates social relations, public and private spaces, culture, mentalities, and subjectivities (...) often shared by both those who benefit from it and those who suffer its consequences’ (de Souza 2014, p. 26). This seems to suggest the notion that once imposed, the forms of epistemological colonialism are reproduced by the oppressed themselves, becoming frequently forms of self-imposed domination, as can be interpreted in many instances of the tutors’ discourse in the course.

While the concepts of Global North and Global South in this context seem to lack a rigorous theoretical conceptualisation, thus remaining for the most part as fundamentally ideological notions, the concepts of pedagogical violence and gnoseological and epistemological violence, or epistemicide, do help us to use one single concept to characterise in a comprehensive way three different phenomena identified analytically in the data: the disregard or denial of the forms of knowledge and knowing of the candidates; the imposition of a pedagogical approach on them, and finally, the infliction of pain on the candidates throughout the course through the mediation of the tutors.

However, it is important to consider that as was also shown in the findings, not all exchanges between the tutors and the candidates recorded in the data could be characterised as pedagogical violence, nor certainly, all discursive practices were forms of gnoseological and epistemological violence (see e.g., the dialogic spaces created by the tutors for the candidates to debate their ideas about a given topic on p. 199). For this reason, these concepts cannot be generalised and
must be used with caution, for example, limiting their scope only perhaps to the exchanges in which they seem to apply.

8.2.4.2.2 Reconceptualisation of the candidates’ response

Another concept that must be redefined in light of the broader consideration of the findings is the concept of *pragmatism*. As mentioned above, in the report of my analysis, I used this concept to characterise the overall response of candidates to the tutors' instructional practices. As documented in the findings, the candidates adopted an attitude that in general prioritised the achievement of the goals of the course in the face of, for example, the tensions generated between some of the assessed teaching practices and the teaching practices and the teaching contexts of the candidates. In general, this meant that the candidates frequently privileged practical adaptation over resistance and conflict (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). However, in light of the reconceptualisation of the instructional practices of the tutors as a form of violence (e.g., pedagogical violence), it is possible to consider that the response of the candidates could have represented rather a survival or defensive strategy than an internalisation and acceptance of such practices (Bourdieu & Passeron 1990). Thus defined, the attitude of the candidates in the course could be interpreted as a mechanism of cultural, gnoseological and epistemological defence used by them not only to protect themselves from what was perceived as a continuous source of pain and suffering but also to consciously or unconsciously preserve their own principles, ideas and/or practices during and after the course, i.e., their knowledges, ways of knowing and ways of acting on them.

Pragmatic behaviour as a form of resistance has been documented in the literature of the so-called education reform (Brathwaite 2016) where teachers have been forced to ‘reposition’ and ‘adapt’ themselves to top-down educational change imposed in their teaching contexts (Moore 2002). In a broader context, pragmatic attitudes have also been referred to in the Literature of Latin American history as forms of cultural resistance among the Mesoamerican peoples who, after the Conquest and the violent imposition of the Spanish culture, continued to worship some of their gods secretly while they simulated to adopt the beliefs and practices of Christianity (Knight 2002). Even though it would be difficult to consider the attitudes of the candidates in the course as a form of simulation, their pragmatism in the course can be conceptualised as a form of cultural resistance or defence, not only before the violence imposed on them in the course but also the imposition of a single model of professional development by the educational authority as referred to in Chapter Two. Similar forms of cultural, gnoseological and epistemological defence have been
themselves the object of inquiry and reflection in the literature of cultural studies in Mexico (e.g., Ramos 1951 [1934]; Paz 1976 [1950]; Uranga 2013 [1952]; Zea 1953; Portilla 1966), even though not in the world of education or, more specifically, teacher education.

On the whole, although the reconceptualisation of the instructional practices and the response of the candidates to them has allowed us to improve our understanding of the nature of the prominent discursive practices identified in the course, including the identification of a particular form of cultural defence, conceptualised in this study as defensive pragmatism, further research is required to account for the complexity and richness of its content in a more in-depth form.

8.4 Chapter summary

This chapter provided a discussion of the findings of this study as they were presented in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. To facilitate the discussion, the findings from each chapter were grouped in four sub-sections (representation, ends, distinctive components, and prominent discursive practices of the course), according to the different aspects of the ethos of the course researched, and then were discussed convergently with a focus on one contentious aspect or a major tension identified in my analytical process. The findings were also discussed in relation to previous research and theoretical conceptualisations in the areas of marketisation of teacher education, appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy, and epistemological decolonisation. In the discussion, the contribution of the present research to the existing literature was also highlighted.

Regarding the first aspect of the ethos of the course researched, it was argued that, even though complex, the representation of ICELT as a ‘highly respected certification’ presented in the findings was not only fundamentally ideological in nature (e.g., not factual) but that it fulfilled ideological functions in the course, such as legitimising the tutors’ discursive practices and serving as a professional referent to value or devalue the professional knowledge and practices of the candidates. In regards to the literature, I mentioned that, although a significant number of studies have addressed the effects of market-oriented ideologies in the field of English language teaching, the nature and ideological functions of such representations in the area of teacher education remain underexplored and in this sense, further exploration is required, particularly at a national language policy level in the Global South where these ideologies tend to have a major impact.

In relation to the second aspect of the ethos discussed, it was argued that even though complex, the expression of the ends of the course ‘on paper’ and ‘in practice’ were relatively consistent with the ends of this type of provision referred to in the literature. However, it was also discussed
that whereas these ends were expressed with generic language, in reality, they presupposed a particular understanding of language, teaching and professional development. It was also mentioned that this understanding was not only in tension but in many cases in contradiction with the educational ends, teaching practices, and even the educational culture of some course candidates, which were in turn disregarded, or simply seen as inherently deficient. Thus conceptualised, these ends were argued to have represented an imposition given the fact that they were neither theoretically justified, discussed nor agreed upon, nor had been the tensions and contradictions that these ends generated acknowledged to which some candidates reacted with frustration, alienation and, in general, with pragmatism, later conceptualised in the chapter as a form of defensive pragmatism. In this sense, this study was said to add empirical evidence to the literature that researches forms of top-down imposition in second language teacher education and that advocates for contextually appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy.

Concerning the third aspect of the ethos of the course researched in this study, it was argued that the operationalisation of the distinctive components of the course made that the candidates focus their attention and work in the course on the completion of the assessment components, frequently in a prescribed manner and without proper regard for their relevance and suitability to the contexts and teaching practices of the students of the course, or even correspondence with their personal beliefs.

