University of Southampton Research Repository

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics

Language Ideologies in English Language Teaching: A Multiple Case Study of Teacher Education Programmes in Chile

by

Gonzalo Pérez Andrade

ORCID ID 0000-0001-8511-3394

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

March 2019

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHAMPTON

<u>ABSTRACT</u>

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES

<u>Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics</u>

Thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

LANGUAGE IDEOLOGIES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMMES IN CHILE

Gonzalo Pérez Andrade

The current status of English as an international language is opening up the debate about what we understand as "subject matter English". Traditional constructs in the English Language Teaching (ELT) profession such as the "native speaker", "standard English", and the culture of English are currently being questioned due to the growing number of users of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Research on Global Englishes has highlighted the need to abandon the current English as a Foreign Language (EFL) paradigm, which considers "standard English" and the "native speaker" as the norm, and adopt a global perspective of English that embraces the linguistic and cultural diversity of English, instead. However, ELT teacher education programmes have evidenced little engagement with these views, while teachers tend to show negative attitudes and resistance to change.

This study explored the beliefs that teacher trainers in three Chilean ELT programmes hold in relation to the global spread of English. It was expected that accessing these beliefs would reveal how ELT programmes in Chile approach this phenomenon, and also provide evidence of how these teacher education programmes adopt, preserve, or promote certain language ideologies in relation to English. Qualitative data were collected carrying out semi-structured interviews, observing teacher educators in the classroom, and analysing relevant documents. The findings reveal considerable tensions in the beliefs of these teacher educators within and across the three programmes,

especially in relation to the goals of ELT instruction. Dominant language ideologies about English were often reproduced in the beliefs and practices of most of the participants. However, this study presents evidence of a growing resistance to the hegemony of idealised native speaker norms in the education of future teachers of English in Chile.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

Table of Tables

Academic Thesis: Declaration of Authorship

I, *Gonzalo Perez Andrade*, declare that this thesis and the work presented in it are my own and has been generated by me as the result of my own original research.

Language Ideologies in ELT: A Multiple Case Study of Teacher Education Programmes in Chile

I confirm that:

1. This work was done wholly or mainly while in candidature for a research degree at this University;
2. Where any part of this thesis has previously been submitted for a degree or any other qualification at this University or any other institution, this has been clearly stated;
3. Where I have consulted the published work of others, this is always clearly attributed;
4. Where I have quoted from the work of others, the source is always given. With the exception of such quotations, this thesis is entirely my own work;
5. I have acknowledged all main sources of help;
6. Where the thesis is based on work done by myself jointly with others, I have made clear exactly what was done by others and what I have contributed myself;
7. Parts of this work have been published as:

Perez Andrade, G. (2017) "An exploration of teachers' beliefs about the global spread of English in a Chilean ELT programme", *Emergence*, IX: pp. 7-18. ISSN: 2041-8248

Signed: ....

Date: March 2019

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Jennifer Jenkins, who has constantly supported me from the moment I first emailed her to discuss my project. Her expertise and guidance have been immensely stimulating throughout my PhD journey. I will always be deeply grateful to her for trusting me and encouraging me to take up new academic challenges and to become an active member of the ELF community.

Special mention goes to my friends and colleagues at the Centre for Global Englishes (CGE) at the University of Southampton. I feel absolutely privileged to have been part of such an active centre, with people who were able to generate thought-provoking and lively discussions, and also to offer their sincere friendship. I would particularly like to thank Dr. Jane Ra, Palwasha Sajjad, Phuong Le Hoang Ngo, Metty Parameth, and Sonia Perelló Bover. In addition, I owe my gratitude to Dr. Sonia Morán Panero, Dr. Tomokazu Ishikawa, Dr. Ali Karakas, and Dr. Robert Baird for their valuable advice and support as former senior members of the CGE. I would also like to thank Dr Will Baker and Dr. Ying Wang (my second supervisor) for their constructive feedback and encouragement at different stages of my PhD.

My deepest heartfelt appreciation goes to my parents, Gloria and Juan Carlos, and my sister, Paulina, for their unconditional support despite the long geographical distance between us. I owe them a very important debt for their consistent encouragement and guidance through phone conversations and video calls. In a similar way, I would like to express my appreciation to my in-laws, John and Vivien, for their constant support and understanding. I would like to thank John for all the generous help he provided me by patiently proofreading my work at different stages of my PhD, and also to Vivien for her meticulous comments, which were an enormous help to me.

I am also enormously grateful to a number of friends, mentors and colleagues who I have been lucky enough to spend time with during this journey. My appreciation goes to Dr. Alessia Cogo, Tian Gan, and members of the Department of English and Comparative Literature at Goldsmiths, University of London, as well as to Dr. Martin Dewey for his

Acknowledgements

Definitions and Abbreviations

AmE   American English

BrE   British English

CEFR   Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

EFL   English as a Foreign Language

ELF   English as a Lingua Franca

ELT   English Language Teaching

ENL   English as a National Language

EOD   English Opens Doors

IPA   International Phonetic Alphabet

L1   First Language

L2   Second Language

NES   Native English Speaker

NEST   Native English-Speaking Teacher

NNES   Non-native English Speaker

NNEST   Non-native English-Speaking Teacher

OECD   Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development

RP   Received Pronunciation

Definitions and Abbreviations

SE   Standard English

SLI   Standard Language Ideology

WE   World Englishes

Chapter 1   **Introduction**

1.1   **ELT and the global spread of English**

There is no doubt that the English language has reached an unprecedented status as an international lingua franca. English has become the global language of academia, technology, business, politics, and tourism, just to mention a few roles (Graddol, 2006; Crystal, 2012; Jenkins, 2014). More than ten years ago, Crystal (2003) estimated in 430 million the number of English speakers in territories that had English as a native language (ENL), as an official language, or had a colonial history. In addition, he concluded that non-native speakers of English (henceforth NNESs) outnumbered native English speakers (henceforth NESs) at a ratio of 3 to 1. Similarly, Jenkins (2015a) suggests that this ratio is likely to be on the increase, especially if we take into account how the English language has received special attention in contexts in which English does not have a colonial or official status – what Kachru (1992) calls the "expanding circle". Governments all over the world have placed the teaching and learning of English in a position of priority to participate in this globalised world. This new sociolinguistic scenario is bringing into question traditional constructs that have largely dominated the ELT profession, and has also motivated me to explore whether and how the training of future teachers of English embraces the multicultural and multilingual diversity of English in one of these contexts: Chile.

Traditionally, users of English in expanding circle contexts, such as Chile, have been referred to as speakers of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). In the EFL paradigm, the "native speaker" of English is regarded as the model since the goal of learning English is communication with NESs, rather than among NNESs (Jenkins, 2014). As Seidlhofer (2011) argues, EFL learners are expected to imitate an idealised NES and adopt the cultural norms of the target language which emanate from ENL countries, such as the UK and the USA. Kirkpatrick (2007, p.184) points out that "native speaker models have prestige and legitimacy" as norm providers because their forms of English have undergone processes of standardisation. Hence, "standard" English (SE) is globally promoted and adopted as a model for learning and teaching, whereas variations from these norms are commonly

seen as errors (Jenkins, 2014). In this view, learners who wish to approximate their use of English to "native speaker" standards (whatever their reasons) and seek integration and membership in NES communities find in the EFL paradigm a convenient option to achieve their goals (Seidlhofer, 2011). However, if we consider the spread of English beyond ENL territories and the extent to which it is used for intercultural communication, especially among NNESs, not only the EFL paradigm fails to acknowledge this sociolinguistic reality, but also contributes to the perpetuation of ideas about language that position certain groups of users of English over others.

A growing number of researchers, especially sociolinguists, have questioned the hegemony of the EFL paradigm and have explored the implications of the spread of English from two main perspectives. On the one hand, the field of World Englishes (WE) has focused on describing the nativised varieties of English that emerged in post-colonial countries (or Kachru's (1992) "outer circle"), such as Indian English or Singaporean English (see Kachru, 1992;2006). That is, research on WE seeks to legitimise the use of English in territories that have developed a localised form of English with its own norms in terms of lexis, grammar, pronunciation, and pragmatics. As Jenkins (2014) points out, WE sees the Englishes that have emerged in these territories as an expression of their users' identities rather than as unsuccessful approximations to the models of English that emerge from territories that Kachru (1992) calls the "inner circle" (or ENL contexts). Nowadays, it has become common to employ the term "Englishes" to emphasise the global diversity of the English language and also "to stress that English no longer has one single base of authority, prestige and normativity" (Mesthrie and Bhatt, 2008, p.3).

Another research paradigm that has devoted its attention to the current global spread and diversity of English is the field of English as a Lingua Franca (ELF). Research on ELF has primarily focused on exploring the use of English as a medium of communication among speakers of different linguacultural backgrounds (Seidlhofer, 2011). Jenkins (2014, p.28) argues that although WE and ELF "share an ideological perspective" that challenges the dominance of the EFL paradigm and acknowledges the linguistic and cultural diversity of English, there is a crucial difference among them. Unlike ELF, the WE paradigm is closely connected to ideas of nation-state. That is, research on WE is mainly concerned with bounded varieties and "places nationalism at its core" (Pennycook, 2009, p.20, in Jenkins,

2014 p. 28) by exploring the roles and uses of English within post-colonial territories. From this perspective, then, WE research excludes inner and expanding circle Englishes (Seidlhofer, 2009). On the other hand, ELF moves away from ideas of national linguistic boundaries and embraces the spread of English across Kachruvian circles (including NESs), placing intercultural communication at its centre (Seidlhofer, 2011; Jenkins, 2014). Hence, it is this understanding of the spread of English that fits in best with studies related to the teaching of English in the Chilean context.

ELF, as a global phenomenon and as a field of enquiry, has received particular attention since the beginning of the last decade, especially after the publication of Jenkins' (2000) empirical study of NNES pronunciation in intercultural communication settings. Since then, ELF researchers have produced substantial work exploring the use of English in interactions between speakers of different languages (or ELF communication) mostly at linguistic, theoretical and attitudinal levels (Jenkins *et al.*, 2011). Regarding ELT, a large body of contributions from ELF research has provided valuable insights for ELT and teacher education (see for example Jenkins, 2007; Kirkpatrick, 2007; Seidlhofer, 2011; Cogo and Dewey, 2012; Dewey, 2012; Sifakis, 2014; Cogo, 2015; Blair, 2017), and have challenged widely held beliefs and assumptions about the nature of language, the knowledge base of teachers, language assessment, and teaching materials (Jenkins *et al.*, 2011). However, evidence shows little adoption of the pedagogical implications of ELF research among teachers and the ELT industry in general, despite commonly acknowledging the need to change perspectives in relation to ELT models (Cogo and Dewey, 2012; Dewey, 2014; Blair, 2015).

One of the few examples of engagement of ELF research in mainstream ELT is the inclusion of ELF as a topic in the syllabus of internationally accepted intensive English language teaching awards, such as the CELTA and DELTA courses. Although the syllabi of these courses stress the need to raise awareness of the global spread of English and its implications on the teaching of English for intercultural communication, the scope and depth of these programmes still prioritise an EFL perspective to the teaching of English and has little impact on the ideas of languages of newly qualified teachers (see Dewey, 2015). Furthermore, research on teachers' attitudes in relation to ELF has reported negative orientations towards adopting a global perspective of English in their teaching

(see for example Jenkins, 2007). In this respect, as Cogo and Dewey (2012, p.171) observe, "[a]rguments being put forward from an ELF perspective have tended in ELT to be greeted with scepticism, if not open hostility".

Considering the reported resistance by teachers of English and the ELT industry in general to embrace principles and practices which are more in-line with the implications of the global spread and diversity of English, it is therefore crucial to further explore the ideological underpinnings of the beliefs that teachers of English hold regarding the English they teach. What is more, this exploration should place teacher education programmes as its point of departure in order to understand how dominant views of language are adopted, rejected, or challenged in the making. As Seidlhofer (2011, p. 201) puts it, "change has to start somewhere… [a]nd the obvious place to start is in language teacher education". For this reason, this thesis has the objective of uncovering the language ideologies that dominate the beliefs and practices of teacher educators in Chilean ELT programmes.

1.2   ELT in Chile

As discussed above, Chile belongs to Kachru's expanding circle. That is to say, English does not have an official status or colonial history in Chile. However, there is a history of migration and social influence from the early 19th Century, which resulted in an association of British migrants and descendants with the Chilean elite (Edmunson, 2009). The relationship of Chile and the English language has, since then, been constantly growing, and especially in the last few decades. In the late 1990s, English was introduced as a compulsory foreign language in the school curriculum from 5th grade. More recently, the importance of learning English in Chile has been stressed even more because "as a new member of the OECD, [Chile] has had similar debates to those internationally on English as a tool of communication in the globalised world" (Barahona, 2016, p.6).

In line with global demands for the learning of English, in 2004 the Chilean Ministry of Education created the programme "*Inglés Abre Puertas*'" ("English Opens Doors", henceforth EOD) with the purpose of promoting the learning and teaching of English in the country. One of the main objectives of the programme was to prepare a generation of

bilingual students by 2018 (Matear, 2008). That is, students in their final year of school were expected to achieve a B1 level in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR). This initiative translated into extra hours of English instruction, the creation of an optional English curriculum for early primary education, and the implementation of a standardised test of English proficiency (Martin, 2016). In addition, EOD has had a major involvement in the education of pre-service and in-service teachers by suggesting standards of achievement for ELT programmes, offering training courses, and granting scholarships to study abroad for future English teachers (Barahona, 2016). The relationship between EOD and ELT programmes responded to the need to regulate the training of teachers of English since it was reported that only about half the population of English teachers in Chile were certified to teach and most teachers of English were teaching this subject in Spanish (ibid.).

In order to support the lack of qualified teachers in the Chilean educational system, the EOD programme launched the National Centre for Volunteers (NCV) so as to attract native speakers of English to work as language assistants in Chilean schools and universities. The main role of these volunteers is to provide assistance in the students and teachers' development of oral skills (Matear, 2008). Barahona (2016) observes that the fact that a teaching degree is not necessary for these volunteers to participate in the programme supports the idea that in order to teach English in the Chilean context being a "native speaker" seems to be more than enough. More importantly, these efforts have not provided observable improvements in the way that the Chilean Ministry of Education had intended, mainly because the results that students obtain in standardised tests have been mostly unsatisfactory (Martin, 2016). Therefore, a great deal of attention has been placed on the training of future teachers of English, with special emphasis on the nature and impact of ELT programmes.

1.2.1   ELT teacher education in Chile

The last two decades have witnessed an exponential growth of state and private universities offering ELT programmes in Chile due to governmental demands for qualified teachers of English. Although intensive courses such as CELTA are currently offered in the country, the impact of these programmes in the Chilean educational system has not yet

been documented. Forty ELT programmes along the country offer courses that range between four and five years to complete including a practicum, and in most cases, they also require the submission of a dissertation in order to graduate (Barahona, 2016). New students are not required to demonstrate a specific level of proficiency in English in order to enrol in ELT programmes in Chilean universities. However, at the end of their course they are expected to achieve a C1 level in the CEFR (Ministerio de Educación, 2014) although this is not necessarily interpreted as a compulsory requirement by higher education institutions.

In order to help students reach the required proficiency level in English, Chilean ELT programmes have traditionally emphasised the acquisition of English as a primary target. In terms of curriculum design, ELT programmes in Chile normally follow an applied science model (see Wallace, 1991) with a clear separation between courses on linguistics and education (Abrahams and Farias, 2010). Courses on phonetics and grammar dominate the curriculum of most of these programmes as a way to develop proficiency in English. In this respect, Barahona (2016, p.49) argues that this emphasis on linguistic accuracy has led to "an understanding that to be a teacher of English [in Chile] it is necessary to master English at a native-like proficiency level, and that RP (Received Pronunciation) English is the best accent for a non-native teacher of English". Undoubtedly, this dominant view of English in ELT programmes is likely to have an effect on the views of pre-service teachers in relation to what forms of English are considered to be acceptable and desirable.

Little research has been done in Chile in order to investigate the causes and effects of this issue. In one of these few examples, Veliz (2011) conducted a small-scale study with pre-service teachers at a Chilean ELT programme in order to explore their views about the global spread of English and its effect on pronunciation models in ELT. The findings of this study revealed a strong orientation towards RP due to its alleged formality, purity and correctness; lack of awareness of the implications of the spread of English for ELT; and even beliefs about American English as an inferior and informal variety (in comparison to RP). What is more, Veliz (ibid., p. 233) points out that "the respondents pass very harsh judgements on individuals who exhibit a 'Chilean accent' in English" and that these views are normally reinforced by the programme's phonetics lecturers.

These views about language seem to be common among pre-service and in-service ELT practitioners. Lack of awareness of the reality of English along with strong preferences towards ENL models may be the result of ideologically-laden understandings of language that go unquestioned in the formation of teachers of English and are taken for granted in the ELT profession in general. These preferences are likely to reinforce issues of discrimination and inequality in both the ELT profession and the English-speaking world by stressing the value of certain forms of English over others.

In light of this phenomenon, it becomes important to explore the views of teacher educators at Chilean ELT programmes as a means of understanding the language ideologies that operate in the training of future teachers of English. Such views are expected to offer an insight of the ways in which ideas about English are spread in the ELT profession in Chile, as well as tensions that may exist within the views of trainers of the same programme. In addition, exploring teachers' beliefs about English in ELT programmes may help reveal how the training of teachers in Chile addresses the linguistic and cultural diversity of English in times in which multilingualism and multiculturality are becoming the norm rather than undesirable exceptions. For these reasons, this thesis aims to answer the following research questions:

1) How and to what extent are ELT training programmes in Chilean universities addressing the global spread of English?

2) What are the beliefs of teacher educators from these universities regarding the English that is taught and promoted in such ELT programmes?

3) What language ideologies underpin these beliefs?

1.3   Rationale for the study

My own experience as a teacher of English, teacher educator, and language learner is one of the main motivations behind this study. As an ELT trainee in Chile, I received comprehensive instruction in a variety of aspects of English, such as linguistic analysis, development of oral and written skills, and cultural studies. As the higher education

institution where I trained as a teacher had strong links with the British Council, the English-Speaking Society, and the British Chamber of Commerce in Chile, British English was the de-facto linguistic norm, and British culture was part of the curriculum. Not only did this training provide me with the tools to become a qualified teacher of English in Chile, but also with the conviction that cultivating this perspective of English would give me an advantage beyond my teaching skills. For this reason, there is no doubt that by then my beliefs about English were more in line ideas of correctness, accuracy, and adherence to a standard form.

When I travelled to the UK for the first time I realised that the idea of English that I had previously learnt and taught was considerably different from the actual use of the language. While I was living in Manchester, I met British native speakers of English from a variety of areas. I therefore developed an interest in linguistic variation, especially in the UK. This motivated me to do an MA in Applied Linguistics and ELT at King's College London where I became part of an international community of teachers of English from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Interestingly, I realised that most of us, as teachers, shared certain ideas about what constituted good linguistic practices in English, and we could easily flag extracts of English as being correct or incorrect. However, we also noticed that, in practice, we would not only rely on – what we understood as – a native-speaker-like linguistic norm, but we would use a variety of other resources in order to communicate, instead.

For my master's degree dissertation, I decided to explore how my Chilean colleagues would evaluate the accents of native speakers of English. Specifically, I investigated the preferences of Chilean teachers of English regarding their choices of models for ELT. Unsurprisingly, the participants showed a strong attachment to Received Pronunciation and General American as the most desirable accents for teaching. Interestingly, some native speaker accents (London and Australian) were even regarded as unsuitable for teaching, which made me realise that, for Chilean teachers, the idea of the native speaker model in ELT seems to be associated with a privileged group of speakers.

After this, I was offered a job as a phonetics and phonology lecturer at a Chilean ELT programme. Having broadened my knowledge of sociolinguistics and developed an

interest in Global Englishes, I intended to implement a curriculum innovation in my own teaching of this subject. As part of this innovation, I taught pre-service teachers of English about linguistic variation in English, and especially about ELF and World Englishes. Even though my students would appreciate learning about the global spread of English, there would still be a mismatch between what they were learning about the use of English and what was expected from them by the programme.

In order to implement innovation and change in the training of teachers it is crucial to work together with the teacher educators themselves. Understanding the beliefs that teacher educators hold can help make better-informed decisions and target aspects of the teacher training process that influence unrealistic views about the language and the ELT profession in general. Similarly, uncovering language ideologies in ELT programmes may inform future educational policy in ELT about issues of power and identity dominating current practices in higher education institutions.

Unfortunately, there is little research on the views that teachers in Chile have about their subject matter (Barahona, 2016). ELF researchers (e.g.: Dewey, 2012) have also highlighted the need to explore the implications of the global spread of English in expanding circle contexts. Therefore, for my PhD I intend to contribute to the existing literature on Global Englishes and teacher education by accounting for the views of how ELF is perceived in under-researched contexts such as South America.

1.4   Structure of thesis

This thesis consists of nine chapters: an introduction with an overview of the problem and a rationale for the research; two chapters of literature review; one chapter on methodology; four chapters of results; and one chapter of discussion and conclusions. Chapter 2 explores the field of language ideologies, and especially how ideological representations about the English language influence ELT. The first part of the chapter focuses on language ideologies as a field of enquiry emerging from linguistic anthropology, and the theoretical underpinnings to understand how language ideologies are represented, reproduced, and challenged. In the second part of the chapter, I provide examples from the literature of how ideas of correctness, prescriptivism and "standard

Chapter 1

English" relate to ideological interpretations of traditional constructs in ELT, such as the idea of the "native speaker".

In Chapter 3, I review the literature on teachers' beliefs. Firstly, I discuss how the concept of 'belief' is commonly approached in the literature in order to provide a working definition for this mental construct. Secondly, I explore the similarities and differences of beliefs with other related cognitive concepts such as knowledge and attitudes. Thirdly, I take into consideration research that has attempted to investigate the beliefs that English teachers hold about English, with a special focus on studies that explore beliefs about the impact of the spread of English on teachers' practices. Finally, I discuss the impact of teacher education on the formation of beliefs and the relationship between teachers' beliefs and classroom practices.

The research methods employed in this study are presented in Chapter 4. I begin this chapter by discussing methodological approaches to the study of language ideologies and teachers' beliefs. Then, the research questions of the study are presented. After that, I describe the suitability of adopting a case study design for the purposes of my thesis, and introduce the data collection methods that I employed (semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and analysis of relevant documents). The rest of the chapter is concerned with presenting the participants, sampling strategies and piloting, and issues of ethics and trustworthiness. Here I also discuss the adoption of thematic analysis as an analytical method for the analysis of qualitative data.

Chapters 5, 6, and 7 present the results obtained in each case study. Each of these chapters outlines the main themes that emerged from the interview data analysis and includes extracts that support them. In addition, these chapters discuss the findings from classroom observations and the review of relevant documents for the purpose of triangulation. Chapter 8 provides the results of the cross-case analysis and presents themes that were common across the three cases which are not discussed in the previous chapters. Finally, Chapter 9 presents a detailed discussion of the most relevant findings of this study along with the answers to the research questions. This final chapter also offers a section on the contributions of the study, its limitations, implications, and suggestions for further research.

It is important to point out here that since the main subjects of study in this thesis are teachers of English who train prospective teachers at universities, the concepts of teacher trainer and teacher educator are used interchangeably to refer to the people who work as instructors in ELT teacher education programmes. Similarly, *pre-service teachers*, *student-teachers, trainees* or simply *students* are also common terms used in this study in an undifferentiated way to refer to the individuals who undertake ELT programmes to become teachers of English.

Chapter 2   Language ideology and the notion of "standard"

2.1   Introduction: the concept of Ideology

It is not uncommon to hear people using the term 'ideology' in conversation, especially when the topic is related to views about social systems, such as politics or religion. In addition, it seems that individuals can easily label certain ideas as 'ideological' or identify other people's behaviours or beliefs as being dictated by a specific ideology, normally in a pejorative fashion. However, when it comes to defining what the concept of ideology consists of, there can be a vast range of interpretations that sometimes demonstrate contradictions in their nature. Different disciplines – such as philosophy, sociology, history and anthropology, among others – have studied ideology from their own perspectives, contributing to our understanding of the current meaning of the term, and also encouraging interdisciplinary approaches. For this reason, in order to propose an appropriate definition of ideology for this thesis, it is useful to explore what this concept has historically entailed, as well as the relationship between ideology and linguistic enquiry.

According to Silverstein (1998), the term ideology was first coined in the 18th century by Antoine Destutt de Tracy, a French Enlightenment philosopher, politician and aristocrat. Destutt de Tracy intended to propose a "science of ideas" – or *idéologie* – as a branch of zoology for the study of ideas in the human mind and, for this reason, he and his colleagues were soon known as *les idéologues*. However, as Woolard (1998) points out, political differences between Destutt de Tracy and Napoleon in the early 1800s caused the term to acquire a negative connotation associated with abstract and non-realistic theories, after Napoleon's attempts to damage the philosopher's reputation. As a result, the original meaning of the term ideology, which was proposed as a science alongside any other *-ologies*, was soon replaced by a rather pejorative connotation. In relation to this, Verschueren (2011, p.7) observes that "ideology is no longer an academic discipline, but rather an object of investigation".

Interestingly, this was not the only alteration that the term suffered. In the Marxist tradition, the term also acquired a notion associated with conceptions of hegemony and power imposed by dominant groups on other members of society (Van Dijk, 1998). Accordingly, Eagleton (2007, p.3) indicates that "one central lineage, from Hegel and Marx to Georg Lukács and some later Marxist thinkers, has been much preoccupied with ideas of true and false cognition, with ideology as illusion, distortion and mystification". In other words, the Marxist perspective sees ideology as assumptions that people have about the world that conceal authoritarian and hierarchical forces, and even considers those assumptions to be natural (Llamas *et al.*, 2007). This view also posits a negative connotation to the term ideology, which is understood as an image of "false consciousness" (Eagleton, 2007, p.89) resulting from the influence of the media and other opinion-makers that serve the interests of the ruling class. In relation to this, Van Dijk (1998, p.2) suggests that "(the) remnants of the classical debates are also crystalized in the everyday commonsense uses of the notion of 'ideology', namely, taken as a system of wrong, false, distorted or otherwise misguided beliefs, typically associated with our social or political opponents". This observation may explain the current understanding of the term ideology among the general public.

However, the Marxist understanding of ideology was later challenged by the German sociologist Karl Mannheim. In his view, ideological critique is not necessarily concerned with unveiling the beliefs, values and agenda of one's opponent and exposing them as lies or false consciousness as such task would not allow the exploration of "the whole 'mental structure' which underlies a group's prejudices and beliefs" (Eagleton, 2007: 109). In this respect, Seargeant (2012) suggests that, in the Mannheimean tradition of ideology, the beliefs that are shared within a community or social group will impact or be impacted by the ways in which power relations are structured in practice. Therefore, ideologies have the power to create and reproduce inequalities among different social groups.

Researchers from a variety of fields would agree that defining ideology is a problematic task. From a multidisciplinary perspective, Van Dijk (1998, p.8) briefly defines ideology as "the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group". This implies that ideologies are not personal beliefs, but rather a social construct that supports the views and practices that are experienced by diverse groups in society. However, this definition

leaves out the sense that these ideas can be promoted, and the fact that ideology can often be associated with issues of power, a notion that is at the core of my research. In this respect, Armstrong and Mackenzie (2012, p.1) provide a definition that incorporates the aspects mentioned above: they define it as "a set of shared beliefs that, while partial, presents these as the objective way of looking at things, or at least as 'received wisdom' where 'received' has the usual sense of 'generally accepted'". This view also relates to Bourdieu's (1977) notion of *doxa,* which refers to what is taken for granted in society.

What should be considered at this stage is that ideology is "a sociocultural-cognitive phenomenon" (Verschueren, 2011, p.8) that "may be used to legitimate or oppose power and dominance, or symbolise social problems and contradictions" (Van Dijk, 1998, p.5). Because of the various dimensions of ideology and the variety of disciplines interested in researching ideology from their perspectives, Eagleton (2007) suggests that it is advisable to study and analyse the concept within the respective field of enquiry, instead of forcing a unifying definition. For this reason, in order to explore how ideologies are represented, created and transmitted, it is important to understand the relationship between ideology and language use. This exploration can help to identify the ideologies underlying linguistic practices and orientations, especially those associated with the English language in its current global dimension.

This chapter explores the relationship between language ideologies and linguistic practices, with special emphasis on its effects on current English language teaching theory and practice. First, I will explore the field of language ideologies in order to provide an account of definitions that have contributed to developing this field, considering their relevance to my research, along with examples of how they occur in socio-cultural groups – mostly from a linguistic anthropological perspective – and their relevance in current sociolinguistic debates. Then, I will focus on how language ideologies about English language have influenced the current dominance of a standard form in the teaching of English as an additional language, especially in those territories that Kachru (2006) refers to as the Expanding Circle. After that, I will discuss the notion of standard language and the process of standardisation, and how these relate to language ideology debates.

2.2   Language Ideology

In spite of the fact that the relationship between language and ideology had been neglected by scholars due to its diffuse nature, research on language ideology[1] has experienced considerable growth in the past few decades (Schieffelin *et al.*, 1998; Blommaert, 1999; Kroskrity, 2000; Johnson and Milani, 2010; Paffey, 2012). The study of language ideology (or language ideologies) emerged as a field of scholarly enquiry in linguistic anthropology, but has also attracted the attention of sociolinguists, and researchers from other areas of scholarship who are interested in "unpack[ing] the workings of language in the context of social processes" (Johnson and Milani, 2010, p.3). As a result, the ongoing research within a variety of disciplines on language ideology debates has spawned a considerable body of literature and a variety of definitions from different perspectives.

A commonly accepted definition of language ideology has been suggested by Rumsey (1990, p.346), who characterises it as "shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language". Although this definition is comprehensive and straightforward, a major criticism of Rumsey's definition is that it conceives language ideologies as uniform, and fails to problematize the variety of sociocultural differences between members of the same group, such as gender, age and class, among others (Kroskrity, 2004). An earlier definition by Silverstein (1979, p.193) addresses the concept with an emphasis on linguistic forms by describing language ideology as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalisation or justification of perceived language structure and use". Silverstein's view considers the relationship between an often-implicit system of beliefs about language and the language users' behaviours, preferences, and understanding of language. Therefore, this definition implies a dynamic dimension of

---

[1] The terms 'language ideology', 'linguistic ideology' and 'ideology of language' are used interchangeably in this thesis.

language ideologies as being abstract representations that can be promoted (or imposed), modified and/or preserved.

One major distinction in the focus of language ideology studies is made by Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) by distinguishing between *neutral* and *critical* analyses of the concept. The neutral view objectively describes language ideologies as being representative of a speech community, and they are conceived as being the product of the socio-cultural system in which the speakers participate. On the other hand, the critical view focuses only on those specific issues of language and language use that play a role in social cognition, considering how these affect – or are affected by – socio-political interests. Critical approaches are commonly used in studies of language politics and in exploring the relationship between language and social class. In this regard, Rumsey's definition of language ideology is neutral, while Silverstein's provides a useful foundation for the critical stance (Woolard and Schieffelin, 1994). However, Kroskrity (2004) suggests that this differentiation is better understood as part of a continuum rather than as a dichotomy, because even shared ideologies of a speech community can represent the interests of a particular dominant group.

Other definitions emphasise the social dimension of language ideology as "the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with loading of moral and political interests" (Irvine, 1989, p.255), or "self-evident ideas and objectives a group holds concerning roles of language in the social experiences of members as they contribute to the expression of a group" (Heath, 1977, p.53). However, Woolard adopts a different term from *beliefs,* by referring to language ideologies as "*representations* whether explicit or implicit, that construe the intersection of language and human beings in the world" (1998, p.3, emphasis added). All these definitions highlight the existence of a system of ideas about language – often not easily observable – which are not only personal, but also socially shared through lived experiences for the benefit of certain groups.

Considering the discussion above, the notion of language ideologies that is adopted in this study is concerned with the beliefs, values and practices that individuals and social groups interact with regarding the use and rationalisation of language. Such a notion is in line

with the Mannheimean conception of ideology which sees it as "collective systems of thought shared by all members of a community" (Mannheim, 1936 in Seargeant, 2012:145). Therefore, language ideology should not be simply understood as sets of ideas about language emerging from social groups in positions of power for their own benefit (Marxist view) but rather as representations of how language operates and should operate in society.

2.2.1   The representation of language ideologies

Having defined what is understood by language ideologies, it is next useful to explore how they are represented in sociocultural groups and how they can be approached for empirical study. In this respect, McGroarty (2010, p.6) highlights the fact that the study of linguistic ideology lacks a core literature due to its multiple disciplinary perspectives, and she points out that "decisions about which topics are appropriate for study, what counts as data, which investigative methods should be used and what constitutes criteria for academic quality are left to individual investigators to work out their particular disciplinary predilections". Accordingly, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994, p. 57) observe that "[s]ome researchers may read linguistic ideology from linguistic usage, but others insist that the two must be carefully differentiated". This crucial distinction is relevant for the nature of data that can be obtained from different "ideological sites" – which are defined by Silverstein (1998, p.136, emphasis in original) as "institutional sites of social practice, as both *object* and *modality* of ideological expression" – using explicit metalinguistic approaches or eliciting language ideologies from speakers by exploring their linguistic behaviour. Examples of methodological approaches to language ideology in more recent research include ethnographic methods (e.g. Menard-Warwick, 2013) and critical discourse analysis (e.g. Paffey, 2012), among others.

In attempting to characterise and illustrate language ideologies, Kroskrity (2004, p.501) analysed the growing literature in the field and proposed a set of "levels of organisation" for the understanding and analysis of language ideologies. These levels of organisation are represented by dimensions such as gender, age, class, kinship and identity that play a decisive role in shaping the social and linguistic views of members of a speech community. In addition, education, religion, ethnic background and other kinds of group

membership are also influential in the formation of these ideologies. According to Kroskrity (2004; 2010), an individual's notions of correctness, truthfulness, prestige, or attractiveness in linguistic terms "are grounded in social experience and often demonstrably tied to political-economic interests". These dimensions represent the basic and essential functions of language ideologies from a linguistic anthropological perspective. Although a considerable body of research on language ideology developed by linguistic anthropologists shows evidence of the manifestation of language ideologies in indigenous languages, it should be emphasised that language ideologies are present in all languages and among all language users, not only minority or endangered languages (McGroarty, 2010).

A major contribution to the understanding of how language ideologies are constructed is presented by Irvine and Gal (2009). By analysing studies on linguistic ideology carried out in Europe and Africa, they identified and developed three semiotic processes by which language ideologies "locate, interpret, and rationalise sociolinguistic complexity, identifying linguistic varieties with 'typical' persons and activities and accounting for differentiations among them" (ibid., p.403). The first of these processes is called *iconisation*, which refers to the association of a particular linguistic feature with a social image, and by doing so, regarding that feature as an inherent indexical attribute of the identity of the speakers of a social group. The second process is *fractal recursivity*, which refers to the creation of an 'other' from the differences identified in the first process, while "the same oppositions that distinguish given groups from one another on larger scales can also be found within those groups and further divide it" (Andronis, 2003, p.265). Finally, *erasure* is the process by which an ideology ignores the linguistic heterogeneity of a social group, contributing to the maintenance of the previous processes. By providing this framework, Irvine and Gal (2009) consider that all views of linguistic issues are affected by ideologies, even the views of those investigating (or criticising) ideologies of language. That is to say, even "(l)inguists themselves operate with a certain body of assumptions – a 'paradigm' which itself constitutes a form of language ideology" (Winford, 2003, p.22).

2.2.2 Language Ideologies in English Language Teaching

From a sociolinguistic perspective, the focus of research on language ideologies has relied on the power-play relations that exist within sociocultural groups (Blommaert, 1999; McGroarty, 2010; Riley, 2011), and especially on those debates that may lead to concrete manifestations in policy-making (see Spolsky, 2004). More recent attention has been focused on linguistic variation and diversity, and on the ideologies of language underlying the hegemony of certain linguistic forms over others. As De los Heros (2009, p.173) points out, "(t)here is a tendency for hegemonic ideologies to have a wide effect on people's evaluation of language use as well as social practices". Examples of linguistic ideology debates of this kind can be observed in a variety of areas related to political, educational and cultural issues, such as language education in multilingual contexts (e.g.: Blommaert, 1999), policy-making in postcolonial territories (e.g.: Ricento, 2000), perceptions of immigrants and their language use (e.g.: Lippi-Green, 2012), the alleged superiority of native speakers of a language over those for whom it is an additional language (e.g.: Holliday, 2006), and the imposition of a normative-prescriptive form of a language over other existing forms (e.g.: Milroy and Milroy, 2012), just to mention a few. In this respect, some scholars have attempted to characterise different types of language ideologies that are present in a variety of social scenarios.

Some of the research on language ideologies reported in the literature reflects the situation of linguistic varieties that are excluded from educational contexts (e.g. Siegel, 2006; De los Heros, 2009) and identifies specific ideologies that account for the hegemony of standard varieties over other forms of the same language. Since this thesis focuses on the language ideologies that underlie beliefs about the spread and diversity of English, I will discuss a few relevant examples of language ideologies that have been regarded as being – directly and/or indirectly – promoted and reinforced in the principles and practices of ELT, and have therefore contributed to the marginalisation of non-standard linguistic forms. Examples of types of language ideologies are numerous and tend to reflect situations and tensions that may be specific of certain contexts or that relate to particular languages. However, the types of language ideologies that I present here are particularly relevant when analysing the English language and its promotion as a universal foreign language.

2.2.2.1   Ideologies of Authenticity and Anonymity

Woolard (2016) proposes two language ideologies that account for the perpetuation of linguistic authority in society, and which, by extension, explain in general terms the ways in which languages and their users are portrayed and understood in the activity of foreign language teaching: the ideologies of authenticity and anonymity. The ideology of authenticity, she suggests, "locates the value of language in its relationship to a particular community" (ibid., p.22). That is to say, for a language or language use to be considered legitimate or authentic, it should be identifiable as belonging to a particular social or geographic area. For this reason, she goes on, "[t]o be considered authentic, a speech variety must be very much 'from somewhere' in speakers' consciousness, and thus its meaning is profoundly local" (ibid.). Therefore, authentic speakers of such a hegemonic language, or language form, are perceived to portray an essentialised image that is thought to be characteristic of such a speech community. Thus, in order "[t]o profit from linguistic authenticity, one must sound like that kind of person who is valued as natural and authentic" (ibid.). This idea relates to Irvine and Gal's (2009) definition of *iconisation* (as discussed above) in the way that specific languages and language forms are commonly associated with the behaviours and values of speakers who, supposedly, represent a typical user of that language. In the case of second and foreign language learning and teaching, new users of that language are expected to assimilate with the target speech communities as closely as possible in order to be accepted as authentic or legitimate speakers of the language. Even though Woolard, introduces this ideology to discuss the tensions regarding the use of Spanish and Catalan in Catalonia, this example is useful to explain how certain forms of English are regarded as carriers of authenticity in ELT. In this respect, Jenkins (2014) suggests that this ideology underpins the emphasis on conformity to AmE and BrE norms that dominate international higher education.

The ideology of anonymity, on the other hand, relates to the ways in which "hegemonic languages in modern society often rest their authority on a conception of anonymity" (Woolard, 2016, p.25). Unlike the ideology of authenticity, the idea of anonymity does not directly associate the hegemonic language with a specific territory, but, instead, promotes the idea of a unified and unmarked form of the language that comes from "nowhere" and is accessible to all users. Such anonymity, Woolard suggests, allows certain languages to

impose their hegemony in society by avoiding the projection of an identifiable dominant group, which can be associated with Bourdieu's (1991) notion of "misrecognition" (*méconnaissance*). "In misrecognition", she adds, "listeners recognize the authority of a dominant language, but fail to recognize the historical developments and the material power difference between social groups that underpin that authority" (Woolard, 2016, p.29). This rationalisation is particularly identifiable in the discourse that promotes English as an international language through foreign language learning and teaching since the supposedly neutral form of English that is promoted through education – in most cases an idealised form of either American or British English – is usually adopted as invariant and unaccented. In this respect, Jenkins (2014, p.78) asserts that "[native English speakers] with certain ('standard') ways of using English (primarily the 'standard' Englishes of North America and the UK) can safely diverge from each others' varieties without arousing negative views of their English".

Despite the ostensible contrastive relationship between authenticity and anonymity, these two ideologies are intrinsically connected as two ends of a continuum that operate simultaneously in the positioning of languages in society (Woolard, 2016). For example, Jenkins (2014) points out that these ideologies have a pervasive effect on the beliefs of non-native speakers of English since only a few idealised forms of English are perceived as legitimate (authenticity), while, at the same time, these forms are also commonly understood as unmarked and as the most suitable for international communication (anonymity). Therefore, the influence of these ideologies may be even more dominantly present in contexts where English does not have an official status or colonial history due to the lack of familiarity with the historical and social roots of the language – and its preferred forms – among members of such societies.

2.2.2.2   Native speaker ideology

Native speaker ideology encompasses a variety of interrelated assumptions and beliefs about language use based on the supposed relationship between one's first language and nationhood, speech communities, and linguistic competence (Doerr, 2009). As its name suggests, this is an ideology that not only concerns the language (or form of the language) that speakers use, but, more importantly, how speakers of such a language are perceived

by those who do not speak it as a first language. The dominance and reproduction of this ideology in society is perceived to perpetuate inequality and discrimination based on the native/non-native status of users of the same language. Doerr (2009), following Pennycook's (1994) and Irvine and Gal's (2009) frameworks, suggests that there are three main assumptions behind the native speaker ideology. The first assumption relates to the association of a language user's nationality with being a "native speaker" of the official or dominant language of that territory. Such an assumption accounts for an essentialised characterisation of speakers of a language other than one's own as representative members of a homogeneous society. In addition, a direct relationship between the first language of a person and an imagined corresponding culture is also the result of this notion. Doerr (2009), in line with Irvine and Gal (2009), suggests that this assumption is constructed by a process of *iconisation*.

The second assumption that Doerr (2009) discusses is the view of language as homogeneous and fixed and of its users as members of a homogeneous community, which, by extension, provides a clear-cut differentiation between those users of a language who are identified as native speakers and those who are not. Such an assumption ignores variation and diversity within the language and – like the ideology of authenticity – conceives a dominant form of the language as the only valid representation of the whole language. This view of language authority is constructed by a process of *erasure* (Irvine and Gal, 2009), through which the uses of the language that do not conform to the imagined homogenous one are perceived as undesirable exceptions or simply overlooked.

The third assumption that contributes to the hegemony of the native speaker ideology concerns the idea that a native speaker of a language is, by birthright, a carrier of high linguistic competence in all its domains. This view emphasises the undisputed superiority of native speakers of a language, on linguistic grounds, in comparison to non-native speakers of the same language, and contributes to the perpetuation of an idea of the non-native speaker as an unaccomplished learner. In her description of this ideology, Doerr (2009) relates this assumption with Irvine and Gal's (2009) idea of *fractal recursivity*, which contributes to the construction of an ideological opposition based on linguistic differences which can be reproduced in a variety of social contexts. In this

respect, Doerr (2009, p. 19, emphasis in original) points out that "[i]n the case of ideological 'native'/'non-native speaker' relationships, hierarchical *social* relationships between the speakers of a standard language and the speakers of a non-standard language within a 'linguistic community' are projected onto the relationship interpreted to be linguistically based between 'native' and 'non-native speakers'". From this perspective, then, the non-native speaker "represents an imagined, problematic *generalized* Other to the unproblematic Self of the 'native speaker'" (Holliday, 2006, p.386).

The ideology of the native speaker has had a historical presence in the ELT industry and profession. For example, Dewey (2014) provides evidence of the dominance of this ideology in popular pedagogical ELT materials and textbooks despite the fact that they claim to promote an international perspective on English. He goes on to explain that this phenomenon is caused, to a great extent, by the strong reliance on the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR), which, as Mauranen (2012) indicates, is highly influenced by the linguistic competence of an idealised native-speaker. More importantly, the "native"/"non-native" divide has had a powerful effect on the ways in which teachers of English are perceived by stakeholders (publishers, students, ELT institutions, and teachers themselves) and society in general. In this respect, Braine (2005, p.13) observes that "NNS teachers were generally regarded as unequal in knowledge and performance to NS teachers of English". ELF researchers, however, have consistently challenged the native-speaker ideology and highlighted the positive impact that moving away from the idealisation of 'native speakers' of English as the ultimate goal in ELT may have on learners' and teachers' identities and beliefs, and on the ELT profession in general (see, for example, Llurda, 2004; Jenkins, 2007; Sifakis, 2014; Baker, 2015; Bayyurt and Sifakis, 2015).

2.2.2.3   Standard Language Ideology

The standard language ideology (SLI) is the ideology about language use that has been most thoroughly discussed in the literature (see for example Milroy, 2003; Siegel, 2006; Armstrong and Mackenzie, 2012; Lippi-Green, 2012; Milroy and Milroy, 2012; Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). In simple words, the SLI can be defined as

"a bias toward an abstracted, idealized, homogenous spoken language which is imposed and maintained by dominant bloc institutions and which names as its model the written language, but which is drawn primarily from the spoken language of the upper middle class" (Lippi-Green, 2012).

In the above definition, Lippi-Green (2012) provides evidence of how the idea of a standard and authoritative form of a language is thought to carry the desirable characteristics of the dominant classes. The pervasiveness of the SLI rests on the effects that such a view of language has on society, allowing opportunities for inequality and discrimination based on ideas of correctness, legitimacy and prestige. The idea of a standard language as the official language of social institutions (such as education, the law, and the media) perpetuates the notion of such an idealised language as neutral and unbiased (Gal, 2006), which is a value shared with the ideology of anonymity.

In addition, the standard is seen as the only representative form of the language, while variations around norm – or non-standard varieties – are seen as inaccurate approximations to it (Armstrong and Mackenzie, 2012). In this respect, Seidlhofer (2018, p.87) argues that

"separate standard languages have generally become the unmarked, 'normal' languages providing the data for linguistic research, which in turn (wittingly or unwittingly) has fed into and perpetuated the standard language ideology that sees imposed language uniformity via one and only one legitimate standard variety as desirable and beneficial for society"

Therefore, this ideology refuses to acknowledge the legitimacy of other forms of the same language that fail to conform to its norms, even when those forms are commonly used in society. Such a view is often reinforced through the authority of language academies and the promotion of usage manuals and grammar books (Gal, 2006), especially through the education system.

What is particularly interesting about the standard language ideology is that, even among people who are linguistically marginalised by dominant groups, it is possible to observe

their acceptance of a hegemonic variety that is perpetuated by the education system (Siegel, 2006); a phenomenon that is motivated by what Labov (1990) refers to as *linguistic insecurity*. In relation to this, Lippi-Green (2012, p.68) points out that "[w]hen speakers of devalued or stigmatised varieties of English consent to the standard language ideology, they become complicit in its propagation against themselves, their own interests, and identities". In addition, the superiority of the standard language is also supported by the belief that this form contains defining linguistic and aesthetic features that differentiate it from non-standard forms, and hence would empower its users (see for example Honey, 1997). However, as discussed in 2.2.2.1, the idea of who counts as an authentic speaker of a hegemonic language is likely to act as a disempowering force against those who wish to conform to the norms of the dominant groups in order to benefit from their social power.

The language ideologies discussed here represent a relevant account of how certain languages or language forms are marginalised in the teaching of additional languages, while other forms are regarded as superior. They also provide examples of how an idealised form of a language is seen as a tool for success, a sign of equality, a norm to conform to, or a marker of prestige and, by recognising it as such, the same may also be true when exploring the underlying ideologies in the teaching and learning of a global language, such as English. However, in order to understand how language ideologies about English are reproduced, promoted, and challenged, it is necessary to explore how "standard English" and the idealised idea of the native speaker have achieved such unrivalled status in society, and especially in ELT. The concept of standard language, and especially "standard English" are recurrent ones in language ideology research and ELT; and for this reason, I will now move on to explore what a standard language is, how the standardisation process works and how the idea of a "standard English language" has shaped the way in which we value (or devalue) Englishes other than the socially preferred standard in the teaching and learning of English.

2.3   Standardisation, "standard English" and the "native speaker"

Standard language is a controversial topic in sociolinguistics. Although this term is constantly discussed in this field, there is little consensus on what it actually means, how

it is realised, and what it entails, mainly because of the ideological conceptualisations of those who promote and support its existence (and dominance), and those who challenge it. Trudgill (2002, p. 159), however, points out that there is general agreement on what constitutes a "standardised language", regarding it as "a language one of whose varieties has undergone standardisation". This brief definition makes us go even deeper, and forces us to explore the process of language standardisation in order to understand in a better way what a standard language is. Simply put, standardisation refers to "the process by which a language has been codified in some way. That process usually involves the development of such things as grammars, spelling books, and dictionaries, and possibly a literature" (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015, p.33).

So far, I have only referred to *language*(s) and *forms of language*, avoiding the use of the term 'dialect' in order to avoid ambiguity. Nonetheless, at this point it is necessary to conceptualise this term before moving on to discuss the process of language standardisation. As my study pays special attention to structural differences within a language, I will not explore in depth what exactly makes a linguistic system a language, but rather the different forms in which a language may be realised on the basis of geographical and socio-cultural factors. Kloss's (1967, p.29) differentiation (in German) between *Abstandsprache* – "language by distance" – and *Ausbausprache* – "language by development" – may be useful to determine which linguistic forms account for a language and which do not. Abstand languages refer to those forms of language that possess a considerable structural independence from other languages. In this way, Spanish, Hungarian and English are separate languages because of their different internal constitution. Ausbau languages, on the other hand, refer to those languages that have developed from a common linguistic source but are concerned with socio-political distinctions, such as Czech and Slovak, for instance. This distinction, although not unproblematic due to the influence of political factors (see Joseph, 1987; Trousdale, 2010), provides a solid foundation for the distinction between language and dialect, which is essential for the understanding of the standardisation process.

A dialect is then "any one of the related norms comprised under the general name 'language,' historically the result of either divergence or convergence" (Haugen, 1966, p. 923). That is to say, dialects are the actual realisations of a common language (Abstand or

Ausbau) as represented by socioculturally and/or geographically different speech communities. This view supports the general sociolinguistic agreement, as described by Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015), that all dialects are equal in linguistic grounds since there is no scientific evidence of the superiority (or inferiority) of certain varieties in their structural composition (cf. Honey, 1997). Hence, dialects are understood as linguistic forms that derive from the abstract concept of language, not from other superordinate varieties.

2.3.1   The standardisation process and the notion of standard language

One of the most influential contributions to understanding the process of standardisation of a language is Haugen (1966). Haugen's language standardisation model has demonstrated wide applicability and has become a fundamental framework for "comparative standardology", especially when investigating European languages (Kristiansen and Coupland, 2011). What is relevant about this work is that it provides an account of the main sub-processes through which a specific dialect of a language undergoes in order to become the standard. In addition, Haugen's model reveals that standardisation is grounded as a social process rather than as linguistic development. These sub-processes or elements of standardisation are *selection*; *codification*; *elaboration*; and *implementation*[2].

In simple words, the element of *selection* corresponds to the process of choosing a specific dialect – from all the language forms available in a speech community – to become a normative model. The relevant issue to highlight here is that the choice of a linguistic model for a speech community is based primarily on arbitrary social aspects (Armstrong and Mackenzie, 2012), responding to the interests of the dominant groups of a speech community, and therefore it is a highly ideologically loaded process. As Haugen (1966, p. 932) argues, "[t]o choose any vernacular as a norm means to favour the group

---

[2] In his 1966 publication, Haugen refers to this feature as *acceptance*. A revision of his own work (1987) modifies this sub-process and analyses under the term *implementation*.

of people speaking that variety. It gives them prestige as norm-bearers and a head start in the race for power and position". Hence, by extension, the variety of the language chosen as the standard will acquire the social characteristics of its speakers. Moreover, one major consequence of the selection of a specific variety is the devaluation of other dialects (Cheshire and Milroy, 1993). Another relevant issue of this sub-process highlighted by Haugen (1987) is that the selection of a norm may be the result of private or public debate, the choice of a majority, or the authoritarian imposition from a ruling force. Accordingly, Deumert and Vandenbussche (2003) argue that this is where the non-linguistic motivations of standardisation – such as, national identity, economic development, and independence – are evidenced.

Codification, in Haugen's terms, refers to "minimal variation in form" (1966, p. 932), that is to say the process of fixing a selected form of the language and making guidance available to the public in the shape of reference works, such as dictionaries and grammar books. The main aim of codification is to reduce variability of linguistic forms and prevent change – both objectives can be regarded as unnatural in the development of a language. In this respect, Leith (1997, p.42) points out that this sub-process "has less to do with description of linguistic forms… than with *prescription* [which is] the evaluation of variants as 'correct' and the stigmatisation of variants which… are felt to be undesirable". This has led to the creation of language academies for the regulation of an important number of languages, such as French (*Académie française)*, Spanish (*Real Academia Española*) and German (*Rat für deutsche Rechtschreibung*), along with the rise of prescriptive grammars for the development of a "legitimate language" (Watts, 1999). However, it is important to point out that there is consensus among sociolinguists that standardisation of a language usually focuses on its written form (e.g.: Haugen, 1966; Joseph, 1987; Trudgill, 2002; Milroy and Milroy, 2012), being the spelling system the most successfully coded, while complete standardisation of a spoken variety cannot be attained unless it is a dead language (Milroy and Milroy, 2012).

Whereas selection and codification are concerned with choosing and fixing a specific language form, *elaboration* focuses on meeting the communicative and social functions of the language. Haugen (1966, p.931) describes elaboration as "maximal variation in function". This means that the standard form is able to fulfil different roles in society,

especially – but not exclusively – related to governmental, educational, legal and literary functions (Jenkins, 2015a). In an ideal case, the element of elaboration of function of a language responds to the needs of a broad variety of speech communities, that is to say, the standard norm should be self-sufficient when it comes to the modernisation of the language, allowing the renewal of its norms – especially its lexicon – in order to avoid the borrowing of foreign forms (Deumert and Vandenbussche, 2003). However, as Kristiansen and Coupland (2011, p. 22) point out, the three sub-processes of language standardisation described so far imply "top-down, controlling activities by national governments and their agencies", and hence, in most cases it is the speech communities themselves who are the ones who have to adapt their linguistic practices to these processes and not the other way around.

Finally, *implementation* refers to the interplay between the promotion of the standardised form of the language and the acceptance of its norms and functions among a speech community. Deumert and Vandenbussche (2003, p. 7) consider this sub-process to be the "Achilles heel" of standardisation because the adoption of – or resistance to – the new norm by the target community is crucial for the success or failure of all the previous sub-processes. For a norm to be adopted, dominant groups may promote the standard variety through newspapers, textbooks, radio and television, but most importantly through the education system since "[a]s long as a small, elite group has a monopoly on education, it is relatively simple to implement a given norm" (Haugen, 1987, p.61). Clearly, the elements of language standardisation are presented as part of a sequential process; however, the normal development of a standardised language causes overlapping and recursion of these elements, especially in relation to codification and elaboration (Jenkins, 2015a).

As the sub-processes of the model of standardisation presented above involve the decisions and views about language that certain socio-political – and particularly authoritative – groups hold for the promotion of a specific language variety, it can be argued that the process of standardisation represents the spread of the language ideologies of these groups. Although Haugen's model does not explicitly refer to the ideological motivations of the standardisation process, it does offer an elitist perspective of the superiority of the language of certain groups by stating that

"Every self-respecting nation has to have a language. Not just a medium of communication, a 'vernacular' or a 'dialect', but a fully developed language. Anything else marks it as underdeveloped" (Haugen, 1966, p.927).

