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Abstract

This research explores perspectives of UK English language teachers regarding the operationalization of the Common European Framework of Reference for languages (CEFR), through pedagogic exploitation of communicative *can-do* statements. A strong feature of the CEFR's influence has been on standard-setting in high-stakes examinations and institutional structuring of curricula, which can be seen as largely top-down from the perspective of the teacher. Therefore the research takes a qualitative bottom-up approach to revealing practitioners' beliefs about working with the CEFR *can-do* statements, especially to inform planning and delivery of lessons and negotiation of syllabus content with learners. Small-scale focus groups were held with teachers at two Eurocentres London schools, and also with a comparative group of in-service teachers working in diverse London contexts, evaluating options for the use of CEFR *can-do* statements designed for self-assessment and listed in published materials. Four themes were identified from the focus group data which informed the development of questions for an embedded qualitative evaluation of two sample CEFR-benchmarked published coursebook units, in order to deepen understanding of the extent to which such materials might support a *can-do* oriented approach. The research concludes that *can-do* statements were often perceived by participants as problematic for learner-centred lesson planning, but were positively regarded as an independent reference for diagnostic evaluation of learner level. Analysis of the sample coursebook materials indicates that although detailed referencing to *can-do* statements is provided by publishers, this is less well integrated into the focus of course activities, and there are insufficient opportunities evidenced for adapting activities to learners' personal experiences and interests that would facilitate teachers' negotiation of a learner-centred and *can-do* oriented syllabus. These findings imply that a *can-do* oriented approach to language pedagogy may require new solutions for cross-referencing of communicative competences to the lesson tasks, topics and form-focused activities in available published teaching materials, and that the traditional sequential organisation of printed coursebooks may be an obstacle to this.
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1 Introduction

It is now quite natural to find references to the common reference levels ‘A1’ - ‘C2’ in English language teaching departments: on the covers of books, in organisation of materials, and in information about exam targets and specifications. In-service English language teachers in the UK are likely to be very familiar with the term ‘Common European Framework of Reference for languages’ (CEFR, or ‘CEF’), but there is perhaps less widespread understanding and agreement regarding its implications for the practice of language teaching. At the time of writing the CEFR text has been translated in to 40 languages (North 2014:1) and the common scale of proficiency has become a ‘crucial’ reference point well beyond Europe for governmental policies that determine immigrant rights to entry and citizenship, and national curriculum targets (McNamara, 2011; Alderson, 2007). Hence it 'has become difficult to ignore' (North, 2014:38). However, it is debatable to what extent the CEFR is consciously exploited in the majority of ELT classroom settings beyond the accepted replacement or approximated interchangeability of generic terms such as ‘elementary’, ‘intermediate’ and ‘advanced’ with the calibrated common reference levels such as ‘A2’, ‘B1’ and ‘C1’. Although the CEFR is not intended to prescribe practice (Council of Europe, 2001), the fact that these levels represent a ‘conceptual grid’ of illustrative can-do descriptors of language competence (Ibid., 2001), means that their adoption as high-stakes learning targets should logically be based on the integrated use of the can-do statements to inform course goals. However, the ideal may often be far from the reality, and Figueras (2012) observes that such principles have still not effectively transferred to classrooms or to teaching materials.

North (2014) provides a detailed guide to planning and teaching with the CEFR can-do statements, and more general advice of this kind can be found in leaflets from major publishers (Pearson Longman, 2013; Cambridge ESOL, 2011) not to mention the CEFR text itself (Council of Europe, 2001). However, very little published research exists describing how in-service teachers think through the challenges presented by such pedagogic exploitation of the CEFR can-do statements, beyond a selection of case studies (Keddle, 2004; Meister & Newby 2005; EAQUALS², 2008; Sahinkarakas et al. 2010). These studies mostly chart successful institutional introductions of can-do oriented procedures initiated by the authors; nevertheless, teachers' concerns are often reported about classroom
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implementation, perceived added workload and integration with existing syllabuses (Sahinkarakas et al., 2010, EAQUALS, 2008). Figueras (2012:481) underlines that when working with can-do descriptors in the classroom the 'shifting from observable behaviour to achievable identifiable targets' is essential to the intended action-oriented approach of the CEFR, but concedes that this is 'not always straightforward'.

Tribble (2012) highlights that the beliefs teachers hold about teaching and learning can affect their abilities to adopt new approaches to instruction. While the can-do statements represent a set of criteria for profiling success rather than a new methodology, Woods (1996:5) points out how the nature of any adopted success criteria raises important questions about how teachers and researchers theorise language learning in relation to teaching activities, often in different ways. Therefore teacher beliefs and practices are a significant dimension in evaluating the impact of the CEFR on the classroom pedagogy, which has been reportedly far less than that on assessment (Westhoff, 2007, Little, 2007; 2011; Figueras, 2012).

In my own professional context at Eurocentres, a private international language school, I have had first-hand experience of working with and contributing to an established English language curriculum of can-do statements, benchmarked to the CEFR. A key ongoing challenge facing teachers on such a programme is the relating of lesson tasks and corresponding materials to a core list of can-do statements as learning outcomes, which by necessity describe communicative competences in a broad way, rather than as sequential teaching items. At Eurocentres this has led to some supportive local innovations such as the 'resource finders' described by North (2014:124), which make connections between multiple learning resources and multiple can-dos. This kind of solution underlines the key role that structuring of teaching materials has to play in the successful implementation (or not) of a CEFR action-oriented approach, and the industry-wide convention of working from a core coursebook may be out of step with this. Given the general continued organisation of coursebooks around topics, functions and grammar (Figueras, 2012, Westhoff, 2007), teachers can often struggle to adapt sequencing and selection of coursebook content to can-do focused objectives negotiated with their learners, especially if such objectives have been informed by diagnostic can-do self-assessment and broader needs analysis.

In order to address the perceived complexities of the issues outlined here, this paper takes a qualitative approach to investigating teacher’s shared perspectives and beliefs regarding the operationalisation of can-do statements, both as a learner self-assessment tool and as stated learning objectives. Small focus groups of experienced in-service teachers were held within and external to Eurocentres, drawing on the potential of focus groups to provide a
stimulus for members to articulate normally unarticulated normative assumptions (Bloor et al., 2001) and explore hypotheses about can-do procedures through peer discussion. A second phase of the study developed questions from themes identified in the focus groups, in order to evaluate how sampled units from two CEFR-benchmarked coursebooks might support a can-do action-oriented approach. This follows an embedded mixed methods design (Ivankova & Creswell, 2009), with the aim of deepening understanding of the challenges and practicalities discussed in the focus groups, through the interrogation of popular and current published materials relevant to ELT programmes in the UK.

There are five chapters to this paper including the introduction and literature review. Each stage of the research is given its own chapter within which the relevant research methodology is described; therefore there is no separate methodology chapter. This allows development of a more coherent account of the rationale, implementation and results of each of the two stages in chapters 3 and 4 respectively, and these results are drawn together in a synthesis of findings in the conclusion, chapter 5.
2 Literature Review

2.1 Background to the CEFR *can-do* statements

The development of the CEFR can be traced back as far as the 1970s, through a series of projects in which the Council of Europe sought to describe achievement in language study independently of the structural features of particular languages, in order to facilitate labour mobility across member states with 'transportable and interpretable credentials' (McNamara 2011:502). This was based on a unit credit concept that favoured an action-oriented approach to defining language learning needs in terms of real-world situations and social interactions (Little, 2006), treating learners as both individuals and social agents (Council of Europe 2001). Trim (2010a:xxvi) states that the creation of a scheme of levels was not in fact the first priority of the original Council of Europe Working Party, who were more concerned with the 'gearing of objectives to the distinctive needs of the learner', and the CEFR levels of proficiency developed 'piecemeal', firstly with the threshold level describing basic independence a foreign language, followed by a process of subdivision and addition resulting in the breakthrough, waystage and vantage and levels, in response to user demand (Ibid., 2011).

This process anticipated the 'branching' or 'concertina' approach (North, 2014) that became a key feature of three broad common reference levels of Basic User (A1-A2), Independent User (B1-B2) and Proficient User (C1-C2) published in the final scheme by the Council of Europe in 2001, with the addition of finer plus levels A2+, B1+ and B2+. The CEFR levels organise *can-do* statements into scales of language proficiency intended to be equally applicable across different European languages, a principle exemplified in the Eurocentres curriculum since the 1980s (North, 2014). A large-scale Swiss research project (North & Schneider, 1998) scaled the levels through empirical Rasch analysis of the way sets of *can-do* statements were interpreted in teacher ratings of groups of learners (Council of Europe 2001:217). It is perhaps this large-scale empirical validation - along with CEFR's perceived neutrality (Council of Europe and Language Policy Division, 2007b) - that has made the scales of *can-do* descriptors such an unprecedented success as a preferred benchmark for language assessment and published courses worldwide. Nevertheless, this should not be mistaken for the scaling of actual proficiency, and the use of teacher perceptions rather than those of trained assessors or applied linguists reflects an essentially pragmatic and atheoretical approach (Alderson 2007:662; Fulcher,2004:258; North 2014:23).
The resultant detailed bank of calibrated can-do illustrative descriptors were included in a taxonomic descriptive scheme (Council of Europe, 2001) and formed the basis of a global scale using the CEFR levels, along with tables for self-assessment and rating of learner performances, subdivided into different skills¹. The descriptive scheme deals with a whole range of possible communicative language activities the learner may attempt including 40 can-do scales in CEFR chapter 4, and the communicative language competences the learner may therefore employ, including 13 can-do scales in CEFR chapter 5 (Council of Europe, 2001). In figure 1 Morrow (2004:9) gives a visual overview of the 32 communicative language activity can-do scales underlying the global scale, which can thus be categorised according spoken, written or audio-visual texts (leaving out those dealing with integrated and strategic activities). This shows greater variety and focus with regard to spoken activities, and some variation between medium, genre or task as the salient focus for each scale. There is a tendency for non-spoken scales to focus more on the medium of communication - which for some scales inevitably shows their origins in the pre-internet era:

![Communicative activities which underlie the global scale](image)

Figure 1 Communicative activities which underlie the global scale (Morrow, 2004:9)

¹ See appendices B and C
However, it should not be overlooked that the illustrative scales only form a part of the CEFR descriptive scheme, which also covers such diverse areas as the situational contexts of language use, possible communication 'themes' (i.e. topics), mediating activities and strategies, paralinguistic features, text and media types, types of knowledge and know-how including sociocultural and intercultural knowledge, learner strategies and study skills. Heyworth (2004:17) notes that the common scale has had so much influence that it is often referred to mistakenly as if it is the whole of the framework, and Alderson (2007:661) comments that although the descriptive scheme represents the greatest part of the CEFR, it is much less referred to than the illustrative scales 'and is less useful'. This could be symptomatic of characteristics of the core text itself, which has often been perceived as overly complex and difficult for language teachers to approach (Alderson, 2007:661; Faez et al., 2011:12; Jones & Saville,2009:53; Council Of Europe, 2002:6, Meister & Newby, 2005:98, Council of Europe and Language Policy Division, 2007b:4.5.2), to the extent of being found by some users (perhaps unjustly) as 'completely baffling' (Morrow 2004:7). Indeed, in a survey of MA students on foreign language teaching courses Komorowska (2004:59) the only parts of the text they found quite clear were the can-do descriptors. It is therefore reasonable to assume that engagement with the CEFR for the majority of English language teachers will not be through the descriptive scheme, but through the levels and the use of communicative can-do styled statements featured in course book curricula, assessment criteria such as those developed for IELTS productive skills4, and learner self-assessment checklists, such as those featured in the European Language Portfolio (ELP).

2.2 Working with the ELP and 'user-oriented' can-do statements

The development of the common reference levels has been described as 'intertwined' with that of the European Language Portfolio (ELP) (North 2007:656). This is a learner-centred document aiming to encourage 'plurilingual development' (Council of Europe, 2001:20) by providing the means for the learner to record their developing linguistic identity in multiple languages in a language passport, promoting learner autonomy through regular self-assessment against checklists of action-oriented can-do statements contained in a language biography; also included is a dossier of samples of best work (Little, 2005). It is advised in developing ELPs that the more generalised CEFR descriptors can be 'tweaked' according to the educational context or 'unzipped' into several sub-descriptors in order to better suit the specific target language learning domain of the learner (North,2014:57).

\[4\] See appendix D
A central thread running through the CEFR and ELP has been the exploitation of *can-do* statements that are intended to be clear and transparent and positively formulated even at low levels, with the aim of having stand-alone integrity - thus negating the need for comparison to other descriptors for interpretation (Council of Europe, 2001:30). The fact that such descriptors can be user-oriented for teachers and learners (Council Of Europe, 2001:39) is arguably at the core of the CEFR's stated capacity to bring curriculum, pedagogy and assessment into much closer inter-dependence, by providing a basis for setting learning objectives, developing activities and material, and designing assessment tasks (Little, 2011:382).

Teachers have reported the positive effect on learner motivation achieved through the use of ELP *can-do* checklists (Faez et al 2011; Sahinkarakas et al, 2010; Little, 2007), though with some scepticism about the accuracy of self-assessments, and a general frustration with the challenges of consulting learners individually and preparing teaching tasks to address needs identified in the portfolios (Sahinkarakas et al, 2010). This need to constantly create new lesson material points to the ‘wealth of anecdotal evidence’ that ELPs have largely been developed separately from curricula (Little, 2007:652) and thus viewed as an optional extra involving more work for teachers. Hence the widespread adoption of the ELP has been reported to be ‘elusive’ and particularly inhibited when used alongside a coursebook (Little 2012:11). This is unsurprising given that coursebooks provide a form of ready-made syllabus that can only be imperfectly mapped to a locally developed ELP.

2.3 Influence of published courses and institutional standards of attainment

The reported problem of mismatch between ELP and coursebook highlights the fact that published coursebooks often play a ‘dominant role’ in ELT programmes (Richards 1993:2), and these may or may not contain their own set of *can-do* descriptors to organise learning material and self-assessment. Even where a coursebook includes *can-do* statements these are not, and cannot be provided in the text as customised to the specific teaching context in the way that was intended for the ELP. Moreover, coursebooks in stating a level on the front cover only serve to feed the illusion that completion of a coursebook equates to completing a CEFR level, reinforcing misunderstandings that the average learner should aim to achieve linear parallel progression in all skills regardless of their personal communicative needs.
This misunderstanding is arguably further bolstered by high stakes public examination requirements stating equal minimum scores in all skills. An example is the minimum CEFR equivalences quoted for IELTS by the official UK visa application information webpage on Gov.uk (n.d., accessed 2014), hence illustrating the legal weight carried by CEFR benchmarking of achievement. North (2014:25) describes how the mathematical scaling of the can-do statements gives them the strength of stability in that 'the learner would acquire the proficiency in the order shown and not in a reverse order'. However the 'horizontal dimension' (Council Of Europe, 2001:24) provided by the range of illustrative scales means that learners are not assumed to progress up all the descriptor scales simultaneously, and this is intended to allow the development of learner profiles that acknowledge the 'inevitable' differences between mastery of productive and receptive language activities (Council Of Europe and Language Policy Division 2007a:III.2.1). Thus 'profiling not levelling' (North 2014:11) is a key feature of the CEFR's intended practical uses of planning language learning programmes, assessment certification and self-directed learning (Council Of Europe, 2001, Figueras, 2007). This can arguably be seen as overlooked by the pragmatic concerns of coursebook publishers and institutional admissions targets, which play a key role in determining the institutional expectations placed on teachers.

2.4 Implications of can-do statements for methodological approaches

In measuring progress the can-do statements demonstrate a construct of assessment, representing an 'assumed view of language proficiency', which would imply an underlying theoretical standpoint on how languages are learned (McNamara, 2011:501). However, the CEFR is very clear that it should not 'embody any one particular approach to language teaching to the exclusion of all others' (Council Of Europe, 2001:18). North (2014:23) points out that the practical decision to use scaled teacher ratings bypassed the lack agreement in SLA research at the time on 'even the simplest fixed orders of acquisition'. Nevertheless, the CEFR's learner-centred and action-oriented approach is far from neutral (Heyworth 2004:13), and North (2014:66) states that the CEFR levels 'did not appear fully formed out of the blue' but were developed from those proposed by David Wilkins, author of Notional Syllabuses (1976). Given the Council of Europe's key role in the development of notional syllabuses (Meister & Newby 2005), the CEFR is often described as having a notional-functional basis, despite the fact that notions represent 'semantico-grammatical categories' with a systematic relationship to grammatical form (Newby, 2008:6) which is not attempted in the CEFR. Moreover, the can-do statements represent more broadly defined competences
than functions (Green, 2012:40) which the CEFR recommends should rather form part of the language specifications for particular languages (Council Of Europe, 2001:30).