As was referred to in the body of the text, this gave rise to tensions among the candidates, who finally adopted a pragmatic stance prioritising the completion of the assessment components tasks. It also implied contradictions, particularly in relation to the course's principles, such as the adaptation of the course to the candidates, their teaching contexts and specific needs, or in relation to the principles of effective in-service teacher training programs referred to in the literature, such as acknowledging and building on the experience, beliefs and prior knowledge of teachers; positioning the course as a non-deficit-oriented development activity, or avoiding methodological prescriptivism.

Finally, in regards to the prominent discursive practices identified in the findings, it was argued the need to reconceptualise two concepts ('strict pedagogy' and 'pragmatism') originally used in my analysis to describe the instructional practices of the tutors in the course and the response of the candidates to them.

In relation to the concept of strict pedagogy, it was argued that the concepts of pedagogical violence and epistemological violence expressed in a more comprehensive and precise way the
epistemological imposition to the candidates of a given way of knowledge and knowing, the infliction of suffering and pain on them by the tutors, as well as the discursive normalisation of such violence.

Regarding the response of the candidates, it was argued that by reconceptualising the instructional practices of the tutors in the course as a form of violence (e.g., pedagogical violence), it was reasonable to postulate that the candidates had adopted a pragmatic attitude as a survival strategy or mechanism of defence not only to protect themselves from the internal and external violence that had been imposed on them but also to preserve consciously or unconsciously their own knowledge and ways of knowing, i.e., as a form of defensive pragmatism, rather than as merely utilitarian acceptance of these practices. Whereas it is possible to think that some form of such pragmatism is likely to be adopted by many candidates to these courses, this form of response had not been conceptualised as such in the literature of language teacher education and, in this sense, it constitutes a contribution to the current body of knowledge in this area.

Taken as a whole, the discussion of the findings in a convergent way and under the light of the literature helped us gain further insight into the aspects of the ethos of the course researched and, in turn, capture and delineate some features of what represented a complex ideological system.
CHAPTER NINE: Conclusion

9.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to present the conclusions of this study and provide a summary of its contribution, limitations, and suggestions for further research. For this purpose, I will first summarise the research aims, processes and key findings. I will then discuss the main contributions of this study to the existing knowledge. After this, I will refer to the implications and limitations of this study, and some possibilities for further research. Finally, I will present a summary of the content of the chapter.

9.2 Summary of the research aims, processes and findings

As was described in Chapter One, this study set out to identify and explore aspects of the ethos of one iteration of the Cambridge ICELT course with the aim to develop a contextualised understanding of it. The concept of ethos was understood in at least two senses, namely, as discursive self-representation and as the fundamental elements that characterised the course (see Bermudez 2007 for a brief account of the main uses of this term in the literature). Concomitantly, the research questions of this study inquired about relevant aspects of the self-representation and of the characteristic elements of the iteration of the course researched with a focus on discourse in three different analytic dimensions: on paper (e.g., the course documents), as implemented (e.g., aspects of the tutors’ implementation through their discursive instructional practices) and finally, ‘experiences in ICELT’, (e.g., aspects of the perception of three candidates of their experience in the course). Thus conceived, this study sought to explore this course from a relatively different perspective and research approach from the ones identified in the existing literature (see Chapter Three), adopting a minimal ideological approach that included an inductive, semantic thematic analysis and innovative research strategies such as the falsification phase.

The study was conducted in a Cambridge English authorised centre in Mexico during a 9 month period, which was the length of the iteration of the course researched. In order to produce data, I adopted a qualitative research design informed by ethnography and case study, including the following research methods: documentary research, class observations, participant interviews, focus groups, and research diary. The data were produced in at least two phases: a first phase where I maintained the research questions in mind but with an open mind, keeping an open eye
for the unexpected (Richards 2003, p. 110) until some potential themes were identified, and then a second phase in which I produced data with those themes in mind but also intentionally distancing myself from the data and seeking to falsify such themes. The data were analysed thematically in relation to each one of the dimensions referred to above and then discussed convergently, and in relation to the theoretical discussion of three areas: ‘the marketisation of teacher education’, ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’ and ‘epistemological decolonisation’.

In terms of its main findings, this study has identified different elements of the ethos of the course studied, showing aspects of its complexity, making manifest relevant aspects of its character, and highlighting tensions and contradictions. Regarding the first aspect of the ethos researched, the discussion of the main findings indicate that, even though complex, the representation of the course analysed was fundamentally ideological and that, as such, it fulfilled ideological functions, including the discursive legitimation of the instructional practices of the tutors, largely expressed in the data in the form of pedagogical violence, or the professional valuation or devaluation of the candidates in detriment of their own epistemologies. In regards to the second aspect of the ethos researched, after being discussed the findings show that the ends of the course presupposed notions of language, teaching, and professional development that were in tension and conflict with the educational ends and teaching practices of some course candidates, whose educational culture was commonly disregarded or seen as inherently deficient. The discussion of the findings concerning the third aspect of the ethos of the course shows that despite its richness in content, the operationalisation of the distinctive components in the course represented an imposition that not only conflicted with some candidates, their teaching contexts and specific needs but that it negated their epistemologies, thus contradicting its own principles and the literature at large. Finally, this study identified discursive practices that describe aspects processes that constituted a complex ideological system, conceptualised in the discussion chapter as pedagogical violence and epistemological violence to which the candidates responded pragmatically, not only defending from the violence imposed on them but also protecting, at the same time, their knowledges and forms of knowing.

9.3 Summary of main contributions

In general terms, this study contributes to the existing literature by providing insight into the complex character (ethos) of a globally marketised teacher training program, showing some of their potential merits and tensions, making manifest some of their limitations, particularly in terms of the development of contextually appropriate methodologies, and making visible aspects
of their ideological nature, including the legitimisation of the symbolic violence it produced throughout the iteration of the course researched and the unique forms of defence and resistance by the candidates identified in my analysis.

In particular, this research contributes to the body of knowledge in the field of language teacher education by adding empirical evidence, and thus further credence, to research conducted and theory developed in different areas of research within this field, such as ‘the marketisation of language teacher education’, ‘appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy’, and ‘epistemological decolonisation’.

In the case of marketisation of language teacher education, for example, this study researched and documented aspects of the representation of the course, such as the ideological functions that this representation fulfilled. As was referred to in the discussion chapter, one example of these functions was the discursive legitimation identified in the data of the pedagogical practices used by the tutors in the course, generally characterised in this study as forms of pedagogical and epistemological violence. Despite its importance, the nature and functions of representation in language teacher education programs, particularly within the context of the marketisation of education (Bartlett, Frederick, Gulbrandsen, & Murillo 2002) remain under-researched and under-theorised. In this sense, this study contributes to drawing attention to the importance of this topic and by empirically documenting one case of teacher training course from a major global provider.