This comment is in line with the notion of the standard that Joseph (1987, p,2) refers to as the "synecdoche" variety. This means that the standard is not seen as a dialect of a specific language but as the language itself, while all other realisations of the language are regarded as subordinate to the standard. In this respect, Armstrong and Mackenzie (2012, p.17) argue that this view relates to the sub-process of elaboration of function "which dictates that the standard should be capable of functioning as a means of expression in a wide range of domains, and indeed the history of standardisation shows the encroachment of the standard into most if not all areas of public activity". A similar view is shared by Silverstein (1996, p.286) who suggests that "[i]n this sense, Standard is, as it were, the absence of 'dialect', and its superiority as such is seen to emerge from its positively specifiable attributes". Even the first edition of the Oxford English Dictionary in 1933 supports this notion in its definition of "dialect" as a subordinate variety that differs from the standard language (Locher and Strässler, 2008). This view is then the product of an ideology that sees the standard language as the hegemonic language of a speech community to which speakers of other dialects – and learners of the language – should ascribe.

In his analysis of the consequences of standardisation, Milroy (2001, p.530) argues that speakers of widely spread languages that have a long history of standardisation (such as Spanish, German, French and English) live in "standard language cultures". He argues that most speakers of these languages adhere to the ideology of the standard, which can be evidenced by a strong advocacy to correctness. The adoption of the standard as the language of education is key in raising awareness of what counts as standard and what is regarded as non-standard (Garvin, 1993). It is important to clarify, then, that not all languages undergo this process in the same way due to the different social motivations of the speech communities associated with those languages. Therefore, it is relevant to explore the case of English and what is understood by its standard and non-standard forms.

2.3.2   Standard and non-standard English

In what he claims to be an overtly non-ideological discussion, Trudgill (2002) argues that "standard English" is not a language, nor an accent, nor a style, nor a register, but just a dialect – and as any other dialect it should be spelt with a capital 'S'. In addition, he defines it not as a simple dialect but "the most important dialect in the English-speaking world from a social, intellectual and cultural point of view" (ibid, p.165). He also points out that "standard English" is the variety that is usually taught in schools, commonly found in print and broadcasting, used as a model for foreign learners, and also the variety spoken by educated people. On the other hand, scholars such as Lippi-Green (2012), Milroy and Milroy (2012), and Crowley (2003) support the view that "standard English" is an idealised language motivated by the socio-economic interests of dominant groups in order to establish social hierarchies. The analysis of the standardisation process above provides evidence that supports the view of standardised languages as the product of a language ideology in general terms. This is why I will now characterise the notion of "standard English" and its influence in the formation of a standard language ideology, by exemplifying how the process of standardisation described by Haugen (1966) applies to the development of a standard in the English language, and by doing so conceptualising the nature of "non-standard English".

In terms of selection, there is clear consensus that William Caxton's introduction of printing in England in the 15th Century represents one of the most influential early attempts to standardise the English language (Leith and Graddol, 2007; Locher and Strässler, 2008; Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). In this respect, Garrett *et al.* (2011) report that the variety chosen for this was the East Midlands dialect – a variety that also includes features of the speech of Cambridge, Oxford and London. Of course, what we now understand as "standard English" has experienced a long journey of structural and functional transformations since then. However, as Leith and Graddol (2007) point out, Caxton's commercial motivations to eliminate variability in the English language had little to do with linguistic reasons. In addition, the geographical area associated with the variety selected by Caxton was already connected to political, economic and academic development (Milroy and Milroy, 2012). Therefore, the first conclusion that we can draw

from this is that the model for "standard English" was originally chosen for social purposes rather than on linguistic grounds.

For many scholars, the publication of Dr Johnson's dictionary in 1755 is seen as the first milestone in the codification of the English language (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). This dictionary was the first to provide a list of words including their definition and pronunciation. Although Dr Johnson's contribution was a striking innovation in Britain, other European countries such as France and Italy were a step ahead and had already formed their academies for the regulation of their languages. It is argued in the literature (e.g. Crowley, 2003; Lippi-Green, 2012; Milroy and Milroy, 2012) that one of the main attempts to fully prescribe the English language was Jonathan Swift's (1712, in Crowley, 1991) "A proposal for correcting, improving and ascertaining the English tongue". Swift's recommendation, which was intended to inhibit variation and prevent change, was in line with what Watts (2000) calls the "ideology of prescriptivism", which is upheld by a variety of myths in relation to the English language that account for the superiority, perfection, and an alleged golden era of the language. The development of grammars and a variety of dictionaries in the 18th century, which were regarded as authorities by speakers of English, marked the zenith of prescriptive attempts to impose the use of 'correct' forms (the standard), and marginalising the use of variants (non-standard).

With regard to elaboration of function, Leith (1997) argues that the multi-functionality that the chosen – and codified – variety of English needed to develop in order to fulfil a range of social roles – such as education, law, literature and religion – forced the standard to acquire a degree of variability in its form and lexis. This gave rise to a view of the standard not as a regional, South-Eastern based dialect, but as a social marker of prestige. Milroy (2000) criticises the way linguists have historically adopted the prestige associated with a minority of speakers – an indexical social attribute – as part of the definition of "standard English" and have used the standardised forms as a benchmark for social status, because they have also contributed to the view of the standard as a norm to which speakers of all varieties should be compared. Also, it is important to point out here that English is a pluricentric language, that is to say, it has expanded beyond the borders of England and led to the development of alternative standard forms that have developed in other English-speaking territories.

Chapter 2

The implementation of "standard English" is better understood as a process of (a) diffusion from authoritative bodies and elites, (b) acceptance by members of society (Kristiansen and Coupland, 2011) and (c) the maintenance of the superiority of the standardised language (Milroy, 2001). Here is where Trudgill's description of "standard English", as stated above, fits best since it relates to how an idealised variety of the language is superposed by influential groups in the shape of education, print and audio-visual media, and available in prescriptive literature for those whose first or additional language is English. Acceptance involves the awareness of what is regarded as being standard in language use and what is not, leading to the praise of certain uses and the stigmatising of others. Leith (1997) observes that this feature was already present in the literature of the 16th century.

As the standardisation of English is a process that has been going on for centuries, the ideologies surrounding "standard English" need to be constantly reinforced in order to maintain the status quo. Those institutions, scholars and movements that perform the role of monitoring the right and proper use of the English language are characterised by Lippi-Green (2012) and Milroy and Milroy (2012) as "guardians of the standard". An example of an institution that has been highly influential and remarkably successful in the maintenance of "standard English" and its promotion as the language of the United Kingdom is the British Council. In an analysis of several of the British Council's annual reports since its creation in 1934, Pennycook (1994) observes the explicitness with which the commercial, political, and expansionist interests of its authorities is revealed in statements like "[t]here is a hidden sales element in every English teacher, book, magazine, film-strip and television programme we send overseas" (British Council 1968-1969, p.11-12, in Pennycook, 1994).

By considering the development of "standard English" stated above, it is possible to draw the following conclusions in order to define what "standard English" is. First, "standard English" is not a dialect, but rather an idealised form of the English language, and therefore, the product of an ideology. This is supported by the fact that "standard English" is not representative of a speech community but rather a linguistic resource used as a social marker. In this respect, Seidlhofer (2018, p.87) argues that the standard is then "a privileged variety representing a prestige linguistic norm recognised in particular

communities and set up as gatekeeping for the achievement of education and therefore social status". Second, "standard English" is a notion of proper language and correctness that is the result of recurrent attempts to prescribe the forms and functions of English. Therefore, "standard English" is a benchmark for linguists and non-linguists who compare their own and other people's speech to an idealised model of correctness. Third, from the point of view of language teaching/learning, of globalisation, and the use of English as an international language, "standard English" is perceived as a commodity (Silverstein, 1996; Heller, 2010), that is to say, a form of the language that can be advertised, sold, and bought as trade goods, and by extension, it is promoted as the language of a nation-state.

In spite of the fact that "standard English" is a controversial topic because of its diffuse nature and ideological burden, efforts have been made to provide an extensive literature that attempts to theorise this problematic issue. Some researchers have tried to find answers in the entries of prestigious dictionaries (e.g. Locher and Strässler, 2008), others have compared the realities of different languages in Europe (e.g. Kristiansen and Coupland, 2011), while some others are more interested in exploring the notions of standard that laypersons have in relation to their own language (e.g. Smakman, 2012). What is interesting here is that, despite the different efforts made by scholars to provide a unifying or universal definition of a standard language, there is a historical tendency in the linguistics literature to assume that there is no need for clarification, and thus the concept of standard language is usually taken for granted (an iconic example of this is Quirk's (1990) response to the conclusions of the Kingman Committee).

As a consequence, what is regarded as "non-standard" English seems to be somewhat neglected and under-theorised. In the same way that a standard variety is sometimes regarded as the language itself, the history of the English language as presented in the literature is, to a large extent, the story of the origin and rise of "standard English", disregarding its variations (Milroy, 2000). Therefore, it may possible to assume that "non-standard English" would comprise – by definition – all the forms of English that do not conform to the norms of the standard in their linguistic, and social, features. This view, however, is unrealistic if we consider that the standard is not a dialect in the same sense as other varieties of English because "the codification that forms a crucial part of the standardisation process results in a situation where in most cases, a feature is either

standard or it is not" (Trudgill, 2002, p.166). In this respect, Cheshire and Milroy (1993) argue that the difference between "standard" and "non-standard English" simply relies on the fact that the former has been codified while the latter has not.

Most studies on "non-standard English" focus on grammatical features that are not acknowledged by standard norms (Trudgill, 2002). In his influential studies on non-standard varieties in the United States, Labov (e.g. 1969) argues that those linguistic forms that have been stigmatised have their own linguistic complexity and should not be regarded as inferior. Early studies that describe grammatical and morphological features of "non-standard English" have evidenced the use of multiple negation (e.g. Anderwald, 2002), and *them* as a plural form for *that* , instead of *those* (for a comprehensive list of these features see Trudgill, 1979). However, Milroy and Milroy (2012) argue that these features are likely to be found in the speech of people who are thought to be speakers of "standard English". A crucial point to highlight here is that the traditional ideological distinction of "standard" and "non-standard English" ignores user variability. That is to say, one speaker may have a preference for standard features in one situation and employ non-standard grammar in other circumstances (or even in the same conversation).

The case of English is an exceptional one because of its nature as a pluricentric language (Jenkins, 2006). However, the standard language ideology promoted by guardians of "standard English" does not acknowledge this feature. The current global dimension of English as a national and official language in a large number of territories around the world has led to the emergence of alternative standard forms of English (such as Standard American English) that are used as a reference against other local non-standard varieties, with the already discussed consequences of social preference or stigmatisation of their speakers. In addition, social mobility and globalisation have emphasised the role of English in the world and, as a consequence, the argument of appropriateness, prestige and correctness that is associated with the standard language has expanded to another controversial dichotomy that is subject to ideological debates: native and non-native speakers.

2.3.3   Native and non-native speakers of English

Discussions over the notion of "nativeness" in the English language and its relevance to different subfields of applied linguistics (such as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, second language acquisition, language teaching, among others) have resulted in different interpretations and even ambiguity when defining what makes a native – or a non-native – speaker of English (Davies, 2003; Holliday, 2009). The global spread of English and the challenged "ownership of the English language" (Widdowson, 1994) raise questions about the social and linguistic differentiation of native and non-native speakers, as well as the appropriateness of this dichotomy. Considerable effort has been made to provide a satisfactory definition that recognises the multiple sociolinguistic backgrounds of English speakers, but as Faez (2011) points out, literature on this subject has failed to respond to the broad multicultural diversity of English speakers and, as a consequence, has led to a perpetuation of discrimination and social inequality.

In simple linguistic terms, "the indisputable element in the definition of *native speaker* is that a person is a native speaker of the language learnt first" (Cook, 1999, p.187). This feature is defined as the most essential characteristic in differentiating these two groups of English speakers (Davies, 2004; Faez, 2011). Nevertheless, this feature is also problematic because it ignores cases of people who grow up speaking more than one language, and also assumes that all those speakers share the same degree of linguistic competence. In addition, Davies (2004) contributes to the definition by adding other features shared by native speakers such as: intuitions about grammar and "standard English", fluency in speech, creativity in writing, ability to translate into their L1 – characteristics that can also define a proficient non-native speaker. He also concludes that "non-native speakers can become native-speaker like in the target language in terms of proficiency, communicative competence and linguistic competence" (2003, p.196) mainly because the issue of nativeness in relation of English is a matter of self-affiliation. Davis's view, nevertheless, seems unrealistic because group membership involves validation by the speech community (Brutt-Griffler and Saminy, 2001).

Yet, what is relevant for my study is not the definition of the features that differentiate a native and a non-native speaker of English but the implications that this distinction

entails. The notion of the native speaker has been "idealised", as Leung *et al.* (1997) put it, as an abstract ideological image of a speaker of "standard English" who carries with them the culture of the English-speaking community. As a consequence, this view of the native speaker results in the exclusion of ethnic and linguistic minorities that also claim membership of the native group, especially in territories where English is a nativised language. In this respect, Seidlhofer (2011, p.52) comments that "notions of *nativeness* and *standard* are conflated to such an extent that they become mutually dependent, indistinguishable, even identical". Phillipson (1992, p.195) also refers to this idealised, intrinsically superior, native speaker that serves as a model for teaching English to speakers of other languages, which he calls "the native speaker fallacy". Similarly, Holliday (2005, p.6) analyses the traditional socio-political and economic position of the native speaker in the TESOL profession which, he argues, is based on an ideology of "native speakerism". In line with Doerr's (2009) descriptions of native speaker ideologies discussed in 2.2.2.2, the ideology of native speakerism is defined as a social construct that conceives native speakers as linguistically homogenous and culturally superior, and hence more qualified as language teachers than non-native language experts. This ideology has important social implications in practice, such as the representation of Western culture and the preference for white, 'educated' British or American – not necessarily qualified – teachers as carriers of proper English.

Support for the alleged superiority of the native speaker is given by Quirk (1990) using as evidence a study by Coppieters (1987) in which intuitions about grammar of native French speakers and advanced non-native users of French were compared. In addition, some authors argue that Chomsky's idea of a speech community based on a linguistically homogeneous group of native speakers has contributed to the development of this dichotomic notion (e.g. Cook, 1999; Davies, 2004; Sato, 2009; Faez, 2011). However, this position has two different implications. First it widens the divisions within native speakers by selecting a limited group of speakers – educated users of "standard English" – as norm bearers, and by doing so discriminating against the rest of native speakers and raising issues of identity as language users. Second, as Seidlhofer (2011) points out, "native speaker intuitions and 'perfect mastery' of French are simply not important to the individuals described [in Coppieters' article], and are irrelevant for their success as full members of the society they live in".

What I argue here is that the native/non-native distinction is unfavourable, inappropriate and discriminatory in many senses. First, I agree with Holliday (2005, p.4) that the conceptualisation of these two groups by simply using the prefix 'non-' "usually signifies a disadvantage or deficit". Moreover, attempting to bridge the existing social gap between the two groups by conforming to the defining linguistic features of the native speaker is both unrealistic and unnecessary. A few scholars have suggested the replacement of the concepts in question by alternatives such as 'native user' (Singh, 1998), 'language experts' (Leung *et al.*, 1997) and even a tri-dimensional perspective concerning 'monolingual English speakers', 'bilingual English speakers' and 'non-bilingual English speaker' (Jenkins, 2015a). Although these suggestions are semantically more favourable than the traditional concepts of 'native speaker' and 'non-native speaker', the real change needs to be done at an ideological level by acknowledging the legitimacy of competent English users despite their geographical origins and lingua-cultural background, and recognising their sociocultural differences beyond the idealised model. A similar view is presented by Doerr (2009, p.38), who acknowledges that "[d]escribing individuals in terms of a categorical classification of "native/non-native speakers" or "expert/non-expert" or "monolingual/bilingual/multilingual"… risks privileging certain criteria in categorizing and creating an inaccurately homogeneous view of individuals".

2.4   **Summary**

This chapter has discussed the concept of ideology and the literature on language ideology, stressing their role in research in sociolinguistics and their implications for ELT. Although definitions of language ideology tend to vary in the literature, there is a general consensus that they are sets of beliefs that frame the ways in which people rationalise and justify language use (Kroskrity, 2010). What is more, different disciplines have been interested in exploring ideological rationalisations of language use, but without much interaction across areas of enquiry. Therefore, as McGroarty (2010) points out, this has meant that the study of language ideology has been developed as a field without a specific core literature or preferred research methods. However, it is evident in this chapter that most of the relevant contributions to the study of language ideology have

emerged from the field of linguistic anthropology (e.g.: Schieffelin *et al.*, 1998; Irvine and Gal, 2009; Kroskrity, 2010).

In addition, this chapter presented relevant examples of language ideologies that have been described in the literature as the most dominant in the teaching and learning of English as an additional language. These included the standard language ideology, the ideology of the native speaker, and ideologies of authenticity and anonymity. Then, this chapter explored how the notion of "standard" has been present in the English language, resulting in contemporary ideas about correctness, prestige and authority that have historically had an ideological load. This has resulted in the propagation of beliefs about English that position certain varieties and forms higher than others, both in the perceptions of laypersons and, even more so, of English language teaching professionals. Since one of the main purposes of this thesis is to explore how hegemonic language ideologies operate in Chilean ELT programmes, it is relevant to investigate those "sets of beliefs" in detail by understanding how beliefs about language use are clustered in order to – consciously or subconsciously – conform to language ideologies that empower certain social groups and marginalise others, which may even include supporters of those hegemonic ideologies (Lippi-Green, 2012). The following chapter, then, concerns the field of teachers' beliefs, which is expected to provide a means to bridge the gap between the abstract nature of language ideologies and the concrete actions of teacher educators in the training of future teachers of English.

Chapter 3   Teachers' beliefs about the impact of the spread and diversity of English on ELT

3.1   Introduction

This chapter explores the field of teachers' beliefs, with a special emphasis on ELT. The study of teachers' mental processes has experienced a rapid growth in the past few decades (Fives and Buehl, 2012). Early studies on teacher cognition, especially in the 1960s, adopted a process-product approach to investigating the observable behaviours that "effective" teachers evidenced in classrooms (Borg, 2015). Later, especially in the 1970s and early 1980s, the field experienced a cognitive-psychological turn, with a focus on how behaviour was influenced by thinking. Teachers' decision-making was then understood as the connection between thought and behaviour, and received considerable attention from researchers, especially from educational psychology (Zheng, 2009). Since then, the study of teachers' mental lives has attempted to untangle the different cognitive constructs that play a role in what teachers think, believe and know. In the early 1990s, teachers' beliefs, as a particular form of cognition, started to receive considerable attention from researchers who sought to understand a variety of phenomena, such as the beliefs of pre-service and in-service teachers (e.g.: Richardson, 2003), and the correspondence between teachers' espoused beliefs and actual practices (e.g.: Fang, 1996; Basturkmen *et al.*, 2004). In the case of language teachers, the focus of scholarly research has been on the particular issues in which teachers' beliefs could have an impact, such as beliefs about their role as teachers, about second language learning, about how teachers learn to teach, about their subject matter, and so on. However, teachers' beliefs about the sociolinguistic reality of English and its influence on the training of future teachers remain under-researched.

The purpose of this chapter is then to review the existing literature on teachers' beliefs, with a special emphasis on studies that reveal beliefs related to issues about models and norms in ELT. This exploration will provide a framework for my own study of teachers' beliefs in the Chilean context, as well as serve as a foundation for the analysis of language ideologies in teacher training programmes in Chile. In order to do so, I begin by

conceptualising the notion of belief, its characteristics, functions, and its relevance in the study of teachers' cognition. In addition, I explore other related notions (such as attitudes and ideologies) to establish differences that can orient my research focus. Next, I refer to some relevant findings and contributions of studies on teachers' beliefs related to English language teaching and teacher training. After that, I narrow down my scope by exploring beliefs related to English as a subject matter, about the appropriateness of specific models for ELT, and the impact of the use of English as a lingua franca in the training of future teachers. Finally, I consider the impact of teacher education programmes on the beliefs of English-language teachers and explore the relationship between teachers' espoused beliefs and classroom practices.

3.2   **Conceptualising teachers' beliefs**

Finding common ground in the study of teachers' beliefs is not an easy task. Many authors highlight that one of the main problems in researching this field is the lack of consensus in defining what teachers' beliefs are (Pajares, 1992; Borg, 2001; Fives and Buehl, 2012; Razfar, 2012; Skott, 2015). Fives and Buehl (2012), for example, point out that it is possible to find a variety of definitions of teachers' beliefs, but that there is still a lack of consistency in the use of the term. In one of the most influential reviews of the teachers' beliefs literature, Pajares (1992, p.309) claims that beliefs

> "travel in disguise and often under alias – attitudes, values, judgements, axioms, opinions, ideology, perceptions, conceptions, conceptual systems, preconceptions, dispositions, implicit theories, explicit theories, personal theories, internal mental processes, action strategies, rules of practice, practical principles, repertoires of understanding, and social strategy, to name but a few that can be found in the literature".

Pajares's point reveals how the concept of belief overlaps with other cognitive constructs that are also of relevance to researchers interested in teachers' mental processes. One consequence of this lack of congruence is the wealth of studies that explicitly refer to teachers' beliefs without conceptualising them, but instead, as Thompson (1992) points out, the understanding of this construct appears to be taken for granted. For this reason, I

will now attempt to conceptualise a working definition of teachers' beliefs for this thesis, by initially exploring what beliefs are – from a general perspective – distinguishing them from other related concepts, and then exploring their impact on teachers' actions and decisions.

3.2.1   Towards a definition of belief

Before importance was given to the study of the beliefs that teachers hold, Rokeach (1968) provided a general definition of "belief" from a social-psychological perspective. He conceptualised belief as "any single proposition, conscious or unconscious, inferred from what a person says or does, capable of being preceded by the phrase 'I believe that…'" (p. 113). Rokeach based his understanding of belief on three assumptions: some beliefs are more intense (central) than others (peripheral); the more central a belief, the more resistant to change it is; and, changing a central belief has an effect on the rest of an individual's structure of beliefs. Rokeach (1968, p.2) calls this structure a "belief system" and characterises it as "having represented in it, in some organised psychological but not necessarily logical form, each and every one of a person's countless beliefs about physical and social reality". In Rokeach's (1968) view, a belief system is not only formed by beliefs, but also attitudes and values. I refer to these other constructs in section 3.2.3.

Although Rokeach's conceptualisation of belief did not emerge from educational research, it has been highly influential in the development of the field of teachers' beliefs (Pajares, 1992; Thompson, 1992). Drawing on Rokeach's contribution, Green (1971) elaborates on the notion of belief system with a special focus on the beliefs held by teachers. He proposes three dimensions to understand the organisation of beliefs. First, belief systems have a quasi-logical organisation. That is, every belief a person (or more specifically, a teacher) holds is connected to another belief either because it derives from this other belief or because it provides support for the existence of the other belief. In other words, Green classifies beliefs as "primary" or "derivative". Second, an individual holds beliefs at different degrees of intensity. Some beliefs are held with particular strength, are less open to questioning, and, therefore, more difficult to modify. Green refers to these types of beliefs as central or core beliefs, while peripheral beliefs are those that are more open to debate, weaker in intensity, and relatively easier to change (as

described by Rokeach above). Finally, under Green's third dimension of belief systems, he argues that an individual can hold contradictory central beliefs because different groups of beliefs are held in clusters that prevent the confrontation or cross-fertilisation of these beliefs. This means that a person may hold beliefs that can be regarded as incompatible without affecting the stability of their belief system. Green (1971, p.47) exemplifies this dimension by indicating that "one may praise the value of competition as an article of economic faith and support, at the same time, the necessity for cooperation as a fundamental demand of social ethics". What is relevant about Green's dimensions is that the organisation of a belief system is not simply dominated by what is believed, but more importantly, by how it is believed.

Rokeach's and Green's characterisation of belief systems have been recurrent in much of the literature of teachers' beliefs and teacher education (e.g.: Johnson, 1994; Richards and Lockhart, 1996; Phipps and Borg, 2009; Kumaravadivelu, 2012). For example, Richards and Lockhart (1996, p.30) point out that "[t]eachers' belief systems are founded on the goals, values, and beliefs teachers hold in relation to the content and process of teaching, and their understanding of the systems in which they work and their roles within it". Accordingly, Johnson (1994, p.451) argues that in order to change their beliefs, teachers need to "have opportunities to resolve conflicting images within their own belief systems". However, Fives and Buehl (2012) notice that even though the notion of belief system is widely accepted in the literature, most studies in the field explore beliefs individually and not as part of a system.

Even though the idea of a belief system seems consistent among researchers, the nature of teachers' beliefs remains unclear, due to the variety of definitions available. For example, Richardson (1996, p.103) defines them as "psychologically held understanding, premises, or propositions about the world that are held to be true". Pajares (1992, p.316) refers to them as "an individual's judgement of the truth or falsity of a proposition, a judgement that can only be inferred from a collective understanding of what human beings say, intend, and do". Similarly, M. Borg (2001, p.186) characterises belief as "a proposition which may be consciously or unconsciously held, is evaluative in that it is accepted as true by the individual and is therefore imbued with emotive commitment…[and] it serves as a guide to thought and behaviour". These definitions,

however, do not seem to recognise the influence of the social context where individuals interact, a factor that is taken up by researchers who adopt a sociocultural perspective to teachers' beliefs (e.g.: Johnson, 1994; Barahona, 2014; Borg, 2015). This issue is highlighted by Österholm (2010), who emphasises the need to take into account the perspective from which beliefs are understood, namely psychological or sociocultural, and argues that ignoring this distinction contributes to the current lack of consistency in the field. Therefore, before defining my own approach to teachers' beliefs, I consider relevant to explore their qualities and the reasons that make beliefs and belief systems interesting objects of study.

3.2.2   The characteristics and functions of teachers' beliefs

Previous research on teachers' beliefs has contributed to the identification of core characteristics of teachers' beliefs based on commonly agreed assumptions (Zheng, 2009). First, it is argued that beliefs cannot be directly measured or observed and, therefore, must be inferred (Kagan, 1992a; Pajares, 1992; Thompson, 1992; Erkmen, 2012; Borg, 2015). This implies that researchers may need to make beliefs explicit by eliciting them. What is more, teachers may be unaware of their complete belief system since beliefs can be held consciously or unconsciously (Fives and Buehl, 2012), and teachers may experience difficulties articulating them (Donaghue, 2003). In relation to this, Johnson (1994) points out that, in order to infer the beliefs that teachers hold, not only is it important to analyse what they openly express verbally, but also their intentions and behaviours.

Second, there is agreement in the literature that the earlier in life a belief is incorporated to a belief system, the more resistant to change it becomes (e.g.: Munby, 1982; Pajares, 1992; Johnson, 1994; Borg, 2003). This proposition is in line with Green's (1971) dimensions of the belief system described above. Accordingly, Nisbett and Ross (1980) point out that teachers are likely to build justifications that support their beliefs even when contradictory evidence is presented. Kumaravadivelu (2012) adds that due to the emotional attachment that teachers have regarding these kinds of beliefs, they may even go against logical reasoning. As a result, the most adaptable beliefs are those that are later incorporated in the belief system (Pajares, 1992; Hall, 2005).

Third, and closely connected to teacher education, there is evidence that teachers' beliefs are highly influenced by the teachers' own experiences as students (e.g.: Johnson, 1994; Golombek, 1998; Borg, 2003; Zheng, 2009). This is a phenomenon that Lortie (1975) calls "the apprenticeship of observation". It refers to the fact that pre-service teachers spend over ten thousand hours of classroom instruction observing and assessing their teachers before they join initial teacher education programmes. That is, a teacher's beliefs are shaped by his or her former teachers' behaviours and institutional codes of conduct. As a result, as Johnson and Golombek (2011, p.1) argue, new teachers "enter the profession with largely unarticulated, yet deeply ingrained, notions about what language is, how it is learned and how it should be taught". This characteristic of beliefs is relevant to understand the source of a teacher's beliefs since, in many cases, these beliefs may have been subconsciously acquired in their training through observation and replicating the views and behaviours of their trainers.

Along with these primary assumptions about teachers' beliefs, the importance of studying them relies on the functions that beliefs may have in connection with the activity of teaching. A number of researchers have argued that beliefs that teachers hold have relevance in their decision-making process (e.g.: Nisbett and Ross, 1980; Nespor, 1987; Pajares, 1992). In this respect, it is possible to identify in the teacher cognition literature three main functions that teachers' beliefs serve: they filter information; they frame problems and situations; and they act as guide for action (Fives and Buehl, 2012). I will briefly exemplify these functions below.

As filters, beliefs play an important role in the implementation of new curricula or other attempts to classroom innovation emerging from top-down processes (Breen *et al.*, 2001; Skott, 2015). For example, Yerrick *et al.* (1997), provide evidence of how the personal beliefs of a group of 8 science teachers acted as a filter when a new science education reform was implemented. The objective of the reform was to introduce dialoguing as a form of teacher facilitation. However, most of these teachers' beliefs about science education were more in line with a view of teaching as transmission of knowledge, and therefore, filtered out new information that was not in line with their original views. This example also implies that, in order to implement educational reforms successfully, reform agents should explore and understand the beliefs of those who will eventually put

changes into practice. Under this function, an exploration of a teacher's beliefs about English may provide evidence of how he or she perceives the nature of language and the goals attached to the teaching and learning of English.

As frameworks, beliefs are responsible for how teachers make sense of the world and, therefore, how they interpret and conceptualise tasks, situations and problems they face. Nespor (1987, p.324) argues that "the contexts and environments within which teachers work, and many of the problems they encounter, are ill-defined[3] and deeply engrained, and… beliefs are peculiarly suited for making sense of such contexts". Johnson (1994), for example, reports how pre-service ELT teachers' beliefs about good teaching practices emerging from past experiences (or "critical episodes") may have a positive or negative effect on how they see themselves as teachers. She argues that as these teachers had not been exposed to an alternative image of language teaching, they struggle to envision more student-centred practices. She also suggests that while some beliefs are particularly resistant to change (as discussed above), modifying those beliefs is even more difficult when teachers are provided with "very few alternative images of teachers and teaching to act as a model for their instructional practices" (p.449). Hence, if pre-service teachers of English are exposed to only one linguistic model, it may be likely that they reject a paradigm shift that they themselves have not experienced (or been instructed on).

Finally, it is argued that beliefs influence intentions and actions (Rokeach, 1968; Pajares, 1992; Hancock and Gallard, 2004; Fives and Buehl, 2012;2016). Accordingly, Bandura (1997) points out that our decisions, actions and emotions are guided by our beliefs rather than by what is socially understood as truth. However, Skott (2015) warns, "[i]ncongruities may be found, if the beliefs that guide action and are likely to be observed in instruction differ from the ones that filter and interpret information and are more readily accessible in research interviews". This characteristic of beliefs has attracted

---

[3] In Nespor's (1987) words, "ill-structured problems are problems that require people to go beyond the information contained in the problem instruction and use background knowledge or make guesses or assumptions in order to solve the problem" (p.324).

a large number of researchers interested in exploring the relationship between teachers' beliefs and their classroom practice. I will explore this issue in Section 3.3.3.

In sum, teachers' beliefs can be described as sets of convictions that teachers hold about the nature of their practice. They may be implicit or explicit; they sometimes carry an emotional load; and are formed through experience in their social world. In addition, teachers' beliefs work as a filter of new information, they act as a frame through which teachers see the world, and they predispose intention and action. After having explored the nature, characteristics and functions of beliefs, it is relevant to examine how this construct is different from (or interacts with) other concepts related to teachers' mental processes.

3.2.3   Beliefs, knowledge and attitudes

There is little discussion in the teachers' beliefs literature about how beliefs are different from other related cognitive constructs (Borg, 2015). Most of this work has focused on establishing the differences between belief and knowledge, whereas differences between the study of beliefs and the study of attitudes do not seem to be thoroughly clarified. Confusion exists because some researchers have tried to separate these concepts, while others understand them as intertwined and impossible to isolate from one another. Even so, some scholars identify divisions even within these concepts. In this section, I attempt to address this conceptual gap in order to frame my understanding of beliefs for the purpose of this thesis.

One of the most problematic factors in defining beliefs relies on its relationship with the concept of knowledge (Pajares, 1992; Thompson, 1992; Richardson, 1996; Zheng, 2009;2015). It is possible to find examples in the literature that see these two constructs as related (e.g.: Fang, 1996), different (e.g.: Richardson, 1996), or even the same (e.g.: Clandinin and Connelly, 1987). In cognitive psychology, for example, knowledge is generally understood as "objective, factual information that has been scrutinized and agreed upon either publicly or within a community of scholars" (Ennis, 1994, p.164). That is, knowledge has in itself a component of accepted truth that is verified, accepted, and shared by a larger group of people. Considering this, Thompson (1992, p.130) argues that

"beliefs, on the other hand, are often held or justified for reasons that do not meet that criteria, and, thus, are characterized by a lack of agreement over how they are to be evaluated or judged." In this respect, Nespor (1987), drawing on Abelson (1979), suggests that beliefs, contrary to knowledge: are personal and unique to each individual; often represent an alternative or ideal reality; carry an evaluative and emotional loading; and, are stored in episodic memory (with past personal experiences and events). In this view, knowledge and beliefs belong to two different cognitive systems.

Other scholars, however, see knowledge and beliefs as inseparable due to their intertwined nature (e.g.: Pajares, 1992; Calderhead, 1995). For example, Clandinin and Connelly (1987, p.488) suggest that, although it is possible to characterise differences between the two constructs, they "are simply different words naming the same thing" when referring to a teacher's mental life. Similarly, Pajares (1992, p.309) found it "difficult to pinpoint where knowledge ended and belief began", but argues that it is the affective, evaluative and experiential nature of beliefs that are responsible for how teachers filter and frame what they are exposed to. Furthermore, Borg (2003) suggests that when studying knowledge about subject matter, it seems impossible to separate the notion of beliefs from such knowledge.

Some researchers have even characterised beliefs as a type of knowledge. Kagan (1992a, p.65), for example, proposes an understanding of teachers' beliefs as a "form of personal knowledge" and argues that "most of a teacher's professional knowledge can be regarded more accurately as belief" (p.73). Conversely, others like Rokeach (1968) see knowledge as a component of a belief since, he argues, there is a cognitive component representing a person's knowledge in every organisation of beliefs. These examples of different views reflect the lack of consensus in defining cognitive constructs and the contributions from different fields of enquiry in ways that may even contradict each other (Furinghetti and Pehkonen, 2003).

Despite all these efforts to distinguish beliefs from knowledge, these differences only remain at the epistemological level when exploring these two constructs in empirical research. For example, in his study of teachers' interpretations of their own teaching, Woods (1996) found difficulties in distinguishing in his data when teachers were referring

to their beliefs or to their knowledge because "[t]heir 'use' of knowledge in their decision-making process did not seem to be qualitatively different from their 'use' of beliefs". In this respect, there is agreement in the teachers' beliefs literature that the distinction between these two constructs is problematic since there are no clear-cut boundaries between them (e.g.: Pajares, 1992; Verloop *et al.*, 2001; Borg, 2003), and even more so when beliefs and knowledge are explored for empirical research (Fives and Buehl, 2012). Similarly, Meijer *et al.* (2001) agree that knowledge and beliefs are almost impossible to separate. However, they argue, "beliefs are seen roughly as referring to personal values, attitudes, or ideologies, and knowledge to a teachers' more factual proposition" (p.172). This raises the question of how beliefs relate to, interact, or overlap with other – sometimes even more related – concepts of interest for educational researchers, such as attitudes and ideologies.

So far, I have referred to attitudes as part of an individual's belief system as described by Rokeach (1968). He defines an attitude as "a relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or situation predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner" (p.112). In addition, he argues that those beliefs that form attitudes have a cognitive component (what the individual believes is true), an affective component (disposition about the object of belief), and a behavioural component (a determination for action). Accordingly, Pajares (1992) argues that "[w]hen clusters of beliefs are organized around an object or situation and predisposed to action, this holistic organization becomes an attitude". This view reflects a transformative process of beliefs into attitudes that is enacted by contextual and psychological factors.

This duality of beliefs as attitudes (or vice versa) is even more difficult to separate. Eisenhart *et al.* (1988, p.54), for example, reviewed the teachers' beliefs literature under the assumption that a belief was "an attitude consistently applied to an activity". There are numerous examples in the teachers' beliefs literature of studies on the beliefs and attitudes of teachers without explicitly stating the main differences between them or using them interchangeably (e.g.: Hall, 2005; Young and Sachdev, 2011; Chun, 2014). In this respect, Richardson (1996) suggests that there is a widespread assumption that beliefs refer to cognitive structures while attitudes are associated with affective and evaluative processes. She observes, however, that a change of research paradigm from a

focus on the affective to a focus on the cognitive has contributed to confusion in defining the boundaries of these concepts.

Again, looking for clear-cut theoretical differences between these two constructs can be a daunting undertaking. Acknowledging this, some researchers have proposed more comprehensive approaches to the study of teachers' beliefs, incorporating different, overlapping mental processes involved in a teacher's decision-making and classroom practices, namely "BAK" – an integration of beliefs, assumptions and knowledge (see Woods, 1996). More recently, Borg (2015, p.1) gathers all these complex mental processes in one multi-dimensional term to refer to "what language teachers think, know, and believe": teacher cognition. In view of the close relationship and unbounded nature of the constructs mentioned above, I also adopt an inclusive approach to teachers' mental processes under the umbrella term "teachers' beliefs". By doing this, I adopt the assumption that the intricate mental processes that are involved in a teacher's views, decisions and actions are interconnected in a dynamic way, co-exist in his or her belief system, and are made manifest in different ways.

Finally, another concept that has been related to beliefs and belief systems in the literature is the notion of ideology. I have already explored the – also blurred – concept of ideology and, more specifically, the theory of language ideologies in Chapter 2. Many scholars researching teacher cognition include ideologies as part of a teacher's belief system (e.g.: Rokeach, 1968; Pajares, 1992; Zheng, 2015). I agree in part with this notion since ideologies, once adopted by an individual, become beliefs that act as filters, frames and guides. However, (language) ideologies, as opposed to beliefs, are rooted in people's social practices (Kroskrity, 2010; Razfar, 2012). This is not to say that beliefs are only individual, intra-psychological phenomena. In fact, I understand beliefs as being socially constructed (Woods, 2003) and situated in context, content and person (Kagan, 1992a). What I argue here is that ideologies, and specifically language ideologies, constitute shared belief systems that have strong effects on how people perceive and use language and language varieties while maintaining or challenging social structures by influencing and shaping the beliefs that individuals hold. That is, a focus on language ideologies can help explain tensions and contradictions in an individual's and shared belief system, while exploring teachers' beliefs as they are enacted in practice and reflection.

Having conceptualised the concept of beliefs, their characteristics, and their relationships with other cognitive constructs in the study of teachers' mental lives, I now turn to discuss how researchers have explored the beliefs of teachers of English, especially in relation to English as subject matter, linguistic models, and the cultural and linguistic diversity of the language. I will also explore the relationship between teachers' beliefs and classroom practices.

3.3   English teachers' beliefs

Educational researchers have been interested in the beliefs of teachers of all subject matters. It seems that the fields most commonly studied are those of mathematics, science and (second) language education. The focus of research also varies according to subject and even more within subjects. Traditionally, researchers have investigated teachers' beliefs about learners and learning, teaching, their subject matter, becoming a teacher, and the self as teacher (Calderhead, 1995). In the case of ELT, Borg (2015) points out that most of the studies of teachers' beliefs started to appear 20 years ago and have included contexts in which English is taught as a first, second and a foreign language. He adds that, since its origin, research on language teacher cognition has produced a vast amount of work that positions itself as a field of enquiry that is solid but also "diverse, with little evidence of replication or programmatic approaches to research whereby a particular theme or methodological approach is engaged within a sustained manner by different researchers" (p. 52).

However, considering the complexity of teachers' belief systems as well as the differences in contexts where they can be explored, it is no surprise that researchers approach them from a variety of perspectives, under diverse conditions, and with different purposes. For example, some studies have paid attention to the beliefs of pre-service English teachers (e.g.: Johnson, 1994; Richardson, 2003; Barahona, 2014) while others focus on in-service teachers (e.g.: Breen *et al.*, 2001; Farrell and Lim, 2005; Zheng, 2015). In addition, researchers have also examined the influence of teacher education programmes on the beliefs of trainee (e.g.: Kagan, 1992a) and experienced English teachers (e.g.: Borg, 2011).

In the remaining part of this section, I explore some of the contributions of previous studies on English teachers' beliefs, with a special focus on beliefs about the impact of the global spread of English on their teaching. Later, I discuss the relationship between teachers' espoused beliefs and classroom practices. Finally, I attempt to explore the extent to which beliefs about the implications of the global use of English shape teachers' decisions and practices.

3.3.1 English teachers' beliefs about English

A great deal of scholarly research on English teachers' beliefs has focused on the cognition that teachers have about their subject matter. Borg (2015) points out that most of this work has paid attention to beliefs about grammar teaching and literacy instruction, while a few researchers have explored other areas such as beliefs about the use of technology, error correction and vocabulary instruction. In addition, there is a growing body of research on teachers' beliefs regarding the teaching of pronunciation (e.g.: Sifakis and Sougari, 2005; Thomson, 2013), while there is currently an interest in issues related to the teaching of English as an international lingua franca (e.g.: Dewey, 2012; Blair, 2015). In this respect, findings from ELF research "have major implications for a multitude of common beliefs and assumptions about what is sanctioned as good practice by the profession" (Jenkins *et al.*, 2011, p.304-5).

However, little attention has been paid to how English teachers and, especially English teacher trainers, rationalise the English that they teach from a teachers' beliefs perspective. Most of the work in this area falls into the field of language attitudes (e.g.: Timmis, 2002; Murray, 2003; Kaur, 2014) and has, therefore, explored the preferences and evaluations that teachers have in relation to pronunciation models for ELT, cultural references, and the native/non-native divide. For example, Timmis (2002) investigated the attitudes of teachers and students from about 45 countries in relation to norms in ELT. He employed two questionnaires – one for teachers and one for students – and follow-up interviews to a few participants in order to explore their views in relation to pronunciation and grammatical norms. Among the findings, Timmis's study suggests that the teachers and students who participated in his study had slightly different views regarding conformity to ENL models. For instance, the teachers showed less attachment

to ENL norms in relation to the students. Moreover, this study reveals that native-speaker English teachers (NESETs) were moving away from ENL models faster than NNESETs. According to Jenkins (2007, p.95) this is "one of the first ELF attitudes studies 'proper' to be published and one that is frequently cited in other studies and discussions". Interestingly, Timmis (2002) does not make explicit reference to ELF as a phenomenon, neither as a context, nor as a field of enquiry but does use concepts such as "English as an international language", "international communication", and "accented international intelligibility" instead.

A more recent study is Young and Walsh (2010). Like Timmis (2002), the authors explored teachers' beliefs about the usefulness and appropriateness of different models for ELT (Native Speaker/English as an International Language – English as a Lingua Franca) with participants from a diverse range of countries. Using participant preparation[4] and focus groups, Young and Walsh (2010) investigated the beliefs and attitudes of 26 teachers undertaking postgraduate studies in a UK university, while 2 representatives of each group (6 in total) where interviewed individually. These researchers were particularly interested in how teachers conceptualised the English they learned, the English they might teach after their in-service training, the best model to learn in their country, and the English that their students will want to learn. The results revealed that most of the participant teachers claimed that EIL/EFL was interesting as a concept but lacked pedagogical implications, while they claimed to teach some form of "standard English" associated with either British English (BrE) or American English (AmE). Interestingly, the authors conclude that most of these teachers have adopted "a need to believe in a 'standard' form of the language… even when participants acknowledged that it does not really correspond to the reality of Englishes which are in use worldwide" (p. 135). Although this study provides a more qualitative account of the preferences and experiences that English teachers have in relation to the global spread of English and its impact on ELT, little is mentioned about the bases for their beliefs and attitudes. Studies

---

[4] This method basically consists of asking participants to read a series of documents before an interview or focus group.

like Timmis (2002) and Young and Walsh (2010) can be useful to reveal teachers' explicit (espoused) beliefs about the sociolinguistic reality of English. However, a more in-depth focus on the perhaps implicit beliefs that can be made manifest in the teachers' classroom practices is needed.

Jenkins's (2007) investigation of attitudes and beliefs about ELF accents remains one of the most influential studies in this area. She used questionnaires to elicit the views of 326 teachers of English including participants from 12 expanding circle countries and included NES teachers of English enrolled in professional development programmes in the UK. Her objective was to explore how teachers perceived ELF accents in relation to NES accents of English. Her findings suggest that NNES teachers of English have a strong attachment to NES English accents (especially AmE and BrE) because of their perceived purity, pleasantness, and even suitability for international communication while NNES accents are generally considered to be deficient or incorrect. More importantly, she identifies tensions in the "deeply entrenched and sometimes contradictory attitudes and beliefs" (p. 206) that the participant teachers revealed and points out that these views "point to the existence of more entrenched and ideologically influenced attitudes which, in turn, may explain the respondents' generally negative perceptions of ELF – and possibly all NNES English – accents" (p. 179). Thus, the relevance of Jenkins' (2007) study is not only in uncovering the linguistic preferences of NNES teachers of English, but also she offers a more in-depth exploration of the participants' beliefs systems as a follow-up part of her investigation.

For the second part of Jenkins' (2007) study, 17 NNESTs were subject to semi-structured interviews in order to investigate issues of their identity as users of English (such as desirability of NES membership and their self-image as L2 users). She found that most teachers had a strong desire to project a NES identity in their use of English as teachers while an association of their L1 and their English accents was also related to a favourable attachment. This ambivalence reveals contradictions in these teachers' belief systems that prevent NNES teachers – especially in the expanding circle – from adopting an ELF perspective in their teaching due to the positive characteristics associated with ENL forms of English. Interestingly, the data showed similarities across NNES teachers despite their differences in L1 and cultural backgrounds.

In a more context-specific study, Sifakis and Sougari (2010) explored the beliefs of Greek teachers about integrating 'Global English' in the classroom. The authors argue that there are a number of factors that may influence teachers' beliefs, which are not necessarily connected to actual practices. In this respect, they refer to subjective and objective hindrances that keep them from integrating ELF-oriented practices in their teaching. They indicate that, on the one hand, "[s]ubjective hindrances include issues of awareness of the global English situation and refer to their understanding or misunderstanding of it and their willingness to appreciate it and approach the concerns it raises with an open mind" (p. 304). On the other hand, objective hindrances refer to specific situations conditioned by the teachers' working context that are beyond their control, such as textbooks, curricula, evaluations and external pressures and expectations.

In their study, Sifakis and Sougari (2010) surveyed 388 school English teachers using quantitative (closed-ended questionnaire) and qualitative methods (open-ended questionnaire). The quantitative findings revealed that age group, years of experience and gender did have an impact on shaping the beliefs of these Greek teachers. For example, female participants gave more importance to knowledge about NES culture than male teachers, while younger teachers were more inclined to incorporate cultural aspects of outer circle cultures in their teaching. Objective hindrances emerging from the data are not reported in this study since the authors only reported data obtained through quantitative methods. The relevance of Sifakis and Sougari's study lies in the fact that they attempted to understand the underlying reasons for these teachers' beliefs in a self-reported manner. They indicate that "when it comes to asking English teachers their views on Global English, it is advisable to distinguish between what they openly claim and what they actually understand and practise" (p. 303). However, not considering the actual classroom practices of teachers in their research design seems to contradict the above statement.

I argue here that the study of teachers' belief systems, without a closer focus on cognition and practices in a more integrated way, fails to capture the underlying reasons behind their preferences, and more importantly, ignores how these views are reinforced and challenged in the teaching of English. As mentioned above, most work on teacher cognition has paid attention to the belief systems of trainee teachers, while there is also a

growing body of research interested in the views of in-service teachers. However, research on the beliefs and practices of English teacher trainers is still limited and, similarly, in-depth studies of ELT programmes as a collective body of teachers remain almost non-existent.

Very few studies have provided insights on how an exploration of espoused beliefs and practices can help understand the impact of the sociolinguistic reality of English on teacher training programmes and English teacher trainers. Inal and Özdemir (2015), for example, examined the perceptions of 300 teachers at all levels (pre-service, in-service, and teacher trainers) regarding the concept of ELF and the relevance of incorporating it into teacher education programmes in Turkey. In this study, the researchers employed a mixed methods results approach; however, they only report the findings obtained through quantitative data collection instruments[5]. Among their findings, the authors report that pre-service teachers are: more willing to incorporate ELF-related issues in ELT programmes; more open to question the current normative approach to ELT; and more critical regarding the alleged superiority of NESETs over NNESETs. On the other hand, teacher educators' beliefs were more in line with ideas of conformity to some sort of British or American standard and the development of grammatical proficiency, but they did emphasise the need to familiarise their students with other varieties. The relevance of Inal and Özdemir (2015) is that they consider the views of academics in ELT departments regarding the current sociolinguistic reality of English. What is more, they carried out this study in a context where English does not have a colonial history or official status (like Chile). However, as Kane *et al.* (2002, p.177) point out, "research that examines only what university teachers say about their practice and does not directly observe what they do is at risk of telling half the story".

I am particularly interested in how teacher trainers reflect on the linguistic instruction that they give to their trainees, how they rationalise the English they teach, and how they

---

[5] According to my understanding, findings emerging from their qualitative data have not been yet published.

translate these views into practice. Of special interest are the views of English teacher educators, as they are the actual model of expertise that pre-service teachers are exposed to. It is therefore relevant to explore whether and how teacher education programmes for ELT can exert an influence on the beliefs of trainee teachers.

3.3.2   The impact of teacher education on teachers' beliefs

Most of the work on English teachers' beliefs has focused on the mental lives of pre-service teachers. Borg (2015) identifies two main perspectives for this endeavour: describing the beliefs that student teachers hold during their training, and evaluating the impact of teacher training programmes on the belief systems of pre-service teachers. Although I acknowledge the importance of the former area of interest, for the purpose of this thesis I focus my discussion on the latter because of the special characteristics of my context of study. That is, pre-service English teachers at Chilean universities spend at least 4 years training to become qualified teachers, and therefore, evidence of the impact of initial teacher education programmes on teachers' beliefs can prove useful for comparative analysis. In this respect, Borg (2015), warns that what is understood as teacher education programmes in the literature ranges from intensive short courses (such as CELTA), one-year courses (such as MA programmes), to longer undergraduate courses, and this variable is likely to influence the findings of research.

There has been extensive debate on the effect of teacher education programmes on the acquisition or change of beliefs. On the one hand, some scholars have indicated that teacher education programmes have little impact on the beliefs of newly qualified teachers (e.g.: Peacock, 1999; Urmston, 2003). For instance, in a review of 40 studies that focused on teachers' cognition, Kagan (1992b) concluded that initial teacher education generally fails to adequately influence the preconceptions of pre-service teachers. He adds that "[c]andidates tend to use the information provided in coursework to confirm rather than to confront and correct their pre-existing beliefs" (p.154). Similarly, Richardson (1996) argues that pre-service teachers' beliefs are mostly shaped by their classroom experience as learners – what Lortie (1975) calls the apprenticeship of observation – and, therefore, the influence of teacher education programmes remains weak. In this respect, M. Borg (2004, p.275) suggests that "the net result of this highly

influential period of observation is that teacher education courses are said by many to have a weak effect on student teachers".

On the other hand, some studies reveal a positive impact of teacher education programmes on teachers' belief systems. Cabaroglu and Roberts (2000), for example, provide evidence of change in 19 out of 20 student teachers enrolled in a 1-year programme. By using a sequence of three interviews, the authors focused on the process of belief development rather than the content of the beliefs. Among their findings, they suggest that "beliefs can be 'flexible' and that pre-existing beliefs do develop… [and this] development is highly variable between individuals" (p.392). In another study, Richards *et al.* (1996) studied the effect of a CELTA course on 5 teachers and reported changes in aspects such as their self-image as teachers, the way they evaluated their own teaching, and their knowledge of professional discourse.

Several problems arise when making comparisons between different findings related to the impact of teacher education on teachers' beliefs. As mentioned above, the nature of teacher education programmes varies across studies. In addition, the use of different instruments for the exploration of beliefs reveals inconsistencies in what counts as evidence. Peacock (1999; 2001), for example, employed Horwitz's (1985) Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (BALLI, a quantitative self-report questionnaire) at different stages of a 3-year ESL undergraduate course in Hong Kong. In the same country, Urmston (2003) applied a questionnaire at the beginning and at the end of a 3-year course. He concluded that despite being "exposed to a combination of innovative, communicative and student-centred ideologies and methodologies based on the underlying philosophy of the course", these pre-service teachers "come to realise that there is a conflict between what the… course tries to impress on them and what they know through experience". This approach to understanding pre-service teachers' beliefs, however, assumes that individuals are able to consciously express their beliefs, restricts the multiplicity of beliefs in an individual's belief system to a set of pre-determined responses, and ignores that some beliefs are more implicit than others. Furthermore, the impact of teacher education on teachers' beliefs reported in these studies does not relate to changes in practice, and simply identifying cognitive changes does not necessarily imply behavioural changes (Borg, 2015).

3.3.3 Correspondence (or non-correspondence) between beliefs and practices

Having considered the beliefs that English teachers hold in relation to the global dimension of English and the impact of teacher education programmes on teachers' beliefs, I now move on to explore the extent to which espoused beliefs are connected to actual classroom practices. As discussed above, from a psychological perspective, beliefs are able to guide decision-making and action. For this reason, researchers have explored the relationship – or lack of it – between teachers' espoused beliefs and teaching practices. Previous studies have sought for evidence of this relationship in the practices of pre-service (e.g.: Johnson, 1994) and in-service second language teachers (e.g.: Breen *et al.*, 2001). However, findings emerging from this kind of research seem to be divided between those that provide evidence of a positive relationship between teachers' espoused beliefs and their practices, and those who conclude that there exist incongruities between them.

An example of consistency between language teachers' beliefs and practices is provided by Johnson (1992). She studied the beliefs of 3 ESL teachers in relation to observed practices in teaching literacy to NNES in New York and found that those teachers that have a clear notion of their theoretical beliefs show consistency with their literacy instruction practices. In a different setting, Farrell and Kun (2008) investigated the beliefs of 3 Singaporean ESL teachers about the use of Singlish in the classroom in the context of implementing a governmental language policy to promote the use of 'good' English among the population. Using classroom observations and semi-structured interviews, the researchers found that most of the practices of these teachers were in line with their espoused beliefs. That is, the teachers rarely corrected their students' use of English, supporting the belief that Singlish was acceptable in classroom situations, despite external pressures. Similarly, Phipps and Borg (2009) highlight a positive correspondence between the beliefs of 3 experienced English teachers and their grammar instruction practices. The authors employed multiple qualitative methods (semi-structured interviews, observations, stimulated recall) over a period of 18 months; among their findings, however, they also report 'tensions' between beliefs and practice that can be attributed to contextual factors. Interestingly, it is possible to observe that in most studies that report a positive relation between beliefs and practices, it is the experienced

teachers who seemed to be more aligned with their own personal theories in their pedagogical actions (Breen *et al.*, 2001; Basturkmen, 2012).

A similar number of studies report limited or lack of relationship. Farrell and Lim (2005), for example, explored the beliefs about grammar instruction of two experienced English teachers in Singapore and compared them to their actual classroom practices. The authors used interviews, classroom observations, and students' written work samples to make comparisons between the teachers' explicit rationalisations of grammar teaching and their classroom practices, and found that although teachers were enthusiastic about alternative teaching styles for grammar instruction, they continued using traditional methods. In addition, Farrell and Lim (ibid., p.10) suggest that the teachers "were not consciously aware of their classroom practices…so they had no way of comparing their beliefs and classroom practices". In the same manner, Li (2013) researched beliefs about communicative abilities of one experienced English teacher in China using semi-structured interviews, recordings of classroom interactions and stimulated recall. The findings of this study suggest that "[t]here is no strict one-to-one relationship between espoused theories and classroom practice" (ibid., p.185) due to "the complex and context-sensitive nature" of this relationship (p.188).