This consideration, along with the need for simplicity and brevity in user-oriented descriptors (Fleming, 2009), means that the can-do descriptors are often perceived as relatively abstract (Alderson et al., 2006), and this has been considered both their weak point and strong point (Meister & Newby, 2005:92). Interestingly, Keddle (2004:49) suggests the linking of 'concept areas' to descriptors to allow easier linking of supporting grammar in the target language syllabus, which sounds not dissimilar to the now largely disused concept of notions. However, it can be argued that the salience of the can-do illustrative descriptors for communicative activities and competences has chimed very well with thinking about communicative language teaching (CLT). The CEFR can-do descriptors as a stand-alone tool support an emphasis on language use rather than language knowledge with a minimal focus on form. Some see a downplaying of explicit form-focus as a key principle of CLT (Mangubhai et al., 2004:292; Clarke, 1989:81) and others as a damaging misconception about CLT (Thompson, 1996:10). Contrary to popular view the CEFR does acknowledge the necessity of developing formal linguistic competence as a secondary feature of the 'double articulation of language' (Council of Europe, 2001:16). Nevertheless in general the communicative paradigm, as a product of the social turn in ELT during the 1970s and 1980s, has shared many values with the CEFR that have in turn fed back into Council of Europe projects (Green, 2012:7). A key concept shared with CLT is of tailoring programmes to reflect the practical communicative needs of learners (Nunan 2004:7) rather than to pursue an unrealistic ideal of complete linguistic mastery.

2.5 Relating can-do statements to language specifications

Despite these shared values the CEFR should not be regarded as a manifesto of CLT or indeed any particular methodology, and the can-do statements form just part of a multi-faceted treatment of communicative competence including 'pragmatic', 'sociolinguistic', 'intercultural', 'strategic' and 'existential' competences (Council Of Europe, 2001). Similarly North (in EAQUALS, 2008) describes common misconceptions about implementing the CEFR as 'basing the syllabus around task-based learning' and 'not teaching grammar'. Action-oriented can-do descriptors do nevertheless encourage a shift in pedagogic routines (Westhoff, 2007:676) away from a more traditional grammatically organised syllabus, and this has been reported as one of the key challenges in their implementation (Faez et al.
2011:12). In one study an English teacher noted how his first attempts to formulate customised can-do statements resulted in form-focused wording such as 'I can write a question with do/does' which needed to be subsequently re-phrased with a more communicative focus, causing him to reflect on his own teaching approach (Sahinkarakas et al. 2010:70). It is perhaps a positive by-product of using can-do statements as classroom learning objectives that awareness is raised of how learners should aim to realise communicative intentions, rather than simply generate grammatically correct sentences (Meister & Newby 2005:52).

Nevertheless this touches on the frequent and perhaps natural desire among users for can-do statements to represent a complete curriculum dealing in linguistic and methodological absolutes, with precise off-the-peg relevance of descriptors to daily linguistic teaching aims. This is contrasted with the relative impossibility of a common framework of ever fulfilling this function. The fact that the CEFR is intended as a 'heuristic to stimulate curriculum development and reform' (North, 2014:39) has perhaps been difficult to accept because of the amount of interpretation involved for users in achieving this. And yet through documenting a broad range of competences in the illustrative scales the CEFR has aimed for comprehensiveness in making more explicit the complexity involved in the teaching and learning of languages (Morrow, 2004:6). Trim (2010a:xi) emphasises the central importance of elaborating on the CEFR by defining optimal grammatical and lexical progression for each target language. This aim is exemplified for English by two prominent projects:

1. The English Profile project, which has set out to produce English reference level descriptors using empirical evidence drawn from a growing bank learner corpora built by Cambridge University Press and Cambridge Language Assessment (Saville & Hawkey, 2010).
2. The British Council / EAQUALS Core Inventory for General English (North, Ortega and Sheehan, 2010) which drew on a meta-study of CEFR-based school syllabuses, examination syllabuses and published coursebooks to provide an inventory of functions, grammar discourse markers vocabulary areas and topics recommended by educators for Levels A1 to C1 (North, 2014:89).

Despite the growing availability of such data, the CEFR itself is seen as having a 'soft touch' over grammar that creates a perceived barrier for teachers and course designers to integrate can-do statements into existing syllabuses, especially those that foreground grammar progression (Keddle, 2004:50). Westhoff (2007:676) observes that very little is stated in the CEFR descriptors themselves about what learners should know in order to carry out the
communicative tasks described, and there are only occasional 'clues' indicating a more exemplar based approach at lower levels with descriptors such as 'lexically organised repertoire', and references to conscious rule-based awareness of form appearing from level B2 onwards (Ibid, 2007:676). This is understandable considering that the illustrative descriptors are concerned with 'what students can do and how well they can do it' (Cambridge University Press, 2011:14). It is perhaps here that a parallel can reasonably be drawn with task-based language teaching (TBLT), which has been described as the 'new orthodoxy' in ELT (Andon & Ekerth, 2009:288), and which emphasises a primary focus on meaning in classroom activities as tasks, whereby language is 'not just something one learns but something one does' (Graves, 1996:22).

Critics of the task-based approach have highlighted the danger of a lack of form-focus leading to fluent but unchallenging or inaccurate language (Foster, 1999:69), or a proceduralisation of lexicalised language with insufficient underlying change (Skehan, 1996a:28). North (2014:150) comments that grammatical input 'has to come from somewhere', and a primary focus on meaning should not negate explicit form-focus 'at some point' for learning to take place. However, in adapting CEFR descriptors to set can-do classroom learning objectives, it is a small step to convert them into communicative tasks and practice of functions for specific situations, but arguably requires more skill and experience to flexibly integrate form-focus, as in the 'incidental' approach often argued in task based theory (Nunan, 2004:9). Skehan (2003:11) observes that where task completion is the driving force in class, teaching preparation is a much less exact process, requiring a 'broader type of readiness for anything to occur, compared to the more comfortable ability to prepare for the pre-ordained structure of the day', indicating that busy or inexperienced teachers may be inclined to retreat into the relative safety of planning a syllabus around a series of grammar points. This has been characterised as the distinction between flexible 'focus on form' and more structural, pre-sequenced 'focus on forms' (Long, 1991, cited in Fotos & Nassaji, 2007). Moreover, there may be a strongly perceived expectation from the students themselves for the teacher to take the latter approach, perhaps arising from culturally based assumptions about language teaching, or from a general desire to have the mechanics of the language systematically demystified. Hence North (2014:136) sees it as commonplace for teachers to operate a grammatically based syllabus while paying 'lip service' to communicative goals.
2.6 Challenges for teachers in implementing an action-oriented approach

Despite the above points, it would be an over-simplification to assume that any difficulties experienced with integrating form-focus into an action-oriented can-do approach are purely down to conservative attitudes, or a lack of teacher confidence to lead phases of spontaneous form-focus. In a survey of English language teachers from 18 countries, Borg & Burns (2008:467) found that the large majority of teachers ‘overwhelmingly felt’ that the integration of grammar with teaching of other skills was an effective strategy they employed. A different kind of challenge is suggested by Woods (1996:108) as arising from assumptions in the literature that content, method and goal are separate entities, where for the teacher these are simply aspects of the same ‘entity’ or unit in their conceptual course structure viewed from different angles. Therefore the focus of can-do statements on the end product of teaching in terms of learner performances, as seemingly separate from the means to train them (which the CEFR purposely does not dictate), leaves a conceptual gap that can represent the greater part of the teacher’s personal lesson planning considerations.

Graves (1996:26) suggests that for many teachers planning begins with ideas about the 'course in action' in terms of material they will use, activities students will do, techniques they will employ, rather than determining objectives and conceptualizing content. Therefore where a coursebook is used, the sequencing of activities in that book will naturally be influential on the planning process. Westhoff (2007) describes how almost without exception European foreign language coursebooks build on a 'grammatical canon' based on a Presentation-Practice-Production (PPP) model incorporating assignments in 'communicative guises'. Though many contemporary ELT coursebooks now include checklists of can-do statements, this may often be a superficial mapping onto the existing structure of the book, as exemplified in North’s (2014) appraisal of New English File Elementary (Oxenden et al., 2006) as being a 'snake syllabus' with skills and functions snaking round a core of grammatical progression.

Similarly Figueras (2012:481) comments that despite having all the trimmings of CEFR alignment such as correlation to the CEFR levels and portfolio checklists, the tables of contents are largely 'still the same as ten years ago' with headings arranged by topics and functions. However, it would be almost impossible for a printed book to integrate form-focus spontaneously, and the best it can do is equip the teacher to do this. A popular approach in coursebook design identified by Nitta & Gardner (2005) is to incorporate consciousness raising tasks that begin with a text in the target language and require some operation with it.
that makes certain linguistic properties explicit. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that for reasons of space coursebook writers will be tempted to exploit the majority of included texts in this way. This further reinforces the inevitability of a 'pre-ordained language structure of the day', which is likely to be more dominant than the intended learner-centred selection of can-do oriented communicative activities as classroom objectives and learning outcomes.

2.7 Research questions

Such outcomes are not necessarily in line with contemporary coursebooks' stated communicative philosophy, and Woods (1996) highlights the inevitable gap between what happens in the classroom for the learners, and the way this is interpreted by teachers and materials writers according to what should happen. Nevertheless, Borg (1998) also points out that teachers' personal pedagogic systems are based on perceptions of what works well in the classroom. Therefore the practical experiential basis for in-service teacher beliefs can provide valuable insights into how can-do statements and coursebook content may be accepted or rejected, as belonging to a range of possibilities balanced in what has been described as the inherently 'tentative' process of planning lessons (Woods, 1996:179). This leads to the first research question: 'to what extent do English language teachers working in the UK view the exploitation of CEFR can-do statements as assisting in the effective negotiation, planning and delivery of lessons and courses?'.

Given the key role ELT coursebook materials can play in the decision-making process involved in lesson planning and delivery, the options coursebooks make available should also be examined, and this leads to the second research question: 'to what extent do published English language course materials benchmarked to the CEFR support teachers to adopt a CEFR can-do action-oriented approach?'
3 The focus groups

3.1 Research method

3.1.1 Overview

A key aspect of my first research question (see p.13) was a desire to understand more deeply the opinions and attitudes of teachers regarding the utility of *can-do* statements in operationalising the core principles of the CEFR in teaching and learning. The initial premise was my own experience at Eurocentres of a perceived tension between institutional curricular expectations regarding the use of *can-do* statements as learning objectives, and the daily tasks of planning, negotiating and selecting lesson content as experienced by English language teachers. Therefore this study can be viewed as a very practical look at contemporary language pedagogy; however, at its heart lies a focus on how teachers conceptualise language proficiency both to themselves and to their learners, and how they construct their learners’ language learning needs and preferences. Consequently the chosen methodology to address this question is based upon a qualitative ‘interpretive-constructionist’ paradigm, whereby the primary aim is to reveal and interpret the ‘meanings and values’ assigned to the pedagogic procedures and classroom scenarios discussed, rather than seek to describe the instructional use of *can-do* statements in terms of ‘objective reality’ (Rubin & Rubin 2012:15,19). Moreover, the exploratory nature of this research suits a bottom-up approach couched in grounded theory, allowing discussion of this perceived tension between principles and practice to be generated from the research data, rather than testing pre-defined hypotheses (Gibson & Brown, 2009).

As explained in the introduction, this study involved conducting teacher focus groups within and outside my institution, with a follow-up evaluation of the treatment of *can-do* statements in published coursebooks. This followed an ‘embedded’ research design (Ivankova & Creswell, 2009) - by developing key questions for the coursebook evaluation from themes identified in the focus groups. Though this can be seen to provide a form of triangulation, Bloor et al (2001:12) warn against the conception of parallel qualitative methods acting as validation of each other, and it is more fitting to regard them as each deepening and enriching emergent understandings of the topic, which are synthesised in the conclusion.
3.1.2 Rationale for using focus groups

In looking at ways to explore the topic a range of methods were considered, including:

- performing a case study of Eurocentres’ conscious operationalisation of CEFR can-do statements
- observation of lessons in which can-do statements were used
- conducting an industry-wide questionnaire-based survey of teacher and/or learner attitudes towards examples of classroom uses of can-do statements
- conducting individual interviews with teachers and/or learners.

What was missing from all of these was the sufficient opportunity for teachers as the instigators of classroom activity to talk through their perceptions and experiences in interaction with their peers, as occurs in the authentic staff room settings where I have found such issues are typically discussed and challenged.

The operationalisation of the CEFR represents a relatively recent development in language pedagogy which can be viewed as an ongoing movement for change, and Bolitho (2012:42) emphasises the importance of a shared vision between stakeholders at all levels as a starting point for any such process of ‘reculturing’. It follows that a key ingredient in considering the classroom use of can-do statements is extent to which such ideas are supported by group norms shared between teachers, and the role of focus groups in revealing normative understandings and shared discourses is widely discussed in the literature (Bloor et al., 2001; Kitzinger, 1994; Smithson, 2010). This is one factor that has made them traditionally a popular tool for market research, although it should be acknowledged that focus group data is highly context dependent (Smithson, 2010:114), and should not be claimed as representative of a target population (Bertrand et al. 1992:199).

Nevertheless, of equal interest was the potential for focus groups to develop unique emergent meanings through the ‘synergy’ of group interaction (Rabiee, 2004:656), a process which Dornyei (2007:144) describes as ‘the collective experience of group brainstorming’. Given that the extent to which the CEFR has influenced teacher working practices is highly dependent on institutional setting and prior training in relevant principles, it could not be assumed that research participants would have a consistent shared level of knowledge or experience of the topic. Where questionnaire and interview data could principally reveal what teachers think about can-do statements (based on varied levels of relevant experience), a focus group setting permits presentation and discussion of the topic through group activities, and allows exploration of how participants think about it and why (Kitzinger, 1994:104). In
this way the discursive nature of focus groups can highlight confusions and contradictions in 'public discourse' surrounding the topic (Smithson, 2010:115), so that attitudes and perceptions are developed in part through the interaction itself (Krueger: 1994:10).

3.1.3 Focus group criteria

The main considerations in forming groups were setting, size, length, number and composition. Due to constraints of time and resources the number of groups was kept to three, allowing piloting of the focus group procedure with one group, and implementing a revised procedure with two groups, each differing in setting and composition, in order to permit comparative analysis in line with the chosen grounded theory approach. Greenbaum (1998:2) emphasises the need to configure groups with participants who can provide the highest quality discussion about the research topic, and as such it was logical that at least one of the focus groups be drawn from Eurocentres, which is referred to in the CEFR text itself (Council of Europe, 2001:38) as exemplifying the institutional use of can-do statements. A sample of the Eurocentres language curriculum aims for B1 can be found in appendix E.

In practice both the pilot group and one of the main comparative groups were recruited from teaching staff of two different Eurocentres schools, and as Eurocentres schools in the UK are geographically distant it was therefore necessary to recruit from within one school each time, for reasons of convenience to participants. Although Krueger (1994: 18,19) discusses the potentially confounding nature of pre-existing relationships between participants, Kitzinger (1994:105) favours the use of pre-existing groups because of their ability to draw on shared experience and 'provide one of the contexts in which ideas are formed and decisions are made'. Taking these issues into account homogeneous groups were favoured, given that the topic was not of a personally emotive nature. However, the recruitment of the second comparative group from a network of part-time 'M.A. in Applied Linguistics and ELT' students from a London university did provide heterogeneity in terms of experience, as participants were mostly known to each other but working in different contexts across London.

The groups were restricted to 4-6 people, defined in Greenbaum (1998:1) as a legitimate size for a 'mini-group', and with a duration of 1 hour. This size took into account the relative complexity of the topic, given the importance of balancing diversity of contributions against opportunity for all attendees to contribute to sufficient depth (Krueger 1994:17). Convenience also had to be considered for the setting, so the Eurocentres groups met on their school
premises and the M.A. group in the campus library. Although these were not neutral environments, Bloor et.al (2001:39) point out that no venue is in fact neutral and that this should rather be acknowledged in design, thus actively recommending holding collegial groups at the worksite (Ibid. p.37).

3.1.4 Ethical considerations

A chief ethical consideration was my professional relationship to participants in the Eurocentres groups, given my senior role in academic development at Eurocentres. This underlined the need to acknowledge in analysis the moderator as one of unique influential factors on the focus group interaction, rather than trying to control this out of the design. This was highlighted in an application for ethical approval which was granted by the Overseeing Research Ethics Committee. All participants were requested to sign a consent form before being recorded anonymously.

3.1.5 Recruitment and participants

Recruitment was organised via the distribution of flyers within Eurocentres, and via email and lecture announcements at The participating university. In all cases a copy of the participant information sheet was provided emphasising the private and anonymous nature of the research. Interested parties were then issued with a brief screening questionnaire via email according to the recommended length of 4-6 questions (Greenbaum:1998:37), which ensured that all participants were actively teaching English language in the UK and had an overall teaching experience greater than 2 years to draw on in the discussion. The questionnaire also collected a sample of what language coursebooks they had used in the last 2 years, as an extra verification of the relevance of coursebook samples chosen for phase 2 of this study. The participants' details are listed on the next page with a labelling scheme identifying the group each belongs to.