Regarding the area of appropriate forms of ELT pedagogy, this study identified some of the main assumptions behind the ends and the distinctive components of the course that were imposed onto the candidates in the course. As was referred to in the discussion chapter, these assumptions were identified to have been expressed mostly in the form of implicit notions on language, teaching and professional development, frequently in tension or conflict with some of the candidates expressed teaching beliefs, epistemologies and practices. Thus conceptualised, this study contributes to the robust body of research in this area, documenting aspects of the discursive normalisation of epistemological and methodological imposition in INSET provision.

Concerning the area of postcolonial theory and research in language teacher education, this study contributes to current developments by introducing the perspective of epistemological decolonisation (e.g., Mignolo 2000; Quijano 2000; Grosfoguel 2000, 2005 & 2007; de Sousa 2014 & 2018), including the notions of pedagogical and epistemological violence, to help explain the nature and effects of the prominent discursive practices of the tutors in the course. At the same time, this study documents and conceptualises a unique form of cultural, gnoseological and
epistemological defence characterised in this research as *defensive pragmatism*, adopted by the candidates before these forms of violence generated in the course and also by the social context of the course with the imposition of ICELT by the educational authority as a model of professional development, as referred to in Chapter Two.

Methodologically, this study contributes to the existing literature by presenting an innovative, qualitative research design that deals not only with issues of complexity, reflection and reflexivity, but also bias, error and illusion.

In terms of complexity, this study employed an original research framework that aimed to explore different aspects of the ethos in one iteration of the ICELT course in three interconnected moments or dimensions: discursive production (ICELT on paper), implementation (ICELT as implemented), and consumption (ICELT as experienced). As such, this framework made it possible to generate a more in-depth, broader, and more dynamic perspective to explore the phenomena under investigation.

At the same time, the research design of this study included an original strategy of data falsification which involved taking distance from the data and seeking to falsify recurring perceptions, understandings, and themes throughout the research process. As expressed in the Methodology Chapter, this strategy was informed by Popper’s principle of falsifiability (Popper, 1959/2002) and Morin’s complex thought (Morin 1999, 2007 & 2008). Its application allowed me not only to deal with issues of bias, error and illusion but to strengthen the integrity of my research as a whole through these processes. One example that illustrates the tangible effect of this strategy is referred to in the Methodology Chapter in relation to the thematic analysis of the data (p. 86). As is mentioned there, this strategy helped me to refine, modify and create new sub-themes which added detail and nuance to the main theme or that, in certain instances, added a completely new perspective that had not been considered previously. It is possible to maintain that without the processes of falsification, the results of this study would have been different. Overall, the processes of falsification designed and implemented in this research represent an innovative research strategy and, as such, constitutes a contribution to the existing literature.

9.4 Implications and limitations

9.4.1 Implications
9.4.1.1 Implications for researchers

The complexity of researching the social world has been widely discussed particularly in the fields of philosophy of science and social sciences (see Chalmers 2013). However, its proper recognition and consideration in individual research studies are less frequent. In this sense, the research design and procedures of this study may help to argue the case for the consideration of this topic as a fundamental criterion for research integrity and rigour when conducting qualitative research as well as to provide researchers with a framework to research accounting for complexity.

This framework could help researchers to deal with some of the following aspects: the ambiguity in research (e.g., the susceptibility of the research methods to produce different results depending on personal and interpersonal factors), the researcher’s bias, error and illusion (e.g., the permanent risk of imposing meaning on the data, even inadvertently or unwittingly) or, the inherent limits of qualitative research, e.g., the recognition of the fact that even the richest research is, inevitably, a filtered picture or perhaps, a 'gross oversimplification' (Gomm & Hammersley 2001) of the phenomenon under research by comparison with everything that could be described of it.

At the same time, some researchers may find some value in applying the research strategies employed in this study, not only to manage subjectivity and deal with issues of bias, error and illusion but also to establish a clear and distinct basis of insights -what I call 'a minimal basis of insight'-, from which further theory-led analysis and theory can be developed, i.e., as a starting point for further analysis.

9.4.1.2 Implications for policymakers

As the findings of this study indicate, many aspects of the course were in tension and/or contradiction with some candidates, their teaching practices and sometimes with their own epistemologies. In this sense, one of the implications of this study for policymaking is raising awareness of the need to conduct thorough and rigorous due diligence processes together with democratic processes of deliberation with the stakeholders and public at large (Habermas 1984) to ensure its potential suitability and relevance of these type of teacher training programs for local teaching contexts, as opposed to its adoption and establishment as a norm or national standard for reasons of prestige, reputation, or even pressure from local special interest groups.
or international players, as was referred to in Chapter Two of this study. These processes should consider a robust number of empirical studies conducted locally, as the present research.

As the findings also suggest, language education policy may benefit too from researching and recognising local epistemologies and methodologies as opposed to policy borrowing and lending, common in the context of globalisation in education (Steiner-Khamsi 2012). As the findings indicate, the language teaching culture and practices of the candidates in the course were already, in many cases, robust and successful before the course took place (see e.g., Chapter Seven). This suggests that, in terms of professional development, many teachers are likely to benefit more by exploring their contexts in their own terms, as promoted for example by the different forms of the practitioner research culture (as defined by Wright 2010), than simply implementing linguistic and pedagogic content from standardised models of teacher professional development, extraneous to their teaching practice and contexts.

9.4.1.3 Implications for teachers

One of the main findings of this study was the identification of ideological aspects of discourse and the functions that these aspects fulfilled in the course: from the self-representation of the course as a 'highly respected certification' (see p. 94) to the positioning of the course as a unique model of teacher professional development with claims of universality (see p. 279), or the discursive justification of pedagogical and epistemic violence in the course through the main discursive practices (see p. 195), among others.

These findings may serve teachers as a starting point of a process of conscientização [consciousness raising and praxis] (Freire 1970, 1994) in at least three ways:

1) To become aware, explore, reflect and discuss ideological aspects in teacher professional development systems imposed from the outside or those produced locally in their professional contexts.

2) To become aware, explore, reflect and discuss the conscious and/or unconscious reproduction of such ideological aspects in their professional practice with their students.

3) Based on the two previous points, teachers who adopt this path would be better placed to re-think and re-value themselves as professionals, including their professional knowledge and ways of knowing, their ideas and their professional practice in the light of
professional criteria decided democratically, relevant to them, that respond to their realities and that vindicate their epistemologies and methodologies.

However, in such or similar processes of empowerment and advocacy, there is always a latent risk of limiting the action to effect change only to the classroom and classroom activities while leaving unchallenged and unchanged the existing power structures. This sometimes leads to self-deception, generating, for example, an illusory sense of empowerment or liberation. Before this, teachers can also find in the procedures and results of this study, elements for self-reflection and self-criticism, such as the data-led research approach or the falsification processes used in this study to avoid the trap of thinking that by doing something, they are changing something.