Researchers have attributed this lack of correspondence to a variety of factors. In a review of 16 studies (mostly doctoral theses), Basturkmen (2012) found agreement that contextual factors mediate between espoused beliefs and practices. For example, Lee (2008) studied the relationship between writing feedback and the beliefs that guide the marking criteria of 26 teachers in Hong Kong and concluded that external factors such as the school's evaluation policy, the strong examination-oriented culture of the country's educational system, and lack of specific training in marking had an impact on the teachers' behaviours. Similarly, Li (2013, p.186) argues that classroom conditions play an important role in a teacher's decision making and interactions, and therefore, "teachers' theories are conceptualised in a given environment and contextualised by this environment". In this respect, Fives and Buehl (2012, p. 488) suggest that researchers should "consider the larger context in which the teacher is situated as well as the multiple aspects of the teacher's belief system that may impinge on which beliefs are enacted at particular moments". For this reason, there is agreement in the teachers' beliefs

literature that researchers should consider potential factors and constraints that may affect the practice of teachers (e.g.: Fang, 1996; Fives and Buehl, 2012; Borg, 2015).

Moreover, methodological issues in the study of the relationship between teachers' mental processes and pedagogical performance have also been addressed as a possible cause of mismatch (Fives and Buehl, 2012). That is, some studies rely on the use of quantitative methods based on predefined beliefs that participants are supposed to align to, "which may obfuscate the complexity in the belief-practice relationship" (ibid., p. 481). However, Basturkmen (2012) also found evidence of incongruences in case studies that employed mostly qualitative methods.

As evidence emerging from studies on the "belief-practice quandary" – as Skott (2015) puts it – shows, lack of a direct relationship between teachers' espoused beliefs and their practices does not necessarily indicate that teachers are not able to relate these two processes. On the contrary, in line with Fives and Buehl (2012), I understand practices as beliefs-in-action and, hence, examining teachers' behaviours in detail can reveal beliefs that teachers are perhaps unable to articulate in conversation. As these beliefs-in-action represent the more implicit nature of teachers' beliefs, exploring teaching practices as a manifestation of beliefs, along with an elicitation of their understanding of the global spread and diversity of English, can help to uncover language ideologies that operate in the training of future English teachers.

3.4   Summary

This chapter discussed the field of teachers' beliefs starting from the concept of belief drawn from social-psychological theory. In simple words, a belief is a proposition that a person holds that is accepted as true. From this perspective, beliefs coexist with attitudes and values in a belief system and are formed through socialisation. Educational researchers and applied linguists have drawn attention to the beliefs that teachers hold regarding a variety of issues ranging from beliefs about teaching and their subject matter to beliefs about their students. In general, teacher beliefs are a set of implicit or explicit convictions about the nature of their practice. They develop through social practice, may carry an emotional load which makes them resistant to change, and can be explicit or

implicitly held. In practice, they filter the relevance of new information; they frame how teachers understand different scenarios; and act as a guide for action. Although the concept of belief overlaps with other cognitive constructs such as knowledge, attitudes and values, researchers have provided evidence that separating these mental processes in practice does not result in accurate division of elicited data (e.g.: Woods, 1996), and it is therefore advisable to group them under the umbrella term "teachers' beliefs".

A great deal of research on teachers' beliefs has focused on the cognition of English teachers, with special attention to pre-service teachers. Some of the most researched areas are beliefs about grammar instruction and second language literacy (Borg, 2015). In relation to the current role of English as a global lingua franca, most studies that explore teachers' views adopt a language attitudes perspective and few studies explore teachers' beliefs about this issue considering their classroom practices in expanding circle contexts. In the same way, little attention has been paid to the beliefs of teacher educators in ELT programmes. Understanding these teachers' beliefs and how those beliefs respond to and interact with the context that the teachers work in can help reveal language ideologies that these programmes promote, resist or may be unaware of.

Chapter 4   **Methodology**

4.1   **Introduction**

This chapter presents current approaches and methods for the study of language ideologies and teachers' beliefs, and offers a rationale for the methodology used in this study. Firstly, I discuss methodological trends in the study of teachers' beliefs and language ideologies in an attempt to explore how these two fields can complement each other for the purpose of this thesis. Secondly, the research questions that guide this study are once again illustrated. Thirdly, I provide the foundations for the research design of this study as well as describing and justifying the different data collection methods employed. After that, I present the rationale for the choice of participants in the case study, along with a description of my role as a researcher. After that, I present the rationale for choosing thematic analysis as a suitable analytical method for this study and I provide a discussion of the different strategies that supported this analysis at each stage. Finally, I comment on the ethical implications of this study.

4.2   **Approaches to the study of teachers' beliefs**

Different research designs have been used for the study of teachers' beliefs, including qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods (Borg, 2015). Early studies on teachers' beliefs relied on the use of quantitative methods such as questionnaires, Likert scales, multiple-choice-type questions, and surveys that revealed teachers' espoused beliefs about a broad range of topics (Barcelos and Kalaja, 2011). However, according to Kane *et al.* (2002, p.197), overreliance on reports from teachers without a triangulation of methods has resulted in many studies falling "prey to a self-fulfilling prophecy". That is to say, the findings are biased by the researchers' own expectations for the participants. For this reason, they emphasise, it is relevant to make explicit the theories and assumptions that underpin research on teachers' beliefs. In this respect, Fang (1996) had previously indicated that the main problem with these instruments is that they reflect what teachers would hypothetically do in specific scenarios and not necessarily what they would actually do in those situations. In line with this criticism, Borg (2015, p.329) considers that "the

exclusive use of self-report instruments… implies that beliefs can be articulated and rated against predefined propositional statements and understood without direct reference to actual instructional practices". This explains why nowadays it is more common to explore teachers' beliefs by incorporating multiple data collection methods.

In recent years, there has been a considerable increase in the number of researchers employing qualitative research methods in the study of teachers' beliefs (Song, 2015). Olafson *et al.* (2011) explored a variety of academic databases (Academic Search Premier, ERIC, PsychArticles, PsychInfo, among others) and peer-reviewed articles written in English under the terms "teacher", "belief" and "qualitative", seeking for empirical studies on teachers' beliefs that used qualitative methods in their design. The result was 112 relevant articles that were classified under a set of criteria that included participants, content area and context, nature of beliefs, methodology, data sources, use of methodological references, findings, and trustworthiness. Following Creswell's (2013) criteria of methodological approaches, Olafson et al. (2011) revealed that case studies are the most used qualitative approach for the study of teachers' beliefs. Other approaches include phenomenology, grounded theory, narrative research, ethnographies, action research, self-study, and general qualitative methodology. However, the authors point out that most of the available literature on teachers' beliefs fails to make reference to the methodological approaches employed in these studies. A potential reason for this, they add, is the word count restrictions that are common in specialised journals.

Fives and Buehl (2012) suggest that the choice of research methods in the study of teachers' beliefs depends on how the nature of beliefs is understood. That is to say, researchers who assume beliefs to be explicit are likely to use methods that ask teachers directly what their beliefs are. Elicitation techniques such as interviews (e.g., Basturkmen *et al.*, 2004), stimulated recalls (e.g., Golombek, 1998), and reflective journals (e.g., Johnson, 1994) have been the preferred methods in this respect. On the other hand, scholars who consider beliefs to be implicit prefer to explore teachers' beliefs in classroom practice through observation techniques (Song, 2015). However, Borg (2015, p.289) warns, "[o]bservation, on its own, … provides an inadequate basis for the study of what teachers think, know and believe" and recommends complementing this method with other sources (such as interviews or self-reported data) in order to compare stated

beliefs and actual practices. In this thesis, I operate under the assumption that teachers hold beliefs that can be explicit and implicit and, therefore, I rely on methods that are able to provide evidence of both views, while eliciting data that can help explore the language ideologies that underlie these beliefs.

4.3 Approaches to the study of language ideologies

As mentioned in Chapter 2, the field of language ideology does not have a core literature or specific research methods associated with it, due to the relatively new nature of the field and the diversity of disciplines from which language ideology research can be approached. Researchers from different fields of enquiry are likely to use research methods that suit their scholarly traditions to investigate language ideologies in specific contexts (McGroarty, 2010). However, it is possible to observe trends in the methodological design of studies that explore ideological tensions in language use and choice, especially in educational contexts. Here I comment on some of these methods and their suitability for this study.

In the early days of language ideology research, Woolard and Schieffelin (1994) identified two main approaches to the study of language ideology that would guide the choice of methods and what counts as data, namely metalinguistic and behavioural approaches. That is to say, some researchers have highlighted the need to focus on how ideologies of language are explicitly discussed (e.g., Silverstein, 1979), while others acknowledge the implicitness of language ideologies and emphasise that they are best explored in practice (e.g., Gal, 1992). Nowadays, however, these approaches seem to be complementary rather than dichotomic, as scholars are incorporating (and mixing) different research methods to the study of language ideology.

Quantitative and qualitative methods have been used in the study of language ideologies (Ajsic and McGroarty, 2015). McGroarty (2010) reports that the most common – although not widely preferred – quantitative methods for the study of language ideologies are surveys and corpus-based studies. On the one hand, surveys that require participants to react numerically to a set of statements or questions have often been associated with social psychological studies of language attitudes. Although language attitudes and

language ideologies represent different approaches to the study of language in society, they overlap in certain aspects because "both streams of investigation help to identify the many influences on language use and language learning, core concerns for teachers" (ibid., p.10). On the other hand, some researchers have used corpora in order to identify the frequency and distribution of concepts, especially in newspapers, so as to explore the presence of language ideologies in contexts other than educational settings (Ajsic and McGroarty, 2015). However, as McGroarty (2010, p.17) points out, these methods fail to explain "the texture of interactions between individual language users and speakers, between individuals in different social positions, or between language users and texts", phenomena that can be best explored with qualitative methods.

Studies that explore language ideologies in educational contexts have incorporated a variety of qualitative research methods. Case studies and ethnographies that incorporate classroom observations, interviews, and other complementary sources are commonly the preferred methods to explore language ideologies in practice. Jaffe (2009), for example, used ethnographic observations and recordings, interviews, and experimental data to investigate the production and reproduction of language ideologies in a bilingual school in Corsica. Similarly, Palmer (2011) combined participant observation with open-ended interviews to explore conflicting language ideologies that teachers reflect and reinforce in a bilingual programme at a US school. Razfar (2005) used semi-structured interviews, video-recordings of classroom activities and surveys to investigate the language ideologies evidenced in repair practices (the correction of one's speech) in the classrooms of two ESL teachers. In addition, reviews of relevant documents, such as curricular materials, have helped to provide evidence of the promotion of certain language ideologies. For instance, Seargeant (2009), in his exploration of ideologies that shape how English is perceived in Japan, analysed official policy and pedagogic documents, among other objects of analysis, in order to investigate the underlying reasons for the status of English and ELT in that country. In this respect, McGroarty (2010) observes that in language ideology research, documents can be explored with a focus on curricular content, the language used in the documents, or a combination of the two.

In this thesis, I argue that a direct exploration of teachers' beliefs can provide evidence of dominant language ideologies that guide teachers' orientations towards specific models

and norms of the English language and, therefore, may encourage teachers to favour the language choice and use of hegemonic social and linguistic groups. What is more, as language ideologies can also be revealed in instructional practices (Olivo, 2003) and are likely to extend their influence to model the aims of educational institutions (Seargeant, 2009), it becomes relevant to investigate how teachers produce, reproduce, or resist specific language ideologies in their classrooms and how ELT programmes, as ideological sites, respond to the current global dimension of English. Considering this, I will now once again present the research questions that guide this thesis and the methods that I used to gather relevant data to answer them.

4.4   Research questions

This thesis aims to answer the following research questions:

1. How and to what extent are ELT training programmes in Chilean universities addressing the global spread of English?

2. What are the beliefs of teacher educators from these universities regarding the English that is taught and promoted in such ELT programmes?

3. What language ideologies underpin these beliefs?

4.5   Research design

In this section, I explain the rationale for the choice of methods used in the collection of data to answer the research questions outlined in Section 4.4. As I discuss below, I employed a collective case study design consisting of semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and an analysis of relevant documents.

4.5.1   Case study

As pointed out in Section 4.2, case studies have been the most widely used approach to the study of teachers' beliefs in recent years. They have also been a dominant approach

to qualitative research in education (Duff, 2008) and a major trend in applied linguistics (Hood, 2009). Case study research has its origin in anthropology, sociology, and psychology and is employed in a wide range of disciplines (Merriam, 2009). Qualitative research theorists highlight that case study is not a methodology but a research tradition (see for example: Stake, 2005; Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2009; Simons, 2014). That is to say, case studies are not defined by the methods employed in investigating a phenomenon but by the particularity – or particularities – of the case or cases to be analysed. Although there are various definitions of case study, in simple words, a case study "is an in-depth description and analysis of a bounded system" (Merriam, 2009, p.40). Casanave (2010) indicates that a "bounded system" refers to a delimited unit of analysis where the phenomenon is investigated. Therefore, a bounded system may consist of, for example, a person, part of an organisation, an institution, or a policy, which becomes the unit of analysis (the case) and this is what, according to Merriam (2009), characterises a case study.

It is the researcher who has the responsibility of setting the boundaries of its unit of analysis according to their own interests (Hood, 2009). Casanave (2010) points out that along with the principle of boundedness, it is essential that researchers provide depth and detail in their descriptions of the case as well as a meticulous knowledge of the context where the case is situated. She claims that "without a thorough understanding of the context, we will not be able to interpret what the particulars of the case mean" (p. 67). Additionally, Merriam (2009) refers to the "special features" that are characteristic of case studies, as being particularistic, descriptive, and heuristic. That is to say, the narrow focus of a case study makes it ideal for the exploration of "puzzling occurrences arising from everyday practice" (p.43); they thoroughly portray the connection between the phenomenon and the unit of analysis in a holistic fashion; and offer new insights about specific phenomena, contribute to the development of a field, or reinforce previously held notions. This heuristic feature of case studies that illuminates our understanding of experience is what Stake (2005) calls "naturalistic generalisation". In addition, case

studies are commonly longitudinal[6] and require the researcher to spend a long period of time collecting large amounts of data (Hood, 2009; Yin, 2009); however, it is the researcher who needs to assess what constitutes a suitable amount of time for data collection, as there are no clear guidelines for this.

Stake (2005) distinguishes three types of case studies depending on the research focus and the interest of the researcher: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective case studies. An intrinsic case study seeks to obtain a deeper understanding of a specific unit of analysis because of its uniqueness – to say what makes it a focus of investigation. He argues that an intrinsic case study "is not undertaken primarily because the case represents other cases but because, in all its peculiarity *and* ordinariness, this case itself is of interest" (ibid., p.445, emphasis in original). In this kind of case study, what is of special interest is the case itself, not the fact that it may or may not represent the reality of similar cases. Therefore, researchers who carry out intrinsic case studies do not commonly attempt to provide generalisations, build theory, or draw comparisons to other cases (Hood, 2009). On the other hand, an instrumental case study has a stronger focus on the phenomenon to be studied and uses the unit of analysis as a site for exploration. Stake (2005, p.445) indicates that in instrumental case studies "[t]he case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else". Finally, in a collective (or multiple) case study, the researcher explores more than one case of the same nature in order to understand a specific phenomenon, and the cases "are chosen because it is believed that understanding them will lead to a better understanding, and perhaps better theorising, about a still larger collection of cases" (ibid., p.446). In other words, a collective case study is a collection of instrumental case studies that explore the same phenomenon. It is important to point out here that researchers may be inclined towards one particular case study design but also incorporate features of the other (Duff, 2008).

---

[6] Dörnyei (2007, p. 152) indicates that "case studies are often at least partially longitudinal in nature".

As mentioned above, case studies do not adopt the use of specific data collection or analytical methods. Quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods approaches can be used in the design of a case study provided that the methods employed are the most suitable in order to explore the particular issues of the unit of analysis (Simons, 2014). However, case study research has often been associated with qualitative methods "precisely because researchers are interested in insight, discovery, and interpretation rather than hypothesis testing" (Merriam, 2009, p.42). For this reason, the most widely used methods in case study research are interviews, observations and document analysis (Bassey, 1999; Dörnyei, 2007; Simons, 2014). In fact, these are also the data collection methods that were employed in this study. I will therefore explain the rationale for this choice in the following section.

4.5.2 Semi-structured interviews

In this section I provide the rationale for the choice of semi-structured interviews. First, I explain why interviews are a reliable source of qualitative data for my study and present the different types of interviews that are commonly found in the literature. Next, a justification for the choice of semi-structured interviews is provided along with the criteria for the design of questions. After that, I comment on issues of preparation and implementation of the research instrument. Finally, ethical and reliability considerations will be discussed.

Interviews were defined over half a century ago as "a face-to-face verbal exchange, in which one person, the interviewer, attempts to elicit information or expression of opinion or belief from another person or persons" (Maccoby & Maccoby 1954, p.449, in Brinkmann, 2014, p. 277). Since then, the essence of interviewing has remained practically the same, but different styles have been developed according to settings, number of people, and purposes of interviewing. Interviews have been widely used in qualitative research as they can help to find out from the participants what we cannot directly observe (Patton, 2002). With respect to the study of teachers' beliefs, Borg (2015) provides evidence that researchers interested in exploring language teachers cognitions have heavily relied on different types of interviews to access their participants' lived experiences, and he criticises the fact that some studies have solely depended on them.

Different types of interviews can be found in the literature in relation to different variables, such as the number of participants (i.e., individual or group), the means through which they are carried out (i.e.: face-to-face, telephone, internet), the style of the interview (i.e., receptive or assertive), or their structural design. The most common way to classify interviews is based on their structure, namely between structured, semi-structured and unstructured (Patton, 2002; Dörnyei, 2007; Duff, 2008). First, structured interviews are a controlled way of conducting interviews that seek to obtain specific information and allow limited opportunity for elaboration (Richards, 2009). Questions in structured interviews are pre-designed and have a fixed order, and data obtained by these interviews are commonly analysed quantitatively and/or can be potentially used as an initial point for the design of a more open-ended research method. This is why some theorists prefer to call this kind of interview "survey interviews" (e.g., Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009), as they are used primarily to collect basic straightforward information from the participants. For this reason, samples in studies that employ structured interviews are usually large and randomised.

Second, unstructured interviews (also known as "in-depth" and "open" interviews) offer the interviewee the opportunity to speak freely about different (normally just a few) general topics that the researcher has previously chosen in order to explore specific phenomena. The researcher role in this kind of interview is more passive and less direct because the objective of unstructured interviews is to allow participants to explore their own world and, by doing so, generate large amounts of data (Arksey and Knight, 1999). In other words, it is the informant who sets the direction of the interview. Due to the length and depth of unstructured interviews, studies that adopt this type of interview tend to restrict their samples to a very limited number of participants.

Third, while structured and unstructured interviews are seen as two ends of a continuum, semi-structured interviews are seen as a "compromise" between the two (Dörnyei, 2007, p.136). They are flexible in the sense that they allow the respondent to lead the conversation while the researcher probes some topics in depth, and perhaps explore unexpected but important new directions (Richards, 2009). They are also the most common type of interview in qualitative studies (Arksey and Knight, 1999). In these interviews, key topics, prompts and sample questions are commonly pre-stated and

written on an interview guide (Patton, 2002) that helps the researcher to keep the themes to be discussed within a frame, while at the same time asking for elaboration and clarification if necessary. In addition, researchers are not necessarily supposed to follow a specific sequence in their questions with every participant, as the answers given and the emphasis that the respondent gives to certain themes normally alter the original order of topics in the interview guide. Samples in semi-structured interviews are commonly medium-size. This type of interview is employed in this study.

The decision for choosing semi-structured interviews in this case study was based on a number of reasons. The main motivation for this choice is the fact that there is a long-standing tradition in the use of semi-structured interviews to explore the nature of English language teachers' beliefs (Borg, 2012). In this respect, Mangubhai *et al.* (2004, p.294) point out that semi-structured interviews "[give] teachers the opportunities and time to detail fully and freely the bases for their approaches to teaching, without the constraints of a set schedule of invariant questions". As beliefs can be unobservable (Kagan, 1992a), allowing teachers to provide in-depth accounts of their opinions, perceptions, motivations and concerns by developing trust and building rapport is likely to provide the researcher with a strong tool to make a teacher's belief explicit.

Another important reason for using semi-structured interviews is their flexibility. Even though the topics and key questions of the interviews I carried out were previously drafted in an interview guide (see Appendix A), the participants in my study had the freedom to discuss other relevant issues that may also contribute to understanding their beliefs and the language ideologies that underpin their orientations. This method also allowed me to ask follow-up questions – or probes – that emerged from the interviewee's answers as well as asking for clarification or examples if necessary (Bryman, 2012). This way, it is the interviewee who, with his or her answers, will lead the conversation, and by doing so, they are likely to feel more at ease and willing to provide details that can enlighten my understanding of their views.

Added to that, the nature of the research questions presented in Section 4.4 required methods that allow the researcher to explore the underlying reasons for the orientations and beliefs that teachers in Chilean ELT programmes held. In this respect, face-to-face

semi-structured interviews helped provide large amounts of data that may reveal the actual motivations of the participants' views and, through close analysis and interpretation, ultimately uncovering the language ideologies that underpin their beliefs and practices as teacher educators and as part of university programmes. For this reason, in this collective case study semi-structured interviews are regarded as the main data collection method.

Nevertheless, there are a few potential limitations and challenges in the employment of semi-structured interviews. One such example is that, by using this method to explore teachers' cognition, researchers are likely to get an idea of what teachers think, but this does not necessarily mean that these teachers will act accordingly in practice (Borg, 2015). In addition, as these interviews require the participants to open up and explore their inner worlds in relatively lengthy sessions, time constraints are likely to limit the teachers' availability to participate in the study, especially in a context like Chile, where working for different institutions is common practice for teachers. What is more, as these interviews have to be audio-recorded for further analysis, some teachers may find this practice intrusive, especially when the interview is carried out in a second language, and when the topics to be discussed could be regarded as sensitive from the interviewee's perspective. In addition, interviewees might be inclined to give answers that they think the interviewer wishes to hear. However, if participants are given the freedom to expand and elaborate their answers, it seems less likely that they would do so.

In order to minimise these challenges, interviews were combined with observations of the teachers' practices in their classrooms and with an analysis of relevant documents that may support or contradict the data obtained through the interviews. Regarding the teachers' time limitations, teachers were encouraged to suggest times and locations for the interviews that suited their timetables. Similarly, participants were given the choice of carrying out the interviews in either English or Spanish (to which all of them agreed that they should be held in English) in order to avoid the need for translation. Finally, consent forms and participant information sheets approved by the University of Southampton ethics committee were handed out to all participants before commencing the study, and interviewees were reminded at all times that they were free to withdraw their participation at any time if they wished to (see 4.10 for ethical issues). All participants

agreed to have their interviews recorded. Details of the teachers who accepted to participate in the study are presented in Section 4.6.

4.5.2.1 The interview guide

There is agreement in the qualitative research literature that one-shot interviews do not always manage to provide data of enough depth and quality (see for example Polkinghorne, 2005; Dörnyei, 2007). In this respect, Seidman (1991, in Polkinghorne, 2005) proposes a series of three interviews with each participant in order to provide a more detailed account of the topics that the researcher would like the participant to develop. The purpose of the first interview is to break the ice (getting acquainted, discussing the objectives of the interview process, trying to discuss some initial central topics). This strategy helps the researcher to arrange a more focused second interview, and the participant to reflect on some of the topics discussed in the first one. Finally, the third interview serves as an opportunity to ask follow-up questions that help clarify the data collected. Nonetheless, due to the teachers' time restrictions, each teacher was interviewed only twice, while follow-up questions and clarifications were carried out via email. It is important to point out here that, in all cases, the interviews were carried out after introductions and an initial classroom observation had taken place.

An interview guide was designed in advance, including topics of relevance and sample questions to be elicited in the two interviews (see Appendix A). In the first interview, the initial set of questions related to the participants' experience as teachers of English and teacher educators, with the purpose of allowing the teachers to feel at ease during the interview. Next, opinions about the global status of English were elicited in order to obtain the participants' personal views on the spread of the language. After that, they were asked about how the programme they work for, and the teachers themselves, respond to the global spread of English. Then, teachers discussed their preferences related to linguistic models and their perceptions of their students' inclinations to specific varieties of English. Teachers were also asked to reflect on their own training and compare it to the way English is taught at their respective institutions. Finally, participants were asked to describe the way they perceived their own English.

For interview two, participants were initially asked about their language learning experiences in order to make them feel comfortable with a topic they can easily handle. Next, their views on bi- and multilingualism, and the use of their students' mother tongue (Spanish) in class were elicited. Then, we discussed issues of evaluation and proficiency and the importance of international exams in their courses. This paved the way to discuss topics of non-native communication, second language users and their suitability for ELT. Finally, participants were asked to reflect on the topics covered in both interviews, and discuss the relevance of adopting a global view of English instead of focusing on native speaker norms and standards. Additionally, programme directors were asked to describe the ways in which their ELT programmes interact with international organisations (e.g., the British Council, foreign universities, the American Embassy). Although the order of topics and questions outlined here reflect the original organisation of the interview guide, the participants' answers and interests influenced the choice of topics and the direction that each interview took.

The pilot version of the interview guide also included questions that required teachers to define certain concepts according to their own understanding. Terms they were asked about, such as "standard English", "native speaker", "non-standard English" and "non-native speaker", were supposed to provide valuable input on how teachers perceived concepts commonly used in ELT. However, after working with these questions with a few teachers that acted as volunteers for the pilot interview (see section 4.7.), I realised that they felt as if they were answering questions related to professional knowledge rather than their notions of how suitable these concepts were in the ELT profession. For this reason, I decided to eliminate these questions from the interview guide and ask for clarification or definition only if the concepts emerged from the participants' discussion.

4.5.3   Classroom observations

As mentioned above, I used observations in this study to complement the data obtained through semi-structured interviews with the same participants. Classroom observations have traditionally been an essential data collection method in the study of teachers' beliefs (Borg, 2015). Although there are few studies that define what observations are (O'Leary, 2014), in general they can be defined as "the conscious noticing and detailed

examination of participants' behaviour in a naturalistic setting" (Cowie, 2009, p.166). In this study, university classrooms where future English language teachers are educated are regarded as naturalistic settings, even though the role of the researcher may alter the normal development of the lessons observed, as I discuss below.

There are several advantages in the use of observations for classroom research. One of the most obvious positive aspects is their directness. The researcher does not need to ask about what participants think they do; instead he or she watches and listens to what they do and say in the setting itself (Robson and McCartan, 2016). In addition, observations are non-interventionist in nature, as it is possible to minimise the researcher's participation while gathering large amounts of data (Borg, 2015). Moreover, observations can also help researchers to complement data obtained through other methods (such as interviews, focus groups, or document analysis) and enrich the interpretation of their findings.

Nevertheless, observations are not free from weaknesses and limitations. This method requires the researcher to embark on a considerably time-consuming activity that involves obtaining access to the setting and the participants as well as gaining their trust. Furthermore, the presence of the researcher in the context where the observation is taking place may affect the normal functioning of the activity of being observer – a phenomenon commonly known as "the observer's paradox" (Labov, 1978). In the case of classroom observations, the presence of an external observer is likely to have an effect (either positive or negative) on the teacher's and the students' behaviour. In this respect, how the researcher approaches the observation activity, and how the researcher role is understood in the setting, may help to minimise these constraints.

In the research methods literature it is possible to find different dimensions for the classification of observations (see, for example, Flick 1998, and Cooper & Schindler 2001, in Cohen *et al.*, 2011). However, in the case of classroom observations, there is a tendency to focus mainly on two broad dimensions in the design of observations as research methods. The first dimension has to do with the scope or structure of the observation activity, while the second dimension is related to the role that the researcher adopts when carrying out the observation (Robson and McCartan, 2016). I will first refer to the classification of observations according to their scope, considering the advantages

and disadvantages of different observation approaches, and then I will move on to discuss classifications according to the researcher's role.

In terms of scope, the distinction is between *structured* and *unstructured* observations (also referred to as *informal* and *formal* approaches), which are commonly associated with quantitative/qualitative tradition divide. At one end, a structured approach to observation basically involves a fixed, pre-defined, and systematic categorisation of the behaviours or events to be observed, and allows the researcher to obtain data that can be analysed quantitatively (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). At the other end, unstructured observations are less rigid and require the researcher to provide a detailed account of the event that is being observed through field notes and/or recording devices. It is relevant to mention that although these approaches may be understood as dichotomic, they are usually understood as two extremes of a continuum and are not necessarily mutually exclusive (O'Leary, 2014).

One of the main advantages of structured approaches to classroom observation is that they offer the researcher a clear and narrow focus on what specific events he or she should pay attention to and, hence, lessening subjectivity in data analysis (Robson and McCartan, 2016). In addition, the systemic nature of structured approaches can be beneficial for achieving high reliability (Cohen *et al.*, 2011). However, it is this lack of attention to detail of structured observation that may force the researcher to ignore the complexities and particularities of what happens in a classroom, and thus, rendering potentially relevant data invisible. In this respect, O'Leary (2014, p.60) points out that "contemporary 'structured approaches' to classroom observation are underpinned by an attempt to itemize classroom behaviour with a view to identifying, presenting and indeed prescribing specific practice as being more effective than others".

On the other hand, the qualitative nature of unstructured approaches to observations highlights the importance of meaning and interpretation of the events under study. That is, the purpose of this kind of observation is based on understanding the reasons why a specific phenomenon occurs in a classroom (O'Leary, 2014) rather than merely quantifying the frequency of specific behaviours. In contrast to structured approaches, analytical categories emerge from the data rather than from a pre-established schedule

(Borg, 2015). Nevertheless, it seems practically impossible to provide a complete detailed account of every single factor that can influence or explain the phenomenon studied in the classroom, and this can present the researcher with problems in the reliability and validity of the study. In this respect, Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2000, p.196) suggest that "the choice between [these approaches]… depends to a considerable extent on the research problem and research design".

As mentioned above, the second dimension for the classification of observations refers to the role of the researcher. The degree of involvement that the researcher has in the setting where the observation takes place is highly relevant in the design of a study. A very influential distinction has been Gold's (1958, in Burgess, 1984) four common researcher's roles: complete participant; participant-as-observer; observer-as-participant; and complete observer. Again, these roles should be understood as points in a continuum with complete participant and complete observer at its two extremes. First, a complete participant role requires the researcher to conceal the fact that he or she is the observer and aims to acquire (desirably) total membership of the group that is being studied. Researchers doing ethnographic fieldwork normally adopt this role. Second, in the participant-as-observer role, the researcher seeks to establish close connections with the group members by participating in their activities as well as assuming his or her role as an observer. Third, the observer-as-participant role refers to limited and formal interactions with the participants during the classroom observations, as the researcher normally sits at the back to avoid interrupting the normal development of the lesson. According to Borg (2015), this is the most commonly adopted role in teacher cognition research. Finally, in the complete observer role, the researcher has no contact whatsoever with the participants, who are completely unaware of the fact that they are being observed.

It is important to point out here that, when deciding on what role to adopt in an observation, researchers should be clear in explaining how their role may be understood in a specific case rather than simply aligning with one of the roles presented in the literature, as researchers tend to interpret these roles in different ways (Borg, 2015). In this study, I identify my role as observer-as-participant because my intention is to keep my participation during the classroom observations to a minimum, overtly acknowledging my researcher status among members of staff and students, and contributing as much as

possible to maintaining the normal environment of the classroom. Reflections on my role as a researcher in the data collection process are presented in the section below.

4.5.3.1   The role of the researcher

Even though I defined my role in the classrooms I observed as an *observer-as-participant*, I adopted different roles and identities in different encounters with my participants. I was aware that introducing myself as a doctoral researcher may have had created different impressions among my participants. For example, in some cases I felt that a few of them perceived me as a more-knowledgeable other or expert coming from a foreign university. Such a view is likely to have created imbalances in the distribution of power between the participants and me which may have motivated them to provide – what they may have thought – were the answers I was looking for. In order to minimise such subjectivities in my data collection, I explained to my participants that my main interest was to find out what their views about the spread of English were rather than disclosing the whole agenda of my research. This strategy allowed my participants to focus on discussing topics that were not necessarily connected with their role at the institutions where they worked while exposing their beliefs about the subject under study.

In other instances, however, my participants were much more experienced than me and the power imbalances between researcher and participant were inverted. Considering the premise that there is no value-free research (Dornyei, 2007), some of my participants managed to reveal, understand and, in some cases, challenge my own beliefs and motivations either because of the scope of my questions and comments or because of associations with my academic background (i.e., paper presentations, impact of supervisory team, membership to specific research groups). The effect of these perceived differences, however, were positive for my research since my participants and I managed to engage in genuine in-depth interactions rather than producing decontextualised data.

Even though my intention was to minimise my participation in class in order to avoid affecting the normal development of the lessons, my classroom observations usually started with a short introduction of myself – usually indicating my name, affiliation and the purpose of my presence in the classroom. In such instances, I mentioned to the

students that my focus of observation were their teachers, not their performance in class and I believe that this may have also had an effect on the teacher' performance as their behaviours were overtly being assessed by an external individual. For example, in a few cases it was clear that my participants decided to include activities, content or examples which were evidently influenced by the conversations we had during the interviews. However, it is hard to predict whether these influences would have been present had I not been in the classroom.

4.5.4   Document analysis

A review of relevant documents related to and emerging from the three ELT programmes was the third data collection method employed in this study. Bowen (2009, p.27) defines document analysis as "a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents – both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material". This method is also regarded as "a third major source of data in qualitative research" (Merriam, 2009, p.161) and is commonly used in case study research as a supplementary method (Dörnyei, 2007). However, unlike studies on language ideology, document analysis does not seem to be a method widely employed by researchers interested in understanding teachers' beliefs. In this study, the main purposes of exploring documents produced by the participant ELT programmes are to corroborate evidence collected in the other two data sources (interviews and observations), to evaluate the correspondence between the teachers' espoused beliefs and the information available in the documents, while also exploring patterns that reveal the presence of specific language ideologies.

There are several advantages in using document analysis in case study research. Yin (2009, p,102), for example, points out that documents are "stable" as they do not change after they are produced. This characteristic makes documents suitable for re-analysis or useful for the purposes of reliability and replication. However, it is likely that electronic documents that are accessible to the general public, such as information on the Internet, may be modified during the data collection phase by the institutions under study in order to suit the purposes of the research project. In addition, documents are also accurate in providing exact information about details and references. Moreover, Bowen (2009) refers to the unobtrusiveness of documents, as in most cases documents are already available

and cost-free for the researcher to collect and analyse, and are not purposively created for the specific study. This attribute is supported by the fact that, unlike observations and interviews, the presence of the researcher does not affect the document under study (Merriam, 2009). Furthermore, the data obtained by reviewing and evaluating documents can be used in the same way as the data obtained using interviews and observations, since the documents are produced in the same context in which the participants carry out their activities (Merriam, 2009).

Nevertheless, as with all data collection methods, there are a few limitations regarding document analysis. First, despite the fact that documents are already produced, they can be difficult to obtain without the authorisation and consent of the respective authorities, especially when some of them may be regarded as confidential. The information in the documents can be either sensitive or simply private, and access to them "may be deliberately withheld" (Yin, 2009, p.102). Second, as they are not produced for research purposes, documents may not necessarily provide enough information and detail to answer a research question (Bowen, 2009). And third, as Yin (2009, p.102) points out, the fact that a researcher may not have access to all the relevant documents may suggest "biased selectivity", which refers to a limited or incomplete collection of documents that may purposefully emphasise or cover specific information. Bowen (2009) suggests, however, that the positive aspects of document analysis as a data collection method evidently surpass their potential flaws.

There are different types of documents that can be useful for qualitative research. These include public records, personal documents, popular culture documents, visual documents, and artefacts (see Merriam, 2009). The research questions will determine what type of documents are relevant for the case, and what to focus on when exploring the documents (Duff, 2008). The documents under consideration for this study were: module descriptions of each relevant course that is offered in the ELT programmes[7]

---

[7] I was particularly interested in courses taught in English and about linguistic analysis (e.g., grammar, phonetics), cultural aspects (e.g., literature, history) and communication (oral and written).

(including name of course, objectives, evaluations and references); the programme

curriculum of each case (a broad description of the courses offered in the programme);

materials used in the lessons that were observed; and information about these university

degrees on their webpages (e.g., graduate profile). In order to have access to these

documents I asked for permission from each Programme Director, who, in some cases,

needed to obtain the authorisation of a different department. Programme curricula were

available to the public on the webpage of each programme. However, obtaining access to

the course descriptions was initially restricted due to internal regulations of two of the

three programmes. Details regarding the documents obtained in each site are presented

in Table 1 below. Examples and extracts of these documents can be found in Appendix I.

Table 1 Documents collected in each case study

Case study	Documents
Programme A	Module descriptions, official website, curriculum (module organisation), classroom materials
Programme B	Module descriptions (only for English language skills modules), official website, curriculum (module organisation)
Programme C	Module descriptions, official website, curriculum (module organisation)

4.6   Sampling and participants

Three ELT programmes were selected as samples in this collective case study. The cases

were chosen following a purposeful sample selection (Patton, 2002), which is a non-

probability sample technique that "lies in selecting *information-rich cases* for study in

depth" (p.230, emphasis in original). Originally, any ELT programme offered at Chilean universities was eligible for the study; however, these three cases were selected for reasons of location, impact on the Chilean educational system, and tradition. That is to say, the selection of participants for this case study corresponds to a mixture of "typical" and "convenience" purposive sampling strategy (see Richards, 2003; Merriam, 2009 for examples of purposive sampling). Each of the three cases, with the rationale for choosing them, is presented below. The names of the institutions are kept confidential for ethical purposes, so I will refer to them as Programmes A, B and C. In order to safeguard the anonymity of the participant institutions, the cities where these universities are based were be kept confidential.

Firstly, Programme A was chosen primarily because of the historical role and tradition of its university in teacher training for a variety of disciplines, as well as the prestige that this institution carries as one of the most important state universities in the country. Its ELT programme has worked closely with the Chilean Ministry of Education through the programme "English Opens Doors" and is one of the programmes with the largest number of students awarded a "Semester Abroad Scholarship"[8]. Ten teacher educators agreed to participate in the study, including the Programme Director.

Secondly, Programme B was chosen mainly because of its active role in setting the standards for ELT programmes in 2014 in collaboration with the Ministry of Education. Although it is a relatively new university (established in the late 1970s) it has positioned itself as one of the most important private universities in Chile, and has recently implemented innovation in its curriculum in order to integrate linguistic components that are normally taught separately in most Chilean ELT programmes. Eight teacher trainers

---

[8] The Semester Abroad Scholarship offers undergraduate students seeking a degree in EFL in accredited Chilean institutions the opportunity to take EFL-related courses in English-speaking institutions. More information is available at http://www.piap.cl/descargas-pdf/beca/2016-2/information_for_foreign_higher_education_institutions.pdf

from this institution accepted the invitation to participate in the study, including the Programme Director and the Academic Coordinator.

Finally, Programme C was chosen primarily because of the large number of students who graduated from, it especially in the last few years[9]. Their ELT programme is also linked to the "English Opens Doors" programme as well as universities in Europe, Australia and North America. In addition, the ELT programme of this private university has an agreement with the British Council that sponsors students from the ELT programme to spend an academic year working as language assistants in the UK. All the universities where these programmes are run have a strong orientation towards the social sciences, education and the humanities. Nine teacher educators working in this programme decided to take part in this study, including the Programme Director. The participants in this study are individualised at the end of this section.

As the Chilean academic year runs from March to December, I decided to carry out my data collection during the first academic term of 2016 (from March to June). In order to promote teachers' participation, I contacted the Programme Directors of each institution in December 2015, introducing myself as a Chilean post-graduate researcher from the University of Southampton, and explaining broadly the purpose of my research. Once I obtained approval and support from the directors, I emailed them a participant information sheet and a consent form for them to spread the word among the staff (see 4.7. for details of ethical approval). However, when I visited the institutions, the interest of the teachers was initially different in each university. In the case of Programme A, most teachers had already signed the consent form and were willing to contribute to the study while others decided to participate at a later stage. In contrast, when I visited Programme B, I was informed that only two teachers were willing to participate, because most of the other teacher educators found it difficult because of their timetable. As for programme C,

---

[9] Information available at http://www.mifuturo.cl/index.php/bases-de-datos/titulados

one of the teachers took the time to introduce me to each of the members of the staff in an informal way in order to motivate them to participate.

In total, 27 teacher educators were recruited to participate in the study. All the participants claimed to be Chilean and identified Spanish as their mother tongue. All of them were interviewed twice and agreed to have their interviews in English and audio-recorded. In the case of observations, however, I did not manage to observe the Programme Directors nor the Academic Coordinator at Programme B because they were not teaching during that term. Moreover, one of the participants had had a health problem at the beginning of the term, so she was not teaching either. In addition, one teacher at Programme C asked not to have her classes audio-recorded for personal reasons. Unfortunately, due to a general university students' strike in the country, there were two teachers at Programme C whose lessons I could not observe, while I only managed to observe one of the lessons of three teachers in the same programme. This strike went on until August 2016. The details of the teacher educators that participated in the programme are presented in Table 2 below.

Chapter 4

Table 2. Presentation of the participants of the three ELT programmes

Programme	Name[10]	Gender	Years of Experience	Discipline (generic)/ Role	Interviews	Classroom Observations[11]
A	Cristina	Female	15	English skills	2	2
	Sofia	Female	11	English skills	2	2
	Daniela	Female	6	English skills	2	2
	Antonio	Male	2	Applied Linguistics/ English skills	2	2
	Victor	Male	6	English skills	2	2
	Silvia	Female	40	Methodology	2	-
	Javier	Male	13	English skills/ Coordinator	2	-
	Sergio	Male	23	Evaluation/ Programme Director	2	-
B	Paula	Female	8	Phonetics/ English skills	2	2
	Lucas	Male	12	Applied Linguistics	2	2
	David	Male	7	Literature/ Coordinator	2	2
	Grace	Female	2	English skills	2	2
	Alex	Male	8	Grammar	2	2
	Julia	Female	34	Literature/ Cultural studies	2	2
	Carolina	Female	30	Methodology	2	2
	Julian	Male	48	Phonetics	2	2
	Esteban	Male	24	Grammar	2	2
	Samuel	Male	14	Programme Director	2	-

Programme	Name	Gender	Years of Experience	Discipline (generic)/ Role	Interviews	Classroom Observations
C	Diego	Male	40	Grammar/ Academic writing	2	2
	Marco	Male	7	Applied Linguistics	2	2
	Myriam	Female	16	English skills	2	2
	Simon	Male	4	Phonetics	2	1
	Olivia	Female	18	Grammar	2	1
	Lucia	Female	20	Cultural studies	2	0
	Gloria	Female	20	English skills	2	0
	Gabriela	Female	6	Phonetics	2	0
	Nicole	Female	21	Methodology/ Programme Director	2	-

4.7   Piloting

The semi-structured interviews were piloted with a group of five volunteers who were working as teacher trainers at a different university from the ones selected for this study. The volunteers were former colleagues of the researcher and agreed to participate and provide feedback in a one-off session in early March 2016, before the actual data collection took place. The piloting session had the purpose of receiving feedback in relation to the discussion topics, scope of questions, and my interviewing skills (Dörnyei, 2007). After each interview, volunteers were encouraged to share their experience as participants and their views about my role as an interviewer. The outcomes of this session helped me refine my initial sample questions and polish my own interviewing skills.

---

[10] I use pseudonyms instead of real names in order to respect the participants' anonymity.

[11] Participants identified with a "-" sign in the observation column were not teaching during the term when the data collection took place.

All the pilot interviews were conducted in English, with the aim of examining how the volunteers felt answering the questions in a language that is not their first one. All the volunteers remarked that they would have expressed the same ideas in their first language. In addition, one of the participants sometimes used Spanish as a resource to refer to a few context-specific concepts. The interviews were audio-recorded and later checked for quality of audio as well as for the purpose of evaluating my own performance as an interviewer. Observations were not piloted due to difficulties in gaining access to university classrooms.

4.8   Data collection timeline

Table 3 below presents details of the timeline of fieldwork employed in this study.

Table 3. Timeline of fieldwork

Activity	Period of completion
Contacting Directors of ELT programmes	December 2015
Visiting universities and meeting potential participants	Early March 2016
Data collection at Programme A (interviews, observations and document review)	Early April to early June
Data collection at Programme B (interviews, observations and document review)	Mid March to early June
Data collection at Programme C (interviews, observations and document review)	Mid April to early June

4.9   Analytical framework

Considering the qualitative nature as well as the depth and richness of the data obtained through the methods outlined in Section 4.5, this study adopted a thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006) approach to qualitative data analysis. Although in terms of conceptualisation, thematic analysis tends to overlap with other related analytical approaches such as qualitative content analysis (see Schreier, 2012), there are minor differences in how these analyses are carried out. Thematic analysis is commonly understood as a generic method for the analysis of qualitative data (Robson and McCartan, 2016). That is to say, this analytical method is not necessarily linked to a particular epistemology or theoretical framework, unlike other methods such as grounded theory, discourse analysis, or conversation analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Silver and Lewins, 2014; Robson and McCartan, 2016).

In order to perform the analysis, I have followed the five phases of thematic analysis outlined by (Robson and McCartan, 2016), which consist of (i) familiarisation with the data; (ii) generating initial codes; (iii) identifying themes; (iv) constructing thematic networks; and (v) integration and interpretation. It is also important to clarify that these phases are not exclusive to thematic analysis, since they are also shared by other qualitative data analysis approaches (Braun and Clarke, 2013). In addition, similar phases for the same analytical method are also presented by other authors, but the few differences that exist among them remain at the conceptual level rather than at the procedural level (see for example Braun and Clarke, 2006; Dörnyei, 2007). What is more, these phases do not represent a linear process, and therefore researchers are encouraged to move back and forth through the different phases, since the results from a particular phase may suggest a re-evaluation of an earlier stage.

For the purpose of familiarisation with the data, I personally transcribed all the interviews as soon as the data were collected. As mentioned in Section 4.5.2, all the interviews were conducted in English and, therefore, there was no need for translation. The interview transcripts were saved in Microsoft Word and later stored into QSR NVivo 11, following the guidelines in Silver and Lewins (2014). As mentioned in section 4.6, each participant was interviewed twice. This data collection method produced a total of 38 hours of raw

interview data. The shortest interview lasted twenty minutes, while the longest lasted

exactly one hour. As the transcription conventions presented in Appendix B, the level of

detail of the interview transcripts attempts to capture the content of the participants'

contributions as closely as possible. A simplified version of these transcription

conventions is presented in Table 4 below, in order to help with the reading of extracts.

These transcription conventions were adapted from Jenkins (2007). Although prosodic

features of speech such as intonation were not of special interest for this analysis, I have

made emphases, pauses, and laughter explicit in the transcriptions in order to contribute

to the interpretation of latent meaning (Dörnyei, 2007). Comments made in languages

other than English are presented in italics and translated to English when necessary.

Initially, I decided to avoid using punctuation marks such as full stops and commas, but

later I realised that they were useful to organise the text of the interview transcripts,

considering the length of some of the participants' contributions. These decisions

regarding the transcription stage acknowledge Dörnyei's (2007) view of transcription as

an interpretative process in which the transcriber's own language ideologies come into

play.

Table 4. Transcription conventions (simplified version)

(.)	Pause of less than a second
(2)	Approximate pause length in seconds
@	Laugh
CAPS	Strong emphasis
Utter-	Abrupt cut-off, unfinished sentence
((author's commentary))	Author's commentary
/Italics/	Words and phrases in a language other than English
?	Rising intonation (questions)
.	End of sentence
"	Quotations
[…]	Gap between the sections of the transcription that were not included
Underline	Represents sentences, phrases or words that are uttered while laughing

The data obtained through classroom observations consisted of field notes and recordings of each lesson. As mentioned in Section 4.5.3, each participant who had teaching responsibilities during the period of data collection was observed twice, with the exception of those whose lessons were affected by the higher education student strike that affected some universities between May and August 2016 (see Table 2 for details). The length of each lesson was approximately 90 minutes, which resulted in a total of over 55 hours of audio recordings. Consequently, after getting familiarised with the raw data, I decided to transcribe only the passages that provided evidence of behaviours and events that made reference to a set of criteria in order to make the data more manageable. These criteria comprised teaching practices that referred in a general way to: (a) standard forms or correctness; (b) varieties of English; (c) native and/or non-native English speakers and; (d) cultural references. These passages were combined with the field notes of each observation and later stored in NVivo. An example of these fieldnotes is available in Appendix G.

A series of documents were reviewed as part of each single-case study. As mentioned in Section 4.5.4, I examined relevant documents that were produced at each site. First, I explored the curriculum of each programme, which were available online for general use. I also had online access to the online version of each programme's "graduate profile". Then, in order to obtain access to the syllabus of the modules that were taught in these programmes, I had to request them personally. Programmes A and C provided me with copies of the syllabus of each of their modules and, in the case of Programme A, they even granted me access to their Virtual Learning Environment (VLE). However, access to similar materials in Programme B was highly restricted because of the university's own regulations. This meant that I only had access to the syllabi of a limited number of modules that some of the teacher educators at Programme B personally shared with me. Then, the content of the available documents was reviewed in order to find evidence of preferences for specific Englishes or ENL varieties, uses of NES as benchmarks for desirable proficiency, and any instances in which English was presented either as a monolithic or multicultural language. As a result, the evidence from the reviewed documents contributed to supporting and challenging the findings from the interviews and classroom observations.

After transcribing the interview and audio-recordings, I read the transcripts repeatedly in order to check the quality of the transcriptions made and to identify early patterns in the data. Similarly, I reviewed the documents, read my fieldnotes of classroom observations and listened to the classroom recordings again looking for superficial patterns across each case and data set. The ideas, relationships and early patterns that emerged in this stage were registered in analytic memos. As Dörnyei (2007, p.254) argues, analytic memos "are invaluable in facilitating second-level coding and are also likely to contain the embryos of some of the main conclusions to be drawn in the study". These memos were registered on the CAQDAS software at all stages of the analysis, and were particularly useful to provide a link between the coding stage and the interpretation of the results.

The second main stage of the analysis consisted of the generation of initial codes. The research questions and the theoretical framework of the study helped to anticipate a small number of codes that had the potential to be found in the data. The codes that emerge in this early analytical stage are referred to in the literature as *a priori codes,* while those that emerge from the actual coding process are called *empirical codes* (Gibson and Brown, 2009). It should be pointed out here that most of the process of coding the data for the purpose of this research followed an inductive approach (Duff, 2008). That is to say, the vast majority of the codes created in the analysis of the data emerged from the different data sets rather than from preconceived ideas motivated by the research questions or the literature. For instance, examples of a priori codes are 'beliefs about one's own English' and 'reasons for learning English', while 'raising awareness of identity' and 'appropriation of English' represent examples of empirical codes. Raw data collected from each individual programme were coded separately in order to highlight the particularities and uniqueness of each case. Following Braun and Clarke's (2006) coding guidelines, extracts from the transcripts generated from the three data collection methods were coded once or multiple times in case they related to more than one code. In other words, the same extract could be labelled under different codes because of its multiple meanings or interpretations. After coding the data for each case, I looked for similarities and differences within the codes in order to split and/or merge codes that either presented features that were difficult to separate or related to potentially different concepts (Gibson and Brown, 2009).

After coding the whole data set, I examined the relationship between the codes and identified candidate themes for each case and across cases. According to Bryman (2012), themes in thematic analysis refer to the categories that the researcher identifies in the relationship of the information that has been coded from the data. By doing this, I observed that a few of the codes were so comprehensive that they could be treated as themes in their own right, while most of the codes were collated in relation to their content in order to form other potential themes. This led to the creation of a three-level hierarchy of "global" (overarching), "organising" (sub-theme) and "basic" codes as suggested by Attride-Stirling (2001, in Robson and McCartan, 2016). Once these potential themes were defined, I re-examined the data and the coded extracts in order to assess the accuracy of the candidate themes and sub-themes in effectively capturing the particularities of the data rather than simply describing each data set. As a result, and following Robson and McCartan's (2016) guidelines, some extracts were re-coded; some themes and sub-themes were created, discarded or renamed; and those codes which did not fit into any particular categories were grouped under the tag "miscellaneous" for later examination. As the analysis continued, this proved to be a useful strategy since some codes that first did not fit into any theme or sub-theme were later incorporated into one or more themes.

Once the themes were refined, I moved on to establishing networks between the themes, and elaborating candidate thematic maps for each case and across cases. In order to encapsulate code-to-code and code-to-theme relationships, qualitative researchers are encouraged to start producing visual representations of these relationships at this stage, by creating matrices and networks that consider even those codes that do not seem to fit in a broader category or theme (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Silver and Lewins, 2014; Robson and McCartan, 2016). This analytical strategy was useful in order to limit the number of themes and/or discard those that were not appropriately supported by the coded data. Once again, I revisited the finalised coded extracts, and made sure that their relationship was coherent enough to address the scope of the research questions, and distinct enough to cover different aspects of the data (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

Finally, the last phase of Robson and McCartan's (2016) guidelines refers to the integration and interpretation of the finalised themes. Using descriptions, summaries,

visual representations, reflection and testing explanations, researchers following thematic analysis are expected to provide informed interpretations of the themes and support their interpretations with relevant extracts from the data. After carefully following these steps, I identified a range of themes for each individual case and across the three cases and organised them in the form of "within-" and "cross-" case studies. In collective case studies, a within-case analysis is an exploration of the particular themes that are identified in each bounded single case, while a cross-case analysis, as its name suggests, consists of an exploration of themes identified across all those single cases (Miles and Huberman, 1994; Stake, 2006; Yin, 2009). For each within-case analysis I selected two of the main themes that emerged from each Programme – with their corresponding sub-themes – based on their relevance to the research questions. After that, I used the same criteria to choose two of main themes that emerged across the three programmes as part of the cross-case analysis. The complete list of themes that emerged from the analysis of each case is presented in Appendix H.

QRS NVivo 11 proved to be an extremely helpful tool for data storage and analysis considering the quantity and quality of data that was collected for this project. The software allowed me to work directly with the transcribed data, field notes, documents and analytical memos in order to test the consistency of the patterns initially identified. Unlike quantitative data analysis software, QRS NVivo 11 does not carry out independent analyses of the data. On the contrary, the analytical tools offered by the software are expected to aid the researcher in the organisation and labelling of the patterns identified in the data as well as the creation of "cases" (individual or group registers of participants) to which the data could be associated. It is important to point out that the use of QRS NVivo 11 in this project did not influence the creation, labelling or association of patterns or cases by any means as these were the result of consistent reflection, familiarisation with the data and engagement with relevant literature. The large number of analytical tools available on QRS NVivo 11 offer researchers a range of different possibilities to approach their data. However. For the purpose of this project – and due to lack of familiarisation with the full properties of the software – QSR NVivo 11 was mainly used for creation and labelling of codes and analytical memos, word searches, mapping of themes, generating matrix coding for comparisons and visualising relationships across themes and cases.

4.10 Research ethics

In order to abide by ethical research regulations, I provided all participant teachers with two documents before collecting any data: a *Participant Information Sheet* and a *Consent Form* (see Appendices C and D). These documents contained information about the study, the reasons why the teachers had been invited to participate, and information about the confidentiality of their participation, along with other relevant details that helped to maintain ethical standards during the whole research process. These documents were designed according to the Ethics and Research Governance Online (ERGO) guidelines by the University of Southampton and were approved in January 2016. Even after consent from participants was given (for audio-recording interviews or classroom practices), teachers were free to withdraw from the study at any time, whatever their reasons.

As stated above, confidentiality was ensured at all times. Names of participants and their institutions were changed, and all data was stored in a password-protected computer to which only the researcher and his supervisory team had access. Although great efforts had been made to respect confidentiality and the anonymity of participants, Merriam (2009, p.161) indicates that "even when the names are changed, some people are easily identified by the details of their messages". For this reason, it is the researcher's responsibility to maintain the degree of confidentiality that was initially guaranteed to the participants (Dörnyei, 2007).