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of in-service experience</th>
<th>Current teaching context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Eurocentres Focus Group (PEG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG1</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG2</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG3</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG4</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG5</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Eurocentres (MEG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG1</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG2</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG3</td>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG4</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG5</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEG6</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA student (KG)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG1</td>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG2</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG3</td>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG4</td>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG5</td>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Participant data for the focus groups
3.1.6 Procedure

A moderator guide\textsuperscript{10} was prepared to be followed flexibly, but with questions organised into four key areas of:

- planning lessons / setting learning objectives
- conducting needs analyses
- working with published materials
- promoting learner autonomy.

This followed a 'semi-structured' design, which Dornyei (2007:145) recommends is only based around 5-10 broad open-ended questions. However, given the need to allow discussion to develop in directions determined by the focus group, a number of question options were laid out according to Rubin and Rubin's (2012:6) categories of main questions, probes and follow up questions. Overall the moderator guide was only followed loosely and not in a stepwise fashion. This approach was facilitated by the inclusion of distinct stages by means of sub-exercises as focusing tasks, allowing cross comparison of reactions across groups (Kitzinger 1994:107), and incorporating specific external stimuli for the group to react to (Greenbaum 1998:64). These tasks were:

1. Using CEFR table\textsuperscript{11} (Council of Europe, 2001) for self-evaluation in a second language and reacting to this with discussion of pedagogic implications.


In the pilot group only the first task was used and it was noted that it became a repeated reference point for the rest of the discussion, which also needed to be more collaborative. Therefore for the following groups a task instruction sheet was developed\textsuperscript{13}, and the second task was designed to focus more explicitly on the use of can-do statements in planning and delivery of lesson content. The reference material for both tasks is illustrated for convenience in figures 2 - 4 on the next pages. Care was taken to also include a factual opening question about teaching context and appropriate 'all things considered' ending questions, as recommended by Krueger (1994:54).

\textsuperscript{10} Appendix J
\textsuperscript{11} Appendix B
\textsuperscript{12} Appendix R
\textsuperscript{13} Appendices K & L
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTANDING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td>I can recognize familiar words and phrases about everyday topics, conversations, and situations in casual conversation. I can understand the main points and details from spoken texts, for example, simple conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. I can understand conversations in a variety of contexts, such as meetings, interviews, and discussions. I can understand conversations on a variety of topics, such as family, friends, work, and leisure activities. I can understand conversations in a variety of contexts, such as meetings, interviews, and discussions. I can understand conversations on a variety of topics, such as family, friends, work, and leisure activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| READING        | I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. |

| SPOKEN INTERACTION | I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. |

| SPOKEN PRODUCTION | I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. I can understand the main points of spoken texts, such as conversations, news reports, and daily life situations. |

| WRITING | I can write a short, simple personal message, the example format being greetings, I can fill in forms with personal details, for example covering my name, address, and address on your letter acceptance form. I can write a short, simple message, the example format being greetings, I can fill in forms with personal details, for example covering my name, address, and address on your letter acceptance form. I can write a short, simple message, the example format being greetings, I can fill in forms with personal details, for example covering my name, address, and address on your letter acceptance form. |

| **Figure 2: Table 2 of the CEFR (Council of Europe, 2001) used in focus group task 1** |

---

**Note:** The table above represents the Common European Reference Level: Self-Assessment Grid. This grid is used to assess language proficiency levels on a scale from A1 to C2.
**Figure 3: New Headway Intermediate 4th Edition (B1-B2) sample unit contents map used in focus group task 2**

(Soars, L. & Soars, 2009)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY/EXERCISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>Can express and respond to feelings, such as surprise, happiness, sadness, interest, and indifference.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Everyday English 1–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical accuracy</td>
<td>Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used 'routines' and patterns associated with more predictable situations.</td>
<td>54, 56, 57, 58, 57</td>
<td>300 books sold! 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Practice 1–3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information exchange</td>
<td>Can find out and pass on straightforward factual information.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Practice 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can exchange, check, and confirm accumulated factual information on familiar routine and non-routine matters within his/her field with some confidence.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Practice 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing and being interviewed</td>
<td>Can carry out a prepared interview, checking and confirming information, though he/she may occasionally have to ask for repetition if the other person's response is rapid or extended.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Practice Roleplay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall listening comprehension</td>
<td>Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or sub related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided speech is clearly articulated in a generally familiar accent.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening 4, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall reading comprehension</td>
<td>Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension.</td>
<td>54, 56, 58, 60</td>
<td>300 books sold! 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading and speaking</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Reading and Speaking 2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall spoken interaction</td>
<td>Can enter unprepared into conversation on familiar topics, express personal opinions and exchange information on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or pertinent to everyday life (e.g., family, hobbies, work, travel, and current events).</td>
<td>54, 54, 60</td>
<td>300 books sold! 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can exchange, check, and confirm information, deal with less routine situations and explain why something is a problem.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>300 books sold! 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonological control</td>
<td>Pronunciation is clearly intelligible even if a foreign accent is sometimes evident and occasional mispronunciations occur.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Everyday English 61 Music of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for orientation</td>
<td>Can scan longer texts in order to locate desired information, and gather information from different parts of a text, or from different texts in order to fulfil a specific task.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Practice 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding conversation between native speakers</td>
<td>Can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around him/her, provided speech is clearly articulated in standard dialect.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>300 books sold! 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary control</td>
<td>Shows good control of elementary vocabulary, but minor errors still occur when expressing more complex thoughts or handling unfamiliar topics and situations.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening 2, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary range</td>
<td>Has a sufficient vocabulary to express him/herself with some circumlocutions on most topics pertinent to his/her everyday life, such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel, and current trends.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: New Headway Intermediate 4th Edition (B1-B2) CEFR mapping unit 7 used in focus group task 2 (enlarged in appendix R) (© Oxford University Press, n.d., accessed 2014)
3.1.7 Transcription and analysis

The interview recordings were imported in .wav format into transcription software on a private drive, in which they were transcribed\(^ {14} \) by setting regular numeric reference points instead of line numbers. A new reference point was applied each time there was a perceived change in interaction - either by a new question being asked, a new speaker beginning a long turn, or the same speaker shifting their emphasis. Interruptions and overlaps were transcribed using a standardised notation convention\(^ {15} \) and relevant paralanguage such as agreement and laughter also noted. In this way a focus was maintained from the start on interactive aspects of group discourse, given the importance assigned to interaction data by Kitzinger (1994) for revealing connections, assumptions, contradictions and changes of opinion.

Krueger (1994:127,135) states that qualitative focus group analysis should be systematic and seek to enlighten. The grounded theoretical approach of this research recommended the development of ‘emergent theories’ by discovering categories through control of similarities and differences between groups (Glaser & Strauss 1967:55), and the principle of systematicity was approached by following principles of ‘logical analysis’ (Bloor et al, 2001:63-70. Therefore viewpoints were grouped, and then explored and interpreted for connections between groups, by means of thematic index codes assigned to the transcript data\(^ {16} \). This principle of allowing thematic interpretation to emerge from the data meant that analysis was integral to the transcription process, and Rabiee (2004:657) points out that such analysis is not linear but consists of overlapping processes.

Each theme is thus worded as a stated belief revealed through qualitative analysis of multiple contributions, and the extent to which each stated belief is supported or challenged by the transcript data is evaluated with examples and discussion in section 3.2. The following themes were identified and colour coded in the transcript coding:

- 'CEFR *can-do* statements represent and over-generalisation of language use and improvement.'
- 'Lesson planning is influenced by more factors than the CEFR *can-do* statements address.'
- 'Integration of CEFR *can-so* statements with course content is problematic.'
- 'CEFR *can-do* statements are a useful roadmap and reflection tool.'

\(^{14}\) Appendices O,P,Q
\(^{15}\) Appendix N Appendix M
\(^{16}\)
In order to address how such beliefs were elaborated across the different focus groups, the discussion of the transcript data does not follow the chronology of focus group questions and tasks as they occurred, and is instead organised according to the above themes. This allows quoted data to be included from the pilot group where it is perceived to demonstrate relevant and informative connections to the main focus group data, despite the non-inclusion of a coursebook focused task in that group.

3.1.8 Methodological limitations

The extent to which this data can address the first research question is limited chiefly by the small number of focus groups I was able to organise during the timespan of the research. For this reason it is important to acknowledge that the data discussed here can only explore particular viewpoints and provide indications for further research rather than 'shore up claims' of generalisability (Richards, 2003:265).
3.2 Focus group results and discussion

3.2.1 Theme 1: 'CEFR Can-do statements represent an over-generalisation of language use and improvement.'

All three focus groups reacted critically to the experience of using Table 2 of the CEFR to rate themselves in a second language. Whilst members of the Post-graduate group (KG) and main Eurocentres group (MEG) expressed some initial enjoyment of using the table, all three groups expressed reservations about the way in which language competence is summarised, and the frequent difficulty experienced with self-placement across level boundaries. The concern with over-simplification was clearly stated by a KG participant:

    KG1: It's trying to describe something that is indescribable, language is so multidimensional and complex, and it doesn't fit into a grid, I don't know where this grid came from, where the research was, or what the foundations are of it. (...)17
    [KG3: ‘The notional functional syllabus I would say, I was going to say before it's assuming that, um, um, functions are everything.]
    (KG.Theme1.1:88-89)

The above illustrates how participants felt moved to critically assess of the authoritativeness and comprehensiveness of the table 2 descriptors, by speculating on theoretical foundations. Of key concern was the perceived limited capacity of standardised self-assessment can-do statements to describe the richness and variety of individual differences in language use, and also the limitations of using such statements to inform classroom practice. The Pilot Eurocentres group (PEG) also interpreted the descriptors as too narrowly 'functional' with respect to form focus:

    PEG4: a lot of this is functional (...) Unless you're teaching that specifically, like a role-play for example, it's quite, it is sometimes quite difficult to see connections with can dos. (...)  
    PEG3: I don't know why we need to have these can-do statements, I don't think there's anything wrong with just teaching some grammar, (...) I think it's perhaps having low expectations that students connect themselves to what they need
    (PEG.Theme1.1:129-30)

17 This symbol (...) denotes redundant words omitted from the quote.
This illustrates how the omission of grammatical features from the Table 2 statements was interpreted as an emphasis on communicative teaching against form-focus by some KG and PEG participants. This reaction can be related to Green's warning (2012:69) that objectives derived from outcomes-based assessment can dominate the classroom, making more acute the problem of 'steering a course between the Scylla of inexplicit generalisation and the Charybdis of atomisation'. MEG participants were more concerned with how indirectly form-focused illustrative descriptors (viewed in task 2) can be difficult to realise as learning objectives in blocks of lesson time:

MEG1: ... 'has sufficient range of vocabulary to express himself...'; On which topic? [General laughter]. Um, yeah the, you can't do that in five minutes obviously, that will take a while to build up.

MEG4: Pretty wide topic, /MEG1: Yes/ everyday life, family hobbies, interests...'
[general laughter]. /MEG1: Come on you've got five minutes!/ Which one do I start with?!

(MEG.Theme1.5:120)

Here the descriptors were co-constructed as being too general for lesson activity planning, but participants elsewhere expressed a need to simplify them for learner consumption, with Table 2 described as 'dense' and 'wordy' (MEGTheme1.4:61), and the Headway Intermediate teacher's resource illustrative descriptors as a 'sea of words' (MEGTheme1.5:93). In both the KG and MEG groups a portfolio style approach was suggested as a solution to engaging learners step by step with the descriptors at the end of lessons, but was also questioned for practical validity:

MEG5:(...) And that could just be a breakdown of these descriptors in an easier way...

MEG3: But, is it, is it really a measure of progress, /MEG1: Will you remember tomorrow? yeah/ or is it just a page full of ticks?

MEG1: Yeah so I'll just take everything now [general laughter]

(MEG.Theme1.4:143-145)

Here the moderator's perceived instrumental role in developing Eurocentres' online learner portfolio procedure should be acknowledged as a possible confounding factor in influencing comments from Eurocentres staff about such an approach. However, across all groups the principle of motivationally 'ticking off' can-do statements was referred to with spontaneous amusement as an invitation for learners to make inaccurate over-simplified self-
assessments. At the same time there was recognition that this was very much dependent on the attitudes of the learners themselves. Participants in all groups explored this further by imagining their own reactions as learners, and in the KG and PEG groups the use of stated classroom objectives with the wording 'will be able to' was constructed as somewhat patronising and unrealistic, as illustrated by the following ironic exchange:

[KG5: So how would you feel if you went into... /KG2: [in sing song voice] 'By the end of this lesson you will be able to, do this and do that' if you were the student (...) [KG2: I'd say, no I don't think I will, /KG5: That's a bit ambitious love! [laughs]/ I think it's still going to take me three months to get, to get this or a few more lessons, maybe it's just those phrases with 'can do'...
(KG.Theme1.9:145)

There was therefore much uncertainty expressed across groups regarding the pedagogical utility of can-do statements as informing selection of language learning activities to fit established time constraints, and critique of what is omitted from the statements in terms of topics relevant to the learners, form-focus, and concrete situational examples of the competences described. At the same time MEG and PEG participants were clear that lesson topics should be at the teacher's discretion, selected independently of any core list of competence objectives (MEG.Theme2.1:103; PEG.Theme2.5:159).

3.2.2 Theme 2 'Lesson planning is influenced by more factors than the CEFR can-do statements address'

Participants in all groups felt it important to cater to diverse learner needs and preferences in the planning of lessons. This ranged from quite casual approaches such as 'just what I think they are going to enjoy that day and if something's been working up to now' (KG.Theme2.5:13) to intensive preparation for exam-based goals, such as a target IELTS score. The process of defining learning aims was often seen as a secondary step in lesson planning, as illustrated by the way MEG teachers reported the communication of lesson aims between colleagues sharing classes:

Moderator: And how is that usually expressed to you? [MEG2: laughs]
MEG1: 'Page 25!' [general laughter] MEG4:
Yes.
MEG2: Page 25 and then you have to work out what the, what the aim is.
MEG6: It's interesting first you said purpose, but then most people if you actually prefer, what would you prefer, [...] you want, you actually think of a specific bit of material almost before the purpose sometimes, picking up…

(MEG.Theme2.6:80-82)

There is shared amusement here at the typified inadequacy of planning information exchange, but MEG6 tentatively picks this up and implies that there is more to this than teacher laziness, as it can be a teacher's preferred thought process to select a piece of material for a group of learners first before distilling the stated aim. Thus MEG6 goes against the flow of the collective joke and group norms it represents, and Kitzinger (1994:113) points to the value of such differences of opinion to reveal how participants 'put their own ideas to work'. This comment is worth considering in the light of the range of possible considerations a teacher balances in planning lessons, and Woods (1996:129) includes in a long list of 'external' factors such as 'estimation of the complexity of a task' and 'estimation of what the group can handle' as operating like 'weights in favour of or against various possibilities and alternatives'. Other MEG participants alluded to this evaluation process but did not break it down in any great detail, for example:

MEG2: Um, just try to see whether I can work with the material or not [laughs] and what it's trying to achieve, and if I'm happy with the material given I'll use it, and if I'm not I will use something else to cover the same aim.

(MEG.Theme2.6:84-88)

The process of balancing multiple considerations was summarised by a PEG participant who explained how the institutional syllabus of can-do statements form a secondary rather than primary reference point for her after looking at student needs and the course book, whereby she states 'I might look there and see what I haven't done for a long time, or haven't done yet' (PEG.Theme2.9:108).

3.2.3 Theme 3: 'Integration of CEFR can-do statements with course content is problematic.'

Thus a picture emerges from the focus groups of a hierarchy of planning priorities usually starting with the learner's needs and preferences, and then selection of material from a coursebook if one is used, with consultation of can-do statements as an optional final
clarification tool. In this equation the inclusion of can-do statements in coursebooks may not be deemed useful at all, as described by a KG participant:

KG5: (...) at the moment the coursebook I've got specifically references the common European framework at the beginning of every unit, but I've only got two students - one girl is a French girl doing journalism, and a Korean girl doing theatre studies, and this whole book is geared towards IELTS - not explicitly - so I'm just doing what I want.
(KEG.Theme2.7:23)

Though MEG participants considered such inclusion of can-dos useful for understanding the underlying aims of coursebook material (MEGTheme3.3:138), some KG and PEG participants were critical of a perceived superficiality of can-do statement mapping in coursebooks as demonstrated in the teacher resource for New Headway Intermediate 4th Edition:

KG1: (...) I'm a bit cynical and I kind of wonder if it's just so they can say that it's pegged to the common European framework, and I suspect that this activity book got written first, and then they went to the common European framework, and were like 'Ooh, what can be matched to it?'
(KG.Theme3.2:38)

PEG4: Sometimes you just get a token thing in a coursebook, which is really, just like, at the end, this unit, after this unit you can /PEG3: Yeah/ /PEG2: Yeah/ /PEG1: laughs/ Der, der, der, and then at the end, okay so now you can, and it's...
[PEG2: But there's been no practice of that, they might have presented it but there's been no practice /PEG4: Yeah/ in the coursebook /PEG3: Yeah/ so how can they do it?
(PEG.Theme3.1:116)

Here PEG2's comment points to a perceived disconnect between stated can-do learning outcomes and the coursebook activities provided to realise those outcomes, which it is left to the teacher to address by generating such activities. Whilst members of all groups described it as a normal process to be selective with coursebook materials and supplement them, some descriptors seen in task 2 were singled out as inherently problematic to teach in a consistent way:
KG2: Yeah, if I can express and respond to feelings, you know, such as surprise and happiness…

KG1: It's like you're talking about a child or an animal

KG2: Mm, it's very personal isn't it, it's very personal, it's very / KG4: Cultural mm/ culturally different how you would respond to happiness and sadness.