9.4.2 Limitations

Despite its contributions, this study is also subject to several limitations:

One major limitation is related to the selection of data produced during fieldwork. As referred to in Chapter Four, during this phase, I produced a considerable amount of data through research observations, interviews, and diary entries (see p. 78). However, for reasons of focus and space, I limited my analytical process to a reduced number of participants and aspects of the data directly related to the research questions of this study. Regarding the former, I had to limit my analysis, for example, to only three candidates (see Chapter Seven), even though, during fieldwork, I focused my attention on eight of them (see Table 4.3). With respect to the latter, despite the potential interesting nature of some data, I only included data that contributed in a manifest way to answer the research questions of this study. Some examples of themes identified in the data but that were not considered in my report are related to the hidden agenda of each one of the tutors in the course; the way in which issues of face and power were negotiated between the tutors and the candidates during the post-observation feedback sessions, and the perceptions of the tutors in relation to the way the course had been moderated externally in the previous iterations of the course, among other topics.

Another major limitation has to do with the nature of the data produced during fieldwork which in large part consisted of textual data, as opposed to visual and multimodal data, particularly in terms of the research participants’ discourse. In this sense, my analytical process was limited to the verbal expression of discourse, without considering the non-lexical aspects of communication, which represents a sensible limitation. At the same time, for reasons of focus and space, the conversational extracts included in this study largely omit the researcher’s turns, thus excluding
the representation of the interactional or co-constructive aspects of the interviews (Mann 2016). Even though justified (see p. 79), this fact also represents a sensible limitation concerning the insights gained from the participants' discourse.

A further limitation is related to the number of interviews that I did for this research. Even though I conducted a fair amount of formal and informal interviews with the course participants during fieldwork (see p. 75), I would have liked to conduct follow-up interviews to gain further insight into different topics that became evident only after the analysis and discussion phases and that, due to limitations of time, I was unable to conduct. Some of the themes that I would have liked to explore further are the perception of the candidates of the brand name 'Cambridge', before and after the course; their perception of the concept of 'pedagogical violence' in relation to the instructional practices of the course; their perception of the notion of 'pragmatic resistance' in relation to their response to such instructional practices, among other themes.

Finally, despite its contributions, this study was limited to research one iteration of the ICELT course, which implies that its findings cannot be generalised to other iterations of the course in the same centre, in Mexico, the region, nor anywhere else in the world. However, it could serve as a good foundation for future research, as will be referred to in the following section 9.5 Suggestions for further research

9.5 Suggestions for further research

The findings, discussion, contributions, implications and limitations of this study have highlighted different topics on which further research would be beneficial. In what follows, I will refer to some of them without following any particular order:

A SOUTHERN EPISTEMOLOGIES PERSPECTIVE ON APPROPRIATE MODELS OF LANGUAGE TEACHERS EDUCATION / TRAINING

This study documents the imposition of a given pedagogy that the candidates were required to follow 'to the letter' to complete the assessment components of the course, regardless of its relevance for their teaching beliefs, practices and contexts. As was commented in the discussion chapter, there is a robust literature that advocates for professional teacher education models and forms of professional development founded on a holistic, bottom-up and democratic view of teacher development (e.g., Widdowson 1983, Richards 1989, Edge 2003 Johnson 2006; Burns 2005; Mann 2005; Richards 2008; Borg 2015; Borg & Albery 2015, Smith 2020). However, there is
a lack of studies on these models of language teacher education from the perspective of precisely those who are oppressed, i.e., those who suffer the pedagogical and epistemological violence that these models are susceptible to produce, as was the case in the iteration of the course researched. In this sense, it would be worthwhile to produce further studies on different aspects of these commercial models of language teacher education from critical and decolonial perspectives produced in the Global South, such as the southern epistemologies perspective (e.g., Mignolo 2000; Quijano 2000; Grosfoguel 2000, 2005 & 2007; de Sousa 2014 2018).

IDEOLOGICAL USE OF THE REPRESENTATION OF THE COURSE

As was documented in this study, the representation of ICELT fulfilled different ideological functions in the iteration of the course researched. In order to deepen the understanding gained in this study in relation to such functions in this or similar courses produced by commercial global providers, further studies would be worthwhile, especially in ELT contexts in the Global South. A particularly fruitful focus within these studies could be the specific role that such representations play in the empowerment/disempowerment of the candidates.

The ideological use of these representations could also be investigated at a macro level (e.g., at a public policy level) in order to explore the intersections among language, ideology and political discourse. One possible focus could be the way in which such representation has been used to justify discursively the adoption and instrumentation of, for example, this or similar continuing professional development schemes in various nation-states, particularly in Latin America.

MORE NUANCED AND DETAILED INSIGHTS

As was referred to in the discussion chapter, aspects of the pedagogy promoted in the course have been widely criticised in the literature and different authors have characterised the whole model as highly instrumental, technocratic and deskilling in orientation (see 3.4.1.2). However, as the findings show, whereas many elements identified in my analytic process are consistent with this characterisation, other aspects of the course hardly match such description. In this sense, considering the findings of this research, future studies could adopt some of the research strategies used in this study in order to produce more nuanced and detailed insights that account for ambiguity using rigorous, data-led and minimal ideological methodological approaches.

CANDIDATES’ EPistemologies AND METHODOlogies
Finally, as mentioned in the methodology section, at the end of the course, I conducted observations of some candidates teaching in their contexts without following any specific approach, methodology or technique, i.e., as they commonly taught their classes in their teaching and learning contexts. For future research, it could be useful to observe the candidates teaching not only after the course but before the course’s formal start with the purpose of gaining some insight into the candidates’ teaching styles and methodologies. In turn, this could help to understand better the relevancy or appropriacy of the course to the candidates, their methodologies and epistemologies, and their teaching contexts. At the same time, it would be interesting to follow the candidates longitudinally to find out whether they internalise and reproduce some of the 'violences' they have experienced in the course researched.
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Appendix 2: My personal opinion about ICELT written at the beginning of the course (21/10/2016)

My personal opinion about the ICELT Course

I think that the ICELT course possesses, among others, the following positive and non-positive elements:

Positive

1. It helps to organise knowledge acquired through experience that otherwise would remain disperse.
2. It helps to name practices and processes to have a better control of them
3. It gives a platform for class planning
4. It tests one’s flexibility and adaptability skills
5. It helps to develop pragmatic skills
6. It gathers teachers from different backgrounds and contexts
7. It provides a certificate to enhance one’s own professional credentials
8. It helps to improve one’s organisational skills

Non-positive

1. It’s highly prescriptive
2. It doesn’t promote/allow the reflection/discussion of its own basic assumptions
3. It doesn’t promote/allow the reflection/discussion of its own principles
4. Teaching knowledge/practices are assumed to be stable, universal and relevant for all contexts
5. It’s mostly conservative and allows little room for innovation
6. The bibliography usually quoted considers mostly anglo-saxon authors – some of whom only speak English (ironic!)
7. If ever promoted, critical thinking and reflection remain within the same paradigm and never refer to the external context (e.g., political dimension of English)
8. It promotes an outdated English Language Teaching system in contradiction with the needs and possibilities in the present time.