4.11 Trustworthiness

The qualitative nature of this piece of research demands evaluation criteria that consider the specific characteristics of interpretivism over the traditional positivist view. In this respect, Lincoln and Guba (1985) propose the term *trustworthiness* as an alternative – also called parallel – set of criteria for the evaluation of research under the interpretivist paradigm. In Lincoln and Guba's (1985) view, trustworthiness consists of the following four criteria: *credibility*, *transferability*, *dependability* and *confirmability*. These criteria relate to the concepts of internal validity, external validity, reliability and objectivity in the positivist tradition respectively.

Chapter 4

Credibility "refers to establishing confidence in the findings and interpretations of the research study" (Lincoln and Guba, 2013, p.104). In order to show credibility in my inquiry, I used a series of techniques before, during and after my data collection. First, I spent three months engaging with my participants and their context, constantly visiting my participants, building trust, and observing the specific features of each case (programme). In addition, I used triangulation of methods in order to strengthen my design and to minimise the weaknesses that semi-structured interviews, classroom observations and document analysis may present when they are used as the only method of inquiry. What is more, constant communication with my supervisory team at all times of the research process has been essential for reflections on the directions that this work has taken, and have been kept in an audit trail. Finally, all recordings obtained from interviews and classroom observations as well as copies of documents analysed for the purpose of this thesis have been archived and are available on request.

Unlike external validity, the criterion of transferability does not seek generalisable findings. As mentioned above, case study research investigates the particularities of one or more bounded entities without the intention of generalisation (Stake, 2005). However, transferability in qualitative research refers to providing enough description of context, methods, data and analysis techniques in order for other inquirers to apply these interpretations to other – perhaps similar – contexts. In this respect, this study does not intend to provide generalisations of the beliefs and practices of teacher educators in Chilean ELT programmes, but to provide thick descriptions of the cases that are under scrutiny. It is, therefore, the readers' responsibility to assess how the context-specific findings of this study may be relevant for replication in other contexts (Duff, 2008).

Dependability "addresses how the findings and interpretations could be determined to be an outcome of a consistent and dependable process" (Lincoln and Guba, 2013, p.105). In order to achieve this criterion, I have created an audit trail (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) with all the steps that were taken in order to achieve the results and findings presented in the following chapters and, therefore, given the same conditions, a replication of the same study should be possible. The depth of detail in the rationale for the research design presented in this chapter also contributes to ensuring the dependability of the findings of this study.

Finally, confirmability is understood as the qualitative research equivalent of the positivist evaluation criterion of objectivity. It refers to the systematic step-by-step process that the researcher undertakes in order to ensure that the results, findings and conclusions presented in a study correspond to the actual responses, experiences and ideas of the respondents, rather than the researchers' own predispositions (Shenton, 2004). The techniques that I have employed to achieve confirmability are triangulation of methods, a statement of my own position regarding the topic in question, and keeping an audit trail with details of all stages of the research process.

4.12   **Summary**

This chapter presented the research questions that guide the present study as well as an overview of approaches and methods for the study of teachers' beliefs and language ideologies. After reviewing the relevant literature, I concluded that the most appropriate research design for my study was a collective case study and opted for semi-structured interviews, classroom observations and document analysis as suitable data collection methods. A rationale for each of the chosen methods was presented along with a description of their strengths and limitations. Details about the implementation of the methods and the challenges faced were also outlined. In addition, this chapter introduced the three ELT programmes that act as cases for the purpose of this study and the 27 participants are individualised. After that, this chapter presented the analytical framework and strategies utilised in the data analysis stage. Ethical considerations were discussed along with strategies to ensure participant confidentiality. Finally, I presented the strategies employed in order to comply with research trustworthiness.

In the following chapter, I present the findings and interpretations of this collective case study. Due to the differences in amount of document data collected across the three cases, codes from document analysis were combined with codes emerging from the interviews for the creation of themes, while themes emerging from classroom observations are presented separately. Since the primary source of data is the semi-structured interviews, coded extracts from document and classroom observation analysis are mainly used to support or contradict the interview data and for the purpose of triangulation.

Chapter 5   Programme A: Within-case analysis

5.1   Introduction

The analysis of interview and document data from Programme A generated two main themes that revealed the beliefs and practices that its English teacher educators hold in relation to the English that they speak, the English that they teach, and the influence of their own training on their current practices. It is important to mention again that most participants across the three cases were trained in this programme and, as might be expected, the majority of the participants who work as teacher trainers in this programme were trained in this university. This particularity is evident in the way in which the participants reflect on their own training and the practices of other teachers in the programme, since in several cases some participants transitioned from a student-teacher relationship to a colleague/mentor association. The main themes that emerged from this analysis were "Pride in tradition" and "Opposition to traditional ELT". A discussion of these themes is presented below and details about individual participants are presented in Section 4.6.

5.2   Pride in tradition

Many of the teacher educators from Programme A refer to the ELT course that they offer as a "traditional" programme because of their long history and prestige as one of the oldest ELT programmes in the country. This tradition emphasises a focus on linguistic analysis that is evident in the curriculum, with almost two-thirds of the modules aiming towards English proficiency (phonetics, grammar, written and spoken English, and lexis), British and American literature, and British and American culture. In Extract 1, when asked about how his module responds to the global spread of English, Julian, an experienced phonetics teacher, reflects on the origins of the programme and how the idea of a tradition in ELT training has been followed and guarded by different generations of trainers. The following extracts are presented using the transcription conventions outlined in Table 4 on page 92, while key points are highlighted in bold.

Chapter 5

Extract 1

> **Julian:** […] there's is another tradition that started with […] the first head of English
> Department at [[our mother University]] more than a hundred years ago and what
> HE started in those days, I'm talking about 1897 (2) um: installed this type of (2) what
> can I call it? um: @@ **institution, if we can call it that, of the teaching of English as a**
> **foreign language at the highest standards**, and what do I mean by high standards?
> well (2) learners, **student speakers of English with a good command, good grammar,**
> **good phonetic and phonological levels (2) literature, American, British, etcetera** […]
> there's always been this very close connection between [[our university]] and the UK
> through the British Council and this is why so many of us ended up doing
> postgraduate degrees, taking those degrees in Great Britain, many of us, **and this is**
> **why there is a long-standing tradition in the English department, in Chile in general,**
> **of people like me, people who speak British rather than American** and a similar
> situation you can find in Argentina which is the other big (1) place

For Julian, the tradition that Programme A has followed since its creation is comparable
to an "institution" or school of thought whose seal is linguistic proficiency and knowledge
of Anglo-American literature. This view is in line with the aforementioned emphasis on
linguistic analysis that is present in the curriculum of Programme A. Julian also highlights
how this tradition has been emphasised by collaborations with the British Council in
South America and has led to the spread of British English as the preferred model of
English for ELT in the country. In fact, the analysis of the phonetics module programme
revealed that the phonetics course is designed to "introduce the students to the practical
aspects of the module, especially to the phonological system of the General British
accent" (my translation). Interestingly, Julian positions himself as a speaker of British
English instead of a Chilean speaker of English, and by doing this, he implies that it is not
necessary to be a native speaker of English from Britain in order to be considered a
speaker of British English, and therefore it is a form of English that student teachers could
eventually acquire.

Further evidence of this so-called tradition is given by other teacher educators from this
Programme. As Extract 2 below shows, Esteban, an experienced teacher of English
grammar, describes how British English has been the dominant linguistic norm for pre-

service teachers to acquire during their training. What is more, he also associates his own form of English with a British variety, one that he acquired from his former teachers.

Extract 2

> **Esteban: we are the traditional [[university]]** and the ones who founded this programme were all Europeans and of course British English was the one that was adopted and for a long time [[this university]] was built with British teachers and we have British teachers **so everybody who studied [[here]] at that time […] ended up being trained in British English** but that's only because of the historical issue [...] and **I think I got my British English from [[this Programme]] because I studied here and [[Julian]], the one next door, was my TEACHER, you understand? and that's why I speak British English**

Esteban's comment reflects how this tradition of teaching and learning British English is passed on from generation to generation through teacher/trainee interactions. The fact that Esteban makes explicit reference to Julian as a source of his own English reinforces the belief that this notion of British English is a variety that can be acquired by non-native speakers as the result of constant training. It is easy to assume that Esteban and Julian claim to speak British English because it was the only model of English that they were exposed to, since the tradition of the programme has historically had a strong preference for and an overt promotion of British English. When asked about this issue, Paula, an early career lecturer who was also trained in this programme, reveals that despite knowing that her understanding of the British tradition in the programme is a matter of repetition from teachers to students, she tends to transmit the same information to her students without actually questioning this information, as can be seen in Extract 3 below.

Extract 3

> **Researcher:** and does the programme promote a specific variety? openly
>
> **Paula:** of English? yeah yes, **I would say yes, we do, the British**
>
> **Researcher:** why do you think is that? why British?
>
> **Paula:** tradition I think- well I think it's got to do with- ((interruption)) **I think it's got to do with the tradition of the school** (.) I think it also has to do a lot with the (.) the history that the British-

((interruption by another teacher educator))

Paula: well but **maybe this is just something I'm repeating because I heard it from a former teacher of mine here** but **that's what I also tell my students** but I don't know maybe I should give it a thought but the thing is **British English has a much longer tradition in studying the phonetics of the language** instead Canadian English, for example, has never been systematised or if it has been it's not very well known (.) and then there's also the matter of prestige, you see, **British English is much more prestigious than any other accent of English** and that's common knowledge, **everybody knows that**, everybody knows that if you speak educated English or I don't know general British you are going to have more doors opens for you so (.) **what I tell my students is this is a strategy** also it's got to do with opening more doors for you if you study British English you are going to be looked at with another pair of eyes, I don't know, like seen as an educated person

In her account, Paula points out other factors that, she believes, are additional reasons why the tradition of teaching British English is so strong in Programme A. For example, Paula positions British English over other English varieties when it comes to ELT due to the extent in which Received Pronunciation has been studied and described in the phonetics literature. In addition, she highlights the embedded prestige that British English carries, which is a characteristic that, in her view, is known to everyone. In this extract, Paula also exposes her belief that acquiring British English in ELT training might be seen as an advantage for the learner's career and as a tool that helps users to portray an image of status through language use. In these three first extracts it is possible to observe that these participants from Programme A refer to British English as a stable and fixed standard variety, not as a comprehensive term that includes the variety of accents and dialects that can be found in the British Isles. Considering this, the notion of "general British" or "educated English" being addressed by teachers of phonetics and relevant curricular documents can be interpreted as a reference to RP.

Most teacher educators in this ELT programme agree that British English is either implicitly or explicitly being promoted as a linguistic target because of the aforementioned educational tradition in the country. This view is also pointed out by Samuel, the Programme Director, who recognises the influence of this historical tradition, but also indicates that this does not mean that trainees are not exposed to other forms of

English during their training, as can be observed in Extract 4 below. Samuel also suggests that even though the programme has traditionally favoured and promoted British English, teacher educators with other Englishes have also been accepted as suitable models and have contributed positively to the development of the programme.

Extract 4

> **Researcher**: do you think that this programme tries to promote a specific variety of the language?
>
> **Samuel:** (5) mmm not explicitly
>
> **Researcher:** okay?
>
> **Samuel:** (2) but by saying that, explicitly, I communicate the idea that implicitly it does
>
> **Researcher:** (1) how?
>
> **Samuel:** it's **because of this tradition that I have mentioned** 'cause when this programme, **when this department started it was created with this view of the British English** and that was mainly because of history (1) people from Europe came here and they created not only this programme but some others in different places (.) and that has remained (1) so as I said before, **implicitly it does but we respect**- for example we've got teachers here from the US, who are native speakers, and **we also have teachers, professors who are working here who do not speak or communicate in British English (1) they've got some other backgrounds, from other cultures (.) and when they teach they show who they are** and what their background is so we respect that and we also of course respect that **students make a decision and say I'm going to use this variety and not this other because I like it**

Samuel´s comment reveals an openness to accept diversity in English that would apply to students and teachers in the programme, as he highlights that he and the department "respect" both the linguistic background that teacher educators may have before joining the programme, and the version of English that students "decide" to adopt during their training. This implies that the kind of English that learners in this programme develop is a matter of choice and taste and not necessarily the effect of exposure to a specific variety. This view is shared by other participants, who claim that even though there is a strong tradition of promoting and fostering British English in the training of future teachers of English in this programme, there is currently higher acceptance of other varieties.

Chapter 5

5.2.1   Acceptable English

Beliefs of what counts as "acceptable" English for trainees to acquire also emerged as part of this theme. It is clear from the evidence presented above that the construct of British English is promoted because of tradition and also because it is the form of English that has been adopted by some of the teacher educators, while other forms of English are also claimed to be accepted as a target for future teachers. Although Julian states that he speaks British English and therefore he teaches British English in his phonetics class, in Extract 5 he acknowledges that, in his phonetics class, he raises awareness of the differences this variety has in relation to American English so that his students can understand that British English is not the only correct form of English.

Extract 5

> **Julian:** well **I speak British so I have to teach British you can't teach something else**, […]
> when I give a lecture for example I give it in British but I try to- **I try not to ignore that
> there is another very important (.) accent which enjoys the same kind of prestige
> which is American** so whenever I have a chance I always tell my students this is
> British, be careful because this is American, **YOU are going to become models and
> YOU will have to say this is right or this is wrong**, so please don't end up saying this
> is wrong simply because that is the pronunciation you have not adopted, there are
> other ways, there is this other very prestigious accent which is American […] AND of
> course **I have nothing against students who don't speak the type of English I speak
> […] provided it sounds native-speaker language** I don't mind which language- which
> accent they will produce

Julian's contribution reveals that, in his view, there are two varieties of English that are suitable for English teachers to acquire and teach: what he understands as British English and a standardised form of American English. The use of these concepts to refer to these varieties as bounded and fixed is in line with Joseph's (1987) view of "standard English" as "synecdoche" since it does not refer to specific varieties of British or American English but to idealised forms that represent prestige and correctness. This perspective narrows down the range of acceptability to two varieties and reinforces the belief that students are expected to choose one of these varieties as part of their teacher training, since they

are supposed to become models of these forms of English. An alternative that Julian presents in his explanation is that he is willing to accept any form of English, provided that is native-speaker-like. Julian's beliefs of what counts as acceptable English in phonetics are known to other members of staff. For example, in Extract 6, Julia, another literature and culture teacher, justifies the normative approach of the phonetics class when discussing her students' preferences in relation to English varieties.

Extract 6

> **Julia:** well I'm not a phonetics teacher but HERE […] they are taught RP, which is British, but MY impression and- [[the students]] are VERY interested in North American English and the North American pronunciation (.) and **I think [[Julian]] tells them that that's fine**, you know, he teaches because **he has to give a STANDARD** but he tells them that it's **totally acceptable too**- and they're very interested in the North American accent

Apart from supporting the idea of acceptability that Programme A implicitly promotes, Julia's comment reflects a clear relationship between the notion of standard and the use of a normative approach for pronunciation. More importantly, the promotion of RP is perceived by Julia as more adequate due to its highly standardised form while the influence of American English is seen as acceptable but perhaps less appropriate for the purpose of teacher training. Another participant from this programme, Grace, confirms Julian's belief of what is regarded as acceptable English for future teachers to acquire by explaining how some students, who are granted scholarships to study abroad during their training, return to the programme with an Americanised form of English that is accepted because their skills have been "validated" abroad. This is presented in Extract 7 below.

Extract 7

> **Grace:** some students- when they go to their semester abroad and they go to Canada or the United States and they come back with this American accent, yeah they are accepted but probably because **they had this validation that they went to this other country** (1) but yeah I think they are accepted as long as they speak this perfect English, I guess (.) **a very standardised version of English**

Chapter 5

In Grace's view, even though there is an espoused openness towards variation among the teaching staff in Programme A, there is still an implicit belief that pre-service teachers in this programme are expected to acquire some kind of native-like proficiency, especially because of the demands of the phonetics classes. The association of British English with ideas of tradition, prestige and the choice of some of the teachers in this programme is evidence of how this belief is replicated in the discourse and practices of some of the participants.

5.2.2   Consistency of choice

The alleged openness to variation from the trainers' perspective seems to be restricted by a component of "consistency of choice" which demands that pre-service teachers stick to their chosen model of English in order to avoid mixing among varieties. From this perspective, choosing a model of English involves adopting its standardised pronunciation, grammatical rules and specific lexis. Extract 8 and Extract 9 below provide evidence of this view of language. For example, in Extract 8, David refers to the way in which he deals with acceptability and choice in his lessons and, in Extract 9, Esteban reflects on how he has made a choice of model and tries to be as consistent as possible with it.

Extract 8

> **David: if I had to classify and label my own way of pronouncing things I would say it's**
> **AMERICAN** because I had formation in there, I studied there for a year and I've been
> going there for different seminars or things so um: in MY case well I accept- well for
> me it's never been an issue, and I don't think it's an issue any- I mean it's not an issue
> any longer I would say (.) for some people it's really important (.) for some other
> people like me it's not really that important […] **I speak this way because it's a**
> **natural thing for me** but then MY students, especially the ones who are into
> phonetics and more technical things, they have like a very strong British kind of
> accent and they follow that and **that is acceptable (.) in terms of the rules of writing**
> **and things, as long as they are consistent I accept everything**

Extract 9

> Esteban: I tell my students, you know what? in my case **I've made a decision and my decision is I'm gonna try and speak AND write and my MODEL, the model I'm aiming at, is standard British English** (.) WHY? just a matter of taste […] if I was teaching English, not grammar, which is a different situation and the student comes to me with the expression "did you ever", you see? instead of "have you ever" and then I (.) **I would SEE if what he wrote is not consistent with the REST of his text and then tell him or her, "okay here you have American English, right? but try to be consistent"** because the problem that happens is that- I mean and it happens to MANY of us, even myself is that **we tend to MIX things because we're not just exposed to one type of English**, we're exposed to several types of English and I go to the cinema and I watch American movies=

The extracts above suggest that in this programme there is a common belief that users of English are expected to follow a specific model related to a standard variety of English and stick to it while avoiding potential mixes or influences from other Englishes, even when contact with those varieties is common practice (such as being exposed to American films). These choices that the participants refer to are likely to emerge as "a matter of taste" or because of past experiences, as Esteban and David suggest respectively. More importantly, this consistency of choice seems to be a necessary characteristic that ELT professionals are expected to display in their use of English. Therefore, the varieties of English that in-service and pre-service teachers are expected to conform to are constructed by these participants as fixed and bounded forms of English, while what this tradition regards as acceptable English does not seem to allow influences of other Englishes – let alone other languages – in the user's repertoire even when, as Esteban mentions in his second interview, **"PURE consistency is impossible to obtain"**. This view of language use is also reflected in the way in which Paula refers to her own English. As Extract 10 below shows, she sees the idea of mixing features of different Englishes in her communication in English as a phenomenon that is surprising and beyond her control.

Chapter 5

Extract 10

> **Paula:** I TRY to stick to the British tradition uh **sometimes the American takes over** @@@ I
> don't know WHY I do that, I don't know, I've been doing it since university, I don't
> know, **but I try to stick to the British**, RP or general British or BBC English whatever,
> those three names

Interestingly, this phenomenon of consistency of choice also seems to be linked to the
idea that teachers can only teach the kind of English that they identify themselves with.
As pointed out earlier in Extract 5, Julian "can't teach something else" because his model
of choice is British English. Similarly, Esteban justifies his adhesion to one particular model
by saying that he is not able to teach all forms of English. In addition, he indicates that he
normally engages in discussions with his students regarding the model of British English
that is promoted in the programme, and emphasises that if students are interested in
developing a different form of English, the programme does not have suitable staff to
provide this kind of training. He says **"I tell my students 'well, if you want to have better
English pronunciation, use the tools that you've been given, because you've been given
tools to develop better English pronunciation but it's British English (1) NOW if you
want to speak American English then you will have to develop on your own because we
don't have American teachers, I mean teachers who are teaching American
pronunciation from first year on'"**. Furthermore, he also admits being aware that his
choice of pedagogical materials is also influenced by his choice of English model, since
even when dealing with local or global topics he prefers to use sources that are in line
with his choice as evidenced in Extract 11 below.

Extract 11

> **Esteban**: ((browsing through The Guardian's webpage)) look at this "we're finally waking up
> to intersex rights?" so the problem with transsexuals
> **Researcher**: so these are global issues
> **Esteban**: yeah: exactly BUT with British sources, **I only use British sources** and WHY? **because
> I wanna be consistent with the type of English I speak myself and I teach** because I
> don't think you can teach all kinds of English […] I made a choice and my choices of
> course have an impact on what I teach to the students because **I cannot teach all**

kinds of English, that's impossible [...] but again you also have to tell students that **there are OTHER alternative, possible, acceptable and correct, not just acceptable, CORRECT ways of saying something**, you see?

The extracts above show evidence of the idea that the construct of British English is encouraged in the curriculum and, for some participants, is perceived as a desirable proficiency goal for their students; American English is recognised as an acceptable model to follow due to its presence in the media and entertainment; and other Englishes seem to be absolutely neglected both as models and also as a means of raising awareness of linguistic variation and diversity in English. These beliefs about the relationship between English varieties and models for ELT seem to have different effects among members of staff, since some of them clearly advocate to this view, while others are more critical of it because of the effect that this tradition has had on their beliefs about their own use of English.

5.2.3   Native-speaker affiliation

As shown in the previous section, Javier and Esteban, two of the most experienced teacher trainers in the programme, overtly identify themselves as speakers of British English despite being Chilean and despite English not being their mother tongue. Furthermore, both have lived and pursued postgraduate studies in the UK and admit preferring this variety over others. None the less, it is not only the most experienced participants from Programme A who have a tendency to associate their English with the idea of standard varieties of English, since it seems to be common practice for other participants who were trained in this programme to do so. For instance, as shown in Extract 8 and Extract 10 above, David classifies his English as American, and Paula tries to follow "the British tradition" while also being influenced by regular exposure to American English.

When describing their own English in the interviews, these participants also report having been praised on their assimilation to native-speaker varieties. Julian, for example, claims to **"have passed off as an English-speaking person, very often"** while Esteban narrates a similar situation in one of his trips to England, mentioning that British people would

normally say **"how come you speak British English if you've never been here?"** and he would reply by indicating that he acquired it as part of his teacher training in Chile. In a similar way, Paula describes how the English she learnt in this programme as a trainee has helped her project an image of an educated speaker of English when she travelled to the UK while she was still a student, as shown below in Extract 12. These examples reveal that these participants see this type of external validation as evidence of the effectiveness of the aforementioned traditional approach to ELT that is offered by Programme A. It is important to point out, however, that two other participants, Carolina and Julia, who spent a considerable amount of time in North America, and who did not train as teachers in this programme, did not describe their English as conforming to a specific variety.

Extract 12

> **Paula**: when I went to England everybody thought my English was very GOOD and **they were like surprised that I was LATINA and spoke such good English** and they asked me all the time where did you learn that English of yours **and I was like "well at university" and it's TRUE** because when I was in school I studied in a co-ed school, very normal, nothing private, there was no bilingualism there, I had a very bad English teacher actually, he made us translate (.) that's what his technique was so my motivation doesn't come from him, so yeah I think that's my answer
> **Researcher**: do you think you are a (1) let's say you're a good product of this university?
> **Paula**: I think so, yeah @ yeah I could say that yeah @@

These examples provide evidence that for these teacher educators, the English that they speak is expected to conform to specific norms that are validated by native speakers of that variety. More importantly, these results are in line with the findings in Jenkins's (2007) seminal study of NNES teachers' attitudes towards ELF. Jenkins found that her participants had conflicting views about their own English, some of which revealed a strong desire to project a NES identity in their use of English in similar ways to the examples presented above. The association of their English with an ENL variety, the consistency of their choices and the importance of NES validation may suggest that these teachers see the English language as a resource that allows membership in idealised ENL communities, since they portray themselves as carriers of others' English. That is to say, the form of English that they associate with is not that of a Chilean user of English as an

additional language – whose first language may influence their English – but instead that of an "educated" native speaker from the UK or the US. Some participants openly manifest this belief when referring to the objectives of this teacher education course. For Julian, for instance, the purpose of the phonetics course is to give his students the necessary elements to develop a form of English which is as close to a native-speaker model as possible, while at the same time learning about the theoretical aspects of phonetics and phonology that they are expected to apply in their teaching. Interestingly, in Extract 13 Julian also refers to his own teacher training by admitting that he replicates in his classroom what his phonetics teacher used to do some decades ago. This is a clear example of how a trainee's observations of their teachers' classroom behaviours, beliefs and practices are likely to have an effect on the trainees' future practices (Lortie, 1975).

Extract 13

> **Researcher:** could you tell me a little bit about the objectives of that course? what you actually do with the students
>
> **Julian:** yes first of all (1) we want our students to be- **I want my students to become (2) speakers of English whose English sounds as (1) less, less foreign as possible** (1) and I think we are pretty successful in that respect […] somebody whose English, the pronunciation of whom is acceptable, I aim- **we aim at HIGH acceptability** (.) because **we have it very clear in our minds that the people that we teach will become models of pronunciation** (.) so we KNOW we are very demanding there and I don't regret it […] we believe very strongly in that principle that which is YOU are going to become- **I tell my students, YOU have to become experts as far as possible, technicians in matters of pronunciation**, you're saying this and I would like to say THIS which is very near but is not quite, okay? (1) in those days I remember **MY phonetics teacher did very much the same things that I do now**=

The emphasis on NES pronunciation models, especially RP, has proved to produce the expected results in their students' development of English, as Julian indicates above. Some other participants from Programme A also manifest their satisfaction regarding the effects of this programme's linguistic instruction on the proficiency of their graduates. Julia, for example refers to how some students develop **"such a beautiful British accent"** and suggests that **"talented students should be given the opportunity to travel abroad**

so that their English becomes almost native". Similarly, Esteban comments that teacher educators from other programmes tend to criticise the emphasis on NES proficiency that is evident in Programme A's curriculum, to which he admits responding by stating **"well, we want to have the best teachers"** assuming a direct connection between language proficiency and effective teaching skills, but also acknowledging that **"language is only one of the components of having the best teachers"**. However, the relationship between language proficiency and pedagogical effectiveness seems to be a problematic issue in this tradition since, as Samuel points out in Extract 14 below, this approach seems to have succeeded in helping students develop the expected linguistic proficiency (C1 level), but this has not necessarily translated into training better teachers of English.

Extract 14

> **Samuel: we know exactly what to teach here because this is a department with tradition** and if we've learned with teachers who've been teaching for forty years, fifty years, our students nowadays should learn the language or should learn how to teach **but most of them don't know how to teach and we see that when we go and see their practicum, so there must be something happening**

5.3   Opposition to traditional ELT

In general, participants from this programme revealed tensions in relation to their own English and the beliefs of others. These tensions showed evidence of clear differences between the beliefs of teacher educators who support the traditional ELT model that operates in the programme, and those who believe that the programme should move away from the idea of tradition that was presented above. The patterns that emerged from the interview data suggest that the familiarity of the participants with each other's beliefs about English as subject matter – due to the fact that most teacher educators were trained in the same programme and many of them were trained by some of their colleagues – translates into a division between those who portray themselves as users of standardised varieties (native-speaker affiliation) and those who distance themselves from such an affiliation.

5.3.1   Criticism of tradition

The findings of the within-case analysis of Programme A also showed that many participants from Programme A presented a clear opposition towards the beliefs about English that some of their colleagues openly display and project in their teaching. Some of the teacher educators who did not show affiliation to ENL varieties when describing their English tended to portray a particular set of beliefs in relation to their own English. For instance, they distanced themselves from an association of their English to an ENL form by demonstrating an embracement of the influence of Spanish in their English; they avowed the belief that insistence on NES models may result in learners acquiring an unauthentic form of English; and they exhibited awareness of Englishes other than the dominant standard forms. More importantly, these teacher educators responded with a degree of criticality to the beliefs and practices that have historically been dominant in the programme.

For instance, in Extract 15 below, Alex, one of the English grammar teachers, criticises the way in which some teacher educators in the department show pride in sounding like users of RP; in his opinion, this is a phenomenon that contrasts with their identity as Chilean teachers. Alex, who was also trained in this programme, reveals how different generations of pre-service teachers are constantly under pressure to produce sounds and communication skills as close as possible to the pronunciation goals required in the phonetics classes. What is more, these pronunciation goals seem to be so deeply ingrained in the curriculum of this programme because of the professional homogeneity of the teaching staff (most of them having been trained in the same programme) that there is limited questioning of or resistance to the influence that this traditional approach may have on future teachers. For this reason, in most cases when teacher educators in this programme referred to the proficiency goals outlined by the programme, they tended to solely refer to pronunciation and, more specifically, to the phonetics courses. In this respect, David questions the traditional goal of native-speaker proficiency that still operates in the Chilean context by stating that **"if you expect other people to be able to speak like a native speaker when you are not a native speaker YOURSELF that makes no sense"** highlighting the fact that, unlike other contexts, the vast majority of teachers of

English in Chile are non-native users of English, and therefore promoting a NES model in the country might be an unrealistic and, above all, unnecessary goal.

Extract 15

> **Researcher**: do you think your students join the programme expecting to acquire a specific variety of the language?
>
> **Alex:** I think there are strong stereotypes around TEACHERS and students (.) **it's very common in this department to have this feeling of- to be PROUD of how close you speak to a native speaker which is very nonsensical** (1**) I'm always making these jokes about talking in RP and being a Latin American** which is very weird if you think a little bit about that um: but students are usually making strong efforts in order to (2) **IMITATE sounds from certain very specific and small population within a very specific place which is England**
>
> **Researcher:** so they come with that idea:=
>
> **Alex:** =they come with that idea and **I think that teachers are also applauding that idea** (.) because we are not saying or we are not against that- It's not a conscious thing I think, **it's because of our training as well because most of us were trained by the very same department** so we all share certain common characteristics which is basically this accent- I don't know if it's an accent I have **but it's a strong influence by the way in which we were trained by the very same people that still work there**

5.3.2   Appropriation of English and Embracement of L1 Features

One of the patterns that emerged from the interview data as a response to the programme's traditional approach to ELT was a rejection of the affiliation to NES English that was evident in Section 5.2.3. Some participants in Programme A demonstrated evidence of appropriation of the English language in their beliefs and their language use. In other words, they claimed not to necessarily follow an ENL model of proficiency, especially in their pronunciation and showed awareness and embracement of their non-nativeness and the influence of their first language. The influence of the emphasis on accuracy, and especially the demands for imitating specific models in their own teacher training, however, is still perceived as a major factor in their use of English and seems to be a source of internal tensions in the teachers' own belief systems.

Extract 16 below shows how Grace avoids classifying her English under a native-speaker label, but does show preference for American English because of the exposure that she had to it during her learning process. It is important to point out here that Grace did not train as a teacher in this programme. In fact, she trained to become a linguist rather than an English teacher at another prestigious university, and claimed not to have received any pedagogical training before joining this programme. Grace's description of her own English shows a close relationship between her beliefs about the way she communicates in English and her identity as a non-native teacher of English. She acknowledges the presence of "mistakes and unperfect pronunciation" in her English when compared against an idealised native-speaking benchmark. However, in Grace's view, distancing herself from a native-speaking norm is not a negative aspect of her English, but a sign of appropriation of the language instead. Similarly, Alex acknowledges the influence of his first language in his use of English, while also indicating that his accent is in line with the training that he received in this programme as a trainee. He states that **"undoubtedly I have some features of RP because of my training (.) undoubtedly I have some features of Spanish because it's my mother tongue [...] if I can categorise it in a way it's a sort of English Spanish-like which is a huge mixture of them"**.

Extract 16

> **Grace:** I would describe it as just (2) oh how would I describe it? (2) **like a mixture** I guess (.) **I find that my English does not really answer to a specific pattern** or a specific variety of English? but I did learn English as a child (.) I started learning when I was like 8 probably so um that means that **I was more exposed to American English than to British English and I do prefer that variety though**, I feel more familiar (.) with it but that doesn't mean that I don't like the other varieties (.) I mean I really like- I like languages in general and I love English and I love Spanish so I love all the varieties of the languages and (.) **but mine specifically mine is just the one that makes me feel comfortable, the one that reminds me who I am as a person and that's this one (.) with mistakes and UNperfect pronunciation** but it's good for me, you know, and the students understand it so that's good (.)

Grace's contribution reveals another interesting phenomenon in the beliefs of these teacher educators. Even though she claims not to conform to specific NES norms in her

use of English and thus having developed her own version of the language, she still refers to varieties of English as synecdoche standards when stating her preferences. Negative attitudes towards the notion of British English that is constructed in this programme are commonly espoused by the participants that criticise the "British tradition" that dominates the programme. For instance, when Carolina refers to the influences that have contributed to developing her English, she admits that **"I don't like the British @@@ accent that's so strong"** revealing a view of what counts as British English similar to the point expressed by Grace. This view of varieties of English as fixed standards along with the insistence upon promoting RP as a model of pronunciation seemed to have also had an impact on the teacher educators' beliefs about the real nature of the English that is taught in the programme. In this respect, the interview data also revealed a sub-theme concerning the authenticity of the English that these teacher have acquired and teach. A discussion of this sub-theme is presented below.

5.3.3 "Fake" English

The sub-theme of "fake" English was a recurrent one among the beliefs about the English that is taught in the programme and the beliefs about the teachers' own English. References to the emphasis on RP pronunciation in the teachers' own training, along with the lack of contact with users of English whose first language is not Spanish, were commonly associated with the development and promotion of forms of English that do not reflect real life communication in this language. Even though, as presented in Sections 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 above, some teacher educators perceive the imitation of an ENL model as beneficial for group affiliation, some others believe that demanding that future teachers conform to native speaker models in terms of pronunciation may lead to a false affiliation to ENL groups.

Lucas, another teacher educator who was trained in this programme, describes how his English has transitioned from a strong affiliation to the notion of British English that dominated his training to a "neutral" accent that makes his English sound less "fake". In Extract 17, Lucas's account evidences that the model of British English that he acquired because of his training – an imitation of RP – was perceived as unauthentic by NESs themselves due to his repeated efforts to imitate an accent that is commonly associated

to the British royalty and upper classes (Milroy and Milroy, 2012). He interprets this experience as a realisation that allowed him to develop a form of English that is not necessarily associated to specific national models since, in his view, English "belongs to the world" and not only to users in the inner circle.

Extract 17

> **Lucas:** I think my English at the very beginning was **a constant imitation of British English** I would say (.) I had the opportunity to go to England when I was a student here and I remember one opportunity, **one particular instance that actually changed everything** because […] I was having a conversation with little kids, I was teaching them Spanish but I was giving them the instructions in English and **I remember I was with my best RP at that time** […] and suddenly <u>one of them</u> asks and says "[[Lucas]] can I ask you a question?" and I say "yes of course" and he said **"are you the Queen's cousin?"** @@ and everyone laughed and I was like shocked- of course I laughed **but I was shocked afterwards because I realised how FAKE my English was, and at that specific moment I think I tried to neutralise my accent**

Similar views about this issue are presented by other participants from this programme. For instance, Carolina postulates that **"what I see here is this fake British accent in Chilean people",** suggesting that the relationship between being users of English from an Expanding circle context and imitating an idealised model of English lacks an appropriate sense of the purpose of teaching English in Chile. Interestingly, Julian, one of the teacher trainers who supports the belief that students should develop native-like proficiency in their use of English, also comments on how some Chilean people, particularly English teachers, tend to display a kind of English that may sound unnatural for them because of their condition as non-native users. He mentions that **"what I do try not to do is sound stilted, you know, because that's the other possibility (2) very good Chilean speakers of English sometimes sound a bit too stilted and I'm against that, nothing artificial please, be as normal as possible"**. By referring to "the other possibility", this participant places acceptability within a continuum that stretches from the unnatural imitation of an idealised English form to the dominance of features of the user's L1 in his or her English.

Chapter 5

Another perspective is presented by Grace who, despite distancing herself from NES standards in her use of English, expresses the belief that she speaks an unnatural form of English herself. In her view, what makes her English unauthentic is connected to the fact that – in the Chilean context – English is not commonly learnt and used in the same way as in ENL countries, and she attributes the lack of genuineness of her English to her limited contact with native speakers, rather than to an alleged constant imitation of an unrealistic model. Unlike other participants from this programme, she admits never having travelled to an English-speaking country, and therefore she suggests that her English lacks the kind of validation that those who have put their English into practice in ENL settings have. Even though in Extract 16 she manifests that she is comfortable with her own English and also demonstrates negative attitudes towards native-speakerism by stating that **"I hate this concept of the native speaker as the supremacy of English (.) that's not real (.) today we have more non-native speakers than native speakers, so English belongs to the world now, they lost"**, positioning herself as an empowered non-native user of English, there is evidence of tensions in her own belief system in relation to her views about her own English, since she also seems to believe in an idealised or pure form of communication in English that can only be achieved by communicating with native speakers in ENL contexts, as presented in Extract 18 below.

Extract 18

Grace: I have never travelled abroad and it worries me a lot that whenever- IF one day I travel to the United States or Australia or whatever, **I'm not going to understand because what I know about English is like FALSE** (.) it's English from the movies, it's English from the TV and that's not real (.) or it's English from here, which is not real (.) it's just (1) [it's assimilation,

Researcher: [what do you mean by not real?

Grace: it's assimilation (.) because we don't s- we are non-native speakers of English and: we are not- **we haven't been exposed to English since an early age like other non-native speakers** so um there's this- yeah I have to [agree?] on the critical period hypothesis that we don't have this NAG for English, this like instinct for English, we have to learn it, like consciously and that's different from learning it as a child so um: that's why **I think that it's not like real REAL English, it's more like assimilation of**

English (.) sometimes I wonder if I'm going to go and ask for a burger somewhere and if I'm going to understand what they say

In her account of what constitutes unreal or fake English, Grace refers to the samples of English that Chilean people are constantly exposed to through entertainment (TV, music, films), which she sees as an unauthentic representation of what English language use actually is, since these samples of language are commonly intended for international audiences. More importantly, she associates her idea of fake English with the English that is taught in English courses – and more specifically, in Chilean ELT courses – since she makes a clear distinction between the "real" English that is spoken by native speakers or those who "learn it as a child" in ENL countries, and the "assimilation" to which learners in the Chilean context are expected to resign themselves, due to the lack of exposure to authentic communication in English in the country. Grace's identification of the English that is learnt in EFL contexts as "fake", and the comparison she makes between native speakers and learners of English as a foreign language, reveal a depiction of native speakers as the sole authority in English language use; it implies that Chilean learners are expected to assimilate to a NES model that they cannot achieve.

5.4   Findings from classroom observations (Programme A)

As mentioned in Section 4.6, all participants from Programme A, except for the Programme Director, were observed twice in order to identify practices that revealed further beliefs about English and in order to support the findings that emerged from the interview data. The tensions among the beliefs of different teacher trainers at Programme A were also found in their practices. For example, one of the most common patterns found in the observations related to beliefs about the superiority of standard forms of pronunciation and grammar, which were made evident in some of the participants' teaching practices. These beliefs are mostly present in explicit and implicit references to the value of idealised forms of English – more specifically, "standard English" – and the marginalisation of non-standard ones. In addition, frequent references to differences between American and British English also revealed a disregard for other Englishes. Although instances in which such beliefs were observable in practice were

limited, in most cases they were made manifest by participants who supported the ideas of tradition in ELT, as discussed in Section 5.2.

In one of these observations, for example, one of these teacher educators[12] engaged in an exchange about the appropriateness of certain Englishes in different situations. During this conversation, he openly shared his belief about the superiority of standard forms as a goal for ELT with his students by stating that **"I would say teachers probably should aim at STANDARD English because teachers are educated people and maybe we should aim at standard English, generally speaking, but it doesn't mean that we don't have to be aware of OTHER possibilities, do you understand?"** Despite the fact that this teacher trainer acknowledges the existence of other Englishes, and even stresses the importance of raising awareness of variation, he directly associates the idea of a standard form with education and prestige, and thus contributes to stigmatising forms that do not conform to the standard as being uneducated.

Another pattern that was common across several lessons observed was an emphasis on communication rather than mastery of norms, especially by teacher educators who opposed the Programme's traditional approach. Beliefs that supported such practices were presented in implicit and explicit ways. Examples of implicit ways in which these participants promoted fluency and communication included a general avoidance of correction of their students' English when their messages were intelligible; very little or no reference to ENL countries or varieties; and common engagement in negotiation of meaning between teachers and students. More explicit instances included opportunities for discussion about ideological issues related to the imposed norms – for example, RP in the case of pronunciation – and comments from teacher educators that directly criticised the dominant focus on correctness that the ELT profession has historically promoted in

---

[12] I decided to further anonymise my participants when describing their practices since the fact that other students were present during the observation may decrease the existing level of confidentiality of this study.

the training of teachers in Chile. Extract 19 below presents an example of such interactions.

Extract 19

> **Teacher:** when we talk about norms we talk about the objective to follow (.) what's a norm anyway? how do we define a norm? if I say ENGLISH what's the norm that you follow? would you follow a norm? **what's the norm in the English department?** Do you think there's a norm? a kind of English we should follow, we should learn?
>
> **Students:** RP
>
> **Teachers: RP, British English <u>of course</u> and General American?**
>
> **Students:** NO
>
> **Teacher:** only RP (.) well **that's the norm that is imposed in here**, right? but yeah what's a norm anyway? there are so many varieties of English, right? different PRONUNCIATIONS (.) you would say qualiTAtive or quaLItative (.) quantiTAtive or quanTItative, and so on.

The example above provides evidence of how some teachers encourage their students to develop a critical perspective towards the linguistic models that they are expected to acquire in the programme. What is more, it also provides evidence of the students' awareness of which norm is the dominant one in their training. In a similar, but perhaps more direct example, another teacher educator, who was providing guidelines about what to include in a lesson plan, advised her students that they "are not grammarians" and should not insist on language points as objectives for their lesson. Even though such instances were limited and did not constitute the main objective of the lessons observed, they revealed a positive relationship between the espoused beliefs of the participants from Programme B and their classroom practices.

Finally, a third pattern of classroom practices that offered evidence of beliefs about English was the relationship between the target language and the students' first language. As far as the researcher was concerned, all the students in the lessons observed spoke Spanish as a first language, like all the participant teacher educators. The classroom observations revealed instances in which this relationship was perceived as positive in some cases, while in others it was regarded as negative. For example, in one of the

phonetics classes, one of the teacher trainers made reference to the negative influence that Spanish-influenced pronunciation had in the production of English sounds. In Extract 20 below, he engages in an exchange with his students about the effectiveness of the pronunciation of one of the students.

Extract 20

> **Teacher:** Will people understand your message? what do you think?
> **Students:** <quietly> yes <quietly>
> **Teacher:** YES they WILL */quién dijo no? ARREPIÉNTETE/* ((who said no? REPENT)**)... people**
> **will say 'he is a foreigner'** ... **do you want to speak English like foreigners?**

The negative attitudes towards Spanish-accented English presented in the extract above clearly suggest a belief about the inferiority of "non-native" English in comparison to "native speaker" standards. The idea of "sounding like a foreigner" is presented as detrimental in the use of English. In fact, as the teacher refers to "people" who will make this type of judgement, it is possible to assume that the scenario that the teacher is portraying is an ENL context. A very similar example was presented by another teacher educator during a dictation and transcription exercise as can be seen in Extract 21 below. While checking the IPA transcriptions that her students wrote on the wall, she draws her students' attention to the way in which the word "blood" was transcribed. Since the answer that the students provided resembled stereotyped Spanish-accented pronunciation, she linked that example with the ways in which Mexican speakers are normally portrayed when speaking English. The idea of "sounding like a Mexican" that the teacher trainer describes here is then presented as undesirable and incorrect against the RP standard.

Extract 21

> **Teacher**: alright (.) this one, well you almost got it (.) BLOOD (.) I said <RP> BLOOD <RP> and
> this says BLOOD /blɔːd/, if you say BLOOD /blɔːd/ **you would probably sound like a**
> **Mexican** (.) I saw a lot of BLOOD /blɔːd/
> **((students laugh))**

Positive attitudes towards the relationship between English and Spanish, however, were limited to mixing the languages during instruction as a pedagogical strategy, providing

comparisons of the structural differences between the two languages, and the discussion of cultural differences.

5.5   **Summary**

The results of this analysis revealed deeply-rooted dynamics within Programme A. In this ELT programme, which represented the most traditional and dominant approach to ELT, beliefs about advantages in native speaker affiliation, the need for consistency in the choice of model of English, and fixed understandings of what is considered to be acceptable English had an important impact in the perceptions that teacher trainers at this programme about what was expected for their students to achieve. However, some participants demonstrated opposition to this dominant approach to ELT and revealed beliefs that embraced the linguistic and cultural diversity of English as well as their condition as non-native teachers of English. More importantly, most participants from this programme showed evidence of the impact of their own training in their belief systems either demonstrating a strong attachment towards the approach that they were subjected to as trainees or negatively criticising the models and ideas about English that they were expected to conform to. The analysis of classroom observations revealed the spread of opposing beliefs through teaching practices that, on the hand, implicitly and explicitly promote the superiority of NES standards, marginalise L1 features in English, while, on the other hand, others raise awareness of ideological issues in the programme's traditional approach.

Chapter 6   Programme B: Within-case Analysis

6.1   Introduction

As mentioned in Section 4.6., one of the particularities of Programme B is the implementation of a curricular innovation regarding the language skills modules. Unlike the other programmes that are included in this study, Programme B's curriculum does not include courses that are exclusively for the learning and analysis of English grammar and phonetics. Instead, it offers language courses that integrate these aspects of language along with communication and vocabulary. In other words, the traditional courses on grammar and phonetics that have historically dominated the curriculum of ELT programmes in Chile – as discussed by Barahona (2016) – do not run as separate modules in this programme, but rather as part of a more comprehensive English-language skills module that includes certain aspects of these disciplines. Participants from Programme B recurrently mentioned this in their interviews, while comparisons with other programmes and even with the programme's previous curriculum were also constantly made. The main themes that emerged from this programme were (a) rejection of tradition and (b) identity as Chilean teachers.

6.2   Rejection of traditional ELT

Comments about the participants' own training were common across the interview data, and many of them reflected a form of resentment towards or rejection of traditional knowledge base and practices in ELT. The emphasis on phonetics and grammar that dominated the participants' curriculum was perceived as detrimental and unnecessary for their career as teachers of English, while, at the same time, they valued the implementation of the new curriculum in their current programme because of the apparently clear distance that it takes from so-called traditional programmes. As with some participants from Programme A, comments about the teachers' own ELT instruction targeted their phonetics classes and the imposition of RP as a pronunciation model. Interestingly, these participants did not commonly refer to other language learning modules that are usually found in traditional ELT programmes, such as oral

communication or writing skills, when referring to their language learning experiences as pre-service teachers. This phenomenon suggests that modules on linguistic analysis – such as grammar and phonetics – may have a more significant impact on English teachers' beliefs than courses that focus on communication in the L2.

The interview data suggests that traditional ELT education is regarded, by Programme B participants, as a system of transmission of knowledge from a mentor to a trainee, which lacks criticality, and leads to unrealistic goals. This view of traditional ELT, as described by these participants, places NES proficiency at its core, and renders other forms of English invisible. Many teacher educators from this programme perceive the newly designed curriculum as a response to this kind of ELT instruction since, as they claim, it does not openly promote a specific variety of English in its language skills modules, and also because courses on linguistic analysis – such as phonetics and grammar – have been removed from the curriculum. When discussing the effects of the new curriculum on the students' development of pronunciation in comparison to other programmes that offer courses in phonetics, Silvia, an experienced methodology teacher, speaks for the other members of staff by criticising the ways in which they themselves have been trained to become teachers of English. In Extract 22, she refers to the ineffectiveness of traditional ELT in responding to the demands of the Chilean educational system since, despite focusing mostly on accuracy and native-like pronunciation, it has failed to train the kinds of English teachers that are required to raise the standards of English proficiency that the Chilean Ministry of Education has set for the school system. In addition, the rejection of traditional ELT that Silvia refers to seems to be one of the main motivations behind the curricular changes that Programme B has experienced, since many of these teacher educators see this innovation as a response to the negative aspects of their own training, especially regarding the focus on NES models.

Extract 22

> **Silvia:** I guess it's the fact that **we were subjected to such a traditional way of learning** or
> such a traditional way of NOT learning, causing in the people who work at this
> university, in this particular programme, **a rejection of WHATEVER LOOKED like a**
> **traditional curriculum** because we don't think that it has achieved anything […] we

are kind of going away and away and away from [[Programme A]], [[another university]] and all these universities that although their teachers are- their English is perfect, their contents are perfect, **the students do not become the teachers they should become**

A similar view is adopted by Javier, the coordinator of the language skills programme in Extract 23. In his account, he refers to the frustration that he and many of his classmates experienced during their training, especially regarding the emphasis on RP as a pronunciation goal. When reflecting on his own training, he discusses the conflicting views that he and perhaps many other teachers of English have in relation to the idea of British English that is imposed on courses that emphasise the acquisition of NES pronunciation. From Javier's perspective, what is problematic about this training is not simply how difficult or unachievable it is to imitate an NES model of English, but the fact that this model is not representative of how English is spoken in real life communication.

Extract 23

> **Javier:** I also received education that was like very non-critical so my role was accepting the teachings of a super teacher with his super voice and his super English […] [[the phonetics class was]] a source of frustration in many people, in all the people I know who studied English, **we all have this, I don't know, FEAR, rejection, complaints, issues with RP**, for example, and: even though okay you learn RP, you go to England and there's no RP, so that's the first clash, what do I do? and people laugh at you because you sound like the Queen or you try to sound like the Queen, **so in the end is like it's actually a waste of time especially if you want to communicate only** and: it's about communication, it's not about pretending

Javier's focus on his phonetics class reveals how influential that training was in the formation of his beliefs about ELT instruction. What is interesting to note in Extract 23 is that it suggests that phonetics courses that follow a traditional approach seem to be the element of ELT programmes that is most responsible for the development of a teacher's ability to communicate in English. Another interpretation of this phenomenon may be that Chilean teacher educators tend to associate immediately their language skills with issues of pronunciation and their ability to imitate NES models. The frustration that Javier

refers to is also shared by other participants from this programme, who also manifest the belief that the focus on NES models had a negative effect on their communication skills. For example, Sofia, one of the language skills teachers, reflects upon her instruction by stating that **"we were pushed to learn a certain accent, so I had to learn the British accent at that time and it was painful (.) it was painful (.) there were some sounds that I couldn't produce (.) finally I learnt but then I made my choice"**. This view of her instruction on pronunciation as a "painful" experience may be associated with Sofia's inability to conform to the pronunciation norms that were promoted in her training. Her comment about acquiring a desirable pronunciation in English and then "making a choice" is also a relevant finding and this matter will be discussed in Section 6.2.1 below.

6.2.1 Relinquishment of the English acquired through training

Most of the participants from Programme B claim to have been instructed "under an RP norm" as part of their teacher training. As mentioned before, the majority of these teacher educators obtained their teaching degrees from "traditional" programmes in Chile, and interestingly, more than half of the participants from this programme were trained in Programme A. The rejection of traditional ELT that I commonly found in the comments from the teacher educators were, in some cases, accompanied by a similar rejection of conforming to RP pronunciation when communicating in English. As Sofia mentioned in the previous paragraph, she managed to learn how to assimilate her speech towards an idealised British variety but then decided to modify her pronunciation. This alleged modification seems to be triggered by three relevant factors: (a) the participants' experiences in English-speaking countries; (b) their experiences as trainees and; (c) an embracement of their identity as non-native teachers of English. All these points are explored by Victor, an English language skills teacher, in Extract 24. Victor's contribution also offers a justification for the predominance of British English as the preferred model of English for ELT purposes, which is in line with the explanations presented by participants from Programme A. This justification is also followed by a citation of the popular and somewhat old saying "Chileans are the English of South America" which makes reference to the cultural, political and economic influence that Britain had in Chilean society during the Nineteenth century (Larraín, 2001) and to the alleged similarity in terms of personality that English and Chilean people would share. This reference is

used by Victor in a sarcastic manner, with the purpose of pointing out that the reason behind promoting British English in Chile is perhaps a wish to become more associated with an image of belonging to Western Europe, and an adoption of the prestige and tradition that are commonly associated with an idealised, aristocratic Britain.

Extract 24

> **Victor:** I was taught a specific variety of English, RP English of course (3) of course in terms of pronunciation, in terms of grammar, standard British English and **my teachers were very strict on me (.) they wanted me to speak like a British person** and that was the target in the end, you see? when we were assessed
>
> **Researcher:** why British [and not other?
>
> **Victor:** [because of a tradition thing (.) the first English school was founded by British scholars so we like that tradition (.) **we Chileans are the British of Latin America** ((being sarcastic)) so of course, it makes sense, you see? (2) but when you go abroad and you try to use this type of English you sound ridiculous because the people see you and they can notice that you are a Latin American person because you look like a Latin American person and if you don't look like a Latin American person you ACT like a Latin American person (2) so**: that was when I forgot, you know, my British accent, my British, you know, those things related to the (.) to this idea of (2) trying to be like a native speaker**

Victor's association of experiences using English in ENL contexts and the fact of being a Latin American user of English is twofold. On the one hand, it suggests that fostering an idealised British English would only have the "desired" effect when used inside the country. That is to say, conforming to RP pronunciation would provide Chilean speakers of English with a more sophisticated or educated image than displaying a use of English that sounds more influenced by the user's mother tongue, because of the alleged admiration that Chilean people may have for British culture in general. On the other hand, Extract 21 suggests that Latin American users of English may not be entitled to display features of NES pronunciation because of their status as NNESs. Either way, Victor claims to have "forgotten" his British accent because of these reasons, and refuses to associate his own English with the standard form that he was instructed in.

Chapter 6

Another example of this abandonment of RP as a personal model of pronunciation is presented by Javier. In Extract 25 below he refers to his experience living in the UK and how this had a major impact on his beliefs about British English. In this extract, Javier reveals that his past negative experiences in England, which related to discrimination because of his condition as NNES of English, motivated him to stop imitating a norm that, as he implies, does not belong to him because he himself is not a British person. He claims to have made a "conscious" decision against approximating to the NES model that dominated his training, not only because of the unrealistic expectations he had in relation to life in Britain but also, and more importantly, because of a realisation of his identity as a Chilean user of English. The concept of identity was another recurrent theme in the data and, therefore, an extensive discussion of this finding is presented in Section 6.3.

Extract 25

Javier: I cannot pretend to be someone who I'm not, even though for example at some moment I lived in England and I was KIND of assimilating because I sounded like terribly foreigner and I was discriminated because of my foreignness and: but that was a very contextual thing, and then I came back with bad taste so: **I decided not to sound, consciously**

Researcher: so, it was an effect of that experience?

Javier: yes so after that (.) I had like prejudices as well (.) **I lived in England kind of young so I was with all the expectations like British people and you know? all the clichés on British** and turned out to be that I ended up in a very rough area and I was like super discriminated because of skin colour, because of accent, because of many reasons so in the end I was like "is it worth it?" because in the end- and I'm not saying by this that all British are discriminating but: **it was an experience that actually allowed me to think of the importance of an accent** and I go back to the initial point of identity like **I'm not British, I'm not gonna sound British, I don't want to sound British** and here we are

The analysis of Programme B's interview data suggests that the teachers' personal experiences in English-speaking countries seem to play a determinant role in the adoption or rejection of specific models of English. As discussed as part of Programme A's findings in Section 5.2.3, passing as a native speaker was received with pride by some teachers

and, therefore, contributed to an association of their own English with ENL standard models. On the contrary, none of the teacher educators in Programme B openly claimed to be users of an ENL variety but they did acknowledge the influence of the imposition of specific models of pronunciation from their training in their use of English, especially RP. For instance, Cristina, another English language skills teacher, says **"I don't think that [[my English]] reflects any variety in spite of the fact that maybe there are some things that you can recognise because of the training"**, while, similarly, her colleague Antonio, when referring to his passion for learning and teaching English, says "**I don't associate that with the United States, I don't associate that with the UK, or with any other country but my own and my own identity. I don't feel that I'm any closer to an English speaking country because I speak English"**.