KG4: Well it's then how would you measure it as well? Everyone responds to those things differently, there's an assumption that they're going to respond in the same way.

(KG.Theme3.1:120)

This illustrates how participants agreed strongly where can-do lists were perceived to inappropriately attempt to categorise diverse aspects of sociocultural behaviour. Where more 'teachable' communicative can-do statements were identified, there was a tendency to collectively brainstorm related form-focus that could be used as evidence of learning by monitoring learner production:

KG1: I think, (...) one that I think looks easy, (...) 'can give or seek personal views and opinions in discussing topics of interest' /KG4: Yeah/ /KG5: I ticked that one as well/ That's, that would be for me the easiest because you can just teach them lots of opinion language and then, give them topics to discuss (...) KG4: I think that's the thing you can give them lots of stock phrases to, you know, give personal opinions and seek personal opinions, and if they're using, if you then set up a productive task, spoken task at the end then you've got your evidence that they can do that.

(KG.Theme2.2:116-117)

This indicates that evaluating student performance against the descriptor itself was perhaps considered inadequate as a way of gathering evidence of learning, although there was an awareness of the relative artificiality of relying on production of specific target forms, where KG4 goes on to comment that it 'doesn't mean that they'll then be able to give opinions real-life afterwards necessarily' (KG.Theme2.2:118).

At a broader level there were concerns about the expectations raised by mapping of coursebooks to the can-do approach of the CEFR, which ironically was perceived to discourage profiling by offering a complete course across skills in one book:
KG4: I think as well it's also assuming that you are a B2 in all the skills. /KG3: Mm/ Because you don't get coursebooks that are mixed across do you?
(KG.Theme3.4:90)

PEG3: Or on the back they'll say, this book will take you from B1 to B2 [PEG3: frowns] ... It's like, how? It's not, it's not a teacher, it is just a book, presenting stuff that you need boxes to tick in order to get there but, it doesn't mean that they will be that level
(PEG.Theme3.1:118)

In this way coursebooks are seen as feeding unrealistic learner self-evaluations of achievement, and this illustrates further the central concern for participants across groups with managing and responding to learner expectations.

3.2.4 Theme 4: 'CEFR can-do statements are a useful roadmap and reflective tool.'

In general, opinions about the utility of CEFR can-do statements as benchmarks for achievement moved between two positions: on the one hand a distrust of following a categorical reductionist 'tick-box' approach as described in section 3.2.1, and on the other hand an appreciation of having a common framework in which to situate assessments of competence. The image of avoiding the syndrome of a 'blank map' or 'blank canvas' was also used (MEG.Theme4.1:149; PEG.Theme.4.1:172). However, there was some discussion of how both teachers and learners often prefer to use intuition based on experience to inform assessments of achievement. Where participants' placed themselves in the learner's position, then learner intuition was often favoured:

MEG3: I mean surely, the measure of progress is how you're actually feeling, and the response between, from other people, you know you can tell whether you're communicating something.
MEG5: But we have to incorporate these, in some way, I mean they're created for a reason so surely we should try and incorporate them into, otherwise what are they for?
MEG3: Exactly. [general laughter]
(MEG.Theme.4.1:145-146)
Here MEG3 'wins' the exchange of disagreement by turning MEG5's rhetorical question in on itself, and the general amusement indicates a shared group scepticism of the utility of self-assessment \textit{can-dos}. However there was often less confidence in learner intuition with regard to participants' students, with KG participants highlighting teacher expertise as a control for students carelessly ticking off self-assessment \textit{can-dos}:

\begin{verbatim}
 KG3: It has to be monitored then by the teacher /KG4: Yeah/ as well and then you have to intervene if they are way off track, or, um, maybe modify their attitude [laughs]
 KG4: Yeah, yeah.
 KG2: And a lot of it's sort of in your head now, after so, you know, it depends on how many years you've been teaching, it's just a part of, what's a better way to say it, a part of you.
 (KG.Theme.4.6:99-100)
\end{verbatim}

Discussion of teacher intuition was here accompanied by acknowledgement of an almost unconscious influence derived from years of using materials benchmarked to the CEFR, 'which would have been written in the common European framework way...'
(KGTheme1.13:156). Thus experienced practitioners may not feel the need refer back to reading the descriptors in their day to day assessment of learner competences and needs, but participants of all groups favoured a \textit{can-do} framework as a neutral reference point for consulting students about their level of English, and the ability to highlight to learners what they \textit{can't} yet \textit{do}:

\begin{verbatim}
 MEG3: I suppose it's, it is a good tool in that sense, to, if someone is saying, 'I really want to move up to the next level', and as a teacher you're thinking, 'No, you're not ready.' Instead of just saying no you're not ready because I judge, (...) it's if we have something there that says, well can you do this? You're including that student in the process - it's self-diagnosis for the student isn't it? (...) MEG6: And also like with their self-study as well, (...) If they can express that, 'I can't do this yet, what do I need to do?' And then, we can still help with the 'how can I?'
 (MEG.theme4.2:153)
\end{verbatim}

Therefore where the perception of institutionalisation of the CEFR as an authoritative pedagogic guide was seen as problematic in the catering to individual differences and selection of course content, it was valued in terms of the agreed basis for level diagnosis it provides. This position was summarised quite clearly in the final KG exchange:
[KG1: (...) I think that for me one key value of this kind of thing is for assessing proficiency, (...) but I don't necessarily know to what extent they useful for teaching, (...) just because you can use that to assess proficiency doesn't necessarily mean that you can decide 'I'm going to teach this today and that's what they going to learn', because people don't learn a skill or a language item in one isolated lesson (...) KG2: That's right so, useful for assessment. (KG.Theme4.2:160)

A picture emerges of participants' preference to use can-do descriptors as a reflective tool to assess competence and identify possible next steps by identifying gaps in proficiency. Whilst this arguably represents a deficit model of diagnostic needs analysis that is not the main goal of the CEFR action-oriented approach, it may reasonably be assumed for planning that any list of statements that is not perceived as sufficiently customised to a particular group of learners' needs will fall into the role of simply answering the question 'is there anything we've not yet addressed at this level?'.
4 Analysis of published course materials

This chapter discusses the qualitative analysis of two popular published coursebooks, in
order to address the second research question: ‘to what extent do published English
language course materials benchmarked to the CEFR support teachers to adopt a
CEFR can-do action-oriented approach?’

4.1 Research Method

4.1.1 Rationale

As discussed in the introduction and in chapter 3 this analysis followed an 'embedded'
mixed-methods design by identifying criteria for qualitative analysis of texts through
interpretation of themes arising from the focus groups. Ivankova & Creswell (2009:144) state
that an embedded research design seeks to answer a second research question about the
research topic using another type of data. Therefore although this analysis cannot claim to
cross-validate the focus group analysis, it can provide an extra dimension of understanding
and conceptual triangulation with regard to the issues discussed in the focus groups. Gibson
& Brown (2009:70) state that in this way the interrogation of documents in conjunction with
interview data can provide a 'means of exploring the ways in which different contingencies or
contexts place different requirements on how particular issues are to be recorded,
represented or talked about.' In this case a key contextual consideration is the tendency of
coursebooks to be regarded as the 'routemap' of ELT programmes (Sheldon 1988:238),
therefore potentially having direct influence on the way in which CEFR can-do statements
may be utilised. The extent of this influence will naturally vary considerably depending on
context and teacher experience; however, the 'security, guidance and support' coursebooks
offer to less experienced teachers (Ansary & Babaii, 2002:1) are such that this influence
should be acknowledged.

4.1.2 Selection of Sources

The selection and evaluation of coursebook texts as 'primary sources' represents a process
of 'analytical filtering' of data, produced not through the research itself, but through the
practices being researched (Gibson & Brown, 2009:66). Thus two ELT texts were selected
that are in current publication for language courses in the UK. The following criteria were
developed for coursebook selection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relevance for English language teaching in the UK</td>
<td>Both coursebook titles should be mentioned in the focus group screening questionnaire (appendix H)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of same or similar level of competence</td>
<td>Both coursebooks should be benchmarked to B1+ on the CEFR.</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mapping or adapting of an existing coursebook text to the CEFR, and the authoring of a coursebook text according to CEFR principles represent a potentially informative contrast.</td>
<td>(i) One coursebook text should belong to a series pre-dating the CEFR (though in latest edition) (ii) The other should make claims about being based on CEFR principles</td>
<td>Meets criterion (i)</td>
<td>Meets criterion (ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of relationship to the CEFR can do statements</td>
<td>Available mapping of unit content to CEFR <em>can-do</em> statements</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of relationship to the CEFR can do statements</td>
<td>Available mapping of unit content to CEFR <em>can-do</em> statements</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sampling was restricted to one ‘unit’ of each book with corresponding teacher guidance, in order to permit a comparative analysis of sufficient depth in this small scale study. As no two units will have same configuration of *can-do* statements, I chose instead to select units with at least one corresponding stated grammar focus (in this case the ‘present perfect’), in order to facilitate comparisons of how each book related *can-do* objectives to form-focus. The teacher’s guide was consulted to reveal assumptions about the nature of language, learning and methodology (Cunningsworth & Kusel, 1991:128). Therefore in summary the following published components were included in the analysis:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Component(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Component(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Book (Soars &amp; Soars, 2009)</td>
<td>- Map of unit 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unit 7 pp.54-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Guide (Soars, Soars &amp; Maris, 2009)</td>
<td>- Introduction to course pp.4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unit 7 teacher's notes pp.76-87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website teacher's resource page (login required)</td>
<td>New Headway Intermediate, Fourth edition and the CEFR PDF (Unit 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="https://elt.oup.com/teachers/headway/?cc=global&amp;sellLanguage=en&amp;mode=hub">https://elt.oup.com/teachers/headway/?cc=global&amp;sellLanguage=en&amp;mode=hub</a></td>
<td><strong>Appendix R</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Headway Intermediate, Fourth edition Language Portfolio PDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Appendix T</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Unlimited B1+ Intermediate (Code: EU)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>Component(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Book (Rea et al., 2011)</td>
<td>- Map of unit 10 p.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unit 10 pp.78-85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ePortfolio DVD-ROM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher's Guide (Clementson et al., 2011)</td>
<td>- Introduction to course pp.4-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unit 10 teacher's notes pp.88-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website teacher's resource page</td>
<td>English Unlimited Intermediate and the Common European Framework of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.cambridge.org/us/cambridgeenglish/catalog/adult-courses/english-">http://www.cambridge.org/us/cambridgeenglish/catalog/adult-courses/english-</a></td>
<td>for Languages PDF (Unit 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unlimited/resources/</td>
<td><strong>Appendix V</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A non-evaluative cross-referencing was also done of the coursebook content maps, learner-oriented can-do statement and CEFR can-do statements, and is provided as a reference in appendices U and Y.
4.1.3 Development and implementation of analytical criteria

Ellis (1997:36) draws a clear distinction between the predictive and retrospective evaluation of coursebooks, whereby the latter occurs following use in the classroom. Therefore this analysis was predictive, and a key recommended feature of predictive coursebook analyses is the use of a checklist (Ellis, 1997:36; Mukundan et al., 2011:22; Sheldon, 1988:242) allowing material to be rated by researchers across multiple dimensions. However, the embedded nature of this study favoured the direct development of criteria for qualitative analysis from the themes arising in the focus groups. This focused the analysis on a qualitative discussion and review of the potential of the materials to support the operationalisation of CEFR principles for UK ELT classroom settings in general, rather than performing an evaluation against a checklist for use in a specific teaching programme. Sheldon (1988:240) highlights the problematic nature of approaching complex subjective evaluations with numeric ratings, and the documents were instead interrogated according to the following questions listed on the following page with corresponding CEFR principles.
Themes derived from focus group contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes derived from focus group contributions</th>
<th>Relevant principles derived from CEFR text (Council of Europe 2001)</th>
<th>Corresponding criteria as questions generated for qualitative analysis of course book materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'CEFR can-do statements represent an overgeneralisation of language use and improvement.'</td>
<td>A can-do focused approach should be relatable to the specific learning context and learners (p.21)</td>
<td>To what extent do the unit activities acknowledge and exploit the learners' own experiences and interests in connection to can-do objectives?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Lesson planning is influenced by more factors than the CEFR can-do statements address.'</td>
<td>A CEFR can-do focused approach should prioritise the needs of the learners (p.44)</td>
<td>To what extent does the course unit offer flexibility to negotiate the syllabus with the learners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Integration of CEFR can-do statements with course materials is problematic.'</td>
<td>Form and meaning should be treated as inter-dependent in a can-do action-oriented approach (p.116)</td>
<td>To what extent does the form focus in the chapter support the realisation of can-do statements through meaning-oriented communicative tasks?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'CEFR can-do statements are a useful roadmap and reflection tool'</td>
<td>Accuracy in self-assessment is increased with reference to clear descriptors defining standards (p.191)</td>
<td>To what extent does the course unit provide opportunities for learners to self-assess their competences against can-do statements?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.4 Limitations of the research

The chief limitation of this phase of the research was that it was conducted by myself as lone researcher without moderating input of external participants. This was mainly due to time and resource constraints for this small-scale study. Therefore this analysis should be viewed chiefly as a possible springboard for further research.
4.2 Results and discussion

4.2.1 Overview

The units analysed are identical in physical length (8 A4 pages) save for an additional 'back of the book' writing activity page (p.109) included with the NHW unit, and each appearing to represent between 6-8 hours of study. Benchmarking to the CEFR at B1+ is displayed diagramatically on the back of student and teacher's books in different ways, as illustrated in figures 5 and 6 below:

![Figure 5 NHW CEFR benchmarking](image1)

![Figure 6 English Unlimited B1+ Intermediate CEFR Benchmarking](image2)

The NHW teacher's book introduction states a 'blend of methodologies' between a traditional grammatical syllabus and a 'more communicative approach' encouraging 'genuine' communication in and out of the classroom. The indication is of a core of grammatical progression with an overlay of communicative tasks, suggesting a theoretical assumption that course structure should be provided by explicit rule learning before moving onto personalised practice. By contrast the EU teacher's book introduction states from the outset that it is designed to 'achieve specific communicative goals' and that while there is a 'substantial' amount of grammar and vocabulary work in each unit the 'goals come first'. These are clearly stated to have been taken from the CEFR, though subject to simplification to make them 'less technical'. Moreover, language exponents fed into the course are stated to draw on the Cambridge International Corpus, identifying high frequency lexis from 'more than a billion words of real text' (Clementson et al., 2011:4).

There is a significant difference between these units in the ratio of learner-oriented to original CEFR can-do statements. While EU has just 7 learner-oriented can-do statements, compared to 19 CEFR can-do statements listed in the teacher-oriented CEFR unit map, NHW has 27 can-do statements for the unit in the learner portfolio compared to 15 in the teacher's CEFR unit map. This suggests that NHW have adopted the 'unzipping' approach described by North (2014), whereas EU authors have instead reduced 'technicality' partly through significant quantitative reduction. This may be influenced by how many can-dos the
EU authors assume to be digestible by learners, as these are integrated in the coursebook whereas the Headway portfolio descriptors are not.

4.2.2 To what extent do the unit activities acknowledge and exploit the learners' own experiences and interests in connection to can-do objectives?

An inevitable limitation of printed material is that it is static, and therefore can only acknowledge learner's experiences and interests by selecting themes with potential relevance to learners from diverse cultural backgrounds, and ideally support this with phases encouraging personal learner contributions. Overall there is a noticeable difference in salient themes between the two units. NHW appears to celebrate westernised culture and celebrity success with gusto, including biographical features about J.K. Rowling and Calvin Klein and their millions, an article charting the English origins of football and a lifestyle section on leisure pursuits including horse-riding and fox-hunting. As there are no references to can-do target competences in the unit itself, these topics dominate the scheme of work represented by each section, leaving little room for reinterpretation to other contexts that may be more relevant to the learners.