Mexico City, Oct 21, 2016
Appendix 3: Sample of an entry from my research journal
(28/10/2016)

INPUT SESSION 1 (Oct 28th, 2016)

Today, the first session of the course finally took place. It was full of emotions (in different senses) and now I feel really exhausted (5 hours of class observation + 3 hours of travel time). However, I need to write down the record of the day while my experience in the field is still fresh in my mind.

- STREAM OF CONSCIOUSNESS

- GETTING LATE! I feel so bad for arriving late today - the very first day of my research! No excuses! Obviously, this won’t happen again.
- SO MANY THINGS TO CONSIDER. There are so many things to consider at the same time. How can I handle them all?
- TUTOR’S CONSENT. I feel so bad too for having drooped in class today ‘unannounced’. I should have contacted Arturo myself!
- KNOW WHO IS WHO. I need to find a way to familiarise myself with everyone in the course as soon as possible and in the most efficient way.
- ACCESS TO THE COURSE ONLINE PLATFORM. I need to access the online platform as soon as possible. I also need to ask [INSERT NAME] to add me to the course mail list ASAP.
- GETTING LOST. I need to find a way to improve my attention span. Today I lost attention and focus on many occasions during the session.

- CLASS SETTING
- Grey carpet; vertical blinds; CCTV security cameras; Lighting; furniture; loudspeakers, walls; bathroom; pieces of wood; a piece of rag; cleanness;

* How does the setting affect CCs in the course? (e.g., the existence of CCTV security cameras in the room?)

** CLASS SCHEDULE (First hour)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Action (s)</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CT’s self intro | CT introduced himself by writing some dates on the board eliciting from CCs what these may refer to | - Broke the ice  
- Established his credentials  
- Established him as an authority in the classroom |                                                                      |                                          |
| CT Elicited information about everybody’s workplace |                                                                      | - Pre-school; Primary (4); Secondary (4); High school (2); Teaching at companies (5) | - 4 CCs 50+                |
| 4.17pm    | "Find someone who knows" activity (handout 1) | CCs mingled around eliciting different information about the course from their peers | - Warm-up activity  
- Perhaps to get to know how much ccs know about the course  
- Standardize info about the course | - Some CCs seemed to be well informed about the grading system |
|          | C Cs Feedback      | CCs reported their answers                                                 |                                                                      |                                          |
| One. Assessed practice |                                                                      | - 4 PTOs (distance; CT’s kindness)  
- PTOs procedure (Frameworks: PPP; LP; actual observation; feedback; reflection; uploaded to Cambridge: ICELT 3)  
- PTOs functions, definition, | - "Contract"?  
- Detailed LP ("it is like an exam")  
- Bottom line: to help you to become more effective, more professional"  
- "You are already good teachers" comment vs ICELT 3  
- Functions: 1) assessment / 2) becoming better (more important)  
- Reflection comment | - "specific word count?" question – concern about technical details  
- "just a requirement" comment about Pos |
| Two. Classroom observations |                                                                      | - 8 PTOs: what do these involve? (single focus; reflection); learning experience |                                                                      |                                          |
- Professional path (or Cambridge path?): pre-service or TKT (6 teachers); Celta; In-service (ICELT); Delta; MA; PhD
- CEF? Question to me
  - “only course for all teaching backgrounds” comment
  - You can take...
  - Second question to me
  - Professional path: Cambridge; without MA: “come back to reality” comment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three. Requirement of the attendance</th>
<th>- 80%; punctuality; 10 online sessions;</th>
<th>- I’m going to arrive late for sure” comment / 30 min late tolerance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Four. Course content | - 7 units (U7: Language for teachers)  
- Most Language Awareness sessions will be online | - Good 1) teacher: vocation, 2) know how (Methodology), 3) Subject matter (Language) |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| 4.51pm | Calendar (handout 2) | Info about:  
- General content  
- Other candidates  
- Online sessions | - Julio will send welcome emails to those who did not get them – including me  
- When everything will be sent to Cambridge” comment  
- “Guidelines from Cambridge”  
- CCs questions |
|---------|----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5.00pm</th>
<th>Observing the surrounding</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**NOTEWORTHY THEMES IN TODAY’S SESSION (Abbreviated version)**

- This seems to be a rather large group (24 CCs). This poses a lot of challenges (e.g., knowing who is who, finding a place to sit, etc). I need to familiarise myself asap with everybody
- CCs come from a wide range of teaching contexts. Interesting!
- I got lost among so many PTOs and POs and PPPs and LPs. I wonder how the “CCs” felt! An interesting theme to explore further.
- The “non-negotiable” learner’s contract is a new element in the course. How new? Why did they implement it? Worth exploring further!
- I feel there was too much emphasis on the technical/formal aspects of the assessment components
- ‘Cambridge’ was referred to as if it were a person. Interesting!

* Completed on October 29th, 2016
Appendix 4: Sample of an entry in the ‘reflexive notes’ section of my research journal (03/02/2017)

Feb 3 2017 (Abbreviated version)

**FALSIFICATION**

**COURSE CONTENT.** After today’s session, it has become increasingly evident the predominance of the assessment components in the course: the content of the input sessions, the tasks in class, and the tutors’ comments have all a clear link to the assessment components. It is as if the course were designed to prepare the candidates to pass them but nothing else. This seems to be in tension with the main aim of the course and also with the candidates’ own needs and interests.

However, I need to counterbalance this perspective in order to avoid looking only at/for evidence that confirms this. I think that the data that is being produced in the course is complex and must be treated as such. In this sense, in the next session, I will start looking at/for evidence that shows potential content not related to the assessment components of the course.

**IMPLIED NOTION OF TEACHERS.** Another topic that needs to be falsified or counterbalanced is the implied notion of the teacher in the content of the course and the tutors’ instruction. Even though this topic will be considered in detail during the phase of the analysis, an image of teachers as technicians, able to implement pre-determined content and execute a methodology that facilitates the presentation of such content, is likely to be prominent. It's everywhere! But this is precisely why I need to falsify it.

**CELTA SPIRIT.** Finally, another theme that has become predominant in recent sessions, and that class today confirmed, is the notion that the course content is delivered as if it were a CELTA course, i.e., a pre-service course for teachers. This is particularly evident in the focus of the sessions on methodology, particularly on prescriptive teaching routines where seems to be assumed that the candidates are new to the profession.