6.2.2   Embracement of Englishes

Participants from Programme B showed similar beliefs regarding the English that is taught in the language modules, suggesting that they do not favour any specific variety of English over the rest. The espoused rejection of a focus on one normative model in traditional ELT seems to be supported by an openness towards variation and awareness of Englishes other than ENL standards. According to the participants, this positive attitude towards the pluricentrality of English is reflected in the programme, especially in the English-language skills module, in an egalitarian view of English varieties in which personal preferences should not necessarily result in the imposition of a model. On the contrary, these teacher educators claim that they raise awareness of and expose students to different Englishes while also adhering to the belief that, due to the global status of English nowadays, any focus on varieties of English is irrelevant.

Participants from programme B also indicated that their students are free to choose whichever English model they desire to acquire or feel comfortable with, but also they claim to have the responsibility to show them that "there is more out there". One of the reasons that the teacher educators suggested for doing so included references to the status of English as a **"globalised language"**, as exemplified by Silvia, who points out that **"if it is globalised you don't have models or you don't really choose one or two"**. Similarly, when asked whether the programme promotes a specific variety of English,

Chapter 6

Javier refers to the programme's openness to Englishes other than ENL standards by saying **"absolutely, I mean, from African English, Indian English, Chinese, Polish, I don't know, South American English"** implying that their detachment from the promotion of one or two specific varieties as models for their students allows them to embrace the vast diversity of Englishes that may be used for pedagogical purposes. More importantly, some of the participants from Programme B revealed that the lack of exposure to the linguistic and cultural diversity of English in their own training was detrimental to their understanding and awareness of English forms other than American and British standards. In this respect, Cristina points out that **"I think we deserved @@ at that moment to know that, of course, there ARE varieties"**. A reflection about this issue is presented by Antonio, one of the English-language skills teachers, in Extract 26 below. What is remarkable in Antonio's contribution is that he asserts that there is a direct relationship between favouring a specific variety of English and promoting that variety in the teaching of English, which is a type of behaviour that, in his view, reflects common practice in Chilean schools.

Extract 26

> **Antonio:** maybe some people like the way British English is pronounced because of the sounds (.) because they like a British writer or because they like a British film-maker whatever, that's another valid reason (.) but that's a personal reason and **that doesn't make a variety better than any other in terms of communication** so that's what we want to make very clear that our students know this very CLEARLY (.) there are varieties that you might prefer […] for various reasons but that doesn't make any variety better in terms of communication or more suitable to teach, **so let's just END with this nonsense basically because they also push their students in schools to acquire one variety of English** so if their students pronounce <GA> number <GA> instead of <RP> number <RP> then "no, that's wrong, you're mispronouncing that word" which is absolutely nonsense (.) everybody would understand that whether you say <GA> number <GA> or <RP> number <RP> that's fine, it's fine to have an accent, **it's fine to have a model that speaks one particular accent if you like, but it's not fine if you use THAT model as a measurement of good (as a norm) as a norm of good or proper ENGLISH** (.) people in South Africa speak South African English, they perfectly communicate and they have a beautiful accent, pronunciation, but it's

> THEIR version, it's part of their identity, their culture, and it's perfectly functional (.)
> the same happens in China with people who speak a Chinese version of English so **it
> happens with all varieties of English, and it happens with MY variety of English**

The concept of variety is a recurrent one in the discourse of these teacher educators. The interview data suggests that most teacher trainers in this programme associate this concept with issues of national identity since they frequently referred to variations in English as being differences in use from country to country in a way similar to descriptions of World Englishes (Mesthrie and Bhatt, 2008). In fact, the analysis of the English language skills syllabus revealed that students who are in the 4th semester of their degree study a whole unit on World Englishes in their English language skills module. However, some of the examples provided by the participants also include territories that do not conform to Kachru's (1992) description of Inner Circle countries such as China, Poland and even Chile (see Section 6.3.1.).

6.3 Identity as Chilean teachers of English

The concept of identity was one of the most recurrent themes that emerged from Programme B's interview data. References to this concept related to two main areas: (a) the participants' descriptions of their own English and; (b) the idea of English that was promoted in the programme. Evidence of the influence of the notion of identity in the programme is also found in the teacher educators' practices, class materials and the programme syllabus, and is discussed in Section 6.4. The emphasis on identity that the programme offers is not only understood by the participants as being part of the restructuring of their ELT training programme, but also as a response to the dominant traditional approach that operates in Chilean ELT programmes. As one of the teacher educators who were responsible for Programme B's curricular innovation, Javier summarises the role that the idea of identity in the education of future teachers by pointing out how a focus on identity can help pre-service teachers achieve a better understanding of their own teaching context, and their role as teachers of English in Chile. This is exemplified in Extract 27 below.

Chapter 6

Extract 27

> **Researcher:** right (.) and talking about the programme where you work at (.) how does the
> programme itself respond to this international, I was going to say global, but
> international (1) current dimension of English?
>
> **Javier:** um: through one simple concept, well it's not simple but initial: let's say starting point
> that's how we start to like organise most of the programme and that was identity (1)
> **we tend to find lots of xenocentric programmes meaning (2) we love USA culture,**
> **we base our [[programme]] on what British do, on what Americans do**, so in that
> way you're responding to globalisation, but if you look at it from the term of identity,
> I mean, with all the implications that it has (1) you start placing yourself knowing and
> appreciating and valuing YOUR context, and that that context belongs to a
> community, let's use the word global community, so: by knowing that we need to
> basically relate with our neighbours in English, I mean, not the direct neighbours but
> **let's say in the international community is ENGLISH, I mean, that's the (2) the**
> **LANGUAGE (1) so: if we know who we are, we: will, I think, make a good use of**
> **what a language means** because it's not to access but to know yourself, to know who
> you are

Javier makes reference to an alleged "xenocentric" perspective that would be present in
other ELT programmes in Chile, and highlights their fixation with idealised forms of
American or British English and culture. Undoubtedly, his point can be interpreted as a
direct criticism of the long-standing "tradition" in ELT that participants in all three
programmes have referred to. In Javier's view, English is a language that allows Chilean
people to participate in a wider community in comparison to Spanish, and this belief is
linked to the concept of teacher identity by a separation of this role of English as a tool
for international communication, and the association of English to ENL models. This view
is also supported by Antonio, who refers to how these ideas about language and identity
are implemented in practice by stating that **"what we do is that we encourage students
to somehow develop an identity as English speakers that has to do with their context (.)
we are Chilean speakers, our native language is Spanish, so we don't expect anybody to
speak a standard version or British accent or American accent or acquire any particular
accent"**. What is relevant about this focus on identity as a theme is that it allowed this
programme's participants to explore their own beliefs about language use, models for

ELT, goals of teacher education, and their own use of English. The results of this exploration are presented as the sub-themes "'Chilean English' as a response to traditional models" and "Developing one's own English" below.

6.3.1 "Chilean English" as a response to traditional models

Beliefs about the existence, promotion and use of a 'Chilean' form of English were common among participants from Programme B. Even though, to my knowledge, "Chilean English" has not been documented as a variety in its own right, many of these participants revealed that they were "happy" with their students acquiring such a form as a result of their training, instead of imitating ENL models. In this respect, "Chilean English" can be understood as what Mauranen (2018) describes as a 'similect'. In other words, the fact that Spanish is the shared first language among Chilean learners of English is reflected in the similarities that these learners display regarding pronunciation, grammar, and word choice. Therefore, this notion of "Chilean English" does not make reference to a codified version of English – or a variety or dialect – but to the performative result of the contact of Spanish with English that may be shared among Chilean learners of English.

The idea of "Chilean English" also seems to be the result of the dismissal of courses on linguistic analysis (grammar and phonetics) and can be interpreted as a response to the emphasis on NES models that have traditionally dominated Chilean ELT. As seen in the previous section, many of these teacher educators tended to reject ideas that would be in line with a focus on NES proficiency, and instead, they openly encourage the promotion of a Chilean identity through the use of English. As can be observed in Extract 28 below, Sergio, the Programme Director refers to the goals of pronunciation that are promoted in the programme and denies focusing on one particular model. Instead, he points out that students enrolled in Programme C are exposed to a variety of different accents as part of what he understands as **"global English, English spoken differently by different people"**, which is an idea that seems to be influenced by the literature on World Englishes rather than on Global Englishes.

Chapter 6

Extract 28

> **Researcher:** does the programme promote a specific variety of English as a target (1) in order to be achieved? In terms of [for example pronunciation
>
> **Sergio:** [accent? pronunciation? I don't know, no:, we are not particular about them developing a particular accent, **we are very happy with them speaking Chilean English** um: of course **we want to and we do expose them to a variety of different accents** because (1) that is one of the- you know, **that variety is part of (.) what we understand as global English, you know, English spoken differently by different people** (.) but (1) what we are really interested in is that our teachers see themselves as Chilean teachers, teachers who understand and value their own culture, their own background and are able to communicate and communicate to their students that English is not about pretending that they are someone else (2) but **using English as a mean to access their own culture, enrich their own culture** […] we have SOME students who are fond of British or American English, but very soon they realise that it doesn't really matter (.) **apparently we are very good at convincing them that they have to put their energies somewhere else** (.) not in what kind of English accent they want to GET or acquire

The promotion of "Chilean English" that Sergio refers to reflects the belief that English does not just belong to its native speakers or to specific ENL territories, but to its users, regardless of their L1. In this case, English is not simply perceived as a language that can help people communicate across cultures, but also as a tool that helps to understand one's own culture. Therefore, this view implies that fostering NES models would fail to fulfil this function since the linguistic and cultural focus of that practice would be on contexts other than the local. In addition, the promotion of "Chilean English" is also expected to have an effect on the students' beliefs about linguistic models in ELT, since, according to the participants, it is the students themselves who join ELT programmes expecting to acquire a specific variety of English. In this respect, Javier comments that **"you come to university thinking 'which English am I going to learn? British or American?' (.) and there's no more English […] and we tell them immediately you are going to learn Chilean English, and for them I think it's one of the deepest shocks that they receive"**. In his claim, what Javier does is to validate the influence of Spanish as a first language on the development of the trainees' English. Although the concept of

"Chilean English" is not present in the documents that I reviewed, there seems to be a common discourse among the teacher educators from this programme that supports its existence and use. It is important to point out here that the researcher did not elicit comments related to the idea of "Chilean English" but instead they emerged from the participants in all cases. For this reason, it is also relevant to mention that two out of the total number of Programme B's participants did not make reference to this concept.

Examples of the existence of "Chilean English" are presented by Cristina and Victor, who classify their English as such. For example, Cristina refers to how she incorporates features of Chilean Spanish in her use of English to suit her own communication style. When talking about her own English in Extract 29, Cristina describes it as "Chilean English" because of the inclusion of expressions from Chilean Spanish such as "po", which is a non-standard intensifier commonly used at the end of a sentence. As there is not a direct translation for "po" in English, users like Cristina find it useful to employ it in front of an audience that understands its meaning (e.g. her students, her colleagues, a Chilean researcher). In addition, Cristina recognises the influence of RP in her accent due to her training, but she rejects the idea that her English is British or RP; instead she comfortably labels her own form of English as "Chilean English".

Extract 29

> **Cristina:** Once someone said 'but you have a British accent' – NO (.) I don't have it (.) no, not
> at all (.) but MAYBE there are some things that you can perceive, maybe because of
> the training but I think that **if I had to define my English I would say that it's Chilean
> English** because (.) as the time has passed by I have incorporated some Chilean
> expressions, so actually in my classes I say **MOVE */PO/***
> ((both laugh))
> **Cristina:** and I say things like that […] I mean it happened once and it was fun and then I'm
> no- I don't say that regularly but I say it (.) like */po/* **I usually say */po/* because that is
> the way I speak** […] maybe we take some expressions (.) like Chilean expressions in a
> way to replicate them in English

Further evidence supporting this claim lies in the views of Victor in Extract 30. From his perspective, his inability to describe his English against an NES norm results in a

classification of his own English as Chilean because of the influence of his identity as Chilean and his mother tongue.

Extract 30

> **Victor:** of course the first thing that comes to my mind is comparing myself, allocating myself, placing myself in a benchmark or something (2) but again (.) if I do that I don't think I can do justice to myself or to the standard you know? (2) so: I don't know it's very difficult (.) probably I'm a Chilean man speaking in English trying my best to communicate but (2) **my English is the English of a Chilean person (2) I'm not sure if I can use the concept of Chilean English 'cause I don't know if that exists, but, of course, I'm not a speaker of a standard variety**, you see? so I wouldn't know where to place myself

These examples suggest that teacher trainers from Programme B are moving away from the traditional concept of variety as a bounded and codified form of language, and transitioning towards an appropriation of the foreign language that reveals the user's national and cultural identity. The participants' open rejection of normative approaches to second language learning seems to find support in the employment and promotion of "Chilean English", which, despite not qualifying as a variety in the traditional sense – neither as an ENL variety nor as a WE variety – and being subject to jokes and prejudice in the Chilean ELT profession (see Section 7.3.1) – seems to offer its users the flexibility and fluidity that allows them to use English for their own communicational and professional purposes without needing to conform to NES standards. Silvia complements this view in Extract 31 below by supporting the belief that when learning an additional language, it is not relevant to follow a specific norm, but what matters instead is what the user can do with the language.

Extract 31

> **Silvia:** where are you going to study? ((as regards Spanish)) in Chile or in Spain or Colombia or Mexico? which accent do you like more? **it DOESN'T MATTER** (.) you can have a mix, you can speak with your own accent and it will not make any difference **as long as you speak accurately, clearly and fluently**, and you use that language as a tool,

> whatever language you're trying to teach [...] so what difference does it make if you speak South African English or, I don't know, New Zealand English? (.) or **CHILEAN ENGLISH** (.) **but dignified Chilean English**

Even though Silvia's view seems to be in line with the beliefs of her colleagues in relation to the validation and promotion of a teacher's own form of English, she raises a few issues related to an "accurate" use of the language that is not explicitly discussed by her peers. She suggests that users of English, more specifically teachers, should be allowed to mix between different varieties of English and using their own L1-influenced pronunciation, provided that they "speak accurately, clearly and fluently". This view is reinforced by her comment referring to a "dignified" version of "Chilean English" as an acceptable form of English. The findings presented here reveal that teacher educators at Programme B share the belief that it is not necessary to adopt a specific variety of English in order to become a successful user or teacher of English. What is more, they openly promote, and, in some cases, admit, using a localised form of English. However, what counts as being accurate or acceptable "Chilean English" is one of the mismatches between beliefs, policy and practice.

6.3.2   Developing one's own English

Another subtheme that is linked to the development of an identity as Chilean teachers of English is the association of an imitation of NES models with the loss of such an identity. In other words, the majority of Programme B's participants shared the view that their students' and their own identities as Chilean teachers of English are at stake when their language learning goals are determined by conformity to NES norms, or by their desire to assimilate their English to idealised NES forms. However, it is important to mention that the teacher educators did not only mention ELT training as the sole influence that pre-service teachers have for fostering specific ENL forms, since it seems to be common for Chilean students to join ELT programme with a preconceived idea of "which English to acquire", as Javier mentions in the previous section. According to some of these participants, the influence of the media, the students' attitudes towards ENL countries and their personal interests, among other factors, also play a determinant role in the reproduction of an ideology of language that positions certain forms of English over the

rest. Evidence of this perspective is presented by Victor, who indicates that he and his colleagues challenge this ideology by reinforcing in their students the belief that they will not "become" native speakers of English by conforming to a specific ENL model. Another important aspect of Victor's comment, presented in Extract 32, is that it suggests changes in his own beliefs about models for ELT because he reports transitioning from having a strong attachment to idealised forms of English and towards reporting practices that challenge such beliefs.

Extract 32

> **Victor**: I remember of course I was a huge fan of British music, britpop and all that (1) **and I wanted to be like one of them** (.) but when you start working- after you- of course you're learning everyday but (2) **then if you have the chance to travel or anything you become aware of the fact that it's never gonna happen**, you're never gonna be like one of them so what's the point in imitating and trying to change who you are, **you're trying to adopt other identities but in the end they'll never be yours**
>
> **Researcher**: what about your students, do they actually experience that shift or do they stick to their original idea?
>
> **Victor**: the thing is that we train them. I mean from day one we are like okay forget it, **you're never gonna be like a British, you're never gonna sound like a British person because you're not a British person, you're never gonna sound like an American person because you're NOT an American person**

As a means of developing their students' own identity as Chilean teachers, and in order to counter the influences of external factors on the beliefs about English that their students may hold, the participants from Programme B report encouraging their students to develop their "own version" of English. For example, Antonio reports that **"that's why we study identity, we study culture, we study World Englishes so that they can develop not only an English-speaking persona but also a teaching persona"** suggesting that exploring one's own context instead of others' (e.g., British or American culture) can help students understand their own reality as teachers of English instead of aiming to copy foreign models. An interesting reference in relation to this issue is presented by Daniela, another English language skills teacher. In Extract 33, Daniela comments on the importance for future teachers of English to develop their "own variety" and highlights the fact that her

own training lacked the exploration of non-native teacher identity that Programme B claims to offer.

Extract 33

> **Daniela:** [[the students]] come with that notion that we should learn- that we have different varieties, but in the end we transmit that (.) they will have access to all of them but **they will develop their own (1) VARIETY of the language** because of (.) identity is something that they must (.) acquire being- as teachers of English (.) LATIN teachers of English (.) so we try to promote that […] I never developed an identity (.) a teacher identity at university (.) they were never promoting that, but I did it **while I was working and here I have kind of reinforced that** […] **I strongly believe that though we do have to (.) keep our identity we should try to use the language accurately** but there's always this transfer from the L1 to the L2 (.) and especially when you are spontaneously speaking and sometimes in the classroom and you make the conversion Spanish into English, but **I always try to let the students know "ok you know what? this is not the best way to say it" this is the proper way or there's another way to say this** so (.) I make them clear that I also suffer from this transfer.

Even though Daniela shows adherence to the belief that reinforcing a Chilean identity through language use is beneficial for her students' language learning process and for their future role as teachers, she reveals tensions in her own belief system regarding the relationship between developing one's own English (and identity) and accurate use of language. This tension can be interpreted as the existence of a belief that associates distancing oneself from ENL Englishes with inaccurate use of the language. In addition, it is relevant to point out that, at the time of the data collection, Daniela was the newest member of staff to participate in the study. Therefore, this new familiarity with ideas of identity in language use, rejection of ELT tradition, and awareness of Englishes that she encountered in this programme may still clash with other previously-incorporated beliefs that may be more resistant to change (Pajares, 1992; Borg, 2003; Zheng, 2009).

6.4   Findings from classroom observations (Programme B)

All the lessons that were observed for the purposes of this study belonged to the "English language skills"[13] module. This module is spread across 9 of the 10 semesters of the programme and covers a considerable portion of the students' timetable (about 13 hours of direct teaching per week). Although this module is supposed to integrate the content that previous courses on English phonetics and grammar used to offer, these were kept to a minimum. As mentioned by most participants in the interviews, the classes were organised around "relevant topics" that encouraged a focus on content over the study of linguistic forms. Such discussions emerged as a common pattern in the observational data and revealed an emphasis on developing critical thinking as a way of challenging the students' beliefs. Examples of these topics in my observations included minorities and the mass media, sexism in advertisements, types of identities, and the socialisation process, to name a few. More importantly, the discussions that were motivated by these topics were commonly framed by historical or current local affairs (i.e.: migration in Chile, the influence of Chilean TV shows, minority groups in Chile).

Such an emphasis on discussing topics over the teaching of English phonetics and grammar was also revealed in the instances of "reflection" that were commonly held at the end of each lesson. During these reflections, teacher educators from Programme B would comment on the purpose of their students' training as a way to bridge what they experience as learners in class with what they will eventually do as teachers in practice. Extract 34 below presents part of one of these reflections after a lesson about the influence of the media on society. In this example it is possible to observe how the teacher trainer explicitly criticises the idea of tradition in ELT and invites his students to avoid reproducing what they are taught in their training without critically analysing their context.

---

[13] The actual name of the module has been modified in order to keep confidentiality.

Extract 34

> **Teacher:** …**the challenge for teachers is to think of ways to break the paradigm**, that's what we have taught you, that's what I believe in, and I believe that that's what you believe in, not all of you but most of you (.) to change the ways in which things are done traditionally (.) to take students a little bit beyond BUT we need to do that in meaningful ways but also being realistic, being aware of your context… **you are NOT technicians (.) you're not going to go to school just to APPLY some old-fashioned methods that you were told were going to work** (.) you're going to GO to your context, OBSERVE, reflect and see what you can do in a very realistic way (.) BABY steps if you need (.) if you need to go back to a traditional activity that will HELP you or catapult you to do something more meaningful eventually that's fine

Another recurrent pattern in the observational data was the exposure to speakers from different backgrounds. In order to deepen the discussions of the specific topics of some lessons, some teacher educators played different types of videos (interviews, music, comedy, adverts) that showed users of English from a variety of contexts. For example, one of the teacher educators used a video showing an Indian woman talking about different reading strategies for a reading-focused lesson. The teacher trainer warned her first-year students that probably they would have difficulties understanding her because of their expected lack of familiarity with the accent, and also confessed that she "loves" the speaker's accent. Other examples included an interview with Pakistani activist Malala Yousafzai, an IKEA commencial with a Swedish speaker of English, American pop songs and sitcoms and a British man talking about RP. This last example is particularly relevant because it was presented in the first pronunciation-focused class of the module. Before playing the video, the teacher educator presented some questions on the board that they were expected to answer with information from the video (e.g. what does RP stand for? How many people speak RP? When and where did it emerge?). After watching the video, the teacher and the students analysed the history and influence of RP, and as Extract 35 below shows, beliefs about this pronunciation model were very similar to the general orientations that other participants from Programme B revealed in the interviews.

Chapter 6

Extract 35

> **Teacher:** "it's not real, it's not representative of the people (.) and within time- you know it started to sort of have **a negative connotation because it represented the politically powerful (.) the educated** (.) you see? so in the end it was like (.) if you use the RP accent then you're POSH, you're SNOB (.) so in the end it evolved within time (.) now in the BBC you can identify different accents, SCOTTISH, NORTHERN, different accents (.) to make it more diverse in that way

During the same lesson, however, the teacher trainer presented another video on RP, but this time it was about vowels 1 and 2 (IPA). While watching the video, the students engaged in a listen-and-repeat activity imitating the RP speaker. After this activity, the teacher explained that "there is a reason why we're showing you this (.) this is a reference for you" and engages in a conversation with his students about what model they think they should follow as learners and teachers, to which most students concluded that they did not need to learn any specific accents. The teacher educator stressed the importance of developing an awareness of one's own identity when discussing the differences between accent and pronunciation. This relationship was also present in the espoused beliefs of most of these teacher educators.

Finally, a third salient pattern in the practices of teacher trainers from Programme B was a view of English as the only language allowed in the classroom. Although most teacher educators encouraged their students to develop fluency by preventing themselves from correcting their students' utterances, they were usually keen on banning use of Spanish in the classroom. Probes such as "English please", "remember that the official language in this classroom is English", or simply "Spanish?" were usually used as reminders of the roles that different languages had in the classroom. In the interviews, the teacher educators revealed that these negative attitudes towards using Spanish in the classroom are motivated by the belief that school learners in Chile fail to achieve the target level of English because their tutors teach English in Spanish. Therefore, Programme B participants encourage their students to use English at all times (while at the university) and through all means (i.e.: face-to-face interactions, emails). However, Programme B's teachers and students tend to code-switch between English and Spanish in practice, especially when engaged in group discussions, and use this strategy as a communication

strategy. What is more, the influence of this interaction between the two languages was regarded as positive when the teacher educators referred to the English that they teach as "Chilean English" (see Section 6.3.1), but also, at the same time, it was regarded as negative when used as a means of instruction. In this respect, there seems to exist a mismatch between the espoused beliefs about separating languages for language learning and the actual use of these languages in teaching practices.

6.5   Summary

The themes that emerged from the analysis of Programme B helped to further explain the criticism of Programme A's emphasis on linguistic accuracy and ENL norms. Following a restructuring of the programme's curriculum, participants from this ELT programme revealed a strong rejection of traditional ELT practices, supported by beliefs that conflicted with their own ELT training. Interestingly, such beliefs were consistent across participants and revealed a common discourse about the importance of reinforcing a Chilean identity in the training of future teachers of English that distances itself from the traditional idea that English teachers are expected to adopt an ENL model/identity. What is more, the findings from this programme showed consistency between the teacher educators' beliefs and their practices regarding their views towards linguistic models, Englishes other than ENL standards and goals of teacher education.

Chapter 7   **Programme C: Within-case Analysis**

7.1   **Introduction**

One of the main particularities of this programme was the implementation of a revised version of the programme's curriculum that adopted a competency-based learning and assessment approach. This curricular development was expected to respond to the guidelines for teacher training courses that the Chilean Ministry of Education (MINEDUC) suggests. The analysis of relevant documents, including the programme curriculum and module specifications, revealed that the implementation of this curricular innovation basically consisted in the reduction of the length of the course to four years, and the inclusion of modules on "English-speaking cultures", "English-speaking literatures" and "Identity and social diversity in the English-speaking world",[14] among other changes. It is important to mention that, at the time of the data collection, these new courses were not being taught yet, because the implementation of the new curriculum only began with the modules that were being offered at that time in the first year of the programme. Consequently, the new curriculum was running alongside the existing – or so-called "traditional" – curriculum, so the lessons that were observed for the purposed of this study were influenced by one or the other curricular design. In Extract 36, Nicole, the programme director, explains that one of the purposes of their curricular innovation was to adopt a more global perspective on English than the one that used to dominate the programme. In this respect, she refers to the importance of exposing her students to Englishes other than ENL varieties, and how the programme has transitioned from a strong focus on linguistic accuracy in the teaching of English to the development of communicative skills.

---

[14] The names of the modules have been translated by the researcher.

Extract 36

> **Nicole: we decided to focus more on what pedagogy means, over the command of the language itself** (.) in the past it was more focused on knowledge, pure knowledge and well we made this change because we're aware of the kind of students we receive […] I don't want to say this but in the OLD or TRADITIONAL models of English- when I studied I studied at [[Programme A]] and it was RP, **I remember that it was always focused on RP but sometimes with our students we cannot GET there**, but we can help them to be GOOD TEACHERS and that implies more things than just MANAGING the language, and we also decided to include, not as optional courses but as part of the curriculum, THREE other activities (.) the first one is CULTURE then we have literature and then in the seventh semester **we have literature from OTHER countries that speak English, not only England or the United States,** so there we have another change […] we have different types of writings to help students construct not just ACADEMIC writing, but we have the other two ((courses)) **to have students UNDERSTAND that there is VARIETY of Englishes** @@@@ right? so that's what we are intending with the new curriculum

As the programme director, Nicole shows strong awareness of the diversity and spread of English and their relevance for ELT. Like the vast majority of the participants in this study, Nicole also trained as a teacher educator in Programme A, and when referring to the model of English that she was expected to acquire, she presents RP as a model that would be unattainable for her students. What is remarkable from this comment is that she makes a comparison between the socioeconomic level of the typical student at Programme C and the promotion of RP, which reveals an implicit connection between that particular model of English and the social and economic background of its learners. In this respect, Nicole makes a clear separation between language proficiency and teaching skills, stressing that the acquisition of native-like English does not necessarily make a teacher a better practitioner. As the data shows, this is one of the most controversial beliefs about ELT, which the participants either adopt or reject and, therefore, reference to the relationship between this belief and the programme's curriculum development proved to reveal important tensions among staff. Accordingly, the main themes that emerged from this programme were (a) tensions in change and (b) dualistic perspective to English.

7.2   Tensions in change

One of the main themes that emerged from Programme C encompasses the clashes between the participants own beliefs about English (and ELT) and the effects of the modified curriculum. While some participants welcomed this curricular change and valued the assumed flexible approach to language that it would bring to the programme, others manifested their discomfort with the implications that this innovation would have on their practices. References to the revised version of the programme were common when discussing issues related to the spread and diversity of English and its implications for ELT in Chile, as well as when discussing the appropriateness of models and norms in the programme. In fact, the themes and sub-themes discussed in this section are evidence of the effect that the curriculum development – which had been recently implemented in the programme at the time of the data collection – had on the belief systems of Programme C's participants.

7.2.1   Developing awareness of Englishes

Discussions about how Programme C understands and responds to today's diversity of Englishes and the impact that it has on the teaching of English in Expanding circle territories were usually accompanied by references to the curriculum development that the programme had recently undergone. Most participants from Programme C explicitly indicated that the programme does not directly address the challenges that the spread of English as a global lingua franca present to ELT. However, they suggested that the potential changes that the modified curriculum would bring – along with the beliefs about English that some of the participants hold – are expected to have an eventual impact on the beliefs and practices of the staff and consequently on the students' own perceptions and attitudes. This is reflected in the way that some teacher educators demonstrate awareness of linguistic variation, challenge the traditional adherence to ENL standard norms in ELT, and show an alleged flexibility regarding the English that their students are expected to acquire.

An example of this perspective is presented by Nicole's discussion of awareness-raising practices encouraged by the department that are intended to incorporate Englishes other

than ENL varieties in the programme's modules and extra-curricular activities. In Extract 37 she describes how some teacher educators in the programme use IT resources to expose their students to English being used by NNES and, more importantly, she comments on how her students' views of correctness and effective use of English are challenged in the classroom. The example of exposing students to Argentinian users of English is perhaps not an arbitrary choice because of the customary pride in displaying their identity that these users – especially the ones from the River Plate area – usually make evident in their pronunciation of English. Therefore, understanding the interplay of factors that influence this type of pronunciation in English reveals Nicole's positive attitudes towards variation as well as a personal distance from native-speakerism and a focus on the role of English as a tool for intercultural communication. What is more, by claiming that she exposes her students to users whose English "may not be very fluent or with perfect sounds", she demonstrates her belief in a separation between correctness and success in language use, and the willingness to challenge long-standing beliefs that support this relationship.

Extract 37

> **Nicole**: I think that more and more the language teachers of the programme are including videos from other contexts like YouTube or other sources where **you can listen to Asian people, ARGENTINIANS speaking in English which is very PARTICULAR @@@ because of the strong accent they have and don't want to LOSE their accent I think** (.) but I think that we: sort of include different examples in */didáctica/* ((didactics)) as well (.) yes I usually show teachers that cannot speak VERY good English maybe not be very fluent or with perfect sounds but the purpose of the class is okay so **the structure of the class is the best class I found** [...] and sometimes students comment "but miss she doesn't speak very well English or English very well" what's the matter? @@@ that's my point of view (.) I think that **nowadays we have a group of teachers who think in the same way like communication is the goal**

In addition, her openness towards Englishes other than idealised forms of British or American versions is clearly presented in the organisation of a collaborative activity that involves ELT programmes from other universities. In Extract 38 she discusses the fact that for some teachers the only countries associated with English are the USA and the UK

while other Inner and Outer circle territories are commonly neglected. The festival that Nicole refers to is an extra-curricular activity hosted and organised by Programme B in which different participant ELT programmes present different cultural aspects of an English-speaking country of their choice. Some of these aspects include performing arts, cuisine and language. It is important to point out that this activity is part of a public engagement initiative and is therefore open to the local community, especially students and teachers of English at schools and universities.

Extract 38

> **Nicole:** we're preparing a festival, an English festival so we invited the heads of the programme from [[Programme B]], [[University Z]], [[University Y]] I don't remember the others so the first thing was okay **we're going to do this but it cannot be United Kingdom OR @@ United States, it has to be ANY other country where people can speak English** and that was VERY difficult for some of the: @@@ head of the departments to choose another country, we chose South Africa and then Canada, Jamaica, JAMAICA was interesting but it was like, the first thing was WHY? WHY? WHY NOT? **because we're INCLUSIVE because we don't want to DISCRIMINATE and English is spoken in many other countries and we don't really know much about** so this is a time for schools and our students to know about THESE OTHER places (.)

The initiative presented by Nicole seems to be in line with the new developments in the programme's curriculum outlined in Section Chapter 7 since it considers the impact and importance of raising awareness about the plurality of English, and aims to detach the idea of the native speaker of English from the two dominant ENL territories. Support for this view is presented by Gloria, one of the English language skills teachers, in Extract 39. In her discussion about the spread of English around the world she refers to an assumed gradual decline of the idea of the native speaker in Chilean ELT. Her reference to the importance of the native speaker in the past reveals a strong historical attachment to British and American English in the ELT profession in the country which, according to Gloria, would lack importance today because of the increasing awareness of Englishes that the programme offers to its trainees.

Chapter 7

Extract 39

> **Gloria**: well the figures are very clear, **there are lots of speakers of English and not necessarily NATIVE speakers of English**, but we have many more people than the native speakers of English speaking English around the world, so I think that's why it's a global language (.) **especially when you think about not being native like or not really having a native accent, which I don't think is important now as it used to be in the past**, let's say FIVE or TEN years ago (.) students who wanted to become teachers of English **HAD TO SOUND like an English from somewhere**, RP or standard American (.) and right now I believe that it's not really important but **some kind of neutr- international English is becoming much more important AND we are much more aware of the different Englishes that we HAVE** (.) Australian English, why not? and we should expose our students to different kinds of English too (.) people even in INDIA, from South Africa, from EVERYWHERE as long as it is intelligible (.) that's MY belief and I go for that

Gloria's contribution can be interpreted as being opposed to the belief that teachers of English should sound like idealised native speakers from specific territories. In fact, her comment about teachers of English historically having to "sound like an English from somewhere" seems to connect with ideas of affiliation and consistency like the ones discussed in Section 5.2. The inclusion of other Englishes that Gloria refers to as a demonstration of awareness of the variability of English seems to be influenced by a familiarity with the field of World Englishes, since her examples include mostly post-colonial varieties. Similarly, her view seems to embrace ELF communication as well, since she mentions the impact of NNESs in the use of English today; however, what counts as suitable exposure for students seems to be conditioned by features of intelligibility, which remain largely unclear. What is also interesting about this extract is the fact that Gloria's idea of an international form of English is preceded by an attempt to characterise it as a 'neutral' type of English. This hesitation in her comment may reveal a conflict between beliefs of international English as a neutral and standardised form – or some kind of compromise between ENL varieties – and a belief about international English being a multilingual phenomenon.

A more direct exploration of the effect of the new curriculum – and of the impact that it is expected to have on the beliefs about English and ELT of teachers and students – is presented by Lucia, an experienced teacher of English culture and literature. In Extract 40 below, Lucia refers to the changes in theory and practice that the transition to the new curriculum is expected to entail, and reveals her belief that adopting a competency-based curriculum implies distancing itself from a focus on ENL normative approaches that are characteristic of traditional ELT, since students are expected to use the language to achieve tasks rather than memorising language points. According to Lucia, the previous curriculum emphasised a separation between language use and the different components of linguistic analysis and, hence, encouraged the promotion of a standardised form of English; in contrast, the new curriculum's focus on performance would value the development of communication skills over the mastery of norms.

Extract 40

> **Researcher:** you were describing before how English is a global language and the reasons why people these days are learning English (.) do you think that the programme responds to those needs?
>
> **Lucia:** on paper yes (.) the new programme, the */ajuste curricular/* yes because when you teach English by competences and students can do something with the language, you are actually answering the question of can you read a paper? can you understand instructions so YES (.) **the OLDER version not so much because the students were not exposed to what you can do with the language (.)** it's this is the grammar of the language, this is the sounds of the language, this is the lexis of the language, try to use it which is something very similar to what they do in SCHOOLS today […] but I don't know if it will work because **teachers don't know how to do this and they don't want to CHANGE** (.) that's the problem (.) they are very stubborn and they don't want to change, they're happy teaching present simple or simple present

In the extract above, Lucia shows a positive attitude towards the approach to ELT that the new curriculum offers in its design. However, and perhaps more importantly, she points out that the success of this innovation relies on her colleagues' willingness to adopt the new approach and adapt their practices to it. In fact, Lucia criticises a supposed resistance to change among English teachers in Chile that, in her view, is built on conformity to long-

standing practices that are accepted as mainstream. Such resistance to change is explored in Section 7.2.2 below and represents a contrasting view of the curriculum to the one presented in this subtheme.

7.2.2 Nostalgia for tradition

The supposed flexibility and openness that the modified curriculum was intended to encourage and promote could also worked as a means of elicitation of beliefs about ELT teacher education that reflect positive attitudes towards traditional approaches. For some teacher educators from Programme C, the changes that the new curriculum involves regarding the purpose of English teaching and the behaviours and practices that the teacher educators themselves are expected to display are perceived as a setback in comparison to the previous traditional programme. Such views seem to be influenced by the participants' earlier teaching and language learning experiences and, more importantly, they reflect a sentiment of nostalgia for the demands and prestige that are associated with traditional approaches to ELT training. This perspective is reflected in the criticism of the modified curriculum that some teacher educators demonstrate. For example, Diego, an experienced teacher of English grammar and academic English, refers to the potential negative effect that the new curriculum may have on the linguistic proficiency of the future teachers that Programme C trains. In Extract 41, he discusses the differences between the two approaches to ELT that the programme is currently implementing, and reveals a belief that associates openness with flexibility and variation with inaccurate language use.

Extract 41

> **Diego:** basically I have two courses (.) one of the old- how do you say */la malla/*?
> **Researcher:** curriculum?
> **Diego:** okay the old curriculum of the university and one of the new one so I can compare the two things (1) believe me or not [...] I prefer the old one, **I'm the result of more demanding years I would say** (.) **I was taught in a different way, I learnt in a different way and I think that studying and making efforts and working hard can lead you to obtain a better result** but it seems that in time we have been trying to make things much easier for the students […] **in the competences you sometimes**

> **don't know what to do and you have to be very tolerant, flexible** and I'm not that
> kind, unfortunately (.) but (.) I'm trying to learn because otherwise I would be
> lost, <u>next year I would be fired</u> [...] probably my perception is that **this idea of
> teaching by competences probably doesn't demand from the students the
> rigourosity or the accuracy to speak or to produce good English** (1) if you say "she
> live here" probably you would be understood, you could be perfectly accepted even
> though grammatically it's incorrect because you are not pronouncing the final s (1)
> and the students have a lot of support to say that because they listen to music, they
> see, **they listen to the Beatles and the Beatles say "she don't care"** or things like
> that

Diego's description of the demands of Programme C's modified curriculum seems to
reveal an understanding of this innovation as being a form of detachment from normative
approaches that encourage correctness and accuracy, and as the encouraging an idea of
flexibility in language use that would be detrimental to achieving the expected levels of
proficiency that the programme expects of their students to obtain. There is a clash
between Diego's perception of the competency-based curriculum and his own beliefs
about effective language learning, which are highly influenced by traditional approaches
that emphasise accuracy over communication. Interestingly, Diego's interpretation of the
new curriculum's promotion of flexibility exposes the view that use of English that does
not conform to standardised norms is regarded as wrong or incorrect. More importantly,
Diego's contribution helps to reveal how teacher educators in the same programme can
display almost totally opposing beliefs about the purpose of ELT training, especially when
compared to Lucia's interpretation of the new curriculum in Extract 40. However, Diego
clearly states that despite disagreeing with the approach to ELT that the programme is
trying to incorporate, he shows willingness to adapt to this innovation.

Another example of this sub-theme is provided by Olivia, another grammar teacher. In
Extract 42 below, she compares the way in which she was taught English grammar
through a traditional approach to the understanding of grammar in Programme C's
modified curriculum. In her reflection she refers to the positive effect that a detailed and
strong focus on grammar had on her current theoretical knowledge of English grammar,
and criticises Programme C's attempts to integrate the study of grammar in a
competency-based approach. By commenting that the grammar modules that

Programme C runs are "more related to English language rather than grammar", Olivia reveals her preference for traditional approaches that encourage the study of grammar in a decontextualized manner that could later be applied in "some kind of exercise" and, like Diego, she perceives this integration as detrimental for her students' development of proficiency in English.

Extract 42

> **Researcher**: and can you tell me a little bit about the courses that you teach there?
>
> **Olivia**: yes I work for the grammar coordination, I'm part of the grammar teachers now, I teach all the levels, from the first grammar that they have until the last one, **it's very different from the grammar that I was taught because we had some wonderful grammar teachers [[at my alma mater]] and the grammar that is being taught at [[Programme C]] is more related to English language rather than grammar if you know what I mean**, because I remember that when I studied grammar, I was taught by [[an experienced grammarian]] in my undergraduate course and also during my graduate course so you need a lot of theoretical knowledge and after that **you could apply that knowledge in some kind of exercise** but here it's mostly related to language, **they go hand in hand with the English language course**
>
> **Researcher**: and you see that as detrimental
>
> **Olivia**: YES (.) for my liking

The nostalgia for tradition that these examples show is directly connected with the participants' positive attitudes towards their own ELT training. In fact, since both Olivia and Diego specialise in the teaching of English grammar, the transition towards a more communicative approach to ELT seems to cause tensions in their belief systems, especially considering that, in their view, the traditional ELT approach that has dominated Chilean ELT training seems to have helped them develop the necessary expertise to run modules on linguistic analysis. Interestingly, however, when describing her own English, Olivia mentions that **"unfortunately it's very standardised, highly standardised"** revealing a belief about the negative effect that a focus on correctness and accuracy may have on her communication skills, which coexists with her belief about the benefits of a focus on linguistic analysis that is separated from communication.

7.3   Dualistic perspective to English

Another theme that emerged from the data gathered from Programme C related to an implicit dominance of American and British varieties of English as the preferred models for ELT. Even though none of these participants openly identified as speakers of an ENL variety in the way that some participants from Programme A did, a deeper data analysis revealed beliefs about the positive effects that imitating these specific varieties may have on the ELT industry, as well as negative attitudes towards Spanish-influenced use of English. Similarly, the analysis of the curricula of each specific programme did not present explicit preference for a specific model of English. However, references to the teacher educators' own preferences and comments about specific modules revealed beliefs about the programme's implicit promotion of ELT models.

The belief that the phonetics courses promote British English is evident in the comments made by some of Programme C's participants. The programme offers a set of four modules on phonetics and phonology ranging from the learning of vowel sounds to the study of the English intonation system. In spite of the fact that the curricula of these courses do not make overt reference to a particular NES model to be followed, nor to the study of Englishes other than ENL varieties, some participants provide evidence of the imposition of RP in these classes. For instance, Marco, a teacher of applied linguistics and grammar, suggests in Extract 43 that it is not the programme's policy to promote the acquisition of any particular form of English in the education of future teachers but it is the preferences, demands and practices of the module convenors themselves that reveal a particular imposition of an RP norm of pronunciation. In this particular example, Marco shows evidence of the widespread belief that teaching and learning about English phonetics and promoting the acquisition of RP cannot be separated.

Extract 43

> **Researcher:** do you think that the programme tries to promote a specific variety of English?
> **Marco:** no (1) **your question is for example if this English teaching programme is promoting the British accent?**
> **Researcher:** for example?

> **Marco: um NO, no no no**, interesting question because I don't know WHEN I discussed this
> with my students, I think it was here on Wednesday
>
> **Researcher:** I should've been here @@@
>
> **Marco:** we were talking about an accent as a barrier (okay) and **it was interesting to realise**
> **that students are very CLEAR about the need for the PHONETICS teacher at least to**
> **be very demanding of the RP accent and trying to reproduce THAT particular**
> **version of English but: that didn't mean that they couldn't opt for a different accent**
> **if they wanted** (.) actually I used MYSELF in the example because I told them that I
> had the SAME phonetics teacher they have here [...] **[[the phonetics teacher]] of**
> **course demands the idea of reproducing the British accent for phonetics reasons**

Apart from the explicit connection between learning about English pronunciation and the imposition of RP that Marco signals, what is remarkable about his contribution is the reference to the freedom that students at this programme have to "opt for a different accent". This reveals an implicit belief about having to conform to an idea of an 'English from somewhere' when learning English to become a teacher of this language. The teacher trainers from Programme C also show evidence of holding this belief, which is made manifest when discussing their own preferences, their views about their own English and what the programme offers in terms of exposure to Englishes. It is important to point out that two of the three phonetics teachers who were working at Programme C at the time of the data collection decided to participate in the study. Support for this view is provided by Simon, an early career phonetics teacher, in Extract 44. As he explains the objectives of the course that he runs, he acknowledges the use of RP as a model of pronunciation while also reflecting an 'either/or' perspective in relation to what the programme should offer as input for pronunciation.

Extract 44

> **Simon**: **we've been studying vowel sounds and they are according to the RP pronunciation**
> (.) I mean **I've been trying to explain the differences between the American one and**
> **the British one** but I think since they are first year students if you show them the
> same symbol pronounced differently it would just create confusion
>
> **Researcher**: right (.) that's what happens in phonetics but do you think that the programme
> tries to promote a specific variety of English?

> **Simon**: no I don't think so 'cause since I was a student here I perceived different accents and not everyone speaks RP so **NO (.) the programme as a whole does not expect students to speak RP**

[…]

> **Simon**: in terms of phonetics, **I would probably create two courses, one for people who want to STICK to the American variety and another for ones who want to go for the RP one** […] the objective of the course is for them to **get away from the Spanish pronunciation** into a sort of more let's say just standard English one **so if they pronounce sounds in a sort of Spanish way I would punish that** but if instead of saying <RP> LOT <RP> they say <GA> LOT <GA> like an American I don't have a problem

In the first part of Extract 44, Simon refers to the introduction of RP as a model of pronunciation in the phonetics class, stressing that this is a particular characteristic of this module rather than a normative top-down requirement of the programme, and highlighting that he, as a teacher who was trained at this programme, did not witness an imposition of this model in his own training. More importantly, in his discussion of his practices, Simon reveals tensions when trying to incorporate features of American English pronunciation in the phonetics module that he teaches, and highlights the dominance of these two idealised varieties in his role as a teacher of pronunciation. This view is reinforced later in Simon's discussion of what he would do to improve Programme C, where he clearly exposes his opinion that Chilean pre-service teachers of English are expected to choose between American or British models and assimilate them as much as possible in order to eliminate traces of their mother tongue. In addition, Simon's association of these models with "standard English" also reveals the influence of ideologies of English that not only ignore the linguistic heterogeneity of American and British varieties of English – referred to as *erasure* (Irvine and Gal, 2009) – but also associate sounding 'foreign' with a deficit perspective to language use which can be interpreted as a form of native-speakerism. This perspective also reflects a view of learning an L2 as 'parallel monolingualism' (Heller, 2006) or 'two solitudes' (Cummins, 2008) in which multilingualism is understood as the mastery of languages as independent systems that do not influence each other.

The other phonetics teacher from Programme C who participated in this study was Gabriela. She was also an early career teacher trainer and, like Simon, graduated as a teacher from the same programme. When referring to the choice and preference of models of English in the programme, she upholds the view that it is the teachers' own preferences that impose the acquisition of specific ENL varieties, by stating that **"they believe that the most important accent and neutral English is the BBC English (.) RP"** and recognising that **"I feel afraid of teaching American English because I haven't had enough courses on that"**. Gabriela's comments reveal two important points that should be mentioned. First, unlike Simon, she assumes that there is an implicit imposition of RP in the training of teachers by some teacher educators in the programme, which she has experienced as a student and as a trainee. Secondly, her comment that she is expected to provide an American norm in her teaching reveals her view of subject matter English as a competition between two main varieties that requires teachers and learners to choose from and abide to. Further support for these beliefs is presented in Extract 45 below. In this example, Gabriela reflects on her own preferences when deciding to study English before becoming a teacher, and reveals tensions in her belief system about the need to master both American and British English, especially in relation to vocabulary, in order to offer her students access to "a wide view of the language". In her comments, Gabriela shows evidence of the need for Chilean learners of English to choose a model, which was pointed out by Marco points out in Extract 43, providing further evidence of the limited range of models to choose from. Gabriela's idea of acquiring "a neutral accent, a mixture of both" can be interpreted as a view that the need to stick to one specific variety is unnecessary. However, the fact that only American and British forms of English are mentioned reveals how dominant these two idealised varieties are and how ignored other Englishes are in Chilean ELT.

Extract 45

> **Gabriela**: **when I was a student I really wanted to speak American English** so I was really into that because my first career or programme that I studied was at [[an American institute]] so I spent two years studying English there so when I arrived **here I realised that I didn't have enough knowledge about pronunciation so I started to improve that so I said "okay do I have to speak like a British person or an**

American?" maybe something neutral but **sometimes I TRY to speak British but the American things start to arise** because we're exposed to movies and everything that comes from Hollywood or the United States […] I think that we have to **acquire a neutral accent, a mixture of both** but for example if I teach my students vocabulary about clothes, I have to tell my students yes there are two words for pants and trousers so maybe if you provide examples taken from both accents maybe you can **make your students have a wide view of the language** and I think that's the goal

What is also remarkable of Gabriela's contribution is the exposure of her beliefs about mixing codes. In her answers, she reveals adherence to the belief about a desirable "consistency of choice", as it was discussed in Section 5.2.2, making reference to an idealised purity and stability of ENL varieties that forces their users to respect the agreement between their choice of English model and the standardised norms that come with them and, therefore, failure to fully respect that agreement would result in some form of contaminated or simply inaccurate use of English. It is important to point out, however, that the implicit belief in a competition between American and British English norms and the need for consistency in the teachers' choice of model was not only common across teachers who taught modules related to pronunciation, since examples of them were also present in the views of other participants from Programme C. For instance, Diego describes in Extract 46 how the teaching staff at this programme are "inclined" towards either American or British varieties depending on their personal preferences and past experiences. In line with Gabriela, Diego recognises the difficulties of providing his students with both models, especially because of his status as a non-native teacher of English.

Extract 46

> **Diego**: I think that here at the university it depends on the teacher (.) **some of us are more American inclined, others are more inclined to teach the British**=
> **Researcher**: =and when you say inclined does it mean that it simply has to do with the way you speak or has to do with what you want your students to achieve as well?
> **Diego**: well in fact **we are trying to be quite aware of the fact that we have to teach both ways if possible but it's not always possible**, for example you find a term that is more common in American English or in- our texts are British, right? […] knowing that

> I'm not a native speaker make things easier for me because **I can take either accent or either pronunciation of any word and I'm sure that many times I have pronounced something in the British style and I wish I had pronounced it in the American style, okay?** but that's because I don't have a clear LINE to follow because of my education, because I have never been in an English-speaking country for more than two months

The involuntary mix of codes that Diego describes in the extract above seems to be understood by him as a negative feature of his use of English. In fact, his comment implies that he believes that native-speakers of English do not experience this phenomenon in their natural communication as he makes reference to his status as an NNES, and the fact that he has not lived in an English-speaking country for a substantial amount of time. The negative attitudes towards Spanish-influenced English, especially regarding pronunciation, and the need to demonstrate consistency in the use of idealised versions of American or British English that some teacher educators demonstrate, seem to respond to implicit demands about appropriate use of English that may be present in the Chilean ELT industry. Support for this view is presented and exemplified in the following sub-section.

7.3.1 Spanish-influenced English as detrimental

The choices of personal and teaching models of English that some teacher educators referred to in the previous section seem to be in line with the belief in a relationship between sounding native and prestige. Many of the participants from Programme C recognised this relationship as an influence from the ELT industry, especially as a matter of Chilean idiosyncrasy, and revealed a form of native-speakerism that does not necessarily imply the view of the native speaker as a better teacher of English, but that sees near-native proficiency as an even more desirable feature than being an NES. The notion of prestige associated with sounding native that emerged from the data seemed to be in direct opposition with the influence of a teacher's mother tongue in his or her use of English. This perspective is summarised by Simon in Extract 47 below, where he justifies his negative attitude towards evidencing one's own first language when using English by referring to the assumed discrimination that Chilean teachers may experience if their English does not reflect adherence to an idealised ENL variety. What is remarkable about

Simon's comment is what it reveals about the pervasiveness of native-speakerism in the Chilean ELT industry, which is evidenced by the comparison that he makes regarding different attitudes towards sounding like an NNES in Chile and in an English-speaking country, revealing that it is the Chilean stakeholders and teachers themselves who seem to perpetuate this ideology of English to a greater extent.

Extract 47

> **Simon**: I think that here in Chile **if you don't sound CORRECT most times you would lose job opportunities** because they would prefer someone who sounds better or who can adapt their pronunciation to one that is more appealing for everyone and **if you go to a job interview and you just start speaking English as you would in Spanish they'd probably take a closer look at your documents**
>
> **Researcher**: so it's important that they express themselves using a more specific variety
>
> **Simon**: yes or **just to get away from the Spanish way of speaking** (.) certainly (.) and I think that has to do with our society 'cause when I was working as a Spanish assistant in England there were teachers there who sounded foreign but they didn't care because they had other elements to back them up
>
> **Researcher**: so when you say in our society you mean here in Chile more than in the UK
>
> **Simon**: yeah I think that in that area we tend to be like- I think **we tend to segregate people because of what they look like, because of what they sound like**

The association of idealised ENL varieties with correctness that is present in Simon's comment is also shared by Myriam, one of the communication skills teachers. When describing her own English and the English that she teaches, she does not reveal any type of affiliation to a specific ENL norm and shows pride in the English that she has shaped. Even though Myriam demonstrates an openness towards embracing the cultural and linguistic diversity of English in her interviews, she also displays a negative attitude towards teachers acquiring a Spanish-influenced form of English, because of the prevailing belief that teachers of English are expected to demonstrate affiliation with American or British English. As Extract 48 below shows, the belief that displaying a Spanish-accented use of English as a teacher reflects incompetence as a user seems to be firmly embedded in the Chilean ELT profession. For this reason, when describing the qualities of a successful user of English, Myriam suggests that showing evidence of one's

mother tongue, or a version of "Chilean English", is acceptable for learners in general but not for teachers, because of the existing prejudice and discrimination that, in her view, are common even among teachers. Similar beliefs and attitudes were also found in interviews to NNES teachers in Jenkins (2007).

Extract 48

> **Myriam**: as teachers we target role models so for us it would be someone that could have beautiful sounds maybe someone who- if I could explain this to a kid **I would say someone that wouldn't sound Spanish**
>
> **Researcher**: okay
>
> **Myriam**: but **when it comes to a person who just learns English it's okay, you can speak with YOUR accent and they would be like the CHILEAN English speaker which is okay**
>
> **Researcher**: but not for a teacher?
>
> **Myriam**: **but not for a teacher**
>
> **Researcher**: why not?
>
> **Myriam**: BECAUSE (.) because of this prejudice, because when you do- when you do use your- but it's just right HERE because in America where I lived they liked when I spoke with my accent in English (.) they teased me but in a nice way
>
> **Researcher**: it's a different attitude
>
> **Myriam**: totally (.) **because there is a benefit from the difference and here we are not like that** (.) I speak English, but I know that I'm not a native speaker and I will never be but I'm okay with that, but some people are not (.) **it is a very common comment "have you heard the way she speaks?"**

The positive orientation towards diversity in English that Myriam reflects in her beliefs about the spread of English seem to be in conflict with her awareness of the dominant native-speaker ideology that operates in the field of ELT in Chile. It is clear in Extract 47 and Extract 48 above that, despite showing awareness of the existence of an ideologically-influenced discourse that favours some forms of English over others in the Chilean ELT profession, these participants still prefer to accept and reinforce the hypothetical demands and implications that they themselves question, instead of showing opposition and resistance in their beliefs and practices. An example of the consequences of this form of native-speakerism is present in a comment by Diego. When

talking about his personal choice of model of English use, he reflects on what his students may perceive about his English. In Extract 49 he shows evidence of how displaying a Spanish-influenced version of English may be seen as a sign of unprofessionalism or incompetence even from the perspective of his students.