The claimed tendency for globally published ELT coursebook series such as Headway to perpetuate 'colonialist' discourses is now well documented (see Pennycook, 1998:156), and the authors of EU seem to be aware of this, stating in the teacher's introduction that the course content is 'international' and 'inclusive' and does not assume any knowledge of celebrity culture. This manifests in the EU unit themes being more situational in nature, including witnessing a crime, complaining about goods and services, resolving a dispute and having a 'long weekend'. However, a western cultural bias can still be seen in more subtle ways, with telephone complaints focused on internet shopping and consumer culture, and disputes between suburban neighbours (complete with middle-class men grappling across a white picket fence). Nearly half the unit is given over to the topic of complaining, and the simplified can-do statements such as 'talk about complaining' and 'make a complaint politely' serve to reinforce this. For learners from cultures where conventions of complaining are different to those of the UK this may be perceived as overkill, and it could be more relevant to highlight the transferrable nature of the skills developed. Therefore the goal of EU page 82 might be better worded as 'make negative comments politely'.

In both coursebooks the use of learners' own experiences as a focus for communicative tasks mainly occurs either in a short warm-up phase or end-of-section open discussion, with little or no integration of learner experiences in the main body of unit tasks. EU sections
generally open with a personally focused warm-up question, whereas NHW sections tend to launch into controlled grammar practice. For example, the practice of ‘I have never + past participle’ at the start of the NHW unit makes no attempt to create a meaningful communicative context or goal, other than the teacher's guide suggesting modelling of personal examples. The end of unit discussion sections in NHW are titled ‘What do you think?’, inviting learners to give their own opinions about the topic of the unit section, and this formula is largely replicated in EU. Therefore personalised phases are mostly just freer communicative drills, fulfilling the principle of controlled practice with opportunities for freer recycling of target forms, but rarely progressing to truly personally relevant meaning-oriented tasks. This means that it is often (arguably) left up to the teacher to think completely outside the coursebook materials for ways of adapting course content to the learners' interests where necessary. This highlights the importance of accessibility and user-friendliness of stated communicative can-do goals to inform such decisions.

4.2.3 To what extent does the course unit offer flexibility to negotiate the syllabus with the learners?

The principle of transferability of can-do learning objectives to personalised contexts is arguably an important one for a negotiated syllabus. It is also logical that such negotiation will make use of adapted learner-oriented can-do statements if these have been produced. A significant strength of the EU unit over NHW as that these are clearly visible at the header of each section (see an example in figure 7 below), whereas in NHW they only exist in the online accessed pdf learner portfolio.

**Figure 7: First section headers in each unit**

The subtitle of the unit on NHW p.54 might instead be interpreted by learners as the unit goals, so that 'present perfect - simple, continuous, passive' - firmly positions this as a grammatical syllabus, despite the fact that no can-dos exist for grammatical control in the learner portfolio. It is not clear why the highly idiomatic expression 'making the right noises'

---
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has been chosen as the secondary unit focus instead of something like 'reacting to personal news', though it may be for the novelty factor in order to stimulate discussion between teacher and learners. Nevertheless 'can make the right noises' does not represent a credible can-do competence, and the portfolio instead gives this section the rather generic descriptor 'I can maintain simple everyday conversations'.

Visibility set aside, simplification of learner can-dos for both units often obscures the sense of the original calibrated CEFR can-do statements. The learner can-do statements are evidently intended to be recognisably unique to each unit, as a pattern emerges of re-wording can-do statements according to the unit section topics. Hence in EU we have can-do objectives such as 'talk about memory' or 'talk about complaining', which follow the construction 'talk about + topic' as a way of formulating simple communicative aims that nevertheless occupy a unique place in the coursebook syllabus. The communicative tasks that realise such aims still represent a form of controlled practice rather than a task with an authentically communicative goal - with the 'talk about' part of the aim secondary to the topic or lexical focus. This arguably results in a narrowing of transferability, except that one can 'talk about' anything. In the NHW learner portfolio this principle often borders on the absurd with statements such as 'I can write biographical questions to ask a famous designer', which understandably is not given a corresponding CEFR descriptor in the pdf map.

4.2.4 To what extent does the form focus in the chapter support the realisation of can-do statements through meaning-oriented communicative tasks?

In NHW the texts about J.K. Rowling and Calvin Klein are chiefly exploited as vehicles for gap-fill grammar practice, which suggests an inductive approach to grammar development 'stripped bare' by simply challenging learners to come up with the correct forms; therefore it must be assumed that the teacher will use their own methods to firstly raise awareness of the target forms in connection to meaning-oriented use - with the teacher's book simply stating that 'the key thing the students need to understand is that the Present Perfect links the past and present.' Sections follow for 'reading and speaking' and 'vocabulary and speaking', with comprehension and discussion tasks for reading and listening texts that focus mainly on checking of specific information. Although the comprehension of any such text can be seen to contribute to a learner's addressing of the mapped statement 'can read straightforward factual texts' it is more doubtful whether this will be 'related to his/her field of interest', and also doubtful whether there has been any conscious coursebook supported focus on developing this competence beyond locating information in response to questions.
The selection of topics and texts to serve grammatical objectives is less apparent in EU, where the present perfect is introduced on p.81 as an awareness raising follow-up to a more functionally-focused listening and reading section about making telephone complaints. However, the effect of highlighting this particular use of perfect forms is to foreground chasing up of late responses and expressing exasperation, with models such as 'I've written two emails, but I haven't received a reply' or 'I've been trying to contact you for two weeks now'. Here a more accurate can-do statement than the stated 'complain about goods and services' might be to 'explain' or 'list' recent actions and experiences - perhaps paraphrased as 'follow up a complaint'. It seems uncertain in both texts how form-focus can be properly acknowledged in the building of can-do competences. In the EU learner portfolio and CEFR mapping grammatical and lexical control are not mentioned at all, and in the NHW CEFR teacher map the 'grammatical accuracy' descriptor is taken from the Table 3's 'analytic assessor-oriented scale' (Council of Europe, 2001), complete with negative wording, as a generic grammar descriptor repeated across units. Overall the approach seems either to select a text to demonstrate a target form, or attach awareness raising of target forms to a selected meaning-oriented text, but in neither case do options for contextualised usage of target forms seem to be adequately described in the provided communicative can-do objectives.

4.2.5 To what extent does the course unit provide opportunities for learners to self-assess their competences against can-do statements?

There is nevertheless high visibility of CEFR benchmarking to can-do statements in EU, which includes a short introduction to the 'CEF' and its principles in the teacher's introduction, and provides a can-do 'self-assessment' section at the end of each coursebook unit. Here learners rate confidence against the 7 or so simplified learner-oriented can-dos that appear in section headings throughout the unit. This to some extent avoids a 'tick box' mentality by providing the opportunity to rate confidence in each can-do from 1-5, with direction to find further practice in the bundled DVD-ROM and the self-study pack (if purchased). Conversely there is no mention of the CEFR at all in the NHW teacher introduction or anywhere else I could find inside the teacher's book or student's book. Teachers can only discover the existence of the NHW CEFR can-do mapping and learner portfolio pdfs by firstly registering a password protected account on the elt.oup.com website (accessed 2014) and exploring the resources. EU instead provides the learner ePortfolio on the bundled DVD-ROM and makes the can-do mapping freely available online, though with
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an equal lack of signposting to these components in the teacher's book. This indicates a
general assumption that learner portfolio and mapping of original CEFR *can-do* statements
are purely for optional reference, with their adaptation into more 'user-friendly' content taken care
of by the authors of the main texts.

Thus a picture this builds of addressing of the CEFR can-do statements as an effective 'by-
product' of developing partial competences through the completion of the coursebook units.
This begins to look more credible if the user refers to EU CEFR 'Map A', which lists the unit
sub-sections that are claimed to address aspects of each given competence. From this
viewpoint no unit is presented as fully realising a can do statement, but instead contributes
to the building of that competence over time. In NHW this process is assumed to be
unconscious unless teachers and learners have gained access to the relevant online
documents and are using them in assessments of achievement. This highlights a key issue
about the relationship between course materials and target CEFR *can-do* competences - it is
of course impossible for any coursebook writer to develop material that will guarantee the
development of such competences, as this depends on so many other factors, not least of
them teacher skill and learner engagement. Therefore the best a publisher can do is
demonstrate that sufficient opportunities have been created for such development to be
stimulated in the classroom, as a benchmarked evaluation of the level appropriacy and
scope of the material. From this viewpoint the non-visibility of *can-do* descriptors in NHW the
student book can be seen as less problematic, although one would expect them to at least
be integrated the teacher's book if they are claimed to be course goals. The decision not to
include original CEFR descriptors in either of the NHW or EU teachers' books may relate
again to their perceived over-‘technicality’, and there is an implied assumption that they will only
be useful to teachers motivated and interested enough to actively seek them out online.
5. Conclusion

5.1 Summary of research

The three focus groups conducted in this study revealed how participants rationalised and co-constructed the perceived problematic nature of incorporating CEFR can-do statements into the routines and procedures of English language teaching. Peer interaction often empowered participants to take a critical standpoint, and concerns were expressed about limited relevance of standardised can-do statements to the individual differences in language use, the uncertain relationship of communicative can-dos to formal aspects of language such as lexis and grammar, and the difficulty of addressing broad competences in planned lesson blocks. However, there was also acknowledgement of the positive utility of can-do statements as a reflective tool for assessing and consulting learners, and for reviewing programme goals.

The embedding of a predictive evaluation of a unit sampled from each of New Headway Intermediate 4th Edition and English Unlimited B1+ Intermediate served to enrich understanding of the extent to which such materials might support or further problematize the use of can-do statements in connection to the focus groups' key themes. In both cases it was found that mapped CEFR illustrative can-do statements chiefly play the role of a separate optional reference to justify the stated benchmarking of the material, rather than as a practical component of the course, though EU displayed conscious integration of simplified learner-oriented communicative can-do unit goals. In both texts here was only limited evidence of activities drawing on learners' personal experiences, indicating that the potential for integration of can-do objectives with classroom practice is mainly mediated by the pre-defined unit topics and controlled practice activities. Therefore the materials examined do not appear to greatly support teachers to adapt or customise can-do learning objectives to their learners' needs, though this principle was of key importance to the focus group participants.
5.2 Summary of related findings of the two phases

In focus group theme 1, participants commented both on over-simplicity and over-specificity of description in the *can-do* statements as factors seeming to exclude diversity and individual differences in language use. This highlights how the CEFR's popular role for standard-setting may create an impression of its descriptors as rigid and prescriptive, rather than a flexible tool for interpretation. However, the extent to which such statements can be re-formulated without losing the sense of their level calibration is difficult to quantify. Both coursebooks re-formulated the mapped descriptors for learner use in a portfolio, but this tended to be in order to relate them more closely and simply to the coursebook unit topics and tasks. This often had the effect of reducing their descriptiveness of communicative competence, along with impairing their potential transferability to more personalised contexts in the classroom.

These factors point to the inherent tension between the need for *can-do* statements to be broad enough to be adaptable to diverse learner needs, and the difficulty expressed by participants of working with objectives seen as too broad for lesson aims. Arguably this tension can only be answered in the *can-do* statements themselves by a compromise between brevity and complexity (Fleming, 2009). However, participants also viewed the scaled competence descriptors as discouraging the consideration of other factors that are not scaled, such as socio-cultural knowledge, underlining that more qualitative aspects of the CEFR descriptive scheme should perhaps be made more accessible or evident to users.

Theme 2 thus highlighted the participants' desire to flexibly respond to learner needs and preferences beyond the scope of the CEFR *can-do* descriptors. This also indicated that the selection of concrete lesson activities is often a primary consideration in participants' planning routines, which was not always seen as easy to relate to a core list of *can-do* statements. Evaluation of the 'negotiability' of the coursebook materials showed that the salience of form-focus or topic as organising principles make lesson content selection potentially a 'take it or leave it' decision for large sections of material, reinforced by highly task or topic focused learner-oriented *can-dos*.

Theme 3 elaborated the perceived problems of relating specific course content to CEFR *can-do* learning objectives. A key concern was how to demonstrate evidence of learning. Solutions put forward revealed a pragmatic desire to measure success through production of target forms, though with acknowledgement of the limitations of this approach for promoting reliable improvement in communicative competence. The form-focus in the two sampled
units differed mainly in task sequencing, with EU achieving a more integrated approach with other skills, but what seemed to be lacking in both cases was sufficient treatment of the communicative purpose of using the target grammar. Thus perhaps a key issue revealed in both focus group and materials studies is a perceived need to work towards models that can measurably be reproduced by learners, even though this may often be to the exclusion of addressing authentic communicative need. Models of communicative competence in action are arguably more elusive than form-focused models, so that one participant suggested an ideal solution might be to have video models for each communicative can-do statement.

In this way it is hardly surprising that in theme 4 participants saw can-do statements as most useful for assessment and consultation of learners about their language level, rather than as a starting point for lesson planning or stated lesson aims. While communicative can-do statements aim to describe attainment in concrete terms, they arguably cannot describe a model of the target competence in action without becoming too situationally specific or lengthy. In the NHW portfolio the adaptation into learner aims in this way sometimes resulted in can-dos that were little more than a paraphrased description of a coursebook task. Participants were acutely aware of the fact that competences (especially regarding range and receptive skills) build over time, which is illustrated in a sample of the EU unit mapping of listening competence\textsuperscript{20}. In this way the coursebook CEFR maps acknowledge the fact that the illustrative can-do statements should be addressed cyclically. However there is arguably a need for more user-friendly cross-referencing of CEFR benchmarked course materials across multiple dimensions, so that the weighing of options involved in lesson planning with reference to can-do objectives can simultaneously and flexibly explore other considerations such as task length, integrated skills, form-focus and topic-focus. Given the fixed sequential nature of published coursebook content this may only be possible to properly address in the future by digital means.

\textsuperscript{20} Appendix W
5.3 Recommendations for further research

The small scale nature of this research recommends follow up with an industry-wide survey of current pedagogic practices in the UK engendered by the benchmarking of ELT curricula and assessments to the CEFR, in order to better contextualise the viewpoints expressed here. Moreover, the inclusion of a predictive coursebook analysis recommends follow up with classroom-based trials focused on the same themes. Participants in this study were experienced in-service teachers either working at Eurocentres or attending a part-time MA in ELT and applied linguistics, and were thus equipped to evaluate CEFR pedagogy with reference to direct experience or knowledge of a range of methodological principles; therefore an informative comparative study would explore beliefs and attitudes of pre-service or newly qualified teachers with respect to the utilisation of communicative can-do statements. Moreover, there is indication from this research that the perceived ease of elaboration of can-do statements into lesson activities varies according to features of the statements themselves, and a larger scale survey study could explore teachers’ responses to individual can-do statements to further clarify what these features may be.
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**APPENDIX A: The CEFR common reference levels**
(©Council of Europe, 2001)