So I need to focus my attention on those instances where the experience and knowledge of the candidates are recognised or referred to in some way with the purpose of balancing my perspective, making it more consistent, and adding nuance and detail.
Interview with the course moderator - Jul 3 2017 (Abbreviated version)

Today’s interview with Liliana was an important event for my research. Firstly, because of the very fact of having conducted it. Testimonial from course moderators are really rare in the literature of the Cambridge English certifications. At the same time, my conversation with her lasted three and a half hours, which allowed us to delve into the topics discussed. Finally, her perspective on the ICELT course, the course administration from Cambridge English, and in general, her take on this type of CPD provision, was very critical, which in itself seems relevant, as this is also has been a rare perspective among the Cambridge people I have interviewed so far.

One of the things that caught my attention and that I remember the most at this moment from this conversation is Liliana’s conceptualisation of her own perspective about the course as a ‘cynical view’, particularly because of her need to ‘defend’ the course from the candidates’ criticism despite sharing, deep inside, that same criticism.

In a sense, I have perceived a similar attitude among the tutors, although they seem to be more convinced of the benefits of the course than Liliana. However is worrisome that the candidates also have adopted a pragmatic attitude in the course, which could be characterised also as cynical, as this all would seriously question the integrity of the course as such. Even though it is clear that the course as a whole is not reduced to this aspect, this element seems to be both prominent and prevalent.

I am aware that I need to systematize the considerably rich data of this interview thematically and consider them with caution, including the need to falsify them. However, I must confess that this interview has had a bad effect on me. It would be better to stop writing now and return to this reflection later with another mood.
## Appendix 6: Transcription Conventions

(Adapted from Braun and Clarke 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Notation and explanation of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The identity of the speaker; turn taking in talk</td>
<td>The first letter of the speaker’s name, followed by a colon signals the identity of a speaker (e.g., Ana is is represented as A:. T, T2, T3 is used when one of the tutors is speaking. Every time a new speaker enters the conversation a new line is started. The first word of each new turn of talk is started with a capital letter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing, coughing, etc.</td>
<td>((laughs)) and ((coughs)) signals a speaker laughing or coughing during a turn of talk; ((General laughter)) signals multiple speakers laughing at once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pausing</td>
<td>(.) signals a significant pause (i.e., a few seconds or more; precise timing of pauses is not indicated); ((long pause)) is used to signal a much longer pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken Abbreviations</td>
<td>Abbreviations were used only when the speaker used them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlapping Speech</td>
<td>(unintelligible)) was used for speech and sounds that are completely inaudible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertainty about who is speaking</td>
<td>? was used to signal uncertainty about the speaker, F? or M? if I was able to identify sex of the speaker, or a name followed by a question mark (e.g., Judy?) if I thought I might know who it is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-verbal Utterances</td>
<td>Occasionally, common non-verbal sounds uttered by participants were included such as ‘um’, ‘er’, ‘mm’, ‘ah’, or ‘yeeeah!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut-off speech and speech sounds</td>
<td>Occasionally cut-off speech and speech sounds are used to signal moments when participants are struggling to articulate their thoughts, feelings etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on particular words</td>
<td>Occasionally, emphasis on particular words is added by underlining such words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported speech</td>
<td>Reported speech is signalled with the use of inverted commas around the reported speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Sample of the generation of initial codes
(Document: course syllabus)

A guide to the In-service Certificate in English Language Teaching (ICELT)

Introduction

WHAT IS ICELT?

The In-service Certificate in English Language Teaching (ICELT) is a highly practical course-based qualification which provides in-service teacher training and development for practising English language teachers. Teachers must attend an approved course during which they produce a number of written assignments and are observed and assessed teaching in their usual context. The coursework and teaching are internally assessed and externally moderated. There is no written examination.

The following information relates to centres offering the full ICELT programme. Modular options are described below.

TARGET CANDIDATURE

ICELT is for practising teachers. ICELT candidates are likely to have very different levels of previous teaching experience. Some may have substantial previous English language teaching experience but little practical training; others may have been trained as primary/secondary teachers and now need to extend their skills to include language teaching.

Teachers need to have had 500 hours' relevant experience by the end of the course. Many ICELT candidates will have had considerably more experience than this. All candidates need to be teaching while taking the course. Course programmes are designed to help teachers develop in the context within which they are currently working.
Appendix 8: Sample of compiling and collating initial codes using MAXQDA (Topic: class observations)
### Appendices 9: Sample of the assessed classroom observation report: ‘Check List and Report on Assessed Teaching’

**UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE**

**ESOL Examinations**

**Teaching Awards**

**ICELT/3**

**IN-SERVICE CERTIFICATE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING**

**CHECKLIST AND REPORT ON ASSESSED TEACHING**

**LESSON NO. 1** (Receptive Skills)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre no.</th>
<th>Candidate no.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place of examination</th>
<th>Level of class (Please circle as appropriate)</th>
<th>Number of years of study of English</th>
<th>Average age</th>
<th>Number in class</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elementary A2</td>
<td>Intermediate B1+</td>
<td>13 and 14 years old.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>January 23rd, 2017</td>
<td>10:00 to 11:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aim of lesson**

*By the end of the lesson students will have developed different reading sub-skills that will help them understand information in a brochure with information about Middle School.*

*They will also develop speaking and listening skills.*
At Pass level successful candidates can:

1. **Lesson planning**
   a. identify learning objectives appropriate to the needs, age and ability level of the group ✓
   b. select and/or adapt materials and/or activities suitable for the learners and the lesson objectives including where appropriate stories, art, music, investigations outside the classroom ✓
   c. assign realistic timing to the stages in the lesson ✓
   d. include an appropriate variety of activity, interaction and pace ✓
   e. anticipate potential difficulties with language and activities ✓
   f. present plans in language which is clear, accurate (including appropriate use of terminology) and easy to read ✓
   g. present materials for classroom use with a professional appearance and regard for copyright requirements ✓-

2. **Classroom teaching skills**
   a. establish rapport ✓
   b. foster a constructive and safe learning environment taking into account appropriate learner and teacher roles ✓
   c. set up and manage a range of classroom events ✓
   d. maintain discipline showing sensitivity to individual needs ✓
   e. maintain learners’ interest and involvement ✓
   f. teach in a way that encourages the development of learner autonomy ✓
   g. teach language items effectively ✓
   h. convey the meaning of new language with clear and appropriate context and check learners’ understanding of it ✓