Extract 49

Diego: […] **I'm always a little bit afraid of what MY students will perceive of my language**, I mean I don't know if they THINK that I'm more inclined to the American accent for example or the British accent (.) or to NONE, you see? because I have never asked myself that and I have never asked them something like that **(.) I don't know what they feel when I speak English or is a <exaggerating Spanish pronunciation> Chilean-style teacher <exaggerating Spanish pronunciation>** or something like that I don't know, right? probably they would mention that

The importance of Diego's comment in the extract above is that it reveals a connection between linguistic insecurity and the dualistic perspective of English that was described above. Diego reveals his concern about failing to display a form of English that can be associated with ENL idealised varieties (British or American), and consequently, accepted by his students since showing evidence of a strong influence of his L1 in his use of English may be perceived as detrimental for their learning or as an undesirable model. More importantly, the reference that Diego makes to the idea of a "Chilean-style teacher" – using a heavily Spanish-influenced pronunciation – is another example of the negative perceptions and prejudice that are associated with teachers who do not assimilate their English to one of the dominant varieties.

An interesting explanation of this phenomenon is presented by Lucia in Extract 50 below. In her view, the ideology of native-speakerism that is evident in the demands from – and choices of – teachers and students are deeply rooted in the activity of teaching English at all levels of education. In her discussion about her students' preferences for specific varieties of English when entering the programme, she suggests that there is a top-down process in which teacher trainers from specific ELT programmes in Chile have traditionally imposed a British normative approach to ELT, which has been replicated at different

universities and adopted by their students who, after becoming English teachers, impose those beliefs about English on their learners.

Extract 50

> **Lucia:** I think that they have this idea that they want to sound British (.) not all of them but **the majority want to sound British because that's what they have been exposed to** […]
>
> **Researcher:** =that they've been exposed to at schools?
>
> **Lucia: YES the majority of the teachers that teach English in Chile sound very British** because [[one of the most traditional universities]] likes British pronunciation and […] I'm ASSUMING that **they are the same that teach in other universities, they all GRAVITATE to that** (.) so they come with the idea that they want to sound like this (.) ALL OF THEM want to sound native like (.) nobody wants to have it wrong [...] all of the students want to sound native and when you tell them **"you don't need to sound native, you can sound like YOURSELF"** and that's like no no no "I have to sound either British or American, I have to decide" WHY?
>
> **Researcher:** Is there a why?
>
> **Lucia:** I think- when I ask them WHY do you want to sound like this? (1) they don't KNOW, they honestly don't know (.) I think- and this is my inference (.) it will open doors
>
> **Researcher:** sounding like a native speaker?
>
> **Lucia:** YES it will open doors, somehow, **they think that native speakers have a better life, that they have better jobs […] and I keep telling them no@@@ it's not gonna change your life@**

What is striking about Lucia's comment is her description of how she challenges her students' beliefs about the supposed benefits of sounding native-like. In her account, Lucia's belief that English teachers do not necessarily need to show affiliation to dominant ENL varieties seems to be often questioned by her students who support their demands and choices with the belief that they will gain access to better professional opportunities in a way that is similar to the advantages of sounding "correct" described by Simon in Extract 47 above.

7.4   Findings from classroom observations (Programme C)

As mentioned in Section 4.6 and indicated in Table 2, a number of classroom observations could not be carried out during the data collection stage because of a general student strike that affected the country in 2016. This meant that, out of the 9 participants from Programme C who had teaching responsibilities at that time (excluding the Head of Department), only three were observed twice, three were observed only once, while two participants were not observed at all. However, this did not prevent the collection and analysis of rich data that contributed to a better understanding of this educational context. Like the findings obtained through the interviews, the observational data from Programme C revealed a series of tensions about what constitutes positive practices in the training of future teachers of English, but more importantly, it also revealed tensions within the teacher educators' own beliefs systems, to the extent of contradicting their own espoused beliefs or performing opposing practices.

One of the main themes that emerged in the analysis of Programme C's classroom observations was an implicit orientation to standard forms. Such an orientation was supported by constant corrections, beliefs about what correct language is, and the dominance of NES as the preferred sources of external input. These patterns were mostly common in the grammar, phonetics and language skills courses. Corrections were mainly done on the spot by some teacher educators and, in many cases, they interrupted the students' development of their points when speaking. Examples of these corrections were found in the practices of most of the observed participants, including a few that openly reported in their interviews that they perceived that constant corrections were detrimental for language learning. These behaviours were so engrained in the lessons of some of these teacher educators that they seemed to be common practice for the students to engage in similar actions. For example, in one of the observed lessons, the teacher trainer involved one of his students in a task by saying **"you are going to help me correct in case somebody makes a mistake"**, which reveals and promotes an orientation towards normative use of English based on idealised standards.

Negative attitudes towards variation were not limited to perceptions of what counts as correct English, but also to correct use of Spanish. For example, another teacher educator

made a reference to the similarities between the English word "apartment" and the Spanish "apartamento", and while doing so, he referred to the word "departamento" which is the variation that is most commonly used in Chile (and accepted by the *Real Academia Española*). The teacher trainer shared his view by stating that **"saying /departamento/ is wrong, we should use /apartamento/, but we don't speak very well"**. In this respect, the Spanish form "apartamento" is perceived as more prestigious and acceptable than the Latin American variant "departamento" despite its widespread use and official recognition. Such comments reveal not only an adherence to idealised versions of English but also a similar position towards idealised forms of Spanish. These comparisons may be influenced by the status of Spanish as another widely spread global language which has undergone processes of variation and change while maintaining an idea of standard that acts as a regulatory norm. It could be argued that beliefs about a standard use of Spanish may have an effect on the perceptions that these teacher trainers have in relation to variation in English – or other languages – and may influence their own identity as teachers and users of this language. Finally, this theme was also supported by the constant references to ENL countries (primarily the USA and the UK) in the examples and tasks used, and the usual appearance of NES in the videos that were presented in class for pedagogical purposes. However, I should point out that due to the limited number of lessons that I observed in this context, this finding is far from being understood as a generalisation.

On the other hand, some teaching practices at Programme C seemed to be in line with an encouragement of tolerance as regards variation. These behaviours were particularly consistent in culture and applied linguistics modules and represented a counterpart to the previously discussed orientation towards standard forms. Positive attitudes towards making mistakes and an acknowledgement of the teacher educators' own weaknesses when compared against an NES benchmark provided support for this theme. Phrases that encouraged the participation of students in class, such as **"you know we're here to make mistakes"** or **"making mistakes is good"**, tended to be uttered by some teacher educators when their students lacked confidence at the moment of speaking in English. Similarly, these participants usually shared their own experiences as English language users as a way to exemplify how they have managed to develop their own version of English without the need to conform to the norms of specific groups. For example, one of

the teacher trainers revealed that when she travels to the USA, **"I say Arkansas /ərˈkænsəs/, they say 'Arkansas /ˈɑːrkənsɔː/"**, highlighting her preference to keep her identity as a non-local in her decision to pronounce that American state in a way which is similar to the Spanish pronunciation. What is more, another teacher educator engaged in a discussion about his experience learning RP in his training and referred to the way in which he speaks English by saying "this is my accent, not RP, I put a lot of effort to learn RP, but I don't use it, I don't even feel comfortable with it". In spite of the fact that discussions like this are expected to help students challenge their own beliefs about their goals of learning and teaching English, these instances were limited to the practices of one or two teacher educators, and, therefore, they represent an exception rather than a generalisation.

7.5   Summary

The analysis of Programme C revealed considerable tensions among members of staff regarding the knowledge base that Chilean teacher education programmes are expected to offer. The implementation of a curriculum innovation is perceived by some teacher educators as a step towards an understanding of English that embraces its diversity and spread because of its competency-based nature, which, according to the Programme Director and other members of staff in charge of its design and implementation, is supposed to emphasise communication over correctness. References to this new approach revealed tensions between participants whose beliefs promoted awareness of Englishes other than ENL forms and those who had a preference for traditional approaches. What is more, the results of the analysis also evidenced a dualistic perspective on English. This was revealed by an understanding of linguistic variation in English as a phenomenon that only concerns British and American varieties. What is more, this perspective seems to reinforce negative attitudes towards L1 influenced English. Regarding the classroom practices of Programme C's teacher educators, these revealed an implicit preference for standard forms of pronunciation and opposing views regarding students' mistakes characterised by the co-existence of on-the-spot corrections and positive attitudes towards mistakes.

Chapter 8   **Cross-Case Analysis**

8.1   **Introduction**

As mentioned in the introduction of this chapter, a cross-case analysis consists of the examination of the similarities and differences that emerged across the cases (Yin, 2009). Even though a cross-case analysis is not a compulsory requirement of collective-case studies (Stake, 2006), the relevance of including this further analysis in this study is to discuss relevant themes that emerged across all three cases and that, due to word count restrictions, were not presented in the within-case analyses. This strategy also helped me avoid repetition and "see essential relationships between circumstances, events, and responses that go beyond the single instances to become evident for multiple cases" (Bazeley, 2013, p.289).

Stake (2006) suggests three different procedures for cross-case analysis: (a) emphasising case findings; (b) merging case findings; and (c) providing factor for analysis. The choice of procedure that the researcher makes will depend on the objective of their study. As my objective is to use cross-case analysis for the discussion of similarities and differences across cases, this study followed the merging case findings procedure, since the within-case analyses presented above have already emphasised the particularities of each case. In this respect, Stake (2006, p.40-41) indicates that "the section reporting the cross-case analysis is expected to be shorter than the sum of the case studies, yet it should convey the most important findings from each". The cross-case analysis revealed three major themes: (a) Importance of English over other languages; (b) authentic English lies somewhere else; and (c) desirable linguistic characteristics of English teachers. These common themes are discussed in the sections below.

8.2   **Beliefs about the role of English as a lingua franca**

The data revealed that participants from the three programmes recognise the lingua franca role of English in the world. These teacher educators demonstrated great

awareness of the use of English as the language of choice among people from different linguacultural backgrounds (Seidlhofer, 2011; Jenkins, 2015b), describing it as a tool for intercultural communication and even, in some cases, as a nation-free language. However, the participants revealed little awareness and engagement with ELF research in general, since in most cases in which they referred to English as a lingua franca they would associate this concept to international trade. As the explicit awareness of ELF as a phenomenon and as a research field among Chilean teachers was not central to the purpose of this study, I did not directly elicit reactions about ELF in the interviews. This resulted in most participants implicitly describing ELF in their discussions about the importance of English while others who were familiar with the concept overtly reacted positively or negatively to its meaning and implications. For example, in Extract 51, David (Programme A) implicitly describes ELF while describing situations in which people do not share a common first language.

Extract 51

> **Researcher:** and what do you understand by the claim that English is a global language?
>
> **David:** well uh that is used in most cases when there is no official and common language for a group of people and **so English is very likely to be the one that people would use in that situation** and we can see it every day and this thing of globalisation, people from different countries living in one- in THIS particular country, for example, it's very likely that English is the language to be used in those situations (.) well and here's Spanish of course but then if you travel around, **English is the one that kind of lets you or allows you to participate in conversations and meetings and things** (2) a couple of weeks ago we had a meeting with a person from a country where English is not the first language, English is not the first language here either, and Spanish was not the first language there either, so **English was the common thing without even talking about that**, it was like the common ground for people to communicate

Like David, many other participants referred to the lingua franca function of English as one of the reasons behind the promotion of the language in the country. For instance, Julia (Programme) talks about English being **"the language that helps you to get across many cultures, different cultures"**, while Sergio (Programme B) points out that **"it's almost like a lingua franca, people can get connected, can understand each other (.) by**

communicating in English (.) despite the language that they speak natively". Comments like these provide evidence of a clear understanding of the spread and diversity of English among participants from the three programmes under study and also reveal an association of English with users who are not necessarily native speakers of it. However, as discussed in each of the within-case analyses above, the participant teachers displayed conflicting views among themselves when discussing the implications of this kind of use of English on ELT, which ranged from an attachment to normative approaches (see Section 5.2) to the encouragement of localised versions of English in the instructions of teachers (see Section 6.3).

An example of awareness of, and positive attitudes towards, ELF research and its implications for ELT was provided by Lucas (Programme A) and is presented in Extract 52 below. In his account, he refers to tensions among teacher educators regarding goals for ELT and highlights the impact that awareness of ELF research has had on their beliefs. More importantly, he emphasises that the common attachment to normative approaches and resistance to incorporate aspects of ELF in ELT is not a generational issue but one that is more related to the specialisation of the teachers, since, he argues, experience is not a defining factor in such attachment and resistance; however, teaching courses on linguistic analysis is. The results of this research are in line with this observation since, as it was indicated in the within-case analysis, it is normally teachers of phonetics and grammar who show a stronger attachment to ENL norms.

Extract 52

> **Lucas:** I think there's young and old teachers who believe British English should be kept as the norm em: the whole idea of English as an international language or **English as a lingua franca has opened new discussions** and you can see some teachers here against that idea […] **so grammar teachers and phonetics teachers are the ones that resist the most** but I think that from our perspective we tend to emphasise the idea that **non English speakers are the ones that are using English the most** so we need to appropriate (1) we need to make English our own language and that means not only resignifying that but also changing language a bit (.) so the whole process of the **appropriation of the English language also carries, I think, this process of CHANGING or mutating English**

Chapter 8

Explicit evidence of this kind of resistance is found among other participants. For example, in Extract 53, Esteban (Programme A, English grammar teacher), like most participants, recognises the role of English as an international lingua franca and the need to incorporate a more global perspective of English to ELT. In line with the specialised literature on ELF, he shows understanding of ELF as a fluid and flexible form of communication in English that cannot be taught in the same way as standardised varieties. However, when describing a situation in an ELF context in which he was unsuccessful at understanding the English of people from different linguacultural backgrounds from his, he revealed a strong attachment to an idea of an ENL normative standard over the need for raising awareness of linguistic variation in English. What is also remarkable from Esteban's conclusion is that he also mentions the concept of "Chilean English" which is a construct that did not emerge consistently from sites other than Programme B. Esteban's notion of what incorporating aspects of ELF into ELT means may then be interpreted as the activity of teaching and learning a range of non-standardised Englishes rather than developing strategies for successful intercultural communication through English.

Extract 53

Esteban: even though we DO recognise it as a global English there's no such thing as A global English (.) because what's A global English? is it teachable to start with? and my answer to that would initially be NO, NO WAY. **Is English as a lingua franca or international English teachable? I would say NO** because (.) the last time I went to England […] I was a visiting professor and they asked me to attend several vivas of PhD dissertations (.) and the majority of the vivas I attended were from Chinese or Vietnamese or Japanese, or I don't know, candidates […] the TEACHERS understood EVERYTHING […] but **I didn't understand a thing because to me was absolutely gibberish** AND (.) and that's the question I ask, what are we gonna TEACH? Shall I record a Japanese, whoever, who is defending a VIVA, who is supposedly at a very good level or advanced level in an international setting after having done research IN English in an English university? (2) but **if I after twenty years or thirty years of studying English didn't understand a word of what these people were saying I think it will be a crime to submit my students to that kind of English**, so even though I DO agree that we have to incorporate these elements, **I think for PEDAGOGICAL**

purposes you have to take decisions, you cannot teach all kinds of English, that's IMPOSSIBLE, not even CHILEAN English.

Misinterpretations of ELF also occurred in a more implicit way. When asked about her perceptions towards the claim that English is a global language, Paula (Programme A, phonetics teacher), distances herself from the promotion of a global, unified and perhaps simplistic standard of English – probably influenced by Nerrière's idea of 'Globish'. As she tries to find the exact acronym to define this alternative understanding of English, Paula's hesitations reveal that the concept that she is trying to produce may be ELF, as presented in Extract 54 below. This understanding of ELF and specifically of ELF research, exemplified by the reference to "people" who would put forward such a view of language, is in line with existing misconceptions about ELF that are commonly found in the work of scholars that have ignored the actual nature and purpose of ELF research (see Jenkins, 2015b for a detailed discussion).

Extract 54

> **Paula: I understand that English can help everybody communicate, it's like a lingua franca**, yeah that's what I understand, not on the other, I mean, oh @ I'm trying to think here (1) because **there are people who say oh there's ELT English as a global language? or EL something, English as a global language, ELL? I guess, something like that (1) and: they claim that there should be no accents**, well I don't see it like that, I mean when somebody says "oh English is a global language" I always think of technology, the internet, most of the publications even are in English, so that's what I understand, information, communication, POWER also, power relations and how we can somehow, you know, get a little bit of that

The few explicit references to ELF, along with the negative attitudes towards it that seem to be based on common misinterpretations of the concept, reveal little engagement with research on its implications for ELT. It is important to mention, however, that many participants addressed the implications of ELF in a more indirect way by referring to the relevance of raising awareness of Englishes, by embracing the influence of their students' L1, and also by stressing the role that NNESs have in intercultural communication in

Chapter 8

English as shown in different sections of the within-case analysis of the three
programmes.

8.3   Authentic English lies somewhere else

Another common theme that emerged from the data collected at the three sites was the
belief that 'real' English only occurred in contexts where English is used as a de facto
language. This view implies that the form of English that these NNES teachers use and are
exposed to does not represent an authentic form of English, but rather an approximation
to the ways in which English is spoken in ENL contexts. This theme is supported by a set of
beliefs about language use, found across the three programmes, which relate to the
contexts in which English is used, the kinds of interactions that teachers engage in and are
exposed to, and the opportunities of using English beyond educational purposes that they
may or may not have. For instance, some of the participant teachers share the belief that
their own form of English does not represent an authentic form of English in its own right
and are in need of experiences that can allow them to validate or authenticate their
communication skills in English. For example, in Extract 55, Marco (Programme C) refers
to the lack of opportunities to naturally communicate in English that he faces on a day to
day basis since most of his communication in this language occurs in educational settings,
which he considers to be an "unnatural" context for authentic communication because of
the kind of English that he is expected to display as a teacher – a rather academic version
– and the fact that Spanish, being a common language, does not jeopardise
communication with his interlocutors.

Extract 55

> **Marco: I've always known somewhere in my head that when talking about English you
> SHOULD go abroad at some point of your career** or your professional experience OR
> your professional interests in order to prepare more […] I would love to have more
> opportunities to practice my English **(.) I leave the university and I can't speak
> English to anybody else**, when I get back home for example, which is exactly the
> same sensation I had since day one when I entered university (.) the only place where
> I could practice the language was the university and then that was my work, schools

teaching it, but finally having this- not the correct feedback from the students who are LEARNING it, **just a lot of corrections all the time, it's an unnatural process of communication using the language actually**, and that's what I'm missing a lot, **real opportunities**, not conferences nor seminars, but even THEY are kind of, I mean, I can programme myself to that and this is the other way around, so: I'm missing that

Marco's discussion of lack of opportunities to practice his English reveals a clear separation between the English that is spoken for real communication purposes (both among NNESs or as a lingua franca) and the version of English that he teaches and uses in his professional context. Furthermore, it seems that the absence of instances in which teachers can use – and practice – English for actual communication purposes beyond educational and academic settings make the Chilean context, in general, an unsuitable place for engagement with such real communication. Therefore, these teacher educators manifest the need to find those "real opportunities" in ENL countries. Similarly, in Extract 56 below, Olivia (Programme C) describes her need to go "back to the roots", by which she also means contexts where English is a de facto language, in order to improve her "genuineness" in language use. This genuineness is defined by her as a form of informal or everyday language **"that you find on the streets, in a conversation in a restaurant… which is typically ill-formed… because this is the way we naturally speak in a natural setting"**. As a result, she stresses the idea that the form of English that she uses on an everyday basis lacks the authenticity or "genuineness" that native speakers of a language display, because of the influence of academic conventions and also, as she mentions in Section 7.2.2, the close adherence to standard norms that she is expected to display in her teaching. More importantly, like Marco, she implies a distinction between her use of English as a teacher and an idealised, and perhaps colloquial, English that she would learn and use if communicating in ENL contexts.

Extract 56

> **Olivia:** I have been losing my genuineness because for that **you need to come back to the roots from time to time** (.) I haven't been able to travel since 2010 so I will try to do it this year and the problem is that sometimes academically speaking I feel very secure but **in everyday language, normal language, I feel some insecurity there, why? because I haven't been able to be there, in situ, and practice that language** (.)

and the other one is the one that I am preparing my students with, that I have to be

clear with in order to teach it, and the other one, the simpler one, is the one that

sometimes I don't feel so secure, so I have to be checking all the time **so I would like**

to be able to manage more genuine language sometimes (.) I'm very honest

@@@@

In addition, Olivia stresses the difference between the genuine level of communication in

English that occurs in ENL contexts and the English that her students learn by describing

the latter as **"pure marketing, it's a way of selling English and I have to teach them that**

if you go to an English speaking country nobody speaks like that", demonstrating

awareness of the reinforcement of idealised standard versions of English that dominate

the ELT industry, especially through coursebooks (Dewey, 2014). Additional support for

this finding is presented by Victor (Programme B) in Extract 57 below when discussing the

relevance of having native speakers of English as members of the teaching staff in the

programme. In his comment, Victor also expresses the belief that the English used in the

Chilean educational context by users whose first language is Spanish is destined to be an

approximation to the language of native speakers, or as he puts it, speaking "Spanish in

English" because of the limitations that sharing the same code would bring. More

importantly, he highlights that, by communicating in English with native speakers, Chilean

users of English would be able to engage in cultural exchanges that otherwise they would

not experience.

Extract 57

> **Victor:** it's important for the students to have contact with native speakers (.) of course it is
> (.) because in the end **I'm a Chilean teacher (.) I work in Chile with Chilean students**
> **so in the end what I do is speaking in- I mean I speak Spanish in English, you see?**
> (2) and we all share the same code so **when you have contact with native speakers**
> **you become aware of the cultural differences (.) of the social differences, of**
> **ideological differences** (.) different world views that are in the end expressed in a
> linguistic way but also and more importantly in an attitudinal way, in an ideological
> way

These views can be connected with Grace's (Programme A) belief of using, and being exposed to, a "fake" form of English in Chilean educational contexts, as presented in Extract 18 (in Section 5.3.3). From the perspective of these teacher educators, then, this 'Chilean similect' would lack legitimacy as a form of English in its own right, and, therefore, may need to be validated in interaction with NESs. In line with the examples presented above, Grace also displayed uncertainty regarding her use of English because of her lack of experience using the language in ENL contexts. In fact, most participants who had not travelled to English-speaking countries by the time of the data collection implicitly manifested the belief of having their English "validated" abroad. This idea of a validation seems to relate to opportunities in which these teacher educators would engage in successful ordinary (non-academic) communication, especially with NESs, instead of the type of communication that they are exposed to and engage in in their teaching duties.

8.4   Desirable linguistic characteristics of English teachers

The national disciplinary standards for ELT courses, published in 2014, suggest that future teachers are expected to "communicate in English in an *accurate and fluid* manner at *C1 level* in all areas of this domain" (Ministerio de Educación, 2014: 29, my translation, my emphasis). Although following these standards is not a compulsory requirement by the Ministry of Education, they are promoted as guidelines for ELT programmes in an attempt to standardise the training of pre-service teachers in Chile. In line with these guidelines, the three programmes declare in their documents that their students should achieve a C1 level at completion of the course. This claim is also confirmed in the interview data. However, beliefs about what achieving a C1 level means – and the methods through which pre-service teachers can achieve this – tended to vary across and within the three programmes. Analysis of the data obtained across the three programmes revealed tensions in the beliefs systems of a number of participants regarding their expectations about their students' use and knowledge of English. Such beliefs seemed to be framed by their views about the goals of ELT teacher education and conflicting ideas about the notion of accuracy.

Chapter 8

Some teacher educators from different programmes associated the desirable linguistic characteristics of an English teacher with the knowledge and skills of a "technician" in the language (see Extract 13 for an example). Such a perspective seems to be closely tied to a thorough knowledge of standard norms of grammar and pronunciation as well as NES-like proficiency. Although only a small number of the teachers who participated in this study revealed a close attachment to this goal of teacher education, many other participants showed conflicting beliefs regarding the linguistic proficiency that teachers of English should achieve. For example, in Extract 58, Gloria (Programme C) discusses her views about the characteristics of a successful user of English and, while doing so, she shows awareness of conflicts in her belief system that prevent her from challenging beliefs that were incorporated earlier in her life. Gloria's example, on the one hand, supports the belief that teachers of English are expected to demonstrate an advanced mastery of the language, whereas, on the other hand, she reveals that such idealised mastery is an acquired discourse that is embedded in the ELT profession, and she recognises the bias in her views.

Extract 58

> **Gloria**: if you're going to be a TEACHER of English that's quite RIGID (.) I know it doesn't make any sense and **it might be some of my preconceived IDEAS because we all HAVE our beliefs** (.) I REALLY think that teachers of English should speak English very well (.) now WHAT is very well? being able to communicate with an English speaker (.) I mean with a native speaker or with OTHER people (.) that is something I consider being successful (.) it's kind of vague though (.) **I might be a bit more demanding when I talk about teachers than when I talk about other people and that might be because of the profession but it doesn't really MEAN that it has to be like that** (.) I mean if you're able to communicate you're successful (.) if you have problems and if you're involved in certain (communication breakdowns?) YES THEN that's a problem, then you're not really successful (.) so that's what I consider

Evidence of such contradictions were found in the other two cases as well. For example, Daniela from Programme B describes successful users of English as people who can **"communicate using the language… [who are] able to communicate and make themselves understood… but it's different in the case of a teacher of English (.) you**

should be able to use the language properly". Similarly, David from Programme A differentiates between the linguistic skills of a teacher and a mere user of the language. In Extract 59, he supports the belief that the more a teacher knows about English and the more proficient he or she is, the better the teacher. Such a perspective is also supported by his views regarding the level of proficiency that a teacher trainer should be able to display in their use of English.

Extract 59

> **David**: […] **if we're talking about a user like these people in here that's a different story, that's somebody that is an expert, somebody that is able to teach others what this person knows, and that's a different thing** (.) we got to understand that (1) because it depends on the audience mainly (.) my audience and everybody else's audience in here is people who are not just going to be good users of the language in terms of communication but they have to be proficient at teaching it and so a good USER of the language, because **being a user is somebody that is able to master the language in the highest possible level** and then being able to teach in the same level and teaching in different contexts
>
> […]
>
> I do believe that a teacher, a university teacher should have at least, well not at least, a C2 level, that is a different thing (.) well (.) **technically it should look like a native speaker but I don't think it's completely possible for somebody like us to speak like a native speaker**, that is not to say that we should stop learning and training

The extracts above raise questions about the relationship between an idealised level of proficiency in the target language and the pedagogic skills and knowledge that competent teachers are expected to display. In this respect, a number of teacher educators across the three programmes demonstrated awareness of such an imbalance, arguing that Chilean ELT courses have traditionally valued native-like competence in English over the development of teaching skills, resulting in incoherent views about what the goals of ELT teacher education should be. Criticism of the dominant view of teachers as technicians is presented by Alex in Extract 60 below. When asked about the differences between a successful user of English and the expected linguistic proficiency of an English teacher, he draws a line between teachers as technicians and teachers as educators, and stresses the

small contribution that a thorough mastery of norms of grammar and pronunciation can ultimately make in the school system.

Extract 60

> **Alex**: I think that has some more questions around that um: one of them is **what is a teacher of English? is the absolute and ultimate specialist in the language or is someone who has enough tools to help other people to develop their linguistic skills?** if you are thinking the second definition I gave you then there's is a problem with the status of a teacher, then we can be just technicians right? I know the tools, I give you the tools, then you develop yourself (.) but on the first one what we are doing is being more academic right? and being something like a very detailed specialist who does not know how to teach basically (.) **we can keep studying the language itself for the sake of knowing, and not knowing anything about pedagogy, so in the end we won't have any results in the system**

Support for this view is also given by Sergio, the Programme Director of Programme B. In line with his views about the idea of Chilean English discussed in Section 6.3.1, he distances himself, and the programme he runs, from the ideas of proficiency and accuracy that are usually attached to the English that pre-service and in-service teachers are expected to demonstrate. In Extract 61 he acknowledges the educational demands that the disciplinary standards for ELT programmes present regarding the level of proficiency that his students are expected to acquire. However, he argues that adopting a teacher-as-technician approach is not the only means to develop proficiency in English, since, in his view, accuracy and proficiency do not mean native-like English.

Extract 61

> **Researcher**: do you use the same criteria for learners of English and future English teachers?
> **Sergio**: no, no, of course ((mumbles)) the thing is that we have our standards, we have national standards for English language teachers but my point is- I mean, **of course we want our teachers to be as accurate as possible but we don't spend most of our time in language accuracy as in other institutions** (1) we prefer to spend that time giving them something interesting to read, something that will enlighten them, or something that will open up their eyes to other realities, and asking for their opinions

about that, more than spending so much time in whether they are able to use
whatever grammatical structure or SOUND like you are a native sort of speaker of the
language

8.5   Summary

This chapter presented a cross-case analysis of the three programmes, which included the
most relevant themes that emerged across the cases. One of these themes was
concerned with the variety of understandings and beliefs behind the concept of English as
a Lingua Franca. In spite of the fact that most teacher educators recognised the lingua
franca role of English in the world, few participants showed awareness of ELF as a subject
of enquiry. Common misconceptions and lack of engagement with the relevant literature
prevented participants from associating this concept with the implications that the spread
and diversity of English may have on ELT. In addition, this analysis presented beliefs about
what counts as authentic English use and concluded that most participants, especially
from Programmes A and C, associated the English language only with ENL territories,
implying that the English used by NNESs in Expanding Circle contexts is simply an
approximation to the English of native speakers rather than a form of English in its own
right. Furthermore, this chapter discussed the conflicting views that teachers across and
within the three programmes have regarding ideas of proficiency, accuracy and the goals
of teacher education, and it exposed tensions regarding the dominance of a view of
English "teachers-as-technicians" of the language. The next chapter discusses the
relationship between these findings, the research questions, and the literature. What is
more, it presents a discussion of the dominant language ideologies that operate in these
programmes and offers a general conclusion to this thesis.

Chapter 9   Discussion and Conclusions

This chapter presents a discussion of the results of this collective case study presented in Chapters 5,6,7 and 8 in connection with my research questions and the literature discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. Firstly, I present a synthesis of my findings, highlighting their significance in light of what was discussed in the literature review chapters. This synthesis is organised in three overarching themes: (1) Dominance of British English; (2) Changes in beliefs and; (3) "Chilean English" as a counter-ideology. Secondly, I provide the answers for each of the research questions outlined in Section 4.4. After that, I refer to the implications that this study has for the development of ELF research, teacher education and the Chilean ELT context. Finally, I refer to the limitations of this study, directions for future research and the final conclusion of this thesis.

9.1   The dominance of the notion of British English

Beliefs that support the promotion of an idealised form of English, referred to as British English, were commonly found in the discourse of Chilean ELT teacher educators. Even though the three programmes under review projected different views towards the notion of British English, this construct was a central element in the exploration of language ideologies about English in this study. Interestingly, examples of Chilean ELT teacher trainers who explicitly supported the unquestioned promotion of a monolithic version of English were limited. However, evidence of the influence of the Standard English ideology in the discourse and practices of these teacher educators and in the curricula of these programmes revealed a general implicit orientation towards ideas of correctness, conformity to standard norms, and negative attitudes towards variation. The findings of this study suggest that this orientation is mostly supported by the historical influence that the notion of British English has had in the ELT profession in Chile, and are in line with Barahona's (2016) observations of the dominant designs of teacher education curricula in Chile. The constant reproduction of beliefs surrounding the notion of British English since the opening of the first ELT programme in Chile has led to the development of a shared belief of an existing 'tradition' (5.2) of what is considered to be good practice in the

education of English teachers. This is also reflected in the indexicality of specific ELT programmes in Chile as "traditional programmes", as the findings from the three cases suggest.

The present study confirmed that traditional programmes, through some of their teacher educators, act as "guardians of the standard" (Lippi-Green, 2012; Milroy and Milroy, 2012), and, in line with Veliz (2011), beliefs about an idealised standard are mostly replicated in the phonetics courses (Extract 3,Extract 5,Extract 13, and Extract 44). In addition, the findings across cases suggest that it is in these specific classes that beliefs that support the Standard English ideology are promoted and acquired. A popular explanation for this phenomenon is the unrivalled promotion of RP as a model for pronunciation in Chilean ELT. Positive attitudes towards RP among teachers of phonetics are framed by a process of iconisation (Irvine and Gal, 2009) by associating this model with ideas of prestige and education that are usually used to describe the British middle class (Milroy and Milroy, 2012). In this respect, this association was perceived, in some cases, as advantageous for NNES teachers (Extract 3 and Extract 47). Such a view is in line with Kroskrity's (2010) characterisation of language ideologies as carriers of socio-political interests hidden in notions of correctness. In relation to this, my results suggest that most of my participants frame their beliefs about English mostly in relation to aspects of pronunciation, and more specifically, to proximity to NES accents, to the extent that they may even project a NES identity in their use of English (Jenkins, 2007), as it was shown in Section 5.2.3.

Support for the notion of idealised standards (Crowley, 2003) in my study also included beliefs about the existence of separate standards of English that are homogeneous in ENL communities. Using Irvine and Gal's (2009) framework, this phenomenon that I call "consistency of choice" could be interpreted as an example of fractal recursivity, since the idea of a British standard norm not only creates an ideological opposition on the idea of "non-standard English", but also on an idealised American standard (or any other idealised standard of English). From this perspective, the purity of each standard should be respected (Extract 9), and users – learners and teachers – are expected to avoid mixing standards (Extract 10), or, especially when it comes to pronunciation, these standards could be merged to create a neutral form (Extract 45). This reported need to abide by

nation-state ideas of a standard language seem to be influenced by these teacher educators' beliefs about their own first language, since, as Milroy (2001) points out, speakers of standardised languages, such as Spanish, usually develop a strong advocacy for standard norms as members of "standard language cultures". Following the idea of fractal recursivity (Irvine and Gal, 2009), it is also possible to understand some of these teacher educators' ideas of linguistic variation in English as concerning the differences between the idealised notions of American English and British English (7.3). Consequently, variability beyond idealised standards of English remain subjected to a process of erasure (Irvine and Gal, 2009).

Despite the dominant idealised view of NESs as representatives of homogenous cultures and language varieties (Doerr, 2009), and the tendency for some of these teacher educators to portray themselves as users of ENL standards (5.2.1), these findings did not support the belief that NESTs are perceived as better English language teachers than NNEST (Holliday, 2006). I speculate that this might be due to the differences between the length and intensity of the education of teachers in Chile (5 years on average) and the teaching qualifications that NESs usually undergo to teach English abroad (from 4 months). This perspective can also help explain why the introduction of internationally recognised teaching qualifications such as CELTA and DELTA has not proved to make an impact in the Chilean education system.

I should point out again that, in line with Kroskrity's (2010) characteristics of language ideologies, degrees of awareness of the dominance of British English in Chilean ELT varied across and within the three cases studied here. As discussed above, discourses that consciously supported and reproduced beliefs that aligned with the SLI, especially under the framework of "tradition", represented a minority among the participants. However, the hegemony of such a discourse was also observable in the beliefs and practices of other participants who were less aware of their own beliefs about ideological issues of English (Fives and Buehl, 2012), in the classroom practices of most participants, and in some of the documents created by the programmes. On the other hand, discourses of resistance and opposition to the dominant EFL paradigm revealed a growing trend in the beliefs of Chilean ELT teacher educators. In this respect, this study found evidence of

critical episodes (Johnson, 1994) that influenced changes in the participants' beliefs that encouraged them to adopt a more critical stance towards the status quo of Chilean ELT.

9.2   Changes in the teachers' belief systems

Although this study did not have the purpose of exploring changes in the beliefs systems of the participants, the findings provided evidence of patterns in the teacher educators' narratives that are expected to explain how resistant beliefs about the superiority of standard forms of English (Jenkins, 2007) were challenged and replaced by some of my participants. In this respect, my results demonstrated that most teacher educators who were aware of the dominance of SLI in Chilean ELT shared specific beliefs about their own training, their identity as NNSTs, and the goals of teacher education in Chile. As the findings in Section 6.2.1 show, even those participants who were critical of normative approaches to ELT recognised having been strongly influenced by the ideas of correctness and prestige discussed in the previous section. In line with earlier research on teachers' beliefs (Johnson, 1994; Golombek, 1998; Borg, 2003; Zheng, 2009), my findings revealed that these teacher educators' beliefs were highly influenced by their experiences as trainees in ELT programmes. However, this study does not completely support Pajares's (1992) claim that "the earlier a belief is incorporated to a belief system, the more resistant to change it becomes", since, as the results suggest, experiences using English for intercultural communication, especially in ENL countries, seem to have a major impact in enduring (5.2.3) or challenging (Extract 17, Extract 24, Extract 25) strongly held beliefs about English acquired during instruction. Changes in the participants' belief systems regarding the dominance of standard forms in ELT are elucidated in the negative attitudes towards the teachers' own training, especially regarding the demands for conformity to RP that is characteristic of phonetics classes in Chilean ELT programmes (5.3.1, 6.2). In addition, participants who had spent time in ENL countries reported that it was through these experiences abroad that they became aware of the diversity of English, and, consequently, criticised their own training's lack of exposure to variation (6.2.2).

The analysis found evidence of earlier changes in the belief systems of my participants, based on the belief that the English that is taught in these programmes is unauthentic (5.3.3, 8.3). This finding is twofold in the sense that, on the one hand, it is in line with

descriptions of RP as an idealised form of the language that is not representative of the heterogeneity of English (Crowley, 2003; Lippi-Green, 2012; Milroy and Milroy, 2012) and, therefore, demonstrating awareness of this feature of RP represents a move away from the dominance of the SLI. On the other hand, however, this finding also revealed beliefs about some of these teacher trainers' own English being regarded as unauthentic because of their limited opportunities to engage in instances of intercultural communication (Extract 18, Extract 55, Extract 56). This inconsistency gives support to Green's (1971) third dimension of the belief system which claims that supposedly contradictory beliefs can coexist in a belief system since they are held in clusters that prevent cross-fertilisation. In other words, according to my results, negative attitudes towards RP and awareness of ideological issues related to English do not necessarily translate into an appreciation of the legitimacy of one's own version of the language.

From the findings I observed another change that emerged from the beliefs and practices of teachers who openly opposed to the dominance of hegemonic ENL models. This change in the participants' belief systems consisted of a transition from a close imitation of NS models to the comfortable display of a Spanish-speaking identity in their English. As previously mentioned, most of my participants agreed that their ELT training lacked exposure to Englishes other than idealised standards, as well as instances of discussion about ideological issues regarding the models they were exposed to (6.2.2). In line with Kroskrity (2010), despite the homogeneity of the instruction received by these teacher educators, the ideologies about language that my participants displayed varied across and within cases and were highly influenced by their self-awareness (or lack of it) as NNESTs. From this standpoint, it can then be assumed that changes in these teacher educators' belief systems might have been motivated by an interplay between the realisation of the limitations of a monolithic model for ELT (5.3.3, 6.2.1), the recognition of the irrelevance for Chilean teachers of English of adopting an NS identity in their use of English (5.3.1), and the legitimacy of one's own English (5.3.2, 6.3). This interplay was mostly evident in the beliefs of participants from Programme B (Chapter 6), but, more importantly, it was supported in the curriculum and their classroom practices, and, thus, provided opportunities for themselves and their students "to resolve conflicting images within their own belief systems" (Johnson, 1994, p.451).

9.3   "Chilean English" as a counter-ideology

In consonance with Kroskrity (2010), and as discussed above, my participants demonstrated different levels of adherence and resistance to the dominant SLI that operates in Chilean ELT. What was surprising, however, was the adoption of the idea of "Chilean English" as a sign of resistance or opposition to the hegemony of the notion of BrE – or more directly, to the idea of "tradition" – in ELT teacher education programmes. As discussed in Section 6.3.1, the idea of "Chilean English" that is promoted in Programme B does not represent a new variety of English or similect (Mauranen, 2012), but rather an opposition to the idea that NNSETs are expected to imitate the linguistic competence of idealised NESs (5.2). Not only does the adoption of the term "Chilean English" go against the globally widespread assumption that learners of English should follow ENL standards which has been largely criticised by ELF researchers (e.g. Jenkins, 2007; Cogo and Dewey, 2012; Dewey, 2012; Blair, 2017), but also against local beliefs about the inferiority of Spanish-influenced English (as exemplified in Section 7.3.1). In this respect, my results reveal that by promoting such a perspective in the programme, teachers remove the traditional idea of the "native speaker" from the centre of ELT activity and place the identity of the learner at the core of the process of becoming a teacher of English.

The evidence from this study suggests that the beliefs that make up the existence and promotion of the notion of "Chilean English" are underpinned by a language ideology in its own right as earlier theorising on language ideologies would suggest (Silverstein, 1979; Woolard, 1998). Despite the fact that the rationalisation and justification of language use that are proposed in the notion of "Chilean English" do not seem to "index the political economic interests" (Kroskrity, 2010, p.192) of specific groups in society, they do reveal the existence of a shared belief-system which acts as a response to the existing inequalities promoted by the dominant ideology. Moreover, through the awareness of ideologically-laden practices in the ELT profession, most teacher educators from Programme B seemed to consciously challenge the dominance of SLI, using the unpopular notion of "Chilean English" as a sign of resistance. Consequently, I argue that the discourse behind this idea constructs a "counter-ideology of language" that redefines the

goals of Chilean ELT, challenges long-standing beliefs about language teaching and use, and promotes the legitimacy of the English of NNESTs.

The concept of counter-ideology appears in a few publications but there does not seem to be a proper theorisation of what it actually entails. Such a concept has tended to be associated with the field of political science rather than linguistic enquiry; however, there are some examples of its use in language ideology research (see, for example, Armstrong, 2012). In this case, a counter-ideology of language refers to a language ideology that can be understood as a shared system of beliefs and practices that openly challenges the dominant ideology by exposing the inequalities that are perpetuated through its uncontested promotion. Therefore, a counter-ideology may involve a degree of consciousness and awareness that is not necessarily present in the belief system that supports the dominant ideology as this is usually perceived as the habitual way of understanding language use.

The results also suggest that some participants from Programmes A and C did hold beliefs that strongly support this counter-ideology (5.3.1, 5.3.2, 7.2.1). However, as in Sifakis and Sougari's (2010) study, objective constraints (i.e.: the strong adherence to SLI in the curriculum, tensions among colleagues, lack of an alternative model) prevented them from making a bigger impact in challenging hegemonic discourses and practices in the education of English teachers. What is more, such hindrances in the legitimisation of this counter-ideology were also revealed in the conflicting views about the idea of "Chilean English" that some of these teacher educators demonstrated (Extract 48). Interestingly, Programme C did show some evidence of these beliefs in their newly modified curriculum; however, existing tensions among staff regarding the goals of teacher education (7.2) seem to have hindered the propagation of the counter-ideology.

What is crucial about this counter-ideology is the fact that the beliefs behind it operate consistently among all the teacher trainers from Programme B, and are supported and reinforced by the curriculum (6.1), the head of department (Extract 31), and, more importantly, the teachers' own classroom practices (6.4). It was evident in the data that one of the key elements for the widespread manifestation of this counter-ideology in this programme was the elimination of courses exclusively dedicated to the study of English

phonetics and English grammar. In this respect, this thesis has thoroughly confirmed that it is those courses that are more consistently promoting hegemonic language ideologies of English, and have more long-lasting effects in the belief systems of teachers regarding their views about linguistic correctness, variation, and other ideological traits. Therefore, the findings from this programme demonstrate that in order to successfully promote an alternative to the dominance of idealised ENL standards as the only models for ELT, it is essential to reflect the beliefs about resistance to the dominant normative approach in the policy that supports the programme and in the cognition and practices of its teacher educators.

9.4   Answers to the research questions

This section aims to answer the three research questions outlined in Section 4.4 in light of the findings and discussion presented above.

9.4.1   Responding to the global spread and diversity of English

RQ1: *How and to what extent are ELT training programmes in Chilean universities addressing the global spread of English?*

Research Question 1 concerned the extent and the ways in which the ELT programmes under study approached the current multicultural dimension of the English language in their curriculum, teacher trainers' practices, and goals for the education of future teachers of English. The three programmes explored here respond to this phenomenon in multiple and different ways, revealing an array of understandings of what the role of English in the world, and the expectations of English teachers, are today. As previously discussed, there is a common acceptance among teacher educators from the three programmes that there is a long-standing bias towards the primacy of the notion of British English in the ELT profession in Chile, which is attributed to the influence of the creation of the first ELT teacher training schools in the country (Barahona, 2016). This bias has had an important impact on Chilean teachers' understanding and attitudes towards variation in English and their relevance to ELT, and consequently, in the curricular design of ELT programmes.

The notion of tradition that is emphasised in Programme A as support for the adoption of idealised BrE norms clearly restricts the programme's openness to ideas of intercultural communication, NNES legitimacy of English use, and tolerance to innovation in the language. More importantly, my findings revealed that, in this context, the understanding of variation in English is limited to two hegemonic idealised varieties: BrE and AmE. This view of variation also translates into ideas of what counts as acceptable models for future teachers of English to acquire and for the exposure to Englishes that they receive in their training. However, some of Programme A's participants did not submit to the dominant preference of BrE, and evidence of this was found in their interviews and through classroom observations. In fact, a few of them did overtly promote beliefs in line with a post-normative approach (Dewey, 2012), challenging ideas of tradition in ELT in a bottom-up fashion. However, these limited efforts were counteracted by the strong adherence to normative models and lack of exposure to variation that were supported by the programme's curriculum. Therefore, considering all these factors, Programme A's response to the global spread of English was scarce, inconsistent, and biased.

In the case of Programme B, the idea of tradition was constantly challenged from its curriculum to the classroom, offering an alternative perspective of what diversity and variation mean in ELT. My findings demonstrate that the integration of courses on linguistic analysis (grammar and phonetics) into a comprehensive course on English language skills acts as a response to traditional approaches to ELT instruction and challenges the dominant notion of BrE as the only linguistic model. Instead, the programme promotes an exploration of the learners' own identity as users of English in order to equip them with the necessary tools to develop a critical stance towards beliefs and practices that are biased towards idealised models. What is more, the results of this study confirm that such a focus on NNST identity is in line with a view of English as a tool for intercultural communication, since the outlined purposes of the programme orient people towards the exploration of the learners' own reality (culture, current affairs, ideological issues) rather than assimilating with ENL cultures through English. From this perspective, the programme does not overtly promote particular varieties of English over others, but rather an acceptance and legitimacy of the learners' own English as a means to understand others. The observed consistency of these factors across different agents in Programme B (policy, Head of Department, and teacher educators) and the coherence of

these with classroom practices represent an innovative way of responding to the spread and diversity of English in Chilean ELT.

In line with the findings from Programme A, Programme C also demonstrated a bias towards ENL standard varieties; however, this had a more implicit character and was revealed in the beliefs and practices of teacher educators rather than in the programme curriculum. The exploration of this programme also revealed conflicts among the beliefs of its teacher educators between those who stick to traditional approaches to ELT and those who demonstrate engagement with views that embrace the diversity of English. In most cases, ideas of variation were limited to a contrast between AmE and BrE, while other Englishes were mostly neglected in the classroom. Opportunities for raising awareness of the diversity and spread of English were made evident in extra-curricular activities and individual efforts from teacher trainers during their classes. In fact, the promotion of a more global perspective of English was commonly attributed to a new curricular innovation that was expected to value communication over norms. However, the transition from a traditional approach to the new perspective has proved to generate internal conflicts in the belief systems of teacher educators who are more resistant to change. More importantly, the reinforcement of traditional approaches to ELT in courses on English phonetics and grammar further prevent a change of perspective. Having said that, it is evident that, like in Programme A, inconsistencies in the course design and opposing beliefs about the goals of ELT teacher education limit the extent to which Englishes other than ENL standards are valued, and maintain an unchallenged monolithic (or dualistic) perspective in Chilean ELT.

Finally, the cross-case analysis reported that the three programmes under study showed very limited engagement with ELF literature, both in their curricula and their teacher educators' beliefs and knowledge. Despite acknowledging and emphasising the role of English as an international lingua franca in the views of these teacher educators, misunderstandings and misinterpretations regarding the concept of ELF were common (8.2), as research by Jenkins (2015b) has shown. More importantly, teacher educators who portrayed beliefs that detached the English language from idealised native speakers and showed willingness to adopt an alternative (ELF) perspective referred to the lack of interaction between those ideas and research on teacher education. It can thus be

suggested that awareness of ELF exists at the theoretical level due to a growing interest in intercultural communication; however, its implications for language teaching remain largely unclear in this context.

9.4.2   Beliefs about English taught in Chilean ELT programmes

RQ2: *What are the beliefs of teacher educators from these universities regarding the English that is taught and promoted in such ELT programmes?*

Research Question 2 aimed to explore the espoused and implicit beliefs of Chilean teacher educators regarding the English that they teach. The answer to this question was informed by data from semi-structured interviews and also by classroom observations, since teaching practices are also understood as "beliefs-in-action" (Fives and Buehl, 2012) as discussed in Chapter 3. In addition, beliefs about the English promoted in these programmes were informed by views about the participants' own English as well as their reflections on their own training, allowing comparisons between what they experienced as trainees and what they do in their teaching roles (Kane *et al.*, 2002; Johnson and Golombek, 2011; Borg, 2015). Such beliefs revealed conformity to norms (e.g.: 5.2,7.3), contradictions (e.g.: 7.4, 8.4), tensions (e.g.: 5.3, 7.2), and resistance (e.g.: 6.2).

Beliefs about British English being the most suitable model for ELT were not the most popular among my participants, but certainly the most strongly held. Support for this belief was found in positive attitudes towards the "tradition" of associating the ELT profession in Chile with the English of the British Isles – both because of the fact that the first ELT schools were founded by European academics (Barahona, 2014) and because of the historical influence of the British Council in the Chilean ELT educational policy (Extract 1). British English, for some of these teacher educators, represents ideas of prestige, status and a perceived advantage for English teachers and NNES users (Extract 3). The belief about the superiority of BrE as the most suitable model for Chilean ELT is reinforced by the – sometimes unquestioned – dominance of RP as the sole model of pronunciation. Such beliefs and practices that stemmed from my participants' own training seem to contribute to their identification as users of BrE (5.2.3). More importantly, my participants' reflections on their training confirmed that such beliefs have been

consistently passed on from one generation to the next, with little or no questioning from teachers or students (5.2).

Beliefs that supported the dominance of standard ENL models in Chilean ELT were usually accompanied by the assumption that teachers of English are expected to conform to the specific norms of language use (especially lexis and pronunciation) of the chosen model in order to demonstrate a desirable "consistency of choice" (5.2.2). Such an assumption also reflected views about variation in English that only consider differences between BrE and AmE (7.3) and ignore the legitimacy of other Englishes. This dualistic perspective of English was also common in the practices of some teacher educators and were particularly stressed in the phonetics classes (Extract 5, Extract 11, Extract 44). In fact, beliefs about the teachers' own English were usually framed by NES phonological features, and, as a result, evaluations of their own and their students' English skills were mostly based on pronunciation rather than other skills (such as grammar, lexis, pragmatics, etc.). The strong attachment to phonological aspects of British English has also influenced Chilean teachers' negative attitudes towards the presence of features of their – and their students' – L1 (6.4, 7.3.1).

However, the current study found evidence that long-standing beliefs about the English taught and promoted at Chilean ELT programmes have started to be challenged by some teacher trainers (5.3, 6.2). It can be suggested that such opposition is based on a series of assumptions that were common across the teacher educators who supported it: an understanding of the dominant BrE as an idealised and unauthentic representation of English (5.3.3); a rejection of traditional approaches to ELT (5.3.1, 6.2) in line with Dewey's (2012) post-normative approach; the legitimacy of L1 features in the production of English as a feature of the speaker's identity (5.3.2,6.3); and an awareness of Englishes beyond ENL standards (6.2.2, 7.2.1). Beliefs that support this perspective are held at different degrees of strength (Borg, 2015) and awareness (Fives and Buehl, 2012). More importantly, correspondence between such beliefs and practices were highly subject to support from the programme curricula and tensions among the belief systems of the teacher trainers in each programme.

9.4.3   Language ideologies in Chilean ELT

RQ3: *What language ideologies underpin these beliefs?*

The purpose of this question was to associate the beliefs that teacher educators have about the English that is promoted in Chilean ELT programmes with sets of ideas about language that position certain social groups over others in the teaching of English in Expanding Circle contexts. In line with Kroskrity (2010), teacher educators across and within the three programmes displayed different degrees of attachment and resistance to different language ideologies. However, the results of this study found clear patterns regarding the influence of dominant language ideologies. As discussed earlier, this study demonstrates that these programmes show evidence of a strong influence of the standard language ideology – or more specifically, the standard English ideology, as studies on teachers such as Jenkins (2007) and Dewey (2012) have shown. Following Irvine and Gal's (2009) framework, Implicit and explicit beliefs that support the dominance of this ideology were mostly found in the prestige and status associated with the promotion of RP (iconisation), the dualistic perspective towards variation (fractal recursivity), and the invisibility of Englishes other than ENL standards (erasure).

This study also provided evidence of how native speaker ideologies are present in the beliefs and practices of most of the teacher educators in these programmes. For example, the promotion of the notions of British and American English as homogeneous standards (7.3) seem to perpetuate idealised images of the language of NES. The notion of the native speaker as the ultimate linguistic model for Chilean teachers of English was also revealed in the negative attitudes towards L1-influenced English (7.3.1) as well as in the desirability to have one's English associated with ENL standards (5.2.3). What is more, the three programmes orient towards a C1 CEFR level as an expected proficiency level for their students to achieve, supporting the notion of the native speaker as the sole benchmark (Mauranen, 2012; Seidlhofer, 2018), rather than successful multilinguals. More importantly, the idea of the NES that operates in Chilean ELT is clearly biased towards idealised speakers of standardised BrE and AmE (5.2.1).

Chapter 9

The results of this study found clear support for Woolard's (2016) ideologies of authenticity and anonymity. Authenticity in ELT was largely associated with features of pronunciation, and especially in relation to idealised ENL models. This was supported by beliefs about what counts as acceptable pronunciation for English teachers, especially in Programme A (5.2.1), the reported need to visit ENL countries to be exposed to 'genuine English' (8.3), and the negative attitudes that some teacher educators held regarding the influence of features of users' L1 in their use of English found in the interviews (7.3.1) and in some teacher trainers' classroom practices (5.4). Similarly, the ideology of anonymity is present in the implicit promotion of RP in the course descriptions of Programme C modules, as they did not openly refer to specific ENL models to be adopted by the students, but were clearly oriented to RP in practice (7.3). In addition, the fact that the three programmes under review implement exams designed by Cambridge Assessment English and the British Council to assess their students' proficiency, reveals a false orientation towards standards for intercultural communication – or "misrecognition" (Bourdieu, 1991) – which, in reality, orient towards the notion of British English. This study, then, provides support for Woolard's (2016) assertion that ideologies of authenticity and anonymity are not mutually exclusive but rather occur simultaneously in "ideological sites" (Silverstein, 1998) such as ELT programmes.

Even though beliefs that supported these ideologies were found in the belief systems of teacher trainers across and within the programmes, this study revealed signs of a growing voice of resistance to the dominant language ideologies described above. This study revealed that a growing number of teacher educators used the notion of "Chilean English" (6.3.1) as a counter-ideology in order to challenge the dominance of traditional models in Chilean ELT. This notion was usually complemented by a sense of ownership of the language that positioned the teachers as legitimate users of English (5.3.2), without necessarily conforming to NES norms or models. In addition, this counter-ideology was revealed in the rejection of the traditional emphasis on the study of linguistic forms (especially courses on English grammar and phonetics) that promoted idealised models as ultimate goals and desirable benchmarks (5.3.1, 6.2). More importantly, the notion of "Chilean English" was also supported by the belief that raising awareness of future teachers' own identity as Chilean users of English (6.3) may help them develop their own

version of English (6.3.2) and, by doing so, contribute to changing long-standing beliefs that reinforce dominant language ideologies in Chilean ELT.