Table 1. Common Reference Levels: global scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficient User</td>
<td>Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.</td>
<td>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
<td>Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.</td>
<td>Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics which are familiar or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes and ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.</td>
<td>Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.</td>
<td>Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B: The CEFR Table 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chapter 3. Table 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Listening</strong></td>
<td>I can recognize familiar words and very basic phrases, and understand short sentences on familiar topics, my family, work and very simple sentences about myself and others.</td>
<td>I can understand short, simple texts, and can talk about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar themes encountered in everyday situations, such as family, work and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can understand extended speech and lectures on familiar topics, and can talk about topics of personal interest.</td>
<td>I can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured and when there are some unfamiliar words.</td>
<td>I have no difficulty in understanding any kind of spoken language, whether live or broadcast, even when it is not clearly structured and there are some unfamiliar words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td>I can read very short, simple texts, and can talk about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can read very short, simple texts, and can talk about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can read simple texts and can talk about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can read simple texts and can talk about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can read simple texts and can talk about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can read simple texts and can talk about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong></td>
<td>I can speak in simple and short sentences about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can speak in simple and short sentences about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can speak in simple and short sentences about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can speak in simple and short sentences about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can speak in simple and short sentences about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can speak in simple and short sentences about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td>I can write short, simple texts about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can write short, simple texts about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can write short, simple texts about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can write short, simple texts about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can write short, simple texts about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
<td>I can write short, simple texts about familiar topics and personal matters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Common Reference Levels: qualitative aspects of spoken language use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANGE</th>
<th>ACCURACY</th>
<th>FLUENCY</th>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
<th>COHERENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Shows great flexibility reformulating ideas in differing linguistic forms to convey finer shades of meaning precisely, to give emphasis, to differentiate and to eliminate ambiguity. Also has a good command of idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms.</td>
<td>Maintains consistent grammatical control of complex language, even while attention is otherwise engaged (e.g. in forward planning, in monitoring others’ reactions).</td>
<td>Can express him/herself spontaneously at length with a natural colloquial flow, avoiding or backtracking around any difficulty so smoothly that the interlocutor is hardly aware of it.</td>
<td>Can create coherent and cohesive discourse making full and appropriate use of a variety of organisational patterns and a wide range of connectors and other cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Has a good command of a broad range of language allowing him/her to select a formulation to express him/herself clearly and to act appropriately on a wide range of general, academic, professional or leisure topics without having to restrict what he/she wants to say.</td>
<td>Consistently maintains a high degree of grammatical accuracy; errors are rare, difficult to spot and generally corrected when they do occur.</td>
<td>Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously, almost effortlessly. Only a conceptually difficult subject can hinder a natural, smooth flow of language.</td>
<td>Can select a suitable phrase from a readily available range of discourse functions to preface his remarks in order to get or to keep the floor and to relate his/her own contributions skilfully to those of other speakers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2+</td>
<td>Has a sufficient range of language to be able to give clear descriptions, express viewpoints on most general topics, without much conspicuous searching for words, using some complex sentence forms to do so.</td>
<td>Shows a relatively high degree of grammatical control. Does not make errors which cause misunderstanding, and can correct most of his/her mistakes.</td>
<td>Can produce stretches of language with a fairly even tempo; although he/she can be hesitant as he/she searches for patterns and expressions. There are few noticeably long pauses.</td>
<td>Can use a limited number of cohesive devices to link his/her utterances into clear, coherent discourse, though there may be some ‘jumpiness’ in a long contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can initiate discourse, take his/her turn when appropriate and end conversation when he/she needs to, though he/she may not always do this elegantly. Can help the discussion along on familiar ground confirming comprehension, inviting others in, etc.</td>
<td>Can produce clear, smoothly flowing, well-structured speech, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C (continued): The CEFR Table 3 (©Council of Europe, 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
<td>Has enough language to get by, with sufficient vocabulary to express him/herself with some hesitation and circumlocutions on topics such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel, and current events.</td>
<td>Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used 'routines' and patterns associated with more predictable situations.</td>
<td>Can keep going comprehensively, even though pausing for grammatical and lexical planning and repair is very evident, especially in longer stretches of free production.</td>
<td>Can initiate, maintain and close simple face-to-face conversation on topics that are familiar or of personal interest. Can repeat back part of what someone has said to confirm mutual understanding.</td>
<td>Can link a series of shorter, discrete simple elements into a connected, linear sequence of points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2</strong></td>
<td>Uses basic sentence patterns with memorised phrases, groups of a few words and formulae in order to communicate limited information in simple everyday situations.</td>
<td>Uses some simple structures correctly, but still systematically makes basic mistakes.</td>
<td>Can make him/herself understood in very short utterances, even though pauses, false starts and reformulation are very evident.</td>
<td>Can answer questions and respond to simple statements. Can indicate when he/she is following but is rarely able to understand enough to keep conversation going of his/her own accord.</td>
<td>Can link groups of words with simple connectors like 'and', 'but' and 'because'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong></td>
<td>Has a very basic repertoire of words and simple phrases related to personal details and particular concrete situations.</td>
<td>Shows only limited control of a few simple grammatical structures and sentence patterns in a memorised repertoire.</td>
<td>Can manage very short, isolated, mainly pre-packaged utterances, with much pausing to search for expressions, to articulate less familiar words, and to repair communication.</td>
<td>Can ask and answer questions about personal details. Can interact in a simple way but communication is totally dependent on repetition, rephrasing and repair.</td>
<td>Can link words or groups of words with very basic linear connectors like 'and' or 'then'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SPEAKING: Band descriptors (public version)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Band</th>
<th>Fluency and coherence</th>
<th>Lexical resource</th>
<th>Grammatical range and accuracy</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>speaks fluently with rare repetition of short phrases. Any hesitation is related to the topic. Speech is generally coherent.</td>
<td>uses vocabulary with full flexibility and precision. Uses idiomatic language naturally and accurately.</td>
<td>uses a full range of structures naturally and appropriately. Produces consistently accurate structures apart from typical errors of native speaker speech.</td>
<td>uses a full range of pronunciation features with precision and clarity. Speech is effective and fluent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>speaks fluently with only occasional repetition of self-correction. Hesitation is usually content-related and only briefly for language. Speech is generally coherent.</td>
<td>uses wide vocabulary with flexibility and precision. Uses idiomatic language naturally and accurately.</td>
<td>uses a wide range of structures flexibly. Produces a majority of error-free sentences with occasional minor errors. Speech is clear and fluent.</td>
<td>uses a wide range of pronunciation features with mixed control. Speech is generally clear, but occasional hesitations can be detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>speaks at length without noticeable effort or loss of coherence. May demonstrate language-related hesitations at times, or some repetition and self-correction. Uses a range of connectives and discourse markers with some flexibility.</td>
<td>uses vocabulary with flexibility to discuss a variety of topics. Uses some less common and idiomatic vocabulary and shows some awareness of style and collocation, with some inappropriate choices. Uses paraphrase effectively as required.</td>
<td>uses a wide range of complex structures with some flexibility. Occasionally produces error free sentences, though occasional grammatical mistakes persist. Speech is clear and fluent.</td>
<td>uses a wide range of pronunciation features with mixed control. Speech is generally clear, but occasional hesitations can be detected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>is willing to speak at length, though may lose coherence at times due to occasional repetition, self-correction or hesitation. Uses a range of connectives and discourse markers but not always appropriately.</td>
<td>has a wide range of vocabulary to discuss topics at length and make meaning clear in spite of occasional inaccuracies. Generally paraphrases successfully.</td>
<td>uses a range of simple and complex structures, with some limited repetition. Speech is generally clear, but occasional hesitations can be detected.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>usually maintains flow of speech but uses repetition, self-correction and a slow speech to keep going. May over-use certain connectives and discourse markers. Produces simple speech fluently, but more complex communication causes fluency problems.</td>
<td>manages to talk about familiar or unfamiliar topics but uses vocabulary with limited flexibility. Attempts to use paraphrase but with mixed success.</td>
<td>produces basic sentence forms with reasonable accuracy. Uses a limited range of more complex structures. Occasionally uses paraphrase.</td>
<td>produces basic sentence forms with reasonable accuracy. Uses a limited range of more complex structures. Occasional paraphrasing is used.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cannot respond without noticeable pauses and may speak slowly with frequent repetition and self-correction. Link basic sentences with repetitious use of simple connectives and some breakdowns in coherence.</td>
<td>is able to talk about familiar topics but can only convey basic meaning in unfamiliar topics and makes frequent errors in word choice. Rarely attempts paraphrase.</td>
<td>produces basic sentence forms and some correct simple sentences but subordinate structures are rare. Errors are frequent and may lead to misunderstanding.</td>
<td>produces basic sentence forms and some correct simple sentences but subordinate structures are rare. Errors are frequent and may lead to misunderstanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>speaks with long pauses. Has limited ability to link simple sentences. Produces only simple responses and is frequently unable to convey basic message.</td>
<td>uses simple vocabulary to convey personal information. Has incoherent vocabulary for less familiar topics.</td>
<td>attempts basic sentence forms but with limited success, or relies on apparently memorised utterances. Makes numerous errors except in memorised expressions.</td>
<td>attempts basic sentence forms but with limited success, or relies on apparently memorised utterances. Makes numerous errors except in memorised expressions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pauses lengthy before most words. Little communication possible.</td>
<td>only produces isolated words or memorised utterances.</td>
<td>produces basic sentence forms. Occasionally uses paraphrase or structure.</td>
<td>produces basic sentence forms. Occasionally uses paraphrase or structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no communication possible. No recognizable language.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>does not attempt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E: Sample Eurocentres curriculum aims for B1
(North, 2014:121)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communicative tasks</th>
<th>Spoken Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask for and give information about feelings and news</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk about likes, dislikes and problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discuss opinions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organise an event and solve problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give advice and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Talk about possibilities in the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate confidently in a shop, travel agency, car rental firm etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compare and contrast choices e.g. where to go and what to do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain a problem face-to-face or on the phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe and compare places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe hopes and ambitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give detailed directions and instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe events or experiences, express feelings and reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe a story, a film, a book or a concert and give opinions about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Give your opinions about music, films, paintings etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Write a standard formal letter (e.g. job application)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand everyday conversations and discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand the main points of radio or TV programmes and films</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand a recorded story narrated clearly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand descriptions of events and reactions to them (e.g. in personal letters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand signs and notices and instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand newspaper and magazine articles on familiar subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand the main points of a story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand letters, notes and emails from friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language resources</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The grammar and vocabulary you need to communicate successfully in the communicative tasks listed above.</td>
<td>Past Simple: regular and irregular verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past Continuous/Past Simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past Simple &amp; Present Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present Perfect + still, yet, already, just</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present Perfect Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Futures: present continuous for future: contrast with 'will' and 'going to'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comparatives and superlatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conditionals: 1st and 2nd + variations (as long as, unless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modal verbs: must, should, could, might, may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linking expressions: because of, although, despite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time expressions: (when, as soon as, while, until etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative clauses: Defining/non-defining (I have a car which is very fast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have a car, which means I can get out of town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Vocabulary | Adjective/noun formation e.g. long/length |
|           | Common products |
|           | Cultural topics e.g. music, films |
|           | Feelings and emotions |
|           | Language for giving opinions, agreeing and disagreeing |
|           | Phrasal verbs e.g. look something up, write something down |
|           | Telephone language |
|           | Travel and services vocabulary |
APPENDIX F: Focus Group participant Information Sheet

INFORMATION SHEET FOR PARTICIPANTS

REC Reference Number: KCL/13/14-336

YOU WILL BE GIVEN A COPY OF THIS INFORMATION SHEET

Title of Study: Working with CEFR* can-do statements
An investigation of UK English language teacher beliefs and published materials.

*The Common European Framework of Reference

Invitation

I would like to invite you to participate in this study which forms part of my dissertation research with Kings College London. You should only participate if you want to; choosing not to take part, or changing your mind, will not disadvantage you in any way. Before you decide to take part it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what your participation will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask me if there is anything that is not clear to you or if you would like more information.

What is the purpose of the study?

The aim of the study is to explore the perspectives and attitudes of English Language teachers in the UK to the use of communicative ‘can do’ statements to organise teaching and learning, as exemplified in courses aligned to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR). In particular I am interested in gaining greater understanding of how teachers prefer to organise the content of their lessons, and the perceived challenges involved in using communicative aims and/or ‘can do’ outcomes to plan, deliver and evaluate lessons with learners. I would also like to explore teacher perceptions of the extent to which current published course materials support a ‘can do’ oriented communicative approach. I believe this can be most efficiently and meaningfully done through a qualitative analysis of teacher focus group discussions, and a parallel analysis of selected relevant published course materials. Please see appendix 1 for an introduction to the CEFR.

The research questions (subject to editing) are as follows:

1. To what extent does the Common European Framework of Reference influence approaches and methods in English language teaching, through its use of ‘can do’ statements to describe language proficiency?

2. To what extent do English language teachers in the UK view the use of ‘can do’-style communicative learning outcomes as assisting (or not) the effective planning and delivery of lessons?

3. To what extent do published English language course materials benchmarked to the CEFR support teachers to use ‘can do’-style communicative learning outcomes with their learners?
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Why have I been invited to take part?

I am inviting English language teachers of adult learners who are currently in-service, with teaching experience greater than two years, both within my organisation and outside my organisation. No specialist knowledge of the CEFR or can do statements is required.

Do I have to take part?

Participation is voluntary. You do not have to take part. You should read this information sheet and if you have any questions you should ask me as researcher. You should not agree to take part in this research until you have had all your questions answered satisfactorily.

What will happen to me if I take part?

If you decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and will be asked to sign a consent form with a simple questionnaire to identify published course materials you use I have used recently. At a time convenient for you I will contact you to discuss the focus group procedure, and arrange a suitable time and date for the focus group discussion to take place. On request, you will be given the focus group topic guide and list of other focus group participants. With your consent I will conduct the focus group discussion in an agreed voluntary location which may or may not be in your workplace, according to stated preferences of participants.

The focus group discussion will take approximately one hour and will be based on the focus group topic guide, but is designed to be flexible to meet the needs of participants. The discussion will be recorded, subject to the permission of all participants. Recordings of focus groups will be deleted after transcription. Even if you have decided to take part you are still free to cease your participation at any time and to have research data/information relating to you withdrawn without giving any reason up to the point of transcription on 1st August 2014.

Incentives (where relevant)

There is no financial incentive for participation; however, your travel costs will be reimbursed, and you will be offered light refreshments a small thank you for giving up your time.

What are the possible risks of taking part?

There are no foreseeable risks in participating in the study. The main disadvantage of participating is that you will be giving up around an hour of your time to take part. It is possible you may find answering some of the questions challenging. This is unlikely, but if it were to occur you could request for the focus group to be terminated at any time.

What are the possible benefits of taking part? (Not mandatory)

There are no direct benefits of taking part. However, the information I get from the study should contribute to a general deepening of understanding of teacher perspectives on course/lesson planning and CEFR, where there is a notable research gap in the industry.

Will my taking part be kept confidential?

What is said in the focus group will be regarded as strictly confidential and will be held securely until the research is completed. Your participation is entirely voluntary. If you change your mind you are free to cease your participation at any time and to request for research data/information relating to you withdrawn without giving any reason up to the point of transcription on 1st August 2014. The UK Data Protection Act 1998 will apply to all information gathered within the focus groups and held on password-locked computer files on a private drive, and locked cabinets at

King's College London - Research Ethics
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Kings College London. No data will be accessed by anyone other than me; and anonymity of the material will be protected by using false names. It will not be possible to link any data back to any individual taking part in the focus group discussion. All recordings of data on audio – equipment will be deleted after transcription. If you ask me to withdraw your data at any time before 1st August 2014 I will remove all traces of it from the records.

**How is the project being funded?**

This project is privately self-funded.

**What will happen to the results of the study?**

The results of the study will be discussed in a dissertation submitted to King’s College London by 9th September 2014. A copy of this dissertation will be made available to you on request.

**Who should I contact for further information?**

If you have any questions or require more information about this study, please contact me using the following contact details:

Tim Goodier, Email: timothy.goodier@kcl.ac.uk
Telephone: 02079038462
Department of Education and Professional Studies,
School of Social Science and Public Policy
Waterloo Bridge Wing
Franklin-Wilkins Building
Waterloo Road
London
SE1 9NH

**What if I have further questions, or if something goes wrong?**

If this study has harmed you in any way or if you wish to make a complaint about the conduct of the study you can contact King’s College London using the details below for further advice and information:

Dr. Jo Lewkowicz Email: jo.lewkowicz@kcl.ac.uk
Telephone: +44 (0)20 7848 3183
Department of Education and Professional Studies,
School of Social Science and Public Policy
Waterloo Bridge Wing
Franklin-Wilkins Building
Waterloo Road
London
SE1 9NH

Thank you for reading this information sheet and for considering taking part in this research.
Appendix 1: About the CEFR

The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, Teaching and Assessment was published by the Council of Europe in 2001. It describes language competence across six broad levels A1 (lowest), A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2 (highest), using action-oriented 'can do' statements such as 'can pass on detailed information reliably' (B2 statement for 'information exchange') (Council of Europe:2001: 79). In this way the CEFR 'provides a common basis for the elaboration of language syllabuses, curriculum guidelines, examination textbooks, etc.' (Council of Europe:2001:1). The CEFR descriptors are designed to apply to any language, with the freedom to adapt them to specific languages, and the CEFR has so far been translated into 39 languages.

Further information and the full text can be accessed at
http://www.coe.int/t/dgh4/linguisto/cadrel_en.asp

References:

APPENDIX G: Invitation for Focus Group Participants

**Title of Study: Working with CEFR* can-do statements**
An investigation of UK English language teacher beliefs and published materials.

*The Common European Framework of Reference

Invitation to participate in research

I am looking for 4-6 practising English language teachers with 2 years+ experience to participate in a 1 hour focus group interview, as part of a privately funded qualitative interview-based study, relating to some dissertation research I am doing.

What is the research about?
The research is looking at teacher perceptions and attitudes to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and the proposed use of communicative 'can do' statements to organise, communicate and / or negotiate objectives for teaching and learning for adult learners of English, and to what extent this is supported by published ELT materials. No specialist knowledge of the CEFR or can-do descriptors is required to participate.

What will happen to me if I take part?
You will be contacted by email for some initial details (no more than 5 minutes to reply), and will participate in a recorded semi-structured focus group interview lasting one hour, in which you will be invited to discuss issues surrounding the role of the CEFR in adult language education and the principle of 'can do' statements in the planning of lessons and courses, setting and evaluating of learning aims with your learners, and exploitation of published course book materials. All participants will be kept anonymous in all documentation and reporting of the interview data.

Where and when will the interview take place?
The interview will be arranged at a time outside working hours and a location that is convenient to all participants, such as your workplace or the university campus.

What will happen to the data collected?
Recorded data will be kept securely on a private computer drive for the duration of the study and then deleted (the study is scheduled to be completed in September 2014). Please note you can withdraw from the study at any time and request any data relating to you participation to be deleted.

Expenses and payments
You will be reimbursed any travel expenses for attending the focus group, and refreshments will be provided during the session.

How to volunteer:
Please contact me in person or via the my email address: xxx@xxx

Further details are provided in the attached participant information sheet.
APPENDIX H: Focus group screening questions and coursebook responses

1. Questions

1) What is your age group? (20-24, 25-39, 30-34, 35-39, 40-44, 45-49, 50-54, 55-60 etc.)

2) How many years you have been teaching English as a foreign or second language?