Any further relevant information about class and local conditions

*An average size classroom with enough space for students to move around, it is well-equipped (smart board and a projector).*
i. help learners develop language accuracy

j. monitor learners’ language performance and give appropriate feedback ✓

k. identify errors and sensitively correct learners’ oral and written language when and where appropriate ✓

l. make appropriate use of learners’ first and other languages NA

m. teach language skills appropriately and effectively including literacy where relevant ✓

n. help learners develop language fluency ✓

o. use appropriate aids, materials and resources (including the board) effectively ✓

p. adapt plans and activities appropriately in response to the learners and to classroom contingencies

q. achieve learning objectives ✓

Not all of criteria a-q will be applicable to every lesson

3. Lesson evaluation

a. reflect critically on their plan, teaching and evaluation, and use of English ✓

b. review and adapt their practice in the light of this reflection and of the views of tutors, colleagues and learners ✓

c. set targets for on-going development (and where appropriate the next assessed lesson) ✓

4. Use of English in the classroom

At Pass level successful candidates can:

a. use clear, generally accurate English for teaching purposes (may include classroom management, response to learners, dealing with language content) ✓

b. use language for classroom purposes that provides a good model for learners ✓

Range and flexibility

c. employ language that is appropriate to the learners’ level ✓

d. reinforce, simplify or clarify meaning when necessary ✓
Pronunciation

e. display generally clear and accurate pronunciation ✔

f. use stress and intonation to reinforce meaning ✔

g. provide a clear, consistent model for learners ✔

Audience awareness

h. select and grade language in response to learners' language needs and potential difficulties ✔

i. show awareness and responsiveness to learners' misunderstanding or lack of understanding ✔

OVERALL COMMENT

Please comment on the lesson planning, classroom teaching skills, lesson evaluation and use of English in the classroom.

Your comments should include:

- reference to the assessment criteria on pages 2-3
- reference to strengths and weaknesses in planning, teaching and evaluation
- areas in which the candidate would need to show improvement in order to reach Pass/Merit/Distinction standard

Comments should support the grade recommended below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lesson Planning:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lesson Planning:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Candidate provided a good lesson plan with all the necessary elements for her class. An adequate group profile and rationale provided.</em></td>
<td><em>Stating the main aim of the lesson needs careful thought.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The stages of a lesson based on a Pre-While-Post framework, were identified and activities planned accordingly. Specific objectives for the different stages were well stated. Adequate reading tasks included to help develop scanning and reading for detail.</em></td>
<td><em>Rationale behind having chosen the Pre-while-post framework needed to be explained.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The teaching of vocabulary words in the Pre-reading stage was well planned. Good analysis on the different words, provided.</em></td>
<td><em>Reading tasks to help develop skimming need to be checked.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Classroom teaching skills:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Classroom teaching skills:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You need to read about tasks that would help develop skimming, and how to handle them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructions need to be checked carefully at all times, especially when they are very complex.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daniela has a very good rapport with students, which helped her create a nice atmosphere in the class where students were not afraid to participate.

There were different classroom teaching skills used throughout which helped Candidate manage the classroom events appropriately (e.g., voice projection, nomination, elicitation, praising students' work and encouraging them to work using the target language, adequate giving and checking of instructions in most parts of the lesson.)
There was a logical and smooth transition between stages and activities. Students participated well during the whole class and were interested in the topic. The lead-in and pre stages were well handled, and this helped Daniela create the need for students to read the text. Good linking of activities throughout. Appropriate tasks included to help develop scanning and reading for detail, which helped develop students’ reading skills effectively. They were very involved in answering the tasks. Tasks were adequately checked. Reading skills were effectively developed.

A very good activity used for the Post-reading stage, well linked to the rest of the class. Students really enjoyed it and participated well. Activity was very well handled and good chart were produced by students.

The candidate put into practice principles from the ICELT course.

A good class!

| Asking students to support their answers while checking the reading task would have been desirable. Just providing the answers was not enough. |
| Close monitoring was needed throughout the lesson. Walking around is not enough. |

Lesson evaluation:

The candidate was able to identify some strengths with regard to the assessment criteria for this practical teaching observation. She was able to identify some development needs and areas of weaknesses with attention to important features of this class. Reflecting, in more depth, on the effectiveness of the reading tasks was needed.

Use of English in the Classroom:

Overall, her use of English during the lesson, was effective for teaching purposes. She displayed good pronunciation and adapted her own speech to meet learners’ needs.

Overall grade for planning, teaching, evaluation and use of English (Please circle as appropriate)

- DISTINCTION
- MERIT
- PASS
- NOT TO STANDARD
- WITHDRAWN

Tutor name: [Redacted]
(Please print)

Tutor signature: [Redacted] Date: January 2017.
Appendix 10: Course’s Lesson Plan Template

PTO LESSON PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>PTO No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer:</td>
<td>Lesson level:</td>
<td>Lesson length:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre name:</td>
<td>Centre Number:</td>
<td>Venue:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Lesson context & Aims

CONTEXT:
What is the theme of the context of your lesson? (e.g., at the restaurant, travelling to Europe, planning holidays, etc)

LEARNING OUTCOMES:
Circle A or B AND the language System/Skill - My lesson’s main aim is:

A) Language (L): e.g., grammar, functions, vocabulary.
B) Skills: (S): e.g., Reading, Listening, Speaking, Writing

My lesson’s secondary aim is:

a) If the main aim is skills, indicate the language system you will use to support the skill:
b) If the main aim is language, indicate the language skill you will use to support the language:

Complete this following box and prompt:
(These should be your aims in terms of what you want the students to achieve)

Main aims:
Sub-aims:

CHECK LIST - have you .....

Ⅰ ensured your main aim is related to your target language (Language Focus) or skills focus (receptive skills)
Ⅰ phrased your aims from the learners’ point of view?
Ⅰ listed your aims according to importance?
Section 2. LEARNER’s PROFILE, RATIONALE & TIMETABLE FIT

Recent work done:

| Profile of the learners and a description of their age and level, their linguistic and affective needs: |

| RATIONALE. |
| How the needs of the learners relate to the main aim, stage objectives, activities and materials in this lesson. |

Section 3: Personal Aims, Assumptions and Problems and Solutions

PERSONAL OBJECTIVES (limit this to two or three points that you want to focus on in this lesson)

TIP: look at your Summary of Feedback Form from your previous TPs and focus on what the tutor advised you to improve.

| Objectives: | Strategies (How are you planning to achieve these objective?) |

ASSUMPTIONS (What you assume the students to know, be familiar with, have experienced or have been taught) Write AT LEAST 4 Assumptions, feel free to write more! (e.g., sub-skills, language systems, learner training, themes and topics, etc).

| |

ANTICIPATED PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS (Classroom Management & Tasks) – you should write at least 5 problems & solutions, but feel free to write more!
### Section 4: TARGET LANGUAGE ANALYSIS SHEET

**Checking Meaning, Pronunciation and Form**

Here write your marker sentence(s) and show exactly how you will check the form, meaning and pronunciation features of the target language

Complete this sheet for all grammar/functions lessons that you teach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Language area and use:</strong></th>
<th>What is the grammatical structure you intend to teach and how is it/are they used? For example; modals of deduction, present continuous for future use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target language:</strong></td>
<td>provide an example sentence (that you will use in the class)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marker Sentences (the possible sentences you will have on the WB to CLARIFY your target language):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus on meaning:</strong></td>
<td>How will you CONVEY AND CHECK the meaning of the target language and its uses. (Please include all timelines, concept questions etc. that you intend to use.) You should start by thinking of a situation or context that will help you convey the meaning and bring the language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus of form:</strong></td>
<td>What is the breakdown of the form—as it will appear on WB/Handout</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Focus on pronunciation:** Include any relevant word/sentence stress, contractions, intonation, weak forms, etc. with phonemic transcript of key words.