9.5 Contribution and implications of the study

This thesis offers a variety of contributions for initial teacher education, the study of beliefs about English and the field of ELF research. The adoption of a multiple case study approach provided an informed exploration of individual and shared beliefs about language that are promoted and challenged in particular ideological sites (Silverstein, 1998). Such an approach also helped understand the interplay between espoused beliefs, classroom practices and the curriculum of each programme, and how these may contribute to the perpetuation or resistance of hegemonic language ideologies that are usually embedded in the teaching of English (Dewey, 2012; Milroy and Milroy, 2012; Jenkins, 2014). This study, therefore, offers new insights into the exploration of language ideologies by investigating the teacher educators' cognitive and decision-making processes that support (or challenge) dominant language ideologies, both at discoursal and practical levels, which is a link that still remains underexplored in ELF research. In addition, the methodological approach adopted in this study provides support for the notion that the relationship between beliefs and practices should not be explored from the perspective of a desirable correspondence, but instead as two different sources of manifestations of beliefs (Fives and Buehl, 2012; Borg, 2015).

From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to the understanding of belief systems as a complex and comprehensive field for the study of teachers' mental lives. The methodology used for the collection and analysis of qualitative data was in line with the assumption that beliefs are better explored as an umbrella term encompassing beliefs, attitudes, knowledge and values (Pajares, 1992; Woods, 1996; Borg, 2015). In this respect, this study presented an innovation in the study of language ideologies by exploring the role that belief systems, teaching practices, and educational curricula have in the identification of beliefs about language that support, both implicitly and implicitly, the propagation and resistance of language ideologies that create inequalities, discrimination, and neglect of Englishes other than idealised standards.

Furthermore, the results of this study highlight the impact of initial teacher education courses in the formation of beliefs about the legitimacy of certain forms of English over others. In this respect, this collective case study provided substantial evidence of how teachers, during the (average) five years of their training, acquire a range of beliefs about English that have an important effect in their views about linguistic correctness, variation, acceptability, and the goals of English language teaching. What is more, my findings suggest that the promotion of such beliefs tends to be unchallenged, while changes in the teachers' belief systems usually occur after their initial training. Moreover, the exploration of my participants' beliefs about English demonstrate that the standard language ideology is so deeply ingrained in the ELT profession in Chile that those changes are frequently motivated by experiences abroad.

Another relevant contribution of this thesis is that it is based on Chile, a context that is largely unresearched both in the study of teachers' beliefs and language ideologies (Barahona, 2016). In fact, Latin American countries have demonstrated limited engagement with ELF research, with a few exceptions in Colombia (González, 2010) and Brazil (Gimenez *et al.*, 2018). In order to contribute to bridging this gap, the present study offers a context-specific description of the beliefs about English that are most commonly held in Chilean ELT, and the ways in which teacher education programmes promote or resist their perpetuation. Explorations like these are expected to inform Chilean educational policy about the importance of understanding existing trends and tensions regarding ideological issues in the teaching of English before implementing new approaches and innovations. More importantly, the findings of this study can help to provide the foundations for ELF-related research that explores ways in which teacher education can contribute to raising awareness of the multicultural diversity of English and its use as an international lingua franca.

The evidence from this study suggests that the notion of "Chilean English", as discussed by my participants, should be understood as a counter-ideology rather than as a new variety of English. That is to say, the promotion of "Chilean English" that was observed in Programme B did not represent an alternative model for ELT and neither did it concern the study of a "Chilean similect" (Mauranen, 2012) that comprises the expected characteristics of the English produced by Spanish-speaking users. Instead, the beliefs and

attitudes behind this concept are the ones that should be explored in the classroom, so that pre-service teachers can have opportunities to challenge and support their own beliefs during their training (Johnson, 1994). The results of this study support the idea that Chilean ELT programmes should start questioning the traditional attachment to idealised British and American linguistic and cultural norms that is commonly associated with the teaching of English. It is expected that moving away from such an association can help teacher educators and trainees challenge the deficit perspective around English use that hegemonic ideologies have historically perpetuated in the ELT profession in Chile.

A more practical implication of this study concerns the revision of the way in which dominant language ideologies are reproduced in courses on linguistic analysis, and more specifically courses on phonetics and grammar. My findings revealed that it is in these courses where beliefs about correctness, appropriateness, and the goals of language teaching and learning are more strongly shaped, due to the long-standing association of these courses with the acquisition of invariable standardised forms. In this respect, this study has shown evidence of the impact that courses on phonetics that promote a normative approach to pronunciation have on the teachers' and learners' own identity as users of English. It is clear in my findings that such a traditional perspective forces teachers and students to adopt an NES identity, and, by doing so, they reinforce the positioning of one (or two) form(s) of English as the only legitimate ones for ELT, while other Englishes remain marginalised. It is then necessary to assess the purpose of these courses in the training of future teachers, and to evaluate how they align with the goals of teacher education that the curriculum intends to promote. As presented in the findings, each programme demonstrated a different relationship between their curricula and their courses on English phonetics and grammar, and, therefore, produced different, and even contradictory, outcomes.

For example, Programme A's strong emphasis on British English was supported in its phonetics and grammar courses and, thus, they supported the hegemonic language ideologies despite the existence of beliefs that can be interpreted as counter-ideological. In the case of Programme B, the rejection of traditional ELT that the teacher educators demonstrated in their beliefs and practices was also consistent with the programme curriculum, especially regarding the removal of phonetics and grammar courses and their

merger with "language skills" courses. However, Programme C showed a clear mismatch between what the new curriculum intended and the beliefs and practices of its teacher educators. Such a conflict may be the result of ideological tensions within their curriculum, which, on the one hand, follows a traditional approach in the promotion of courses on English grammar and phonetics from a normative perspective, and, on the other hand, intends to focus on the development of the students' communicative skills over the acquisition of an idealised norm. Hence, it is necessary for curriculum developers on ELT programmes to take into account the language ideologies that they may be promoting in their courses, while also considering how the beliefs about English – and language in general – match those of the teacher educators who ultimately deliver the training courses.

9.6 Limitations of the study and directions for future research

A number of limitations should be considered. As mentioned in Section 4.6, I could not observe all my participants as originally planned. This was due to an unexpected student strike that occurred during the last weeks of my data collection and this meant that some teacher educators were only observed once, while others were not observed at all. Details of the teacher educators' participation are presented in Table 2 on page 88. At that point I considered discarding those participants from the study because I would not have access to their classroom practices. However, since the main objective of the carrying out those observations was not to compare them with the teacher trainers' beliefs but to explore "beliefs-in-practice", I decided to retain their participation by including their interviews in the data set that fitted their specific case. In addition, none of the programme directors that I interviewed had teaching duties at the time of the data collection; however, their views, like those of the teacher educators who were not observed, were highly valuable for the understanding of the beliefs that operate in the three programmes.

Another limitation of this study is that my samples are not necessarily representative of all teacher trainers from each programme. Even though the only requirement for participation was to be a teacher educator of a module that is either taught in English or about English, some members of staff did not feel motivated to participate and, by doing

so, prevented the study from considering their specific beliefs about English. There is no doubt that their participation would have enriched my findings even more and may have offered alternative perspectives of what the goals of teacher education in Chile are. Nevertheless, the number of participants that I had from each university allowed me to carry out in-depth analysis of all the collected qualitative data. In addition, I did not have access to the views of NESs who taught in these contexts, who, although they are limited in number, can also provide relevant support or alternative views regarding the dominant beliefs about English in these programmes.

Furthermore, even though this multiple case study provides enough evidence of the language ideologies that are promoted and challenged by the beliefs and practices of almost 30 teacher educators, this should not be considered as a generalisation of Chilean ELT. This study only included universities from a specific area of Chile and, therefore, it did not include the views of teacher trainers based in any of the large number of ELT programmes based in other cities. Moreover, the case study nature of this thesis suggests that the findings presented here are representative of the views of a group of teachers in a specific place and time and, consequently, it is assumed that both the teacher educators' views and the programmes' curriculum are likely to change and eventually differ from the results presented and discussed here.

Further work might explore the beliefs of teacher trainees during their initial education process and compare them to their teacher educators' beliefs and the views promoted by their programme in the curriculum. This would help understand how beliefs are taken up and challenged by pre-service teachers during their training in order to assess the real impact of teacher education programmes. Working together with trainee teachers and their trainers would help provide a larger picture of how beliefs about English are negotiated in practice since trainees may also bring their own beliefs and ideologies into the classroom and challenge those of their trainers.

What is more, it would be interesting to explore the beliefs and practices of teachers who have been exposed to the notion of "Chilean English" in the way that has been discussed in the findings of this thesis and, hence, observe the actual effect of their training. Such an approach would offer interesting insight regarding these teachers' identity as NNESTs,

the ways in which they respond to the diversity and spread of English, and their beliefs of what constitutes appropriate knowledge base in Chilean ELT. In addition, this exploration would also provide further evidence of the extent to which the ELT profession in Chile has been influenced by this controversial notion. Another possible area of future research would be to investigate whether there is a direct relationship between the promotion of a standard of English and beliefs about a similar form in Spanish as some examples in this thesis suggests. This would help understand whether English teachers in Chile – or language users in general – hold beliefs about correctness, prestige, variation and norms as a result of their training as teachers or because of the fact that they belong to a "standard language culture" (Milroy, 2001).

Finally, more research is needed to better understand the goals of teacher education for ELT at a macro-level. For this reason, investigations on the motivations and expectations regarding this issue from the perspective of governmental bodies, such as the Ministry of Education, as well as local teachers associations can help both understand how such institutions influence teacher education programmes and also how they are impacted by international institutions that promote the teaching and learning of English.

9.7   Conclusion and final remarks

The purpose of the current study was to explore how Chilean ELT programmes respond to the current status of English as an international lingua franca and how ideologies of language operate in the training of future teachers of English. This investigation placed teacher educators at the centre of its focus, giving special importance to the ways in which their beliefs and practices reflected their personal and institutional views regarding the goals of teacher education for ELT, ideas of language correctness, and the spread and diversity of English. For this purpose, I adopted a collective case study approach to investigate how hegemonic language ideologies operate in three ELT programmes in Chile. Using semi-structured interviews, classroom observations, and the review of relevant documents, I managed to reveal the dominant beliefs about English in each programme as well as the existing tensions within and across my participants' belief systems. More importantly, this study also provided evidence of how such beliefs contribute to the perpetuation of long-standing ideologies that have historically

promoted idealised standards of English as the only acceptable and desirable form of the language for teachers of English to both acquire and teach.

Chilean English teacher educators revealed that beliefs about English are shaped by the notion of "tradition" in ELT, which comprises the prestige of acquiring RP pronunciation, the need to consistently adopt and display features of idealised forms of American or British English, and negative attitudes towards the influence of one's L1 in the use of English. The analysis of interviews, classroom practices and the curricula demonstrated that such a perspective on ELT is mostly shaped in courses that emphasise accuracy in the acquisition of idealised NES features of pronunciation and grammar. These views revealed a strong attachment to the standard language ideology (Lippi-Green, 2012; Milroy and Milroy, 2012), NES proficiency as the ultimate goal (Holliday, 2005; Doerr, 2009), and ideologies of authenticity and anonymity (Woolard, 2016). The beliefs that support these ideologies have therefore prevented Chilean ELT teacher training from raising awareness of Englishes other than ENL standards and from engaging with WE and ELF research.

However, despite the dominance of these hegemonic ideologies, this study found evidence of a discourse of resistance among an important number of participants. In this respect, these teacher educators demonstrated positive attitudes towards their NNES identity, an appreciation of their own English, an awareness of Englishes beyond ENL countries, and a rejection of the dominant idea of "tradition" in Chilean ELT. Although the degree of engagement with these beliefs varied among teacher educators, my results showed that support from the programme curriculum and peers was significant in the correspondence between these teacher educators' beliefs and practices. Moreover, I have suggested that such a set of beliefs constitutes a counter-ideology, which operates under the notion of "Chilean English", as a response to the historical attachment to the notion of British English that has largely shaped Chilean English teachers' beliefs about the English that pre-service (and in-service) ELT practitioners are expected to acquire.

The empirical findings of this study provide a new understanding of the ways in which beliefs about English are shaped in ELT programmes and reveal the lack of engagement that Chilean ELT has with the linguistic and cultural diversity of English. It is recommended that ELT programmes examine the tensions among their teacher educators' belief

systems – and the goals of teacher education that are implicitly and explicitly promoted in their curricula – in order to have a clear understanding of the language ideologies that are being promoted in their classrooms and how they may affect their students' beliefs about English. Finally, it is expected that Chilean ELT starts to consider the relevance of introducing pedagogical contributions from ELF research (Dewey, 2012; Bowles and Cogo, 2015; Jenkins, 2015a; Blair, 2017) in teacher education programmes in order to equip teacher trainers and future teachers with the necessary tools to develop a critical perspective towards their own practice and the ELT industry in general.

Appendix A **Interview Guide**

Interview	Topics	Sample questions
1	• Introductions • Background information • Past experiences • Role in the programme • Spread of English • Targets and models • Successful user and self-image	• How long have you been an English teacher? • What motivated you to become an English teacher? and a teacher trainer? • What are the main objectives of the course that you teach? • In your opinion, why do you think more and more people are learning English these days? • What do you understand by the claim that English is a "global language"? • How does this university programme respond to the global spread of English? • What is (are) the linguistic target(s) / model(s) that you present to your students? Are the teaching materials you use in line with these targets/models? • Do your students join the programme expecting to acquire a specific variety of English? Does the programme promote a specific variety? • What do you understand by "a successful user of English"? • How would you describe your own English? • How different is ELT preparation today from the time when you were a trainee? • What would you change about the way English is taught in Chile? (or in this university?)

Appendix A

2	- Use of mother tongue - Non-native Englishes - Influence of foreign institutions - Evaluations and International exams - Models for Chilean learners	- Do you speak any other languages? Tell me about your language learning experiences. - What is your opinion about using Spanish in the classroom? - What is your view about the efforts by the Ministry of Education to pursue bilingualism with English in Chile? - In what ways does learning English mean adopting a second culture? Which culture? - What's the best way to measure a person's ability to communicate in English? - How important is it that English teachers in Chile take International exams (TOEFL, IELTS etc.)? - What makes these exams international? Do they reflect the global dimension of English in your opinion? - What's your opinion about incorporating non-native communication of English in ELT courses? - Which form(s) of English is (are) suitable for the Chilean reality? - How relevant is it for Chilean teachers to adopt a global view of English instead of focusing on native speaker standards?

Appendix B **Transcription Conventions**

(.)	Pause of less than a second
(2)	Approximate pause length in seconds
[?]	Unintelligible to researcher
[word?]	Researcher's guess
(?)	Inaudible
@	Laugh
CAPS	Strong emphasis
[	Overlapping speech starts
Utter-	Abrupt cut-off, unfinished sentence
((author's commentary))	Author's commentary
(comment)	Listener's comment during speaker's turn
/Italics/	Words and phrases in a language other than English
=	Equal signs, one at the end of a line and one at the beginning, indicate no gap between the two lines.
?	Rising intonation (questions)
.	End of sentence
<SOFT>text<SOFT>	Other modes of speaking
Underline	Represents sentences, words or phrases that are uttered while laughing
:	Colons represent lengthening of a syllable or word
"	Quotations
[[NAME]]	Changes of names to protect anonymity
[…]	Gap between the sections of the transcription that were not included

Appendix C **Consent Form**

CONSENT FORM *(FACE TO FACE: Version 1)*

Study title: Language Ideologies in ELT: A Multiple Case Study of Teacher Education Programmes in Chile

Researcher name: Gonzalo Perez

Staff/Student number: 27298299

ERGO reference number: 18821

Please initial the box(es) if you agree with the statement(s):

I have read and understood the information sheet (insert date /version no. of participant information sheet) and have had the opportunity to ask questions about the study.

I agree to take part in this research project and agree for my data to be used for the purpose of this study

I give my consent to be interviewed for the purpose of this research project and allow these interviews to be tape-recorded.

I give my consent to the researcher to observe my lessons for the purpose of this research project

I understand my participation is voluntary and I may withdraw at any time without my legal rights being affected

Appendix C

Data Protection

I understand that information collected about me during my participation in this study will be stored on a password protected computer and that this information will only be used for the purpose of this study. All files containing any personal data will be made anonymous.

Name of participant (print name)…………………………………………………

Signature of participant……………………………………………………..…..

Date…………………………………………………………………………

Appendix D **Participant Information Sheet**

Participant Information Sheet (Face to Face)

Study Title: Language Ideologies in ELT: A Multiple Case Study of Teacher Education Programmes in Chile

Researcher: Gonzalo Perez   **Ethics number**: 18821

Please read this information carefully before deciding to take part in this research. If you are happy to participate you will be asked to sign a consent form.

What is the research about?

Hello, my name is Gonzalo Pérez and I am currently conducting research for my PhD degree at the University of Southampton. My main objective is to find out about how Chilean ELT teacher trainers perceive the global dimension of the English language and how English teachers reflect these views in their practices.

Why have I been chosen?

You have been chosen because you work as a teacher trainer in one of the most important initial teacher education programmes for English language teachers in Chile.

What will happen to me if I take part?

If you agree to participate, I will coordinate a short informal meeting with you to get to know each other and set dates for interviews and classroom observations. After arranging this, you will be invited to an initial interview. Interviews will be held in English or Spanish as you deem appropriate. Additionally, I will need to observe a couple of your lessons to complement my research data. Finally, you will be invited to a final follow-up interview to talk about the classroom observations and get your final comments on the research. All these activities will happen in a period of one month.

Are there any benefits in my taking part?

Appendix D

Your participation will be very helpful in understanding how Chilean ELT programmes address the global dimension of English and the role that teacher trainers have in understanding this phenomenon.

Are there any risks involved?

There is no potential psychological or physical risk involved, however, you have the right to withdraw from this research project at any point if you wish to do so.

Will my participation be confidential?

Your anonymity will be respected at all times. There will be no explicit mention of your workplace but I may need to make reference to the course you teach in a generic way (i.e. Oral English, Phonetics, etc.). All collected data will be coded and carefully stored on a password protected computer where only the researcher and his supervisory team will have access.

What happens if I change my mind?

You are allowed to stop participating in the project at any point of the fieldwork if you decide to do so. All of your information will be removed and this will not affect you in any way.

What happens if something goes wrong?

If there is any concern or if something goes wrong please contact the Chair of the Faculty Ethics Committee, Professor Chris Janaway (+44(0)2380593424 or c.janaway@soton.ac.uk)

Where can I get more information?

If you have any questions or comments regarding the research project, please feel free to contact me via email (gp5g14@soton.ac.uk) or my supervisor Prof. Jennifer Jenkins (j.jenkins@soton.ac.uk).

Appendix E **Sample Interview 1**

Institution: Programme B
Nickname: Javier
Date: May 2016
Duration: 38 minutes
G: Gonzalo (Researcher)
J: Javier

G: okay this is interview one (.) and I would like to start with a very simple question (.) how long have you been an English teacher?

J: (6) so far 13 years

G: okay and have you work at different institutions? different levels of students?

J: yes (.) school um: then at university and now at the Ministry

G: and what motivated you to become an English teacher?

J: (2) many reasons really (.) actually I think that the trigger was one teacher of English. he saw that I liked languages and everything and he said like you might be a teacher and I said (.) why not? (.) so I decided on pedagogy instead of like translation or something else ((mumbles)) anyway I liked all these social things like education, sociology, anthropology um: (.) pedagogy had EVERYTHING basically so- besides I liked languages so I mixed two things that I liked a lot

G: why English and not another language?

J: because there's no other language @@ in the country at the moment (.) basically=

G: =but back then there used to be an offer (.) I remember when I applied, I could for example study French or German=

J: =ah yeah but I don't know I didn't see any (competition?) no no no any connection (.) I like French, I like German but I didn't see any use in learning those languages in practical terms, I mean, I value languages but for practical purposes in the country (.) fine, English

G: and what motivated you to become a teacher TRAINER later?

J: a teacher trainer, well that was pretty much an accident because at that time I was teaching at school, in a public school (2) the thing I remember (2) it was back in 2006 and my teacher at that time was [[Silvia]], of methodology, and I remember that I was doing some work with her as part of some activity and she was working at that moment at university so she couldn't move much so I used to go there and she said let me know how it works and everything so it became sort of like through conversations and because of my practicum teacher as well and she told her that I

was really good at planning, that my classes were fine and everything so I think that she got interested and then they called me for a small project to help students who were about to fail so I was in charge of like, I don't know, 10 students, so I started to get the grasp of what was English pedagogy (.) and then simultaneously I started to work in some other places like INACAP dealing with a bit older students (1) and then:, I don't know, as I went like gaining some practice they started to give me courses, official courses, so I then entered to teaching the ESP programme and then to the pedagogy programme=

G: at the same university?

J: at university

G: and (.) well I would like to change the topic now a little bit and ask you, in your opinion, why do you think these days more and more people are learning English

J: unfortunately because of economical reasons and that's like the triggering element in societies (.) it's what moves societies and: competitivity basically is the motor of English, you don't know English you don't have space and it's a surplus so: (3) unfortunately I say because, I don't know, it's like a very limited vision of a language so if you say for example, and I see this also in the national programmes of education, English for the access of better opportunities instead of, I don't know, understanding other cultures in the first place, understanding the world, how the world works, I don't know, letting yourself know where you ARE in the world in this pseudoglobalised society but in the end money is what triggers English or MOVES English at the moment

G: and what do you understand by the claim that English is a global language?

J: global em: because it's a superlanguage it's like the consequence of two superpower countries um: their negotiation, their internal negotiation and then as a UN language, official language, first official language (2) it turned out to be that we're ruled by THAT concept, I mean, the States is the one setting the rules of the game and one of the rules is English so- and the globalisation as well comes with technology and technology comes from advanced, I don't know, first world countries such as USA (.) again (1) and basically they determine the order and we are playing THEIR game, with their economy, with their rules, with their LANGUAGE so: globalisation to me seems to be like very (2) I may say negative or it brings me negative connotation to ME, in terms of my political belief uh that's why for example I prefer, I don't know, Global English and it gives me the creeps and I prefer saying, you know, [words?] like World English or International English if you want to, I don't know, use the political

relationships between countries but to me World English is like a bit more accurate in terms of concept but global: brings too many, I don't know, issues behind and hidden a bit

G: right (.) and talking about the programme where you work at (.) how does the programme itself respond to this international, I was going to say global, but international (1) current dimension of English?

J: um: through one simple concept, well it's not simple but initial:, let's say starting point, that's how we start to like organise most of the programme and that was identity (1) we tend to, I don't know, find lots of xenocentric programmes meaning (2) we love USA culture, we base our on what British do, on what Americans do, so in that way you're responding to globalisation but if you look at it from the term of identity, I mean, with all the implications that it has (1) you start like placing yourself knowing and appreciating and valuing YOUR context and that that context belongs to a community, let's use the word global community, so: by knowing that we need to basically relate with our neighbours in English, I mean, not the direct neighbours but let's say in the international community is ENGLISH, I mean, that's the (2) the LANGUAGE (1) so: if we know who we are, we: will, I think, make a good use of what a language means because it's not to access but to know yourself, to know who you are (.) it's not a means but it's a means, I don't know if you understand what I mean, it's difficult to explain (2) but=

G: so you need to get to know yourself before you actually=

J: GO and look at other realities, other cultures (2) I mean, there's also- there's a slight line in between nationalism and identity, basically we mean what does it mean to be Chilean? today with the conditions we have, with the society we have, the economy we have, the CULTURE we have, and how we function, WHO we are, I don't know, when we begin the programme in day one, so students arrive and we ask them WHO YOU ARE, no WHO ARE YOU? and we place the question basically from their perspective so the question is WHO AM I? and that's the first traumatising activity that we give them because they really go blank and they don't know what to answer so it's like a curious phenomena that, you know what, this determines that you will be manipulated in the future if you don't know who you are (1) so like be critical, know yourself from day one because you need to know yourself in order to educate others, I mean that's going to be your profession for hopefully the rest of your life=

G: =instead of replicating=

J: =instead of replicating, exactly, so like get to know your people and develop bonds [?]

minimum relationship with, I don't know, with the students so first step is to KNOW

them, to know who THEY ARE, that's the first step

G: right (.) could you tell me a little bit about your role at the university?

J: my role (1) well my role has been a bit of a chameleon (.) and I've been doing, I do a lot of

stuff, I mean, Jack of all trade um teacher, coordinator, um: teacher in the MA

programme, assistant, I perform many things and it's because obviously the (1) sort

of university, it's a really low-income university so we have to do everything, we

don't have money to spend on more people so we are kind of specialised=

G: =did you have a role, for example, when the university worked in this project of renewing

the standards of English teachers in Chile?

J: I was at that moment coordinator

G: now you're also focusing on integrated language=

J: =yes

G: can you tell me a little bit about the, let's say, the stamp, the specific features that that

programme has that makes it different from the rest (1) well you were mentioning

about the concept of identity, that is relevant for the students, what about the

language itself?

J: in terms of English and English teaching and learning, I think that we have like many:, I

don't know, cornerstones, let's say (1) first one is, from the point of view of teachers,

teamwork, because of the evolution of the programme we have discovered that if we

don't work together nothing happens and: we have seen that in the (1) students

performance in their fifth year, through years (.) so we have seen how these, I don't

know, integration, HUMAN INTEGRATION, first has [?] impact on students (.) in the

way they express themselves, in the things they say, how they understand teaching,

their English, their level of English has also like increased, I mean, there's lots to do,

of course, but still, I don't know, the difference between one generation and the next

one is, I don't know, amazing, so that's one thing (2) the other, I don't know, seal is (.)

integration, I think that if you look at all the /mallas/ and all the course descriptions,

syllabus and curriculum is all based in fragmentation so, for example, I don't know,

looking at one of the universities that you're studying (1) for example they spend one

semester on allophony (1) and I would like to KNOW exactly WHY a teacher would

need allophony in a classroom so basically, I don't know, coherence is something that

lacks in many programmes, I don't know, a lot of subjects have no sense and I

perceive that it's a matter of ego, I mean, we have someone who studied something

and is like kind of powerful in the team or in the programme so we cannot take away the SUBJECT because that person is going to lose his or her job (2) in that sense we overcome that=

G: =but you didn't have that problem earlier?=

J: =we did, we did. we decided to eliminate all these like subjects, for example, phonetics, grammar that were like, on the one hand a problem FOR students and: a problem for teachers because it was a source of division (.) usually we have discussions on-coming from the grammar teachers saying that all the language teachers suck because they don't teach grammar (.) so they are like "we're not teaching grammar in language, we are teaching the language", so in the end, I mean, the coherence in the programmes was, I don't know, FAULTY and: we decided to eliminate the linguistic subjects and we added more language hours, so that's a second cornerstone, the third one was a strong emphasis on critical thinking (.) and critical thinking well it's like very open to interpretations, I mean, we started with very political visions on critical thinking (.) but then it has evolved through years, I mean, today is very different from, I don't know, five years. we were, I don't know, giving students stronger, I don't know, education on politics and how to think, I don't know, I'm not talking about political party but political thoughts (.) reading philosophy, reading sociology and they still do (.) but today is a bit more like focused on specific topics that we have like being able to condense things=

G: and how is that transition from being- I actually don't really know the old curriculum very well but did you, for example, need to renew the staff or, I don't know, like did you get any resistance in the programme? talking about the teachers

J: the initial was like normal, traditional, fragmented curriculum and each teacher doing whatever, I don't know, they wanted to do, I mean, what we call */libertad de cátedra/* um what they did basically was like "okay you do page such and such of the book, I do this one, don't mess up with me, so you do your half I'll do mine" and then: well through years of reflection and discussion we realised that that's not the formula to ask and we started like to try out teams, for example, two teachers working together, observing how they work but then the element that was like key was rotation so: teacher A with B, then with teacher C, and then with teacher D and then we started to observe like how too strong beliefs were dealing to reach agreements and obviously we had (.) literally fights, lots of discussion in bad terms because sometimes we were so opposed in ideological visions of teaching that obviously that caused enormous conflicts so: (1) we understood that no matter what

we need to continue and the demands of the programme, because it's a very
demanding system, started to have teachers worn out and they didn't basically resist
the system and they started like to leave=

G: =because one of the teachers at the programme actually mentioned something about
that, I'm not gonna say who, but THAT person said "this programme is not for ANY
teacher" you need to have a specific profile, would you agree with that?

J: absolutely, I think, first of all a traditional teacher would collapse because basically you
need to neglect your tradition in the sense of- we were all trained on grammar, we
were all trained in phonetics and we understand that English does NOT exist without
grammar or phonetics=

G: =somehow it worked as well

J: and how come we don't have phonetics, we don't have grammar and then we have
students speaking GOOD English, C1 English, at the end of programme so we are
doing something correct and basically like we need a profile and we look for a profile
whenever we interview teachers, I don't know, we have this very uncomfortable
interview and we make like this is a really non-political or politically-incorrect
questions=

G: =can you tell me for example what kind of questions?=

J: =I don't know, for example the typical question that you receive is, I don't know, describe
your classes, normal question, but we ask WHAT'S YOUR WORSE CLASS? what has
been your worst class and why? so the teacher goes like WHAT? I've never thought
about it actually em: do you like any political side? left or right? why? so incorrect
questions because you need to like be exposed to:, I don't know, because WE
challenge ourselves with different topics so for example with one unit that we teach,
not unit, one class that is one of the classicals we teach about SATANISM and we ask
students what they understand about satanism so they come up with all their
prejudice, I mean, it's not that we are justifying satanism but we are dealing with the
topic of prejudice so that topic is really good so they describe what they think,
sacrificing people=

G: so it's a way to introduce the topic (right) and get the students' beliefs

J: right (.) and then we read some parts of the Black Bible and then they realise that their
beliefs have nothing to do with what satanism is about really, so then we start
looking at what happened? somebody told you? did you think about it? why did you
believe that? so:

G: where did that come from?

J: right (.) so they start rationalising why they believed what they believed (2) and finding teachers who do that is very difficult, right, interviews in our case is a long process, then: few of them like classify as (1) appropriate teachers, let's say, for the programme (.) besides the working load, which is really high, because of the number of hours and the workload is demanding because basically teachers are used to work on their own and here you need to coordinate with 5, for example, and you need to come up with ONE class (1) so basically we believe that 5 professional can design a better class than one on their own (.) right? so we have like all knowledge inclusive in one programme and: we give students at the same time the opportunity to have altogether the same experience (1) so the teacher, I don't know, in his or her class someday they decide how to do it but the class is the same

G: okay (2) and in relation to the way that language is presented (2) does the programme promote a specific variety of English, for example?

J: absolutely, I mean, from African English, Indian English, Chinese, Polish, I don't know, South American English

G: and how do you do that? and how are the materials that you use in line with that idea?

J: we don't use a textbook, I mean that was one of the first, I don't know, healthy decisions that we made in the programme because the book basically, I don't know, cleansed from all, I don't know, relevant topics for a teacher um: so we decided to start building our own material and basically we read books and the programme is like really, I don't know, READING ORIENTED, and they read, I don't know, from Foucault, I don't know, Freire, they read, I don't know (2) we read, I don't know, everything, and we try to explore as much as we can interesting topics, interesting themes (.) we watch- we give a lot of emphasis to cinema, movies and videos and also let the students get involved in those, I don't know, creations. they do their own movies, they write their own things so:

G: and what about the students' reactions? do they join the programme, for example, expecting to acquire a specific variety of the language?

J: ah no, of course, I mean, you come to university thinking which English am I going to learn? British or American and there's no more English so: and we, I don't know, the prejudice of, I don't know, British speak better and Americans don't and vice versa so you, I don't know- and we tell them immediately you are going to learn Chilean English, and for them that's the- I think it's one of the deepest shocks that they receive

G: that's why I ask, yeah

J: um and they start understanding that you're not going to be British, you may sound like a

bit, but you're not going to be one and that has to do with identity so we start like

looking at, I don't know, white theory, for example, like one of the topics and: the

white fallacy so that the predominance of one single accent is THE accent and we all

know that, I don't know, as teachers we were all trained under RP NORM so: there

was no choice, I mean, those who had, I don't know, had some little [?] on American

English, FORGET IT, I mean, this is RP and that's it so (2) they have the freedom

anyway but apparently after the shock they seem like very, I don't know, relieved,

they're like "you know what? I don't need to worry about an accent, I mean, because

I already have one (1) what I need to do is communicate and be intelligible"

G: but you also have native speakers in the programme?

J: yeah but those are like, I don't know, instances for them- I mean, our native speakers are

from South Africa and one from Ireland and it's not like the standard

G: but the reason you have them is because...

((interruption))

J: no, I mean, it's not an issue (1) and we are more @@, I don't know, but the thing is that

those people actually came because they had interest in curriculum not because they

are like native speakers (.) I mean, actually we don't profess that religion

G: and also they are qualified?

J: they ARE qualified, I mean ((mumbles)) I mean there was one moment, no many years

actually that it was just Chileans teaching and they were like super qualified teachers

and that was it

G: em: I would like to change the topic now and ask you what do you understand by a

successful user of English?

J: a successful user of English (2) but in terms of pedagogy or any person?

G: I'm talking about users

J: users uh okay (1) someone who can be intelligible and can communicate (.) simple ideas,

that's all

G: and how does that differ from a successful teacher of English?

J: a successful teacher of English? (in terms of language use) in terms of language use, I

assume that the premise is that a good teacher-good learning, that's what I perceive

in the question but: I would say that not necessarily, I mean it depends on the

purposes, I mean, if you don't have any clear goal, the person, I mean, people have

abilities and if you foster them properly, if you give them a chance, for example THIS

GIRL, she has a motivation so the teacher has little to do there, it's just like open the

space for her to develop and eventually that's going to be a good USER of English because that user would fill the need to communicate and USE English, and by using it you will [?] sorry the need of improving, because you will feel the need to say more things and won't have the vocabulary or whatever you need to say and you will go for more (.) so the teacher who opens those spaces to me is like a good qualified teacher, in terms of language

G: you say you've been an English teacher for about 13 years, how different was YOUR preparation to what you see these days, in general? because obviously the programme you're working at is a lot different (.) but what about the current offer of ELT programmes?

J: from my experience being a student the difference is black and white, I mean, radically different (2) I received (2) TRAINING, I didn't receive education, I mean, that's the difference and today my focus is on providing as much as we can education and that's the, I would say like institutional programme problem and that's when I say that team work is necessary because they are so- obviously like [administrative teamworks?] and you know what? things are happening but teachers sitting to discuss, I don't know, WHAT'S GOING ON? in the classroom, I think that hasn't happened much (.) or we pretend we have that conversation but we don't so: I would say like critical teachers (1) we say, we pretend to be one but actual critical teachers doing things in the classroom that can be different, few

G: I think we're getting to the end of the interview, I just have 2 more questions to ask em: what would you change about the way English is taught in Chile?

J: uh! I mean we have to start from scratch again (1) first of all- but you mean at school?

G: let's analyse everything

J: okay (.) the problem are universities and: because of these notions of, I don't know, experts, there are too many experts and they love saying that they are experts but what they do is like the classroom is an extension of their egos, "I know a lot, and you know what? you're going to learn a lot from me" but you don't give a chance to the students to do something because it's about me, it's about MY subject, it's about what I know so they never give the chance to the student to explore whatever, whatever they like, so: you pick up all those learnings as a preservice teacher and then literally you need to do it on your own and you need to make it on your own without any guide, any help, any orientation (.) what education is about and is not something easy like to enter a classroom (.) I'm sure that whoever you ask "what happened to you on your first day in front of a class I think that everybody like regret

and they suffered that day, and they suffer for the following few years because they didn't know what to do until they found the easy answer, get a book with gaps and fill them so: that's the problem in schools now, few teachers risk like to teach English not to teach, I don't know, gap filling and testing gap filling, IF the test is about gap filling so: there's sort of an abandonment on the teacher training because is a teacher training process and not a teacher education process and you're not accompanied there's like literally no one to listen to your experience or what's happening to you and this lack of humanity in the area I think has the impact on schools in the end, which is the aim, I mean, the ones who pay all the consequences are our kids, our students (1) and that counts because of like bad programmes, in general, I would say

G: em: would you change anything at the university where you're working at?

J: as an institution? or my programme?

G: in the programme

J: in the programme (2) em: apart from the salaries well no, not really, because I value no matter how low conditions we have to work because they are really, I don't know, limited we have freedom and I haven't seen that freedom anywhere else, we are free to create, to innovate, to develop, to develop ourselves, to make mistakes, we have that space, and I don't think that exists in other places and if it does it's because there's */libertad de cátedra/*, you close your classroom and that's your space and you can do whatever you want, and that whatever you want doesn't mean that it's going to, I don't know, turn into LEARNING but, I don't know, maybe, I don't know, some part of your satisfaction, SELF-satisfaction

G: okay and finally (.) I would like to ask you a very broad but probably very simple question (.) I would like you to analyse it the way you want so I'll just ask the question and wait for your answer (.) how would you describe your own English?

J: my own English (.) limited (why?) why (.) because it's a language and within that language, then if we go linguistic it's an interlanguage, and that interlanguage is I don't know condemned to be poor (.) in general em: but also I like being limited in some sense, so to speak because I'm constantly studying and I'm looking personally as a challenge like ways to know more words or know more things about the language and read, I don't know, about the language with the language for the language, I don't know, it's like a development challenge but I would say it's ENOUGH to communicate, to teach but: it can always be better

G: do you think it has any influences, for example

J: what kind of influences?

G: in terms of assimilating your- the way you speak to a specific accent or varieties

J: I mean, my English is Chilean, I mean, and I'm proud of it, that's what it IS. I cannot pretend
someone who I'm not, even though for example at some moment, I don't know, I
lived in England and I was KIND of assimilating because I sounded like terribly
foreigner and I was discriminated because of my foreignness and: but that was a very
contextual thing and then I came back with bad taste so: I decided not to sound,
consciously

G: so it was an effect of that experience?

J: yes so after that, I don't know, I had like prejudices as well, I lived in England kind of young
so I was with all the expectations, I don't know, like British people and you know? all
the clichés on British and turned out to be that I ended up in a very rough area and I
was like super discriminated because of colour skin, because of accent, because of
many reasons so in the end I was like "is it worth it?" because in the end- and I'm not
saying by this that all British are, I don't know, discriminating but: it was an
experience that actually let me, I don't know, allowed me to think of the importance
of an accent and I go back to the initial point of identity like I'm not British, I'm not
gonna sound British, I don't want to sound British and here we are

G: but at that time your idea wasn't that clear

J: my idea wasn't that clear because of my education as well, because I also received
education that was like very non critical so my role was accepting the teachings of a
SUPER teacher and that SUPER teacher with his SUPER voice and his SUPER English,
you may know who I mean em: has a negative impact on people and I think that
because of HIS passion, he I don't know ran over others (1) and: he's a source of
frustration in many people in, I don't know, all the people I know who studied
English, we all have this, I don't know, fear, rejection, complaints, issues with RP, for
example, and: even though okay you learn RP, you go to England and there's no RP
so that's the first clash, what do I do? and people laugh at you because you sound
like the Queen or you try to sound like the Queen, so in the end is like it's actually a
waste of time especially is you want to communicate only and: it's about
communication, it's not about pretending

G: yeah (1) well that's the end of the interview (.) is there anything you would like to say
before I turn this off? any ideas in your head?

J: no unless you need me to say something incorrect

G: no no no I think I got everything I want for now (.) I'll come back for a second interview

Appendix F **Sample Interview 2**

Institution: Programme A
Nickname: Julian
Date: April 2016
Duration: 31 minutes
G: Gonzalo (Researcher)
J: Julian

G: okay so this is interview number two (.) first of all do you speak any other languages apart from English and Spanish?

J: no I don't

G: have you ever had a motivation to learn another language?

J: not really (.) not motivation but I felt the need when I went to Britain a couple of times (.) when I went to France and I just couldn't communicate with the French, you know ordinary conversation, to ask for DIRECTIONS you know? how to go, how to get to a place and @@@ I felt so stupid

G: when was that?

J: that was in 93, 94

G: so English wasn't enough in France

J: it was enough ONCE but I don't know about the other times (1) I didn't even TRY (2) no I felt embarrassed and I felt really uncomfortable (.) apart from that NO

G: right (1) and what's your opinion about using Spanish in the classroom?

J: I have nothing against it but of course only in CERTAIN cases (.) when it is absolutely essential (.) because I believe very strongly in comparing things (.) NOTICE the difference between this and that (.) a different construction, a different whatever (.) and very often expressions that you can't (2) well that are better-explained if you use Spanish (.) no I have nothing against that

G: and when you see your students speaking in Spanish?

J: UH (2) INSIDE the classroom (.) well these are practices that really depend on each one of us (.) there's no rule that says, you know, in class your students should speak English in class (.) of course that is encouraged all the time (.) but it's left very much to each one of us

G: okay (.) in your opinion what does it mean to be bilingual?

J: oh my ex wife is bilingual (.) well it implies a NUMBER of things, which I don't have

G: for example?

Appendix F

J: well (.) being a bilingual person means having a lot of- not only knowledge about the
language but also- oh this is different to explain but- you've got to be (1) what is the
word I need? (2) you've got to be in possession of a number of not only linguistic
abilities and competences but it goes beyond that (1) to say the right thing at the
right time in the right place (2) being bilingual means, for example, just to give you a
very sort of everyday example, when I COUNT, when I'm doing figures, you know and
I add up things or I divide things, a figure by another figure, I automatically turn into
Spanish (.) I can't say my multiplication tables in English, I have to THINK before I say
four times four are sixteen (.) okay yes but */cuatro por cuatro dieciséis/* comes much
sooner, much easier and these are the problems that a bilingual person doesn't have

G: so you don't see yourself as a bilingual person?

J: for example my children, I could NEVER (.) I never spoke English to my children but my wife
did (.) because for her English was her first language (.) she spoke English ever since
she was born (.) she listened to English ever since she was born because her mother
was British and she learnt Spanish- she started learning Spanish when she was eight
or nice so now she speaks English to our grandson and it comes absolutely nature for
her

G: so how possible do you think it is for your students to become bilingual?

J: I don't think they have a chance (.) NO (.) I think it's too late (3) I read a list once of the
competences that a bilingual person has and it was a long list of things, something
like twenty items and it had to do with all kinds of situations (1) knowing absolutely
everything (.) why do we say */blanco y negro/* and in English they say black and
white, why don't they say white and black? why do we say it in reverse order in
Spanish, you see? there are SO many things (.) many of which I think belong to the
real world, you know, so many different kinds of situations (.) no I don't consider
myself, I know I would never BE a bilingual (2) would I like to be one? probably YES,
yes, no doubt about it but that's a fact that I have to learn to admit

G: so under YOUR definition of bilingualism, MULTILINGUALISM wouldn't even be POSSIBLE?

J: mmh that would even be MORE difficult (2) yeah yes, okay I can't say any more

G: it's like a yes no question actually (1) so how do you understand these efforts that the
ministry of education are making in terms of making Chile a bilingual country?

J: uh that's a nice way of putting it (.) being bilingual, let's fight for bilingualism, sounds very
nice, socially-speaking and from any other point of view but that is IMPOSSIBLE (.)
maybe they should say let's teach our children as much English as possible (.) being
able to communicate with people doesn't make you bilingual of course, NO (2)

((interruption))

J: I don't know whether they know what they're saying @@@ I'm not sure (.) that's
impossible (1) I worked at an English, so-called English school, English-speaking
school (.) one of the best in Chile (1) and not even THERE can they produce this kind
of people, you know, everything is English in playgroup and upper levels but that
didn't make anybody bilingual, no

G: and probably in relation with the same topic, in what ways does learning English mean
adopting a second culture?

J: mmh I think it DOES (2) em: it's difficult to DEFINE being culturally-foreign, you know but in
some respect, for example, in my particular case I do things that English people do
and that we do differently in Chile (1) everyday things, you know, when having a cup
of tea with a sandwich (.) and what did I do in England? I knew I had to put the plate
with the solid stuff in front of me and the cup of tea away from that and in Chile it's
the other way around, the CUP is in front of you and the plate is further away, you
know, is that a cultural thing? YES IT IS, is that part of culture? I suppose it is (.) that's
a very minor, ridiculous little example but it has to do with that and I THINK that the
answer to your question is YES (1) has THAT got anything to do with the language?
NO, but it has to do with the culture (1) NOW defining culture is not an easy thing to
do but I suppose it embraces a number of things (.) some of which I haven't even
thought about @@

G: yeah but when we talk about English what culture do we adopt?

J: when we talk about English?

G: the English language

J: well I suppose there's something called English culture but I wouldn't dare define it (.) it
embraces MANY many aspects which have to do with everyday life, which have to do
with other levels of, I don't know what to call it, behaviour, practices

G: but is it possible to keep your own culture, your own identity and being a proficient user of
the language?

J: I think so (1) my ex wife always said, when I speak Spanish, she says, on the phone (.) I
automatically change into a higher volume and when I speak English I switch it down
a little bit well that is saying something isn't it? or speaking with your hands, so to
speak, you know, the English don't move their hands around when they speak and
we tend to when we speak Spanish (1) there are so many personal ways that you are
supposed to change when you go from [?] to the other (1) is this important? I don't

know, it depends (2) I suppose why you NEED to be absolutely bilingual (.) I'm aware

of that and I don't worry really

G: can you tell me a little bit about how you evaluate your students in the courses that you

teach?

J: I think it varies a lot (.) some of them are very good, very very good (.) well because they

are- because they have this GIFT, this natural gift, I believe very much in this (.)

because speaking a foreign language implies not only sitting down and learning rules,

you know, about everything, grammar, pronunciation, et cetera (2) but also being

able to put them into practice and SOME people find it very difficult to put things into

practice (.) so the VERY good students can get very high there, they can reach a

higher level (1) I TEND to think, I want to think that what we are doing here at the

university is training teaching, training people who want to become teachers at a

high level of proficiency (.) I very much AGREE with one of the authorities in the field

when they say who says teachers of English as a foreign language are a different kind

of @@@ a different kind of people (1) and I believe that (.) he talks about high, what

is the term he uses there? well it will come to me- HIGH ACCEPTABILITY (2) I know

that none of my students will end up being a bilingual to begin with and I am NOT

aiming at that but I always say "I'm gonna teach you 100% if you can get a

percentage of that well let's hope it'll be as near 100 as possible" (1) now I know that

there are other students who will never get there, some of them will get 50% and

probably a few of them even less than that and that is- I suppose that explains WHY

some people end up with a FOUR, which is a passing pass, a bare pass, OR with a

SEVEN (.) I have people- I have students to whom I have given a seven, a minority yes

G: and how do you normally evaluate them?

J: well (1) in various aspects (.) THEORY, they've got to know the theory but also oral

production and ideally they've got to go hand in hand, everything I teach is put into

practice, I DON'T believe in teaching THEORY for the sake of it, you know, I don't

believe in theory which cannot be put into practice, I never teach ANYTHING that just

will remain there, you know, on a printed page (.) I'm very clear there and I try to be

as, what is the word? as WISE as possible, if I may say so, in that I have made a list of

priorities- I think prioritising is ESSENTIAL (.) there are things to which you HAVE TO

devote more time and there are other things which are not very essential or not

essential at all (.) and I have mentioned them to them and I say "okay please note

this but it doesn't matter if you don't remember this, and let's move quickly into

something else which is much more important" and I'm doing that all the time when

somebody says "could you say this? what's the difference between this and that?" "well that is negligible forget about it, so I try to DO and make the most of my time. I mark my students for three aspects, as I said before, THEORY, oral production AND TRASCRIPTION, I believe very much in transcription because it gives you the tools to KNOW about pronunciation more scientifically (.) I don't know of any OTHER way and marking intonation and accentuation and all that which is then making a written RECORD of speech

G: how important do you think it is for English teachers in Chile to take international exams?

J: I think it's VERY important (.) I ALWAYS encourage my students, once they finish the course with us to take these foreign papers, CAMBRIDGE (2) and sit for the real exam, not just answer old papers unofficially (1) I encourage them to do that yes and it's a very good thing that such a things happens

G: and what makes these exams international?

J: oh I think mainly because- I think what makes them international is the fact that they set standards and when you have an international standard it means that everybody understands what A B or C means, you know? (3) I agree with that (.) I mean I'm glad that there is such a framework which we didn't have in MY time (.) now everybody knows what A B C means or 1 2 levels

G: and what about variation? variation in terms of accents?

J: mh: I do bel- well I mean they DO exist of course, I can't say they don't, nobody <u>can say</u> <u>that</u> there IS variation, there IS variation in MY mother tongue but I have it very clear in my mind that when it comes to TEACHING (1) MY students will become models in EVERY ASPECT and a good model I think, should be, ideally would be somebody who gets very near a native pronunciation, whatever that is, American, British, Canadian, Australian or whatever (3) so that's what I think

G: this is a really interesting topic because we talk about variation but how can we incorporate that in the curriculum, for example, in your lessons, specially when you teach about pronunciation

J: well that's not a very difficult thing to do because there is a body of theory behind that (2) as a TEACHER I say "yes in other places they say it like this, they use a different grammar, they use different lexis, they use different pronunciations (.) and I have NOTHING against that (1) just half an hour ago somebody says "SIR you say reSEARCH all the time and [Carolina] says REsearch, why?" well and I say well that's very simple, one is British and the other one is American and I have nothing against (2) the American model although I don't speak that

Appendix F

G: and what about varieties that go beyond the native speaker model?

J: uh (1) IF we are dealing with things that our students hear on television and movies, you know, things such as I ain't, I ain't started yet or things like that, you know, or (2) double negatives and things (.) I think it's OUR job to teach those things, to point it out to them and say "you will hear this, would you know this?" they've got to UNDERSTAND why something is considered to be NON-STANDARD (2) because it's also part of reality, you know, it's not something that you have to ignore or you could ignore simply because you don't like it (.) I have nothing against that but I mean I TRY to teach that there are different ways to go about things very often=

G: =and what's your opinion about presenting your students with samples or forms of the language performed by non-native speakers?

J: well I do that every now and then (1) as a tool, as a teaching instrument to say "okay listen to this, any comments? you know, has anything caught your attention? say why" (2) and of course in MY case it's always materials that have to do with different- faulty pronunciations, you know, particularly now, for instance, I'm teaching PROSODY, WRONG stress patterns and things like that (1) yes I find it useful (1) it's like "do you agree with this? listen" or I can provide them with wrong models and correct models and I say, okay find the mistake, there is ONE mistake @@ I find that useful

G: so how relevant is it for English teachers to embrace diversity in that way? and moving away from, for example, British and American models and try to work for a more international form of English?

J: oh how would you define international? if by international we mean anything which is NOT the real thing and by the real thing I mean NATIVE um: you will face a NUMBER of possibilities, I mean ANYTHING which is called A, let's call native A and anything that is non-native could be B, now MANY things can be B, in different DEGREES (.) if it's a question of identifying B I suppose it's correct (2) but incorporating that into a TEACHING point, I'm not sure (.) we don't have all the time in the world to begin with, we can comment on things on the latest film for example where somebody was saying funny things, I mean funny in the way that they're not STANDARD, or that are not BRITISH (1) ITALIANS trying to speak English and I say "can something tell me what kind of English is that?" you know things like that (1) somebody imitating- an American actor imitating an Italian in the states, can anybody comment on that? (1) what is it they say? or a French speaker trying to produce English (.) I wish I had more TIME (2) I watch the BBC every day, you know, and I make recordings of that, now we can do that, and I wish I had more time to present my students with those models

and say "okay any comments here? what is it that- what French traits can you hear in this type of English

G: and the BBC has also tried to move on in terms of the model they present

J: yes yes absolutely

G: they are more into diversity (.) well in the British Isles

J: yes yes and outside yes because there's a lot of African and Asian (4) what can I say? we see Asians and Indians and (2) people like that being interviewed (.) that is also very useful (.) not very useful for my students, I don't think, but for me YES (.) I don't think I have time to incorporate that into my teaching (.) I don't have time but I mean certain such models DO exist but I don't think that they are to be imitated (1) it's difficult to DEFINE international English (.) I suppose there are many many international Englishes (1) can we speak of something which we could call Latin American English? even THAT would be difficult because in ARGENTINA, if you could compare an Argentine English, with Chilean English, Colombian English and Brazilian English, you would end up with, I don't know, MANY MANY descriptions

G: can I ask you a final question? do you think there's such thing as Chilean English?

J: I think so, yes, I think I could hear somebody in another part of the world trying to speak English, a CHILEAN speaking English in another place, you know, in ENGLAND, for instance, I think I would say immediately "ah I bet this bloke is Chilean" or this lady yes yes (.) MAINLY becau- probably because I have a lot of practice there (.) I also teach SPANISH phonetics so I know EXACTLY what kind of mistakes I expect (.) yes

G: OKAY (.) well that's the end of the interview (.) thank you very much

Appendix G **Sample Fieldnotes**

University: Programme B
Name of teacher: Sofia
Class: English Language Skills (1st year)   Date: 24th March 2016
Duration: 90 minutes

Before starting the lesson, the teacher introduces me to the class as a researcher in a simple manner. I briefly explain that I will be observing the teacher and have no intention to interrupt the normal flow of the lesson. I also point out that I will be sitting at the back of the classroom and ask students to "ignore me". At the beginning of the lesson, the T asks students to recall what they did the day before. She gives them a few minutes to discuss this while she opens the PPT presentation on the computer (which is projected on a board). She addresses the audience in English from the beginning of the lesson, however, some students tend to interact in Spanish about unrelated issues while others follow the instructions of the teacher and do the task in English. The atmosphere is relaxed and quiet.

SOFIA: OK, so in the meanwhile, because the mouse (pause) the mouse is not working so in the meanwhile. So what did you do yesterday?

S1: We made an activity

SOFIA: OK (3) What kind of activity?

S1: We answered some questions about [?] identity

SOFIA: OK. So you answered questions about identity. What kind of questions? What questions?

S1: Of types of identity (2) and the things that (2) confront the identity.

SOFIA: OK. So, types of identity? And?

S2: Difference [?] Difference between each other.

SOFIA: Differences between or among different kinds of different kinds of identities. And do you remember those types of identities.

SOFIA: YES?

S3: There's social and mmm collective and...

S4: Individual

SOFIA: Social, collective and individual (2) or personal identity. What about the spoilt (2) spoilt or stigmatised identity. Do you remember that? That [?] to be the strong one. Isn't it? (3) Mmmh, and what's the difference between collective and social (2) identity? Do you remember? That was one of the questions that you had to answer.

Appendix G

S2: That collective identity can be chosen, but social identity is given... it's like a role that one play in society.

SOFIA: OK. It's a social construction, someone else has given you [clears throat] I'm sorry - a role. Like being, like gender for example. OK? What being a woman means and what being a man means, right? So, it's not about our genitals but it's about the role we play in society, what it's expected from me as a girl, as a woman, as a mother, as a... student, as a... whatever, right? That identity was kind of imposed. Do you think so?

S3: (quietly) yes

SOFIA: And the collective one is the one we choose. What ideas if you have to look for an example, if you have to find an example, to portray this, uh, collective identity (interrupted by technician) (10) so, example?

S1: [?] it depend on context

SOFIA: OK. depends on context. It depends on context. How?

S1: For example, in my house I'm son and brother but here I'm student and with my friends I am friend.

Sole: But did you choose that identity? I mean, being a son, being a brother, being a [?] maybe a friend, mm uh.

S2: Maybe being transgender.

SOFIA: OK

S2: That's something they, I mean, they don't decide.

SOFIA: Could you explain?

S2: A transgender, male or female, I mean, I don't know if they decide 'cause maybe they don't decide. They was born, */o sea/*, they were born with that gender but in another body, so it's not like, decide?

SOFIA: OK? It was a forced decision. Yeah

S2: More like a forced decision.