3) Are you currently teaching in the UK?

4) How long have you been teaching in the UK?

5) What published course books you have used in the last couple of years if any (and their levels)?

2. List of published coursebooks provided in responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coursebook or series title</th>
<th>Levels titles given (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New English File</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Cutting Edge 3rd Edition</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XNew Headway 3rd Edition</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XNew Headway 4th Edition</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XEnglish Unlimited</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakout</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Leader</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XNew Headway</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Skills</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Total English</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready for IELTS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IELTS Masterclass</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step Up to IELTS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation IELTS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on IELTS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective IELTS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold First Maximiser</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Advanced Maximiser</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCE Expert / Compact</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premium C1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: Focus group participant consent form

CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS IN RESEARCH STUDIES

Please complete this form after you have read the Information Sheet and/or listened to an explanation about the research.

Title of Study
Working with CEFR* can-do statements
An investigation of UK English language teacher beliefs and published materials

*The Common European Framework of Reference

<<university name>> Research Ethics Committee Ref: <<UNIVERISTY REFERENCE>>/13/14-336

Thank you for considering taking part in this research. The person organising the research must explain the project to you before you agree to take part. If you have any questions arising from the Information Sheet or explanation already given to you, please ask the researcher before you decide whether to join in. You will be given a copy of this Consent Form to keep and refer to at any time.

I confirm that I understand that by ticking/initialling each box I am consenting to this element of the study. I understand that it will be assumed that unticked/initialled boxes mean that I DO NOT consent to that part of the study. I understand that by not giving consent for any one element I may be deemed ineligible for the study.

1. *I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet dated 29/4/14, rec no. <<UNIVERISTY REFERENCE>>/13/14-336 for the above study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information and asked questions which have been answered satisfactorily.

2. *I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving any reason. Furthermore, I understand that I will be able to withdraw my data up to the time of transcription on 1st August 2014

3. *I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes explained to me. I understand that such information will be handled in accordance with the terms of the UK Data Protection Act 1998.
4. *I understand that my information may be subject to review by responsible individuals from <<university name>> for monitoring and audit purposes.

5. I understand that confidentiality and anonymity will be maintained and it will not be possible to identify me in any publications

6. I agree to be contacted in the future by <<university name>> researchers who would like to invite me to participate in follow up studies to this project, or in future studies of a similar nature.

7. I agree that the research team may use my data for future research and understand that any such use of identifiable data would be reviewed and approved by a research ethics committee. (In such cases, as with this project, data would/would not be identifiable in any report).

8. I understand that the information I have submitted will be published as a report and I wish to receive a copy of it.

9. I consent to my focus group discussions being audio recorded.

10. I agree to maintain the confidentiality of focus group discussions

11. I understand that confidentiality cannot be guaranteed during the focus group.

__________________  ________________  ________________
Name of Participant  Date                     Signature

__________________  ________________  ________________
Name of Researcher  Date                     Signature
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APPENDIX J: Focus group moderator guide sheet

Title of Study: Working with CEFR* can-do statements
An investigation of UK English language teacher beliefs and published materials

*The Common European Framework of Reference

Introduction read to participants:

During this discussion we will talk about lesson / course planning and delivery, and we will also talk a bit about the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), which is a framework describing language competence across six broad levels A1 (lowest), A2, B1, B2, C1 and C2 (highest), using action oriented / communicative ‘can do’ statements such as ‘can pass on detailed information reliably’ (B2 statement for ‘information exchange’) (Council of Europe:2001: 79). This information is given in the appendix on your info sheet which you can refer to at any time.

Please note that this is not a test of your knowledge or working practices, and there are no right or wrong answers. The focus group interview will be recorded, and the recording kept securely on a private drive until the study is published, at which time it will be wiped. You are free to withdraw from the interview and withdraw your contributions at any time.

OR (for Eurocentres employees)

Please note that although I will ask general questions about your working context that I clearly already know a lot about, this is not a test of your knowledge or working practices, and there are no right or wrong answers. The focus group interview will be recorded, and the recording kept securely on a private drive until the study is published, at which time it will be wiped. You are free to withdraw from the interview and withdraw your contributions at any time.

Opening factual questions for each participant:

- What different classes or courses have you taught in the last year?
- How would you briefly describe the learning objectives of your most recent group of English language learners?

Theme 1: Planning lessons introductory discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Probe questions</th>
<th>Follow up questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can you describe how you decide what to teach in your lessons?</td>
<td>Do these decisions form part of a written plan?</td>
<td>Can you describe the typical format of your written plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you ever teach lessons planned by somebody else?</td>
<td>What, or what would be, the key things you want to know about the lesson in this situation?</td>
<td>Can you think of examples of lessons you have taught planned by someone else?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme 2: The CEFR and needs analysis

**Introduction:** (Hand out) Here is a copy of Table 2 of the Common European Framework of Reference. This table was designed for learner self-evaluation and gives an overview of the communicative skills and levels described in the CEFR, which includes a range of more specific scales. Please take a few moments to familiarise yourselves with it by choosing a profile for your own competence in a second language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Probe questions</th>
<th>Follow up questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Is this a tool you would like to use in order to decide what to study next in your second language?</td>
<td>□ Have you used something like this with your learners?</td>
<td>□ How easy or difficult was it to assess your own ability with this tool?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Is the Common European Framework of Reference used in your professional context?</td>
<td>□ (yes) How is it generally used? □ (no) Have you seen it used in other contexts?</td>
<td>□ Do you see the CEFR as a positive or negative thing, or neither? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ To what extent do you perceive the CEFR to influence course content?</td>
<td>□ Is this helpful?</td>
<td>□ Could the way it is used be improved in any way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ How useful do you think ‘can do’ statements are for setting learning outcomes on language courses?</td>
<td>□ Are there any aspects of planning where you think they are not appropriate?</td>
<td>□ How might ‘can do’ statements be made more useful for planning?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 3: Learning objectives in published materials

**Introduction:** (Hand out) Here is an example of the unit map from a student book for a popular ELT course book (Headway 4th edition Intermediate) that has been mapped to B1 on the CEFR. On the back you can see a mapping of this unit to published CEFR ‘can do’ statements which is available on the official web page of teacher resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Probe questions</th>
<th>Follow up questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ How useful would you find each of these unit maps?</td>
<td>□ Would you use either of these maps to help plan lessons? How?</td>
<td>□ Are there any advantages or disadvantages to the two different mapping approaches you can think of?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Do the course materials you use specifically reference the CEFR?</td>
<td>□ Do you think this is clear? Why / why not?</td>
<td>□ How might these materials and the way you use them be different without the CEFR?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theme 4: Setting learning objectives and promoting learner autonomy

**Introduction:** (Video) We will now watch a 3.5 minute excerpt from video conference published by Cambridge English TV on Youtube, which advocates the use of can do statements with learners and discusses ways in which they can be used. Then you can respond to the ideas portrayed in the video. Here is a copy of the first slide for your reference.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main questions</th>
<th>Probe questions</th>
<th>Follow up questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were there any ideas in the video that you would like to try or have tried?</td>
<td>How might your learners respond to these suggestions?</td>
<td>What might be the challenges involved in implementing these ideas?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often do you tell the learners in advance what you are going to do with them?</td>
<td>What are the different ways you describe this?</td>
<td>Can you give some examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you see any relationship between the teacher’s method / style, and the wording of lesson aims and outcomes?</td>
<td>How would you describe your teaching method or methods?</td>
<td>Has your teaching approach been affected in any way by the curriculum you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways do your learners influence decisions about what to do in lessons?</td>
<td>Do you approach lesson aims differently with different levels? How?</td>
<td>How much you negotiate aims with learners?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you train learners in any way to self-evaluate their learning?</td>
<td>Which ways do they tend to prefer? evaluate their learning?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Closing the focus group session:**

Thank you very much for your contributions, I will now stop the recording and answer any further questions you may have about this study.

**References:**

APPENDIX K: Focus group task 1 instructions

Focus Activity 1 (Hand out 1):

a) Look at table 2 of the CEFR and think about a second or third language you have been exposed to, have studied, or have used. Try to rate your ability in that language using the table in the different skills areas. Discuss how easy or challenging this activity was to do.

b) Now discuss how this table might be used with a multi-national group of adult English language learners in the UK:
   (i) At the beginning of a course of language study?
   (ii) During a course of language study?
   (iii) At the end of a course of language study?

Do you use something like this with your learners, or would you consider using something like this with your learners?

Visualisation of hand out 1:

APPENDIX L: Focus group task 2 instructions

Focus Activity 2 (Hand out 2):

a) Look at:
- (on the reverse) the mapping of these same unit contents to detailed 'can do' statements benchmarked at Bl in the CEFR. This map is available via the teacher resources page on the Oxford University Press website. (You will not see the actual unit of the book).

Discuss:
(i) How might these two maps of the same course book unit be used differently?

(ii) Can you identify two 'can do' statements from the descriptors column that you think would be relatively straightforward to address as classroom teaching / learning objectives for a multi-national group of adult learners following a Bl course in the UK? If yes, how might a course book help you address these?

(iii) Can you identify two 'can do' statements from the descriptors column that you think would be more challenging to address as classroom teaching / learning objectives for a multi-national group of adult learners following a Bl course in the UK? If yes, how might a course book help you address these?

Visualisation of hand out 2:


**APPENDIX M**: Summary of focus group themes and supporting viewpoints
(Colours designate coding of viewpoints to themes in transcript samples)

### Theme 1: 'CEFR Can-do statements represent an over-generalisation of language use and improvement.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>No. of transcript references coded</th>
<th>Mentioned in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can dos encourage an over-simplified tick box approach to learning achievement</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can dos impose artificial distinctions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence development does not fit neatly into lesson blocks</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level boundaries are ambiguous on the self-assessment scale</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment can dos are too wordy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment scales can dos need to be broken down to separate tasks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The self-assessment descriptors contain non-relevant skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The self-assessment scale misses important aspects of formal control</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a need for more concrete situational examples</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners judge competence in relation to others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuition is enough to determine objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme 2: 'Lesson planning is influenced by more factors that the CEFR can-do statements address'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>No. of transcript references coded</th>
<th>Mentioned in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lesson is a carefully timed performance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do objectives can interfere with inductive approach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can dos should work independently of topics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of form is a benchmark for judging competence</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing aims as assessment scores</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing aims as assessment tasks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form focus is a concrete starting point for lesson plans</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Theme 2: 'Lesson planning is influenced by more factors that the CEFR can-do statements address'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>No. of transcript references coded</th>
<th>Mentioned in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional can dos are the most easily realised</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives are institutionally determined</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning should address learner preferences and expectations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive skills are difficult to plan teaching activities for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students have pre-conceptions about the importance of form focus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course book is often the starting point before identifying the aim</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lesson activities and tasks reveal the aim</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topics provide course cohesion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do statements are not the starting point for planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can dos represent the communicative approach against other approaches</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme 3: 'Integration of CEFR can-do statements with course content is problematic.'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>No. of transcript references coded</th>
<th>Mentioned in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can dos are difficult to measure in reality</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can dos can inform course objectives if materials are created by the teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can dos need to be properly integrated in to the course</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course books only superficially employ can do statements</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course books should provide a good quantity and choice of activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coursebooks are the main provider of course structure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profiling does not fit with course expectations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students want to see the course book used</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The influence on coursebooks of CEFR principles is not always obvious</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme 4: 'CEFR can-do statements are a useful roadmap and reflection tool'  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Viewpoint</th>
<th>No. of transcript references coded</th>
<th>Mentioned in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PEG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do statements can justify an activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do statements can provide a roadmap for learning</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can do statements work better for reflection than as learning objectives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can dos are more for course design reference than everyday use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can-do statement lists can highlight what a learner can't yet do</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit approach can be demotivating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deficit needs inform planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learners judge competence in relation to others</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment against can-dos is motivational</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-assessment against can-dos raises awareness of learning needs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher and learner perceptions of competence differ</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wording I can personalises self-assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N: Transcription scheme

The focus group data has been transcribed according to the conventions detailed below:

/Example/ Overlapping utterance

[Example] Interruption that ‘takes the floor’

[Example] Transcriber observations e.g. of non-verbal communication and paralinguistic features

[…] Omitted incomprehensible utterance

(...) Omitted redundant utterance (in analysis only)

‘example’ Direct quotation by speaker

deexample Emphasis by speaker

… Pause in speaker delivery
APPENDIX O: Pilot Eurocentres Group (PEG) transcript coding of themes and viewpoints

**Theme 1: 'CEFR Can-do statements represent an overgeneralisation of language use and acquisition.'**

**PEG.Theme1.1 Can dos are mainly functional in focus**

| 129 | 1:01.5 - 41:46.5 | PEG4: Mmm no, I think, um, the difficulty I've mentioned, a lot of this is functional, it's you know, you're out and you're speaking to a native speaker, for example, or you're dealing with a situation where you're travelling, so it's all functional language. Unless you're teaching that specifically, like a role-play for example, it's quite, it is sometimes quite difficult to see connections with can dos. It might be that you're just teaching grammar point, or, just, I don't know, just some of these information gap activities where they are describing something, I don't know...it's |

**PEG.Theme1.2 Can dos don't capture the richness of sociocultural reality**

| 80 | 25:09.1 - 26:28.8 | Moderator: Okay. PEG4: I find this really problematic, um, the language that I have chosen is not a language that I've formally studied, so I would say that my listening and speaking is pretty good, but I can't listen to lecture, so, I'm not B1 - I find it really difficult, I find it, I think it's aimed at someone who's had an education and who's had a certain type of education in a language, it aimed at possibly the kind of students we get the school I work in, but it's not aimed at somebody who has, I learnt this language from my birth it's my first language, not my second, and I'm A1 in reading and writing which is fine but I'm between B1, B2 and C1, for listening and speaking because of the references to lectures, um, I don't know, films, um, I don't know, complex lines of argument, so... |
| 82 | 26:37.1 - 27:08.4 | PEG1: I'd probably agree with that, um, I learnt Spanish but I learned it working in a pub, so I can't speak about, um, certain things that you learn in the class early on, /PEG5: Unless you meet a lecturer in a pub/ but I can serve 50 customers and my listening is good because of that, so it's completely different, sort of, where skills are completely different from talking about my dreams and my ambitions, what I can describe, and use. |
| 84 | 27:39.8 - 28:06.3 | PEG4: I mean even with the speaking, um, so say I can present clear detailed descriptions on a wide range of subjects, yes I can, but related to my field of interest, I couldn't speak about teaching in that language, so it's, it's just, I mean, aimed at a certain type of person, and not everybody fits into this pattern. |
| 87 | 28:34.8 - 28:59.8 | PEG2: Yeah looking at the listening one, part of it, I think um this B1 this is for Russian, that the problem is it says, um, I can understand the main points of many radio or TV programs on current affairs, like, why current affairs? I don't know why that's there why isn't it like on reality TV? That's what I'm interested in, sorry /General laughter/ |
| 88 | 28:59.8 - 29:27.5 | PEG2: But you know, I think that PEG4: is right, there's a certain, it's almost like there's an agenda behind it, and its current affairs because it's looking for someone who is educated in a certain way, and you watch these types of programs, and is not taking into account other things, unless that is in C2 I don't know. [...] |
PEG.Theme1.2 Can dos don't capture the richness of sociocultural reality

91 30:03.9 - 30:19.0  PEG1: For me that's not really how I studied language, I'd read books because I liked them, and that's how it grew, I didn't think 'right next, experiences and ambitions!'

131 42:48.5 - 43:11.9  [PEG2: Yeah, but it seems that people don't want to do things before a certain level, so for example, 'B1 spoken production, can describe experiences and events my dreams and hopes and ambitions' /PEG3: oh they don't have them at that level [...] / - They are not allowed, like they don't have, at A2 level they don't have dreams and ambitions, and at A1 level they don't have dreams... But it's only that B1 that they have them.

180 57:01.4 - 57:26.7  PEG2: I'm not sure that I'm C2 in writing [General laughter] it says I can write summary reviews of professional literary works. I don't think I've ever done that. PEG3: Maybe you're not C2 in English... [PEG2: But I can write short simple postcards [General laughter] PEG1: A1!