**Introducing Language:** Which way of introducing language will you use?

**Source or Grammar Reference used to prepare for this lesson:**

Write title, author, year, publisher and page number here of the grammar reference you used to analyse your Target language. THIS IS ALSO ASSESSED.

---

**Potential Problems of Meaning:** (write the potential problems learners might have with Meaning- write at least 2 potential problems AND their solutions)

**Problem:**

**Solution:**

**Potential Problems of Form:** (write the potential problems learners might have with Form- write at least 2 potential problems AND their solutions)

**Problem:**

**Solution:**

**Potential Problems of Pronunciation:** (write the potential problems learners might have with Form- write at least 2 potential problems AND their solutions)

**Problem:**

**Solution:**

---

**Section 5:**

**Resources and Materials**

Write title, author, year, publisher and page number here and on all your copies/handouts THIS IS ALSO ASSESSED.

Material designed by Daniela Cuevas Arellano
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAGE AND OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>INT´R</th>
<th>PROCEDURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Note the objective of each stage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TEACHER AND STUDENT ACTIVITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Production</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freer Practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 11: Cambridge English Guidelines for Writing Methodology Assignments (Assignment 1: Evaluation of teaching)

(UCLES 2015, p.33)

Assignment 1: Evaluation of teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FORMAT</th>
<th>SYLLABUS FOCUS</th>
<th>ASSESSMENT CRITERIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length: 1,000-1,500 words</td>
<td>1.1. Concepts and terminology used in English language teaching for describing form and meaning in language and language use</td>
<td>Specific assessment criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment outline</td>
<td>1.2. Language used by teachers and learners</td>
<td>Pass level assignments will show that the candidate can:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are required to teach a lesson and analyse and evaluate it with reference to the following:</td>
<td>1.3. Language selected for teaching programmes</td>
<td>1a. Analyse and evaluate the lesson with reference to the areas outlined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achievement of learning objectives</td>
<td>2.2. Learning theory</td>
<td>1b. Identify successful and less successful elements of the lesson with reference to these areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design and implementation of tasks and activities</td>
<td>2.2. Learning theory</td>
<td>1c. Demonstrate understanding of the underlying causes of these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Classroom management</td>
<td>2.2. Learning theory</td>
<td>1d. Outline steps for further development of their linguistic and professional understanding and skills in the areas outlined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teacher and learner language</td>
<td>2.2. Learning theory</td>
<td>At Merit level, the candidate can meet all the specific Pass level criteria listed above. In addition, there will be evidence of greater ability and understanding in at least two of the above specific criteria and in general criteria 3 and 4 listed on page 32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines</td>
<td>3.2. Evaluating and selecting resources and materials</td>
<td>At Distinction level, the candidate can meet all the criteria listed above. In addition, there will be consistent evidence of exceptional ability in terms of the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teach the lesson, then:</td>
<td>4.1. Planning for teaching</td>
<td>a. Breadth of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Identify which of the above or which elements of the above were successful in your lesson, and support your view with evidence.</td>
<td>4.2. Classroom management</td>
<td>b. Depth of understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Identify which of the above or which elements of the above were not so successful in your lesson, and state why you think they were not successful.</td>
<td>4.3. Teacher and learner language</td>
<td>c. Sensitivity and ability to respond to learners’ needs and expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. With reference to your lesson preparation for this lesson, including your lesson plan, state what aspects of your planning contributed to the success of the areas identified in 1a.</td>
<td>4.4. Classroom procedures and techniques</td>
<td>d. Insight into the topics under discussion and the evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. With reference to your lesson preparation for this lesson, including your lesson plan, state how you would change your lesson and lesson plan to avoid the difficulties described in 1a and state why these changes would improve the lesson.</td>
<td>6.1. Evaluating teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Outline the steps you will take to further the development of your linguistic and professional understanding and skills with regard to your analysis in sections 1-3.</td>
<td>6.2. Working with people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3. Continuing professional development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 12: Sample of *Friendly* Guidelines for Writing Methodology Assignments (Methodology Assignment 1)

**ICELT**

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING METHODOLOGY ASSIGNMENT 1  
*“Evaluation of Teaching”*

*Cover page*

*Assignment outline*

*DECLARATION.*

*Table of contents*

**BODY OF THE ASSIGNMENT**

*Introduction.* - Aim of the assignment (not longer than 10 lines)

*BRIEF class profile (not longer than 15 lines), especially including ss’ needs (a more detailed class profile should be included in the lesson plan)*

*BRIEF description of the lesson plan (not longer than 15 lines) including MAIN AIM OF THE LESSON (a detailed lesson plan should be included as an appendix to the assignment)*

**ANALYSIS OF OUTCOMES FROM THE LESSON**

1. Successful aspects and analysis of previous planning which contributed to success. - Mention AT LEAST two successful different areas (two to three) supporting your statements with evidence taken form the class and comment on elements of previous planning that contributed to success of these areas, organised as follows (example):
   1a) Achievement of learning objectives
   1b) Teacher language.- giving instructions
   1c) Classroom management.- Use of aids.

2. Unsuccessful elements and proposed modifications. - Mention at least two unsuccessful different areas (two to three) supporting your statements with evidence from the class and state how you would change your lesson preparation (including lesson plan) to improve these aspects in future classes, organised as follows (example):
   2a) Classroom management.- Discipline
   2b) Design and Implementation of activities
   2c) Teacher language.- Questioning.

**CONCLUSION/ PERSONAL ACTION PLAN.**

Based on your experience with this lesson mention concrete actions you will take in the near future for your further development as a teacher (What did you learn about your weak points as a teacher after analysing the lesson? and what will you do to overcome them?)
*WORD COUNT.*

*Bibliography

*Appendices (correctly labelled and sequenced)