SOFIA: So, any other example? of collective identity? You've said that collective identity is the identity that we (1) choose. And we, by choosing that identity, we immediately belong to a bigger (1) group. And it's different from the social identity. Alright? So, an example of collective identity could be? (asking for ideas to the students).

S3: A goth (1) a gothic (1) [?]

SOFIA: OK?

S3: A group?

SOFIA: You mean like a...

S3: Or pokemon

Students laugh

SOFIA: OK. What we call "tribus urbanas" something like that, right? I am otaku, or otako, no
I'm not @ or my religion sometimes. OK, well I'm not sure if in Chile we can choose
our religion, I did, but I'm not sure if most of you could actually decide (3) uh (2) or
make a decision related to religion.

S4: Maybe, I choose the [?] career?

SOFIA: OK? (3) OK! Now I get it, yes because you decided to come here and study English
pedagogy here at this university. And this university has a, I mean, it's a particular
one, let's say, it's not the same programme than in another university so, yeah, uh
uh.

...

SOFIA: OK. Good. What else? (2) What about factors shaping your identity (1) or the
components of identity.

S1: DNA

SOFIA: Mh?

S2: DNA

SOFIA: OK, DNA.

S2: the gender?

SOFIA: Gender

S3: the [?]

SOFIA: I'm sorry

S3: the culture, culture

SOFIA: culture

S4: family

SOFIA: family.

S4: school, friends

SOFIA: school (.) peer group

S4: education

S5: workplace

SOFIA: mmh?

S5: workplace?

SOFIA: workplace

S4: education

SOFIA: education (.) OK (.) ah uh

S6: age

SOFIA: of course

S6: ethnic group (3) ethnic group

SOFIA: ethnic group (.) good

S7: social [unintelligible]

SOFIA: ok (.) so my social environment (.) the society I belong to (.) mh uh (.) good (.) and
what are the most import- (.) I mean if you think about you (.) think about yourself
you also had to do it (.) think of yourself try to analyse yourself and what did you find
(3) factors shaping YOUR identity.

S2: my family

SOFIA: your family (.) that's the most important component let's say (.) good (.) what about
the rest of you (.) family?

S6: school

SOFIA: school

S5: friends

SOFIA: friends

S3: maybe the experience in the past

SOFIA: experiences from (.) ok past experiences (.) mh uh

S5: relationships

SOFIA: relationships (.) absolutely (.) relationships (.) COOL

...

SOFIA: so now (.) uh well we are going to [?] what did you after the identity lesson or identity
class? did you do something else afterwards?

(students shake their heads)

...

SOFIA: What about yesterday's key words?

S1: [???]

SOFIA: ok (.) do you remember them?

S2: [?] young at heart [?]

SOFIA: what was the most (.) I don't know (.) interesting key word let's say

S1: young at heart

SOFIA: uh?

S1: young at heart

SOFIA: young at heart (.) that's a chunk (.) right (.) maybe I'm old but I'm young at heart

S3: the [?] people

SOFIA: UH?

S3: the *lolein* (Chilean slang for someone older who acts and dresses like a young person)

SOFIA: uh the *lolein* people(.) good (.) Spanish (.) good (2) in Chilean (.) OK (.) thank you very much for the (2) uh review (.) it was a short review but it was useful (.) uh here we are going to continue with the unit of identity but today we are going to talk about the socialization process but in the second module (.) and we are going to continue wondering (reading the slides) WHO AM I (.) that's a though question right? isn't it? (.) so today's menu (.) objective (.) to develop strategies to read English articles (.) that's the first thing we are going to do (.) to develop strategies that motivate people to read English articles (.) then to show understanding of the importance of the socialization process and to identify the different agents shaping people's identities (.) ok (.) and in module one we are going to have the reading comprehension workshop (.) ok (.) this is to give you tools (.) to read (.) ok (.) simple but useful tools ok? and then we have module two the socialisation process (.) so let's go with the reading workshop (.) so in groups of four discuss (.) reading today's texts (.) uh (2)

Students work in groups of four and exchange ideas about their reading habits. Sofia notices that the students are talking in Spanish and says "Remember that the official language in this classroom is English". When asked for translations of words from Spanish she says "let me check" and justifies the fact that she does not know give a straight answer by saying "I have two languages in my mind" or "I'm not a walking dictionary".

T checks answers with the students asking for pros and cons when reading. After this, T tells students that they are going to watch a video connected to what they were discussing.

SOFIA: ok (.) this video (.) the person that is going to speak in the video is an Indian woman ok (.) so maybe the accent (.) is not that easy to understand (.) I think it is but maybe you're going to find it a little bit difficult so we are going to watch it twice ok? good

T plays the video showing a woman talking about reading strategies: (1) skimming (2) scanning (3) analyse positive and negative detail (4) expand your vocabulary http://youtube.com/w_N2_366hL4

SOFIA: ok(.) what and how does it work (.) skimming

[many students answer simultaneously]

Appendix G

> SOFIA: shhh [asking them to keep quiet] (.) raise your hand to answer because (2) in that way
>
> we can order (.) this (2) "chicken house"=
>
> Sts: =@@@@
>
> SOFIA: I don't know how to say in English @@=
>
> Sts: @@
>
> SOFIA: ok so=
>
> S1: = a brief reading for identify the (.) principal? ideas or concepts.

T confesses that she "loves" the speaker's accent. Finally sts do an activity in which they have to recall the class activities they did the day before and associate what they did in relation to the reading strategies presented in the video.

Appendix H **Analytical Codes**

Programme A – Interview and document analysis themes, sub-themes and sample codes

1) Pride in tradition

   a) Acceptable English

      i) Promotion of British English

      ii) Need for a standard (accent)

      iii) NS-like as desirable proficiency (inner circle)

      iv) Apprenticeship of observation

   b) Consistency of Choice

      i) Teachers' own choices

      ii) Difficulties teaching American English

      iii) Mono-dualistic perspective

   c) NS affiliation

      i) Superiority of BrE

      ii) Passing for a NES

      iii) Identity as users of ENL English

      iv) External opinions on the teacher's English

2) Opposition to traditional ELT

   a) Criticism of tradition

      i) Awareness of ideological issues

      ii) Importance of teaching over linguistic proficiency

      iii) Own training as brainwash

   b) Appropriation of English

      i) Ownership of English

      ii) Negative attitudes towards BrE

      iii) Identity as Chilean teachers

      iv) Awareness of Englishes

   c) "Fake" English

      i) No experience abroad

    ii) Experiences abroad as "eye-openers"

    iii) English in ELT as unauthentic

3) Beliefs about ELF

    a) Anti-ELF sentiment

    b) Changing English

    c) English as a culture/nation-free language

    d) Tool for intercultural communication

Programme A – Classroom observations

1) Acknowledgement of variation

    a) Awareness raising

    b) Criticism to focus on form

    c) Negotiation of meaning

    d) No or very little corrections

    e) No or very little reference to ENL varieties

2) Relationship between English and Spanish

    a) Negative relationship

        i) Call for English use

        ii) English at all times

        iii) L1 influence as negative

    b) Positive relationship

        i) Comparisons between English and Spanish

        ii) Cultural differences (local v/s ENL)

        iii) Direct translations

        iv) Mixing English and Spanish in class

3) Superiority of Standard forms

    a) Affiliation to ENL varieties

        i) Explicit superiority of standard forms

        ii) Implicit superiority of standard forms

        iii) Implicit superiority of ENL models

        iv) Prestige

b) Comparisons between AmE and BrE

c) Reference to ENL countries

   i) Reference to ENL varieties

d) Focus on repetition

   i) Corrections of form

Programme B – Interview and document analysis themes, sub-themes and sample codes

1) Rejection of traditional ELT

   a) Relinquishment of acquired English

      i) Negative attitudes towards NS model

      ii) Difficulties in own training

      iii) Awareness of ideological issues

      iv) Bookish English

   b) Embracement of Englishes

      i) World Englishes

      ii) Tool for intercultural communication

      iii) Awareness of Englishes and linguistic variation

   c) Focus on grammar as detrimental

      i) Negative for learners

      ii) Grammar is unnecessary

      iii) Grammar restricts fluency

2) Identity as Chilean teachers

   a) Chilean English

      i) Appropriation of English

      ii) Response to students' expectations

      iii) Students don't need to focus on form

   b) Developing one's own English

      i) Communication over norms

      ii) Focus on relevant topics

      iii) Critical thinking

      iv) Awareness of own identity

Appendix H

Programme B – Classroom observations

1) Available models

    a) Deconstructing RP

    b) Exposure to NNESs

    c) Exposure to NES

    d) Focus on pronunciation

    e) Repetition

2) Content over form

    a) Correction is unnecessary

        i) No correction

        ii) Repair

    b) Focus on local issues

    c) "Glocal" topics

3) Critical thinking

    a) Challenging students' beliefs

    b) Identity

    c) Reflection

    d) Teachers not technicians

4) English as the official language

    a) Beliefs about English against other languages

    b) English at all times

Programme C – Interview and document analysis themes, sub-themes and sample codes

1) Tensions in change

    a) Developing awareness of Englishes

        i) Need for exposure students to variation

        ii) English has a lingua franca function

        iii) Appropriation of English

        iv) Positive influence of experiences abroad

        v) Teaching skills over linguistic proficiency

    b) Nostalgia for tradition

        i) Resistance to change

        ii) Learning languages is not for everyone

        iii) Own training was more effective

        iv) Incorporating other Englishes is problematic

        v) Lack of engagement with curriculum innovation

        vi) Need for exam preparation

2) Dualistic perspective

    a) Focus on ENL standards

        i) Promotion of RP

        ii) Teachers' personal preference for AmE or BrE

        iii) Consistency of choice

    b) Spanish-influenced English as detrimental

        i) Negative attitudes towards L1 influence

        ii) Desirability of NES proficiency

        iii) External demands

        iv) Chilean idiosyncrasy

3) Authentic language use

    a) Fake English

    b) Lack of genuine practice

    c) Deficit perspective

    d) Need for validation abroad

Programme C – Classroom observations

1) Orientation to standards

    a) Correct language

    b) Corrective feedback

    c) Desirable pronunciation

    d) Don't use Spanish

    e) ENL preference

Appendix H

        i) Exposure to NES input

        ii) References to AmE or BrE

        iii) Reference to ENL countries

    f) Grammar-focused orientation

        i) Decontextualised language

        ii) Exam-oriented task

        iii) Grammar-focused task

    g) Modelling pronunciation or grammar

2) Tolerance

    a) Accommodation

    b) Chilean English

    c) Teachers' own difficulties learning English

    d) Mistakes are OK

        i) No or very little corrections

    e) Not only ENL

        i) Beyond ENL countries

        ii) Challenge of students' beliefs

        iii) Critical orientations towards the spread of English

        iv) Reference to local culture

    f) Own English

    g) RP is not a goal

Appendix I **Sample documents/extracts from case studies**

The document below corresponds to one of Programme B's module descriptions collected for review. This document was originally written in English and, for purposes of confidentiality, some details have been omitted or modified.

--Start of document --

Name of Curricular Activity	:	English Language Skills IV
Code	:	
Credits	:	20
Nature	:	Compulsory
Prerequisite	:	Integrated English Language III
Type	:	Course
Weekly study time allocation	:	**direct teaching:** 13,3 hours **independent study:** 6,6 hours
Academic Period	:	4th semester

Appendix I

Curriculum Description:

This is an Integrated English Language course designed to guide students to achieve a upper intermediate level of English competence (CEFR B2+) in listening, speaking, reading and writing as well as critical thinking, and appreciation of literature and culture of English speaking countries. The course also offers opportunities to develop appropriate pronunciation of key English sounds as well as accurate control of frequently used language structures, high-frequency vocabulary and vocabulary related to the topics of the course. Also, in this course students will reflect on the effectiveness of teaching methodologies used in class as the foundation for their training as effective future English language teachers.

Learning aims:

During this course students will develop the knowledge and skills to:

1. Listening;
   a. identify specific information in contexts of their interest
   b. identify the main message of text in contexts of their interest
2. Reading;
   a. identify specific information suggested in the text
   b. identify the main ideas even if they are not explicitly stated
3. Speaking;
   a. exchange oral information in familiar situations
   b. express ideas coherently using language that is appropriate to the context
   c. use a general pronunciation which enhances communication
   d. use accurately the English sound studied in the course
4. Writing;
   a. write simple and complex sentences with the correct punctuation.
   b. write paragraphs simple short well-structured paragraphs
5. Pronunciation;
   a. identify and produce the following English sounds: /ʤ, ʧ, ʃ/, long vowels, /ɪŋ/ in

-ing verbs, Basic tones: Fall - Rise / ↘, ↗/ in Wh-questions
   b. understand the relevance of pronunciation as a key language component for successful communication,

        c. read a simple sample of a transcribed text,

6. Lexico-grammar;
   a. use correct word order
   b. use correct tenses, adverbs and adjectives

7. Literature;
   a. appreciate the value of reading literary pieces by linking their content to personal experiences, social and cultural trends
   b. understand the connection of literary work with the context where it was created

8. Critical thinking;
   a. observe reality from several points of view
   b. relate course contents to personal experiences, social and cultural trends

9. Social skills;
   a. interact with other students sharing ideas
   b. cooperate in team and group activities

10. ICTs;
    a. make efficient use of technology as a means to enhance learning opportunities individually, collectively, guided or autonomously

11. Pedagogical experiences:
    a. develop a personal opinion on the effectiveness of the language learning activities carried out in the course based on factual description of activities
    b. develop confidence speaking and presenting in front of others
    c. project voice and use gestures to assist communication

Methodology:

Classroom activities and homework will revolve around different topics discussed and read about in class within each Unit. These activities will all contribute to the completion of a Unit Task. Tasks have been designed to provide the opportunity to work individually, in pairs and in groups Co-teaching is also essential to the process of teaching development. Sharing collective activities is a core instance to develop teaching and learning communities. Consequently, student participation is central in this course. Strategies and appropriate activities, such as student presentations, role playing, projects, interviews, short plays, surveys and debates, will be used to guide students to develop all four language skills; reading, writing, listening and speaking. Developing the student's ability to critically think and analyze will be achieved through analysis of the topics in the recurrent cycle of observation, questioning and proposal. Technology will be used as a learning support through permanent use of relevant websites, and technological resources.

Contents:

UNIT 1	Topic: WORLD ENGLISHES (Dates may change) Task 1 - Written task: Reflective essay
UNIT 2	Topic: TEENAGE ISSUES IN THE EFL CLASSROOM (Dates may change) Task 2 - Oral task: Oral Group Presentation Journal Entry 1
INTEGRATED MIDTERM - ORAL EXAM/READING SEMINAR 1	(Dates may change) Written Midterm Exam Oral/Reading Seminar 1
UNIT 3	Topic: ALTERNATIVE PEDAGOGIES (Dates may change) Task 3 - Written task: Argumentative essay.
UNIT 4	Topic: LANGUAGE CONSOLIDATION (Dates may change) Task 4 - Oral task: Individual analytical report presentation Journal Entry 2
FINAL EXAM - ORAL EXAM/READING SEMINAR 2	Written FINAL Exam Oral/Reading Seminar 2 Final Feedback Session

Assessment:

Four Tasks	10% each	40%
Two Journal Entries	7,5% each	15%
Midterm Test	oral 25% // written: 75%	15 %
Final Exam	oral 25% // written: 75%	15%
Two Reading Seminars	7,5% each	15%

In order to pass, the student needs to obtain a minimum final mark of 4,0 provided that:

1. **A minimum of a 4,0 average in the Midterm and Final Exam is achieved.**

2. **A minimum class attendance of 80% is achieved.**

Attendance:

Students will be allowed into the room only 10 minutes late. After 10 minutes, they will be left absent in the attendance.

Attendance to one Teacher Assistant (TA) Workshop a week is part of regular class attendance.

Medical certificates only entitle students to take a test they may have missed for health reasons. They do not count for the minimum attendance requirement.

Important Information:

Students who miss a task submission deadline and have a medical certificate should be prepared to present or hand in their paper the very first day they attend class. This may affect the group performance during the tasks.

Students who miss any assessed activity and have a medical certificate should send an email to Monday class teacher to schedule a make-up.

Students who do not have a medical certificate but missed an evaluation due to circumstances beyond his/her control, he/she might be allowed to sit a make-up exam at the discretion of all the course teachers.

Students who are unprepared or late for a presentation or do not submit a coursework within prescribed time parameters will receive a 1.0

Assigned homework must be completed for the following class irrespective of the fact of student attendance.

Students who arrive without the course material and/or incomplete homework may be asked to leave the class and/or be marked absent. If a student has a concern, he/she must speak to his/her teacher before class starts.

Due to the nature of this course, no student are exempted from the final exam, regardless of semester marks

**IMPORTANT NOTICE: Plagiarism is a serious offence which will be severely sanctioned. The first time work will be given a 1.0. If a second time occurs, course suspension and program expulsión may take place (Reglamento académico Título VI, Art.21)

RESOURCES:
OBLIGATORY MATERIAL:

- Monolingual Dictionary
- Course material available in the University Platform.

COMPLEMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Gower, Roger. Grammar in Practice. Cambridge: CUP, 2002.
- McCarthy, Michael. English Collocations in Use: CUP, 2005.
- O'Dell, Felicity. English Idioms in Use: CUP, 2010.
- Marks, Jonathan. English Pronunciation in Use. CUP, 2007.

WEBSITES FOR CURRENT EVENTS:

www.cnn.com
www.guardian.co.uk
www.tcgnews.com
http://www.nytimes.com/
www.bbc.co.uk
https://www.washingtonpost.com/
http://indianexpress.com/
http://www.straitstimes.com/global **http://www.iran-daily.com/**
http://www.aljazeera.com/news/
http://www.news.com.au/
http://www.bbc.co.uk/radio/radioplayer/

STUDY LINKS:

- **http://www.studygs.net/**
- **http://www.studygs.net/schedule/**
- **http://www.ucc.vt.edu/stdysk/checklis.html**
- **http://www.studygs.net/schedule/goals.htm**
http://www.wordcounter.com

PRONUNCIATION AND LISTENING WEBSITES:

- **http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/activities/phonemic-chart (Obligatory)**
- **http://www.uiowa.edu/~acadtech/phonetics/english/frameset.html**

- **http://www.thisamericanlife.org/podcast**
- **http://www.phon.ucl.ac.uk/home/johnm/flash/flashin.htm**

- **http://www.bbc.co.uk/voices/results/wordmap/**

CRITICAL THINKING WEBSITES:

http://www.criticalthinking.org/pages/critical-societies-thoughts-from-the-past/762

Date	Activities, Contents, Deadlines
Week 1	**UNIT 1: World Englishes** Reading of the week: Historical Context.
Week 2	Reading of the week: First, second and third diaspora.
Week 3	Reading of the week: Varieties of World Englishes / Colonial, postcolonial critique.
Week 4	Reading of the week: Descriptive grammar / English as a Lingua Franca. **Task 1 - Written task: Reflective essay** **UNIT 2: Teenage issues in the EFL classroom** Reading of the week : Identity, Culture & Rebellion
Week 5	**UNIT 2: Teenage issues in the EFL classroom** Reading of the week: Identity Culture & Rebellion // Teenage Sexuality
Week 6	Reading of the week: Teenage Sexuality // Bullying: Definition, Prevalence. **Journal Entry 1**
Week 7	Reading of the week: Hostile Hallways; Bullying, Teasing and Sexual Harassment in Schools

Week 8	- **Task 2 - Oral task: Ted Talk Group Presentation** - **UNIT CONSOLIDATION** - **Written Integrated Midterm Exam** - **Oral/Reading Seminar 1**
Week 9	- **Oral/Reading Seminar 1** - **UNIT 3: Alternative pedagogies** - Reading of the week: A Popular Education Handbook
Week 10	Reading of the week: A Popular Education Handbook // The Waldorf Education Method
Week 11	Reading of the week: the Waldorf Education Method // The Montessori Method by Maria Montessori: Introduction.
Week 12	Reading of the week: The Montessori Method by Maria Montessori: Introduction // Homeschooling // Child-Centered Gifted Education.
Week 13	- **Task 3 - Written task: Argumentative essay** **"building a personal position towards alternative schooling".** - **UNIT CONSOLIDATION.** - **UNIT 4: Language Consolidation** Reading of the week: Language structures in context / Teaching Language Skills **Specific text to be included in relation to students' main weaknesses identified throughout the course.
Week 14	Reading of the week: Language structures in context / Teaching Language Skills **Specific text to be included in relation to students' main weaknesses identified throughout the course. **Journal 2**

Week 15	Reading of the week: Language structures in context / Teaching Language Skills **Specific text to be included in relation to students' main weaknesses identified throughout the course.
Week 16	Reading of the week: Language structures in context / Teaching Language Skills
	Specific text to be included in relation to students' main weaknesses identified throughout the course. **-Task 4 - Oral task: Individual analytical report presentation **-UNIT CONSOLIDATION // END OF CLASSES**
Week 17	**Written FINAL Exam** **Oral/Reading Seminar 2** **Final Feedback Session**

--------------------------------------End of document--

Sample document 2: Programme C's curriculum organisation (available online)

The document below has been translated from Spanish into English and, for purposes of confidentiality, some details have been modified and are presented with generic names. Modules which are taught in English are shaded.

Semester 1	Semester 2	Semester 3	Semester 4
Communicate Competence in English (Beginner's level)	Communicate Competence in English (Basic Level)	Communicate Competence in English (Pre-intermediate level)	Communicate Competence in English (Intermediate level)
Introduction to Lexis and Grammar	English Lexis and Grammar	Applied Grammar	Contextualised Grammar
Introduction to the Pronunciation of English	Phonetics and Phonology (segmentals and articulations)	Phonetics and Phonology (Allophones and Connected Speech)	Phonetics and Phonology (Supra-segmentals)
Culture and Civilisation in the English-Speaking World	Literature in the English-Speaking World	Didactics	Linguistics
Education and Society	Optional module	Optional module	Academic Writing I
Optional module	Psychology I	Epistemology and Curriculum	Inclusive Education
Optional module	Practicum I	Practicum II	Practicum III

Semester 5	Semester 6	Semester 7	Semester 8
Communicate Competence in English (Upper-intermediate level)	Communicate Competence in English (Advanced level)	Communicate Competence in English (Full competence level)	Dissertation
Methodology I	Methodology II	Identity and Diversity in the Anglosaxon World	Dissertation
Assessment I	Assessment II	Optional module	
Second Language Acquisition Theories	IT and ELT	Educational Research	
Academic Writing II	Academic Writing III	Primary Education Practicum	Secondary Education Practicum
Evaluation Practices	Identity and Teacher Professional Development	Primary Education Practicum	Secondary Education Practicum
Optional module	Practicum V		
Practicum IV			

Bibliography

Abelson, Robert P. (1979) 'Differences between belief and knowledge systems', *Cognitive Science*, 3, pp. 355-366.

Abrahams, Mary J. and Farias, Miguel (2010) 'Struggling for change in Chilean EFL teacher education', *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 12(2), pp. 110-118.

Ajsic, Adnan and McGroarty, Mary (2015) 'Mapping Language Ideologies', in Hult, Francis M. and Johnson, David Cassels (eds.) *Research Methods in Language Policy and Planning: A Practical Guide*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 181-192.

Anderwald, Lieselotte (2002) *Negation in non-standard British English: gaps, regularizations and asymmetries*. London: Routledge.

Andronis, Mary Antonia (2003) 'Iconization, fractal recursivity, and erasure: linguistic ideologies and standardization in Quichua-speaking Ecuador', *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Symposium about Language and Society—Austin*, Texas Linguistic Forum 47, pp. 263-269.

Arksey, Hillary and Knight, Peter (1999) *Interviewing for Social Scientists*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Armstrong, Nigel and Mackenzie, Ian E (2012) *Standardization, ideology and linguistics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baker, Will (2015) *Culture and Identity through English as a Lingua Franca: rethinking concepts and goals in intercultural communication*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bandura, Albert (1997) *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Barahona, Malba (2014) 'Pre-service teachers' beliefs in the activity of learning to teach English in the Chilean context', *Cultural-Historical Psychology*, 10(2), pp. 116-122.

Barahona, Malba (2016) *English Language Teacher Education in Chile: A cultural historical activity theory perspective*. London: Routledge.

Bibliography

Barcelos, Ana Maria Ferreira and Kalaja, Paula (2011) 'Introduction to beliefs about SLA revisited', *System*, 39(3), pp. 281-289.

Bassey, Michael (1999) *Case Study Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Basturkmen, Helen (2012) 'Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers' stated beliefs and practices', *System*, 40, pp. 282-295.

Basturkmen, Helen, Loewen, Shawn and Ellis, Rod (2004) 'Teachers' Stated Beliefs about Incidental Focus on Form and their Classroom Practices', *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), pp. 243-272.

Bayyurt, Yasemin and Sifakis, Nicos C. (2015) 'ELF-Aware In-Service Teacher Education: A Transformative Perspective', in Bowles, Hugo and Cogo, Alessia (eds.) *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 117-135.

Bazeley, Patricia (2013) *Qualitative Data Analysis: Practical Strategies*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Blair, Andrew (2015) 'Evolving a post-native, multilingual model for ELF-aware teacher education', in Bayyurt, Yasemin and Akcan, Sumru (eds.) *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 89-101.

Blair, Andrew (2017) 'Standard language models, variable lingua franca goals: How can ELF-aware teacher education square the circle?', *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 6(2), pp. 345-366.

Blommaert, Jan (1999) *Language ideological debates*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Borg, Michaela (2001) 'Teachers' beliefs', *ELT journal*, 55(2), pp. 186-188.

Borg, Michaela (2004) 'The apprenticeship of observation', *ELT journal*, 58(3), pp. 274-276.

Borg, Simon (2003) 'Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do', *Language teaching*, 36(2), pp. 81-109.

Borg, Simon (2011) 'The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs', *System*, 39, pp. 370-380.

Borg, Simon (2012) 'Current Approaches to Language Teacher Cognition Research: A Methodological Analysis', in Barnard, Roger and Burns, Anne (eds.) *Researching Language Teacher Cognition and Practice: International Case Studies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 11-29.

Borg, Simon (2015) *Teacher Cognition and Language Education*. London: Bloomsbury.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bowen, Glenn A. (2009) 'Document analysis as a qualitative research method', *Qualitative research journal*, 9(2), pp. 27-40.

Bowles, Hugo and Cogo, Alessia (eds.) (2015) *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Braine, George (2005) 'A history of research on non-native speaker English teachers', in Llurda, Enric (ed.) *Non-Native Language Teachers: Perceptions, Challenges and Contributions to the Profession*. New York: Springer, pp. 13-23.

Breen, Michael P. *et al.* (2001) 'Making sense of language teaching: Teachers' principles and classroom practices', *Applied Linguistics*, 24(4), pp. 470-501.

Brinkmann, Svend (2014) 'Unstructured and Semi-Strucrured Interviewing ', in Leavy, Patricia (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 277-299.

Bibliography

Brutt-Griffler, J. and Saminy, K. (2001) 'Transcending the nativeness paradigm', *World Englishes*, (20), pp. 99-106.

Bryman, Alan (2012) *Social Research Methods*. 4th edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burgess, Robert G. (1984) *In the Field : an introduction to field research*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Cabaroglu, Nese and Roberts, Jon (2000) 'Development in student teachers' pre-existing beliefs during a 1-year PGCE programme', *System*, 28(3), pp. 387-402.

Calderhead, James (1995) 'Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge', in Berliner, D. C. and Calfee, R. C. (eds.) *Handbook of Educational Psychology*. New York: Simon & Schuster, Macmillan, pp. 709-725.

Casanave, Christine Pearson (2010) 'Case Studies', in Paltridge, Brian and Phakiti, Aek (eds.) *Continuum Companion to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. London: Continuum, pp. 66-79.

Cheshire, Jenny and Milroy, Jim (1993) 'Syntactic variation in non-standard dialects: background issues', in Milroy, James and Milroy, Lesley (eds.) *Real English: The Grammar of English Dialects in the British Isles*. Harlow, Essex: Longman Group UK Limited, pp. 3-33.

Chun, Sun Young (2014) 'EFL learners' beliefs about native and non-native English-speaking teachers: perceived strenghts, weaknesses, and preferences', *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 35(6), pp. 563-579.

Clandinin, D. Jean and Connelly, F. Michael (1987) 'Teachers' personal knowledge: What counts as 'personal' in studies of the personal', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 19(6), pp. 487-500.

Cogo, Alessia (2015) 'English as a Lingua Franca: descriptions, domains and applications', in Bowles, Hugo and Cogo, Alessia (eds.) *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 1-12.

Cogo, Alessia and Dewey, Martin (2012) *Analysing English as a Lingua Franca: A Corpus-driven Investigation*. London and New York: Continuum.

Cohen, Louis, Manion, Lawrence and Morrison, Keith (2011) *Research Methods in Education*. 7th edn. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Cook, Vivian (1999) 'Going Beyond the Native Speaker in Language Teaching', *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(2), pp. 185-209.

Coppieters, René (1987) 'Competence differences between native and near-native speakers', *Language*, pp. 544-573.

Cowie, Neil (2009) 'Observation', in Heigham, Juanita and Croker, Robert A (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 165-181.

Crowley, Tony (1991) *Proper English*. London: Routledge.

Crowley, Tony (2003) *Standard English and the Politics of Language*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Crystal, David (2003) *English as a Global Language*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crystal, David (2012) *English as a Global Language*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Canto Classics.

Cummins, Jim (2008) 'Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education', in Cummins, Jim and Hornberger, Nancy H (eds.) *Encyclopedia of Language and Education*. 2nd edn. Boston, MA: Springer pp. 65-75.

Davies, Alan (2003) *The Native Speaker: Myth and Reality*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Davies, Alan (2004) 'The native speaker in applied linguistics', in Davies, Alan and Elder, Catherine (eds.) *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 431-450.

De los Heros, Susana (2009) 'Linguistic pluralism or prescriptivism? A CDA of language ideologies in Talento, Peru's official textbook for the first-year of high school', *Linguistics and Education*, 20(2), pp. 172-199.

Bibliography

Deumert, Ana and Vandenbussche, Wim (eds.) (2003) *Germanic standardizations: past to present*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Dewey, Martin (2012) 'Towards a post-normative approach: learning the pedagogy of ELF', *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 1(1), pp. 147-170.

Dewey, Martin (2014) 'Time to wake up some dogs! Shifting the culture of language in ELT', in Bayyurt, Yasemin and Akcan, Sumru (eds.) *Current Perspective on the Pedagogy of English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 121-134.

Dewey, Martin (2015) 'ELF, teacher knowledge and professional development', in Cogo, Alessia and Bowles, Hugo (eds.) *International Perspectives on English as a Lingua Franca: Pedagogical Insights*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 176-193.

Doerr, Neriko Musha (2009) 'Investigating "native speaker effects": Toward a neww model of analysing "native speaker" ideologies', in Doerr, Neriko Musha (ed.) *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 15-46.

Donaghue, Helen (2003) 'An instrument to elicit teachers' beliefs and assumptions', *ELT journal*, 57(4), pp. 344-351.

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

Duff, Patricia (2008) *Case study research in applied linguistics*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis.

Eagleton, Terry (2007) *Ideology: an introduction*. 2nd edn. London: Verso.

Edmunson, William (2009) *A History of the British Presence in Chile: From Bloody Mary to Charles Darwin and the Decline of British Influence*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Eisenhart, Margaret A. *et al.* (1988) 'Teacher Beliefs: Definitions, Findings, and Directions', *Educational Policy*, 2(1), pp. 51-70.

Ennis, Catherine D. (1994) 'Knowledge and beliefs underlying curricular expertise', *Quest*, 46(2), pp. 164-175.

Erkmen, Besime (2012) 'Ways to uncover teachers' beliefs', *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 47, pp. 141-146.

Faez, Farahnaz (2011) 'Reconceptualizing the native/nonnative speaker dichotomy', *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 10(4), pp. 231-249.

Fang, Zhihui (1996) 'A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices', *Educational research*, 38(1), pp. 47-65.

Farrell, Thomas S.C. and Kun, Serena Tan Kiat (2008) 'Language policy, language teachers' beliefs, and classroom practices', *Applied Linguistics*, 29(3), pp. 381-403.

Farrell, Thomas S.C. and Lim, Poh Choo Particia (2005) 'Conceptions of grammar teaching: A case study of teachers' beliefs and classroom practices', *TESL-EJ*, 9(2), pp. 1-13.

Fives, Helenrose and Buehl, Michelle M. (2012) 'Spring cleaning for the "messy" construct of teachers' beliefs: What are they? Which have been examined? What can they tell us?', in Harris, Karen R., Grahan, Steve and Urdan, Tim (eds.) *APA Educational Psychology Handbook: Vol 2. Individual Differences and Contextual Factors*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, pp. 471-499.

Fives, Helenrose and Buehl, Michelle M. (2016) 'Teachers' beliefs, in the context of policy reform', *Policy Insights from the Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 3(1), pp. 114-121.

Frankfort-Nachmias, Chava and Nachmias, David (2000) *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. New York: Worth Publishers.

Furinghetti, Fulvia and Pehkonen, Erkki (2003) 'Rethinking characterizations of beliefs', in Leder, Gilah C., Pehkonen, Erkki and Törner, Günter (eds.) *Beliefs: A Hidden Variable in Mathematics Education?* New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers, pp. 39-58.

Gal, Susan (1992) 'Multiplicity and contention among ideologies: a commentary', *International Pragmatics Association*, 2(3), pp. 445-449.

Bibliography

Gal, Susan (2006) 'Contradictions of standard language in Europe: Implications for the study of practices and publics', *Social Anthropology*, 14(2), pp. 163-181.

Garrett, Peter, Selleck, Charlotte and Coupland, Nikolas (2011) 'English in England and Wales: Multiple ideologies', in Kristiansen, Tore and Coupland, Nikolas (eds.) *Standard Languages and Language Standards in a Changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus Press, pp. 55-65.

Garvin, Paul L. (1993) 'A conceptual framework for the study of language standardization', *International journal of the sociology of language*, 100(1), pp. 37-54.

Gimenez, Telma, El Kadri, Michelle Salles and Calvo, Luciana Cabrini Simões (eds.) (2018) *English as a Lingua Franca in Teacher Education: A Brazilian Perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Golombek, Paula R. (1998) 'A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge', *Tesol Quarterly*, 32(3), pp. 447-464.

González, Adriana (2010) 'English and English teaching in Colombia: Tensions and possibilities in the expanding circle', in Kirkpatrick, Andy (ed.) *The Routledge Handbook of World Englishes*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 332-351.

Graddol, David (2006) *English Next: Why global English may mean the end of 'English as a Foreign Language'*. London: British Council.

Green, Thomas F. (1971) *The Activities of Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hall, Leigh A. (2005) 'Teachers and content area reading: Attitudes, beliefs and change', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(4), pp. 403-414.

Hancock, Elizabeth and Gallard, Alejandro J. (2004) 'Preservice science teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning: The influence of K-12 field experiences', *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 15(4), pp. 281-291.

Haugen, Einar (1966) 'Dialect, language, nation', *American anthropologist*, 68(4), pp. 922-935.

Haugen, Einar (1987) *Blessings of Babel: Bilingualism and language planning. Problems and pleasures*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Heath, Shirley Brice (1977) 'Social History', in *In: Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives.* Social Sciences. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, pp. 53-72.

Heller, Monica (2006) *Linguistic Minorities and Modernity*. London: Continuum.

Heller, Monica (2010) 'The commodification of language', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 39, pp. 101-114.

Holliday, Adrian (2005) *The Struggle to Teach English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holliday, Adrian (2006) 'Native-speakerism', *ELT journal*, 60(4), pp. 385-387.

Holliday, Adrian (2009) 'English as a lingua franca, 'non-native speakers' and cosmopolitan realities', in Sharifian, F (ed.) *English as an International Language: Perspectives and Pedagogical Issues*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 21-33.

Honey, John (1997) *Language is power: The story of standard English and its enemies*. London: Faber & Faber.

Hood, Michael (2009) 'Case Study', in Heigham, Juanita and Croker, Robert A (eds.) *Qualitative research in applied linguistics: A practical introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 66-90.

Horwitz, Elaine K. (1985) 'Using students beliefs about language learning and teaching in the foreign language methods course', *Foreign Language Annals*, 18(4), pp. 333-340.

Inal, Dilek and Özdemir, Esra (2015) 'Re-considering the English language teacher education programs in Turkey from an ELF standpoint: what do the academia, pre-service and in-service teachers think?', in Bayyurt, Yasemin and Akcan, Sumru (eds.) *Current Perspectives on Pedagogy for English as a Lingua Franca*. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 135 - 152.

Bibliography

Irvine, Judith T and Gal, Susan (2009) 'Language ideology and linguistic differentiation', in Duranti, A (ed.) *Linguistic Anthropology: a reader*. 2nd edn. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Irvine, Judith T. (1989) 'When talk isn't cheap: Language and political economy', *American Ethnologist*, 16(2), pp. 248-267.

Jaffe, Alexandra (2009) 'The Production and Reproduction of Language Ideologies in Practice', in Coupland, Nikolas and Jaworski, Adam (eds.) *The New Sociolinguistics Reader*. New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 390-404.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2000) *The Phonology of English as an International Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2006) 'Current perspectives on teaching world Englishes and English as a lingua franca', *Tesol Quarterly*, 40(1), pp. 157-181.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2007) *English as a Lingua Franca: Attitude and Identity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2014) *English as a Lingua Franca in the International University*. London and New York: Routledge.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2015a) *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Jenkins, Jennifer (2015b) 'Repositioning English and multilingualism in English as a Lingua Franca', *Englishes in Practice*, 2(3), pp. 49-85.

Jenkins, Jennifer, Cogo, Alessia and Dewey, Martin (2011) 'Review of developments in research into English as a lingua franca', *Language Teaching*, 44(3), pp. 281-315.

Johnson, Karen E. (1992) 'The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English', *Journal of Reading Behaviour*, 24(1), pp. 83-108.

Johnson, Karen E. (1994) 'The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers', *Teaching and teacher education*, 10(4), pp. 439-452.

Johnson, Karen E. and Golombek, Paula R. (2011) 'A sociocultural theoretical perspective on teacher professional development', in Johnson, KE and Golombek, PR (eds.) *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-12.

Johnson, Sally and Milani, Tommaso M (2010) *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse: texts, practices, politics*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Joseph, John Earl (1987) *Eloquence and Power: The rise of language standards and standard languages*. London: Frances Pinter.

Kachru, Braj B. (1992) 'World Englishes: Approaches, issues and resources', *Language Teaching*, 25(1), pp. 1-14.

Kachru, Braj B. (2006) 'The English language in the Outer Circle', in Bolton, K and Kachru, Braj B (eds.) *World Englishes: Critical concepts in linguistics*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, pp. 241-255.

Kagan, Dona M. (1992a) 'Implication of research on teacher belief', *Educational psychologist*, 27(1), pp. 65-90.

Kagan, Dona M. (1992b) 'Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers', *Review of educational research*, 62(2), pp. 129-169.

Kane, Ruth, Sandretto, Susan and Heath, Chris (2002) 'Telling half the story: A critical review of research on the teaching beliefs and practices of university academics', *Review of educational research*, 72(2), pp. 177-228.

Kaur, Paramjit (2014) 'Attitudes towards English as a Lingua Franca', *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 118, pp. 214-221.

Kirkpatrick, Andy (2007) *World Englishes: Implications for International Communication and English Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bibliography

Kloss, Heinz (1967) '"Abstand languages' and 'ausbau languages"', *Anthropological linguistics*, pp. 29-41.

Kristiansen, Tore and Coupland, Nikolas (eds.) (2011) *Standard languages and language standards in a changing Europe*. Oslo: Novus Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V (2000) *Regimes of language: ideologies, polities, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.

Kroskrity, Paul V (2004) 'Language ideologies', in Duranti, A (ed.) *A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, pp. 496-517.

Kroskrity, Paul V (2010) 'Language ideologies - Evolving perspectives', in Jaspers, Jürgen, Östman, Jan-Ola and Verschueren, Jef (eds.) *Society and Language Use*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 192-211.

Kumaravadivelu, Balasubramanian (2012) *Language Teacher Education for a Global Society: A modular model for knowing, analyzing, recognizing, doing, and seeing*. London: Routledge.

Kvale, Steinar and Brinkmann, Svend (2009) *Interviews: Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Labov, William (1969) *A Study of Non-Standard English*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse for Linguistics.

Labov, William (1978) *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Labov, William (1990) 'The intersection of sex and social class in the course of linguistic change', *Language variation and change*, 2(02), pp. 205-254.

Larraín, Jorge (2001) *Identidad Chilena [Chilean Identity]*. Santiago: LOM Ediciones.

Lee, Icy (2008) 'Understanding teachers' written feedback practices in Hong Kong secondary classrooms', *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 17, pp. 69-85.

Leith, D and Graddol, D (2007) 'Modernity and English as a national language', in Graddol, D *et al.* (eds.) *Changing English*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press pp. 79-116.

Leith, Dick (1997) *A Social History of English*. 2nd edn. London: Routledge.

Leung, Constant, Harris, Roxy and Rampton, Ben (1997) 'The idealised native speaker, reified ethnicities, and classroom realities', *Tesol Quarterly*, 31(3), pp. 543-560.

Li, Li (2013) 'The complexity of language teachers' beliefs and practice: one teacher's theories', *The Language Learning Journal*, 41(2), pp. 175-191.

Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Guba, Egon C. (1985) *Naturalistic Inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Yvonna S. and Guba, Egon C. (2013) *The Constructivist Credo*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press, Inc.

Lippi-Green, Rosina (2012) *English with an accent: Language, ideology, and discrimination in the United States*. 2nd edn. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Llamas, Carmen, Mullany, Louise and Stockwell, Peter (2007) *The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Llurda, Enric (2004) 'Non-native speaker teachers and English as an International Language', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 14(3), pp. 314-323.

Locher, Miriam A and Strässler, Jürg (2008) *Standards and norms in the English language*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Lortie, Dan C. (1975) *School teacher: A sociological inquiry*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mangubhai, Francis *et al.* (2004) 'Teaching a foreign language: one teacher's practical theory', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, pp. 291-311.

Martin, Annjeanette (2016) 'Second language teacher education in the expanding circle: The EFL methodology course in Chile', *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 18(1), pp. 24-42.

Matear, Ann (2008) 'English language learning and education policy in Chile: can English really open doors for all?', *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 28(2), pp. 131-147.

Bibliography

Mauranen, Anna (2012) *Exploring ELF: academic English shaped by non-native speakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, Anna (2018) 'Conceptualising ELF', in Jenkins, Jennifer, Baker, Will and Dewey, Martin (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge, pp. 7-24.

McGroarty, Mary (2010) 'Language and ideologies', in Hornberger, N H and McKay, S (eds.) *Sociolinguistics and language education*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 3-39.

Meijer, Paulien, Verloop, Nico and Breijaard, Douwe (2001) 'Similarities and differences in teachers' practical knowledge about teaching reading comprehension', *The Journal of Educational Research*, 94(3), pp. 171-184.

Menard-Warwick, Julia (2013) ''The world doesn't end at the corner of their street': Language ideologies of Chilean English teachers', in Ramanathan, V (ed.) *Language Policies and (Dis) Citizenship: Rights, Access, Pedagogies*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, pp. 73-91.

Merriam, Sharan B. (2009) *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mesthrie, Rajend and Bhatt, Rakesh M. (2008) *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Miles, Matthew B and Huberman, A Michael (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Milroy, James (2000) 'Historical description and the ideology of the standard language', in Wright, Laura (ed.) *The Development of Standard English 1300–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 11-28.

Milroy, James (2001) 'Language ideologies and the consequences of standardization', *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 5(4), pp. 530-555.

Milroy, James and Milroy, Lesley (2012) *Authority in language*. 4th edn. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Taylor & Francis Group.

Milroy, Lesley (2003) 'Social and linguistic dimensions of phonological change', in Britain, D and Cheshire, J (eds.) *Social dialectology. In honour of Peter Trudgill. Amsterdam. S*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 155-171.

Ministerio de Educación (2014) *Estándares Orientadores para Carreras de Pedagogía en Inglés*. Santiago: Gobierno de Chile.

Munby, Hugh (1982) 'The place of teachers' beliefs in research on teacher thinking and decision making, and an alternative methodology', *Instructional science*, 11(3), pp. 201-225.

Murray, Heather (2003) 'Swiss English teachers and Euro-English: Attitudes to a non-native variety', *Bulletin suisse de linguistique appliquée*, 77, pp. 147-165.

Nespor, Jan (1987) 'The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching', *Journal of curriculum studies*, 19(4), pp. 317-328.

Nisbett, Richard E and Ross, Lee (1980) *Human Inference: Strategies and shortcomings of social judgment*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

O'Leary, Matt (2014) *Classroom Observation: A Guide to the Effective Observation of Teaching and Learning*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Olafson, Lori, Salinas Grandy, Cristina and Owens, Marissa C. (2011) 'Qualitative Approaches to Studying Teachers' Beliefs', in Fives, Helenrose and Gill, Michele Gregoire (eds.) *International Handbook of Research on Teachers' Beliefs*. New York: Routledge, pp. 128-149.

Olivo, Warren (2003) '"Quit Talking and Learn English!": Conflicting Language Ideologies in an ESL Classroom', *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 34(1), pp. 50-71.

Österholm, Magnus (2010) *Proceedings of the Sixth Congress of the European Society of the European Society for Research in Mathematics Education*. Lyon, France, January 28th - February 1st 2009. Lyon: Institut National de Recherche Pédagogique.

Paffey, Darren (2012) *Language Ideologies and the Globalization of 'Standard' Spanish*. London: Bloomsbury/A&C Black.

Bibliography

Pajares, M. Frank (1992) 'Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct', *Review of educational research*, 62(3), pp. 307-332.

Palmer, Deborah (2011) 'The Discourse of Transition: Teachers' Language Ideologies within Transitional Bilingual Education Programs', *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5, pp. 103-122.

Patton, Michael Quinn (2002) *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Peacock, Matthew (1999) 'Beliefs about language learning and their relationship to proficiency', *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 9(2), pp. 247-265.

Peacock, Matthew (2001) 'Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about second language learning: a longitudinal study', *System*, 29(2), pp. 177-195.

Pennycook, Alastair (1994) *The cultural politics of English as an international language*. Essex: Longman Limited Group.

Phillipson, Robert (1992) *Linguistic Imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Phipps, Simon and Borg, Simon (2009) 'Exploring tensions between teachers' grammar teaching beliefs and practices', *System*, 37, pp. 380-390.

Polkinghorne, Donald E (2005) 'Language and meaning: Data collection in qualitative research', *Journal of counseling psychology*, 52(2), p. 137.

Quirk, Randolph (1990) 'Language varieties and standard language', *English Today*, 6(01), pp. 3-10.

Razfar, Aria (2005) 'Language ideologies in practice: Repair and classroom discourse', *Linguistics and Education*, 16, pp. 404-424.

Razfar, Aria (2012) 'Narrating beliefs: A language ideologies approach to teacher beliefs', *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 43(1), pp. 61-81.

Ricento, Thomas (2000) *Ideology, politics and language policies: Focus on English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

Richards, Jack C, Ho, Belinda and Giblin, Karen (1996) 'Learning how to teach in the RSA Cert', in Freeman, D and Richards, Jack (eds.) *Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 242-259.

Richards, Jack C. and Lockhart, Charles (1996) *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, Keith (2003) *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Richards, Keith (2009) 'Interviews', in Heigham, Juanita and Croker, Robert A (eds.) *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 182-199.

Richardson, Virginia (1996) 'The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach', in Sikula, J, Buttery, T. J and Guyton, E (eds.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. 2nd edn. New York: Macmillan, pp. 102-119.

Richardson, Virginia (2003) 'Preservice teachers' beliefs', in Raths, J and Mcaninch, A. C. (eds.) *Teacher Beliefs and Classroom Performance: The impact of teacher education*. Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, pp. 1-22.

Riley, Kathleen C (2011) 'Language Socialization and Language Ideologies', in Duranti, A, Ochs, E and Schieffelin, B (eds.) *The Handbook of Language Socialization*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, p. 493.

Robson, Colin and McCartan, Kieran (2016) *Real World Research*. 4th edn. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Rokeach, Milton (1968) *Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values: A Theory of Organization and Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rumsey, Alan (1990) 'Wording, Meaning, and Linguistic Ideology', *American Anthropologist*, 92(2), pp. 346-361.

Sato, Shinji (2009) 'Communication as an intersubjective and collaborative activity: When the native/non-native speaker's identity appears in computer-mediated communication',

Bibliography

in Doerr, Neriko Musha (ed.) *The Native Speaker Concept: Ethnographic Investigations of Native Speaker Effects*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 277-293.

Schieffelin, Bambi B, Woolard, Kathryn Ann and Kroskrity, Paul V (1998) *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press. 16.

Seargeant, Philip (2009) *The Idea of English in Japan: Ideology and the Evolution of a Global Language*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2009) 'Common ground and different realities: world Englishes and English as a lingua franca', *World Englishes*, 28(2), pp. 236-245.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2011) *Understanding English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Seidlhofer, Barbara (2018) 'Standard English and the dynamics of ELF variation', in Jenkins, Jennifer, Baker, Will and Dewey, Martin (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of English as a Lingua Franca*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Taylor and Francis, pp. 85-100.

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

Siegel, Jeff (2006) 'Language ideologies and the education of speakers of marginalized language varieties: Adopting a critical awareness approach', *Linguistics and Education*, 17(2), pp. 157-174.

Sifakis, Nicos C. (2014) 'ELF awareness as an opportunity for change: a transformative perspective for ESOL teacher education', *Journal of English as a Lingua Franca*, 3(2), pp. 317-335.

Sifakis, Nicos C. and Sougari, Areti (2005) 'Pronunciation issues and EIL pedagogy in the periphery: A survey of Greek state school teachers' beliefs', *Tesol Quarterly*, 39(3), pp. 467-488.

Sifakis, Nicos C. and Sougari, Areti (2010) 'Between a rock and a hard place: An investigation of EFL teachers' beliefs on what keeps them from integrating Global English

in their classrooms', in Gagliardi, Cesare and Maley, Alan (eds.) *EIL, ELF, Global English: Teaching and Learning Issues*. Bern: Peter Lang, pp. 301-320.

Silverstein, Michael (1979) 'Language structure and linguistic ideology', in Clyne, R, Hanks, W and Hofbauer, C (eds.) *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*. Chicago: Chicago Linguist. Soc., pp. 193-247.

Silverstein, Michael (1996) 'Monoglot 'standard' in America: standardization and metaphors of linguistic hegemony', in Brenneis, D L and Macaulay, R K S (eds.) *The Matrix of Language: Contemporary Linguistic Anthropology*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Silverstein, Michael (1998) 'The uses and utility of ideology: a commentary', in Schieffelin, B, Woolard, Kathryn A and Kroskrity, Paul V (eds.) *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 123-145.

Simons, Helen (2014) 'Case study research: in-depth understanding in context', in Leavy, Patricia (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 455-470.

Singh, Rajendra (1998) *The Native Speaker: Multilingual Perspectives*. New Dehli: Sage.

Skott, Jeppe (2015) 'The Promises, Problems, and Prospects of Research on Teachers' Beliefs', in Fives, Helenrose and Gill, Michele Gregoire (eds.) *International Handbook of Research on Teachers' Beliefs*. New York: Routledge, pp. 13-30.

Smakman, Dick (2012) 'The definition of the standard language: a survey in seven countries', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, (218), pp. 25-58.

Song, Sun Yung (2015) 'Teachers' beliefs about language learning and teaching', in Bigelow, Martha and Ennser-Kananen, Johanna (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Educational Linguistics*. New York: Routledge, pp. 263-275.

Spolsky, Bernard (2004) *Language policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stake, Robert E. (2005) 'Qualitative case studies', in Denzin, N K and Lincoln, Y S (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 3rd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 443-466.

Bibliography

Stake, Robert E. (2006) *Multiple Case Study Analysis*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Thompson, Alba G. (1992) 'Teachers´beliefs and conceptions: A synthesis of the research', in Grouwns, Douglas A. (ed.) *Handbook of Research on Mathematics Teaching and Learning*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co, Inc, pp. 127-146.

Thomson, Ron I. (2013) *Proceedings of the 4th Pronunciation in Second Language Learning and Teaching Conference*. Ames, IA: Iowa State University, Aug. 2012.

Timmis, Ivor (2002) 'Native-speaker norms and International English: a classroom view', *ELT journal*, 56(3), pp. 240-249.

Trousdale, Graeme (2010) *An introduction to English sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Trudgill, Peter (1979) 'Standard and non-standard dialects of English in the United Kingdom: problems and policies', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 1979(21), pp. 9-24.

Trudgill, Peter (2002) *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Urmston, Alan (2003) 'Learning to teach English in Hong Kong: The opinions of teachers in training', *Language and Education*, 17(2), pp. 112-137.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (1998) *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.

Veliz, Mauricio (2011) 'A critical interrogation of the prevailing teaching model(s) of pronunciation at teacher-training college level: A Chilean evidence-based study', *Literatura y Lingüística*, 23, pp. 213-236.

Verloop, Nico, Van Driel, Jan and Meijer, Paulien (2001) 'Teacher knowledge and the knowledge base of teaching', *International Journal of Educational Research*, 35(5), pp. 441-461.

Verschueren, Jef (2011) *Ideology in Language Use: Pragmatic guidelines for empirical research*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, Michael J. (1991) *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wardhaugh, Ronald and Fuller, Janet M (2015) *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. 7th edn. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Watts, Richard J. (1999) 'The social construction of standard english: Grammar writers as a 'discourse community'', in Watts, Richard J and Bex, Tony (eds.) *Standard English: The Widening Debate*. London: Routledge.

Watts, Richard J. (2000) 'Mythical strands in the ideology of prescriptivism', in Wright, Laura (ed.) *The Development of Standard English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 29-48.

Widdowson, Henry G. (1994) 'The ownership of English', *TESOL quarterly*, 28(2), pp. 377-389.

Winford, Donald (2003) 'Ideologies of language and socially realistic linguistics', in Makoni, S *et al.* (eds.) *Black Linguistics: Language, Society and Politics in Africa and the Americas*. London: Routledge, pp. 21-39.

Woods, Devon (1996) *Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Woods, Devon (2003) 'The Social Construction of Beliefs in the Language Classroom', in Kalaja, Paula and Ferreira Barcelos, Ana Maria (eds.) *Beliefs About SLA: New Research Approaches*. New York: Springer, pp. 201-229.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (1998) 'Introduction: Language Ideology as a Field of Inquiry', in Schieffelin, B, Woolard, Kathryn A and Kroskrity, Paul V (eds.) *Language ideologies: Practice and theory*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 3-47.

Woolard, Kathryn A. (2016) *Singular and Plural: Ideologies of Linguistic Authority in 21st Century Catalonia*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Woolard, Kathryn A. and Schieffelin, Bambi B. (1994) 'Language ideology', *Annual review of anthropology*, pp. 55-82.

Bibliography

Yerrick, Randy, Parke, Helen and Nugent, Jeff (1997) 'Struggling to promote deeply rooted change: The "filtering effect" of teachers' beliefs on understanding transformational views of teaching science', *Science Education*, 81, pp. 137-159.

Yin, Robert K. (2009) *Case Study Research: Design and methods*. 4th edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Young, Tony Johnstone and Sachdev, Itesh (2011) 'Intercultural communicative competence: exploring English language teachers' beliefs and practices', *Language Awareness*, 20(2), pp. 81-98.

Young, Tony Johnstone and Walsh, Steve (2010) 'Which English? Whose English? An investigation of 'non-native' teachers' beliefs about target varieties', *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 23(2), pp. 123-137.

Zheng, Hongying (2009) 'A review of research on EFL pre-service teachers' beliefs and practices', *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, 4(1).

Zheng, Hongying (2015) *Teacher Beliefs as a Complex System*. Cham: Springer.