PEG.Theme1.3 Can dos encourage an over-simplified tick box approach to learning achievement

118 36:58.6 - 38:14.9  PEG3: Or on the back they'll say, this book will take you from B1 to B2 /PEG3: frowns/ ... It's like, how? It's not, it's not a teacher, it is just a book, presenting stuff that you need boxes to tick in order to get there but, it doesn't mean that they will be that level, it just means that they will have been exposed to that language which is considered by someone that wrote it however long ago that this is what people at that level can do, and it feels a bit, yeah disconnected /PEG2: Arbitrary/ Yeah, and not the reality of learning because it's so individual, it depends on how much they putting themselves, the coursebook is not the answer it's just a facilitator, and it shouldn't claim to be anything else- just for advertising 'do this book and you will therefore go up a level' because then they have these expectations that we have to manage, so we're seeing you for 20 hours a week in our school, and how many hours are there in the week, right so it's a small percentage therefore I cannot do it for you. [PEG2: And it's at the end of the course, 'I finished this book, therefore I go to next level]

PEG.Theme1.4 Competence development does not fit neatly into lesson blocks

154 49:50.2 - 50:19.4  PEG3: But more like 'to practice' rather than 'by the end of this lesson /PEG4: 'You will be able to'/ you will be able to' [General laughter]. Because it assumes a level of confidence that I wouldn't have after an hour, of studying something and practising, [Agreement from B] and students tend to be very hard on themselves, so very few of them would say 'great, yeah I've got it' /PEG1: Tick!/ I can do that now.
PEG.Theme1.5 Learners judge competence in relation to others

PEG1: I don’t know, um, for me when I’m learning, I was judge my own ability, and I feel like I have a fairly good idea, I would never look for something like this /PEG4: Yeah/ to tell me, and so I sort of imagine it’s the same for the students, whereas they can feel when it’s comfortable, they can feel when it... I don’t think they need...

PEG2: They can see when they, when they are actually able to do something, /PEG1: Yeah/ when they’ve had some success, and you know they’ve written something and someone has understood it, or they’ve had a conversation, maybe not with the teacher, that may be outside, some kind of interaction in some way /PEG4: Yeah/ /PEG1: Someone to tell me/ They have read something and they’ve understood an article like, um, in the newspaper, and...

PEG.Theme1.6 Level boundaries are ambiguous on the self-assessment scale

PEG3: Yeah I’m the same really from learning Spanish from teaching, so the education sector, and everyday vocabulary are very good at, but I can’t write anything, my grammar is terrible, because I’ve learned fixed phrases, so it’s kind of hard to choose I’m in between one bit of the this band one bit of another. [...]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PEG.Theme1.9</strong></th>
<th>There is a need for more concrete situational examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>30:48.4 - 31:28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG4: I think this one is too vague.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: So actually you’re pointing to needing more detail?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG4: Yeah. I mean I was looking at, okay, I can deal with most situations, I can enter unprepared into conversation - I don't understand that, what I can do about that, in order to improve and get to 'I can interact with the degree of fluency and spontaneity makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible, so I don't really understand what I need to do.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>148</th>
<th>48:50.6 - 49:04.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: So, so, um, do you find this a tool that you use in every lesson to talk about can do statements or...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>149</th>
<th>49:04.0 - 49:23.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEG5: Um, not every lesson but PEG4 mentioned about descriptors for writing, and um, I use them quite a lot because, um, I need to show my students where, what they need to produce, and they think that they are there but they are not, um, but I use them quite a lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PEG.Theme1.10</strong></th>
<th>Intuition is enough to determine objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>47:22.8 - 47:49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG1: I don't know, um, for me when I'm learning, I was judge my own ability, and I feel like I have a fairly good idea, I would never look for something like this /PEG4: Yeah/ to tell me, and so I sort of imagine it's the same for the students, whereas they can feel when it's comfortable, they can feel when it... I don't think they need...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PEG.Theme1.11</strong></th>
<th>The self-assessment scale misses important aspects of formal control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>41:46.4 - 42:26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEG3: I don't know why we need to have these can do statements, I don’t think there’s anything wrong with just teaching some grammar, like so that they can use the grammar, and it's like, that's not a can-do statement, it's just they need it, I don't, I think it's perhaps having low expectations that students connect themselves to what they need, so um, 'to look at conditionals so that I can talk about wishes and regrets' - they just need to know that they'll use conditionals for their own uses, they don't need to have a can-do statement of 'now you can talk about wishes and regrets', let's just look at conditionals and you can do whatever you want with it. I feel that sometimes they can be a bit restrictive in the books, they're always 'okay, modals of deduction - mysteries' not 'modals of deduction, let's look at some different contexts, see when you use it', if you don't use it [...]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme 2: ‘Lesson planning is influenced by more factors that the CEFR can-do statements address’

#### PEG.Theme2.1 A lesson is a carefully timed performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18:45.5 - 19:25.2</td>
<td>PEG3</td>
<td>Um keeping up variety /PEG4: yeah/ /PEG2: yeah/ so when you got the students for longer than four weeks, five or six weeks maybe, how do you approach presenting, I don't know, the skill of reading or writing in a different way to the same students. So avoiding repetition within teaching and even just techniques that you use inside the classroom, like how, um, you change the pairs, or get the energy, change the energy levels, those little tricks it's very easy to forget them and it's hard to [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:25.2 - 19:45.3</td>
<td>PEG4</td>
<td>And taking things off the page, so if you are going for something from the book and you think that it's valid what they're trying to achieve, how to make it motivating, sometimes that ideas generation can be exhausting, 'cos it's, you're racking your brains /PEG3: You don't want to do the same thing all the time/ ... Asking other people for advice or ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:55.6 - 20:17.0</td>
<td>PEG5</td>
<td>I agree with PEG4; I've been teaching IELTS writing for the past 4 or 5 months, and it's just writing on Monday or Tuesday, so it's kind of difficult to actually, you know, make it interesting and you know um so that students won't fall asleep sometimes, so yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PEG.Theme2.2 Topics provide course cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11:00.6 - 11:39.2</td>
<td>PEG2</td>
<td>Er, yes but also topics as well, um, with IELTS it's a bit easier because there's kind of very, we call them IELTSy topics they come up regularly, and the students know what they are, um they are aware of the environment as a big topic - that's something that they'll ask for - um, they do that in my FCE / CAE class they do the same thing, they ask for particular topics, although they are slightly more vague, because it's a more general exam compared to the IELTS exam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:05.7 - 14:33.1</td>
<td>PEG2</td>
<td>I think you're right because some books, um, they feel like self-study it's just like exercise, exercise, exercise with no lead in practice or development, and you're right they are quite difficult books to use, but students like to, I think, have a book. It gives some kind of the grounding /PEG3: A record that they can.../ they haven't just got thousands of hand-outs /PEG4: mm/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:33.0 - 14:45.0</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Okay, so one of the qualities you described of motivating book is, er, you can see how everything is connected. Um, what sort of features of a book help you to see how things are connected?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45.0 - 14:48.4</td>
<td>PEG4</td>
<td>Well, there would ideally be some kind of topic that runs through it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:48.4 - 15:07.5</td>
<td>PEG4</td>
<td>and also opportunities for things to be recycled in a topic at various points - often you get a language point and it's totally divorced from the rest of the unit, and, um, I think that's, that's the key</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:24.9 - 16:17.7</td>
<td>PEG3</td>
<td>Like repetition /PEG5: yeah, yeah/ of skills not just repetition of a narrow topic, which happens with some of the general English books I think, the topic is for example this week 'mysteries' /PEG4: yeah/ and I just... It's not meaty and it's just...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PEG.Theme2.2 Topics provide course cohesion

PEG4: quite childish/childish..., it's, a very narrow amount vocabulary that perhaps isn't used that frequently, and then it's just like that's the bit that's repeated, repeated and repeated, not the skills that is that are so transferable to every part of English.

/Moderator: Okay! So I feel like sometimes the balance in some of the course books is... Well they've just like had the idea of mysteries and they've run with it. It's like 'how much are they going to talk about this?', 'Why isn't it something like the news?' - There will be a topic on that but it's like, they've chosen topics to fill up units.

PEG.Theme2.3 Can dos represent the communicative approach against other approaches

PEG4: Um, it's helpful but it's not the first place I go to. I don't think it's, um, I'm pretty much repeating what I said before, it's probably the last thing I would look at like, after my list of places I would go to plan my lessons, it's the last thing I would look at.

/Moderator: okay

PEG4: I think the problem with it aiding teaching is that it's - teachers are busy people and there is a lot to look at, it's perhaps you can't, with the course book you can see the material and the aim relates to it, whereas with the aims of the can dos you can see the can do but you have to find the material, so it, it's just er, that's why I don't think I would use it that much for planning or for my own teaching.

/Moderator: Ah ha/ if you go about it that way round.

PEG2: I think there's a general fear to do anything heads down

PEG2: I think there's a danger, um, or maybe not a danger but a tendency sometimes for... Because it's all about using the communicative approach, and things like that, that lessons can often end up being vocabulary input and then conversation and speaking, and then other skills and systems are missed [repeated agreement from D at this point], and there, and is almost too much of that, so we are not building on the student's overall profile, like it can be a bit uneven I think /PEG3: Yeah/

PEG4: I think there's a general fear to do anything heads down /PEG2: Yeah/ and
### PEG.Theme2.4 Can dos represent the communicative approach against other approaches

45:38.2  
serious /PEG2: Yeah/ because there is this emphasis on communicative language teaching, and I think some people think perhaps that communicative language teaching means speaking /PEG2: Yeah/ /PEG5: Not grammar/ /PEG3: Yeah/ /PEG2: Yeah/  

### PEG.Theme2.5 Can dos should work independently of topics

159  51:03.0 - 51:07.6  
Moderator: Is that something that you find missing from communicative can do statements?  
[Um... No I don't find it missing, I don't need it anywhere, I want to tell the students that's what it is, but I wouldn't want it in a list of 'these are the ones at B1', that they have to cover, like I'm not interested, I don't think it's useful.  

### PEG.Theme2.6 Expressing aims as assessment scores

23  4:42.5 - 4:59.0  
PEG1: I think more recently have had more students doing IELTS who don't actually need the score for university they've just decided or have been told it's a good idea to have it /PEG4: yeah/ so there's far more students just doing it, I'm just doing it to see what I get.  

25  5:03.6 - 5:21.3  
PEG2: I think also with, um, our South Korean students I think sometimes if they get a good, they can use their IELTS score for credits when they go back to university back in South Korea, so they're not going to study in English but it will help their degree  

27  5:28.0 - 5:56.0  
PEG1: I think that what some of my students like is that, um, that they've been, that these criteria have been explained to them that they've been working towards this level for quite a while, and so that's quite motivating. 'Cos I've got a student I think is not really learning much in my IELTS class - I think she'd be better in general English, I think she just likes getting a score in her essays, to see if she's improving, whereas in general English perhaps you don't get that so much.  

30  6:07.2 - 6:18.8  
PEG5: I think that in the case of general English classes it's more difficult to actually measure the progress than in the case of IELTS classes, I might be wrong but [...]  

31  6:18.8 - 7:07.2  
[PEG3: Yeah, we were talking about it today because, I'm teaching general English but doing a monthly test, and my students requested a listening test, so I did an IELTS one they said it was good because it was challenging, and it's not something I would do every month though, but talking to a colleague about the idea every month we test, we assess their speaking and their grammar, but not really formalising the reading and listening, we just measure it in class when actually it's quite collaborative where they are working together and I think and some of them they, they asked why do you just assess the speaking, like the production side of things, in general. But, yeah, it's good to get a good idea of their level listening and reading, if we formalised it.  

37  8:02.2 - 8:10.1  
PEG3: It was a general English class, but I gave them the IELTS listening so I then
PEG.Theme2.6 Expressing aims as assessment scores

8:34.3 transformed it back into the Euro centres level, so they got levels six, um, 6.5, which was good as they were upper intermediate, so it was appropriate, there was a couple that got less, so yeah it indicated they were in the correct class, but um, I should have predicted what I thought they would get perhaps, 'cos some of them did better than I thought, so...

38 8:34.2 - 8:38.7 Moderator: Okay, so the main point was that they were happy to receive this score?

39 8:38.7 - 8:40.1 PEG3: Yeah, it was motivating

PEG.Theme2.7 Expressing aims as assessment tasks

103 32:43.8 - 33:23.6 PEG4: I think sometimes I break it down, so I take one category, I don't know, like task achievement in the writing, and I might take 3 pounds just get them to tell me what the difference is between them? PEG1: Yes/ and what they need to do in order to get a higher mark in each subcategory that is there so say writing an overview, so a five would be no clear overview, six is there is an overview, seven is there is a clear overview, so just getting them to tell me this stuff, and then me eliciting from them, 'So in your opinion what is a clear overview?'; um, that kind of thing.

104 33:23.6 - 33:43.5 Moderator: So those descriptors are benchmarked to exam scores and not common European framework?

PEG4: yes

Moderator: So would you say that you prefer to work with a numeric scale rather than the Common European framework scale?

PEG2: No

Moderator: When talking to your learners?

PEG.Theme2.8 Form focus is a concrete starting point for lesson plans

158 50:54.9 - 51:03.0 PEG2: 'Cos I think sometimes it's nice if they can, you know, they, on the board they can see what their grammar aim or skill is, but also what the topic is as well and that's ...

PEG.Theme2.9 Planning should address learner preferences and expectations

44 9:37.3 - 10:24.2 PEG4: I always go with what the students want, always that's my basis it's especially more, more often than exam classes, because they know what they want a bit more they are a bit more specific with their requests, so in a general English class they'll say okay 'I want phrasal verbs' or 'I want, er, speaking or listening' but they are not so specific that... an IELTS student will tell you that 'I want listening section 3 describing...' I don't know what. Um, so with them I find it easier, I do the same with general English, um, it's a bit hard to cater exactly to what they are trying to describe because they are so vague way that they describe it.

108 34:24.4 - PEG4: Well, we have a syllabus that we follow that is based on the can dos, which is
**PEG.Theme2.9 Planning should address learner preferences and expectations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35:04.0</td>
<td>Pegged at each level, so, um, for example I'm doing B1 at the moment, so I would use that may be to fill in any gaps where I, I don't know, I've got my students' recommendations or student requests of what they want to study, I've got the book, then I might need something else so I might look there and see what I haven't done for a long time, or haven't done yet, so I might use that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PEG.5: Um, I sometimes simply ask my students what was the aim of this exercise, what did you learn today? And this is the aim of the lesson, and if we plan our lessons based on what students want, they need, in a way we do achieve this aim you know, this is what we did and why we did it, hopefully.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35:15.5 - 35:39.9</td>
<td>Peg5: Um, I sometimes simply ask my students what was the aim of this exercise, what did you learn today? And this is the aim of the lesson, and if we plan our lessons based on what students want, they need, in a way we do achieve this aim you know, this is what we did and why we did it, hopefully.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PEG.3: Yeah, I think they appreciate a mixture /PEG.4: Yeah/ because too much vocabulary speaking, they don't feel, because so many of them come from a place where they have learnt English from book, it feels little bit wishy-washy not to have some, you know, testing or, bookwork, /PEG.4: Writing/ writing, in fact it's, and I think I assumed in the past that students would think that was boring, but actually I think they appreciate it, and it feels quite meaningful, um / PEG.4: They do appreciate it/ yeah /PEG.4: They appreciate the heads down kind of thinking time/ /PEG.2: Yeah/ |

**PEG.2: Yeah/|

**PEG.3: And it gives you a chance to check their learning, and its concrete evidence, and it means they've got a written record, I don't know, I think that perhaps the pendulum's swinging more to... just mixing it, and you know, variety is the key, and it's like keeping that communicative, there's communicative elements, but balancing with how things work, and always trying to contextualise it, and allow for personalisation [...]**

**PEG.Theme2.10 There is a need for more concrete situational examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:10.2 - 12:20.6</td>
<td>Moderator: So, you mentioned the book, how much does that influence your planning if you're using it with a class?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20.6</td>
<td>Peg1: Er, it's what goes on the wall [A laughs] I find that it's useful it's a useful framework, um, but I would say that it changes a lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PEG.Theme2.11 The lesson activities and tasks reveal the aim**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19:45.3 - 19:48.2</td>
<td>Moderator: Okay, so your starting point might be something quite abstract?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:48.2</td>
<td>Peg4: It might be, or it might be something in the book. Peg2: Yeah, it's... Moderator: Any other difficulties or challenges?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PEG.Theme2.12 The lesson activities and tasks reveal the aim**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17:11.3 - 17:36.0</td>
<td>Peg1: I suppose it's because we've got a short time passing over these lessons, between so um literally we give the teacher a rundown of this is what you're going to do first, this is what comes next, so I suppose you will see the aim because you'll get shown the entire lesson, and almost step-by-step what you're going to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:31.0 - 17:48.3</td>
<td>Peg3: Yeah, or you just say to them, like this is what I want them to produce, a piece of writing practising avoiding repetition, before the break we have done this, and yeah so I think say the aim but don't write it down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Theme 3: 'Integration of CEFR can-do statements with course content is problematic.'

**PEG.Theme3.1 Course books only superficially employ can do statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Segment Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 116 36:10.9 - 36:50.3 | PEG4: Sometimes you just get a token thing coursebook, which is really, just like, at the end, this unit, after this unit you can /PEG3: Yeah/ /PEG2: Yeah/ /PEG1: laughs/ Der, der, der, and then at the end, okay so now you can, and it's... [PEG2: But there's been no practice of that, they might have presented it but there's been no practice /PEG4: Yeah/ in the coursebook /PEG3: Yeah/ so how can they do it? They haven't, unless the teacher created something and did something with that language to practice it, and the students somehow had a go at manipulating it [...]

| 117 36:50.2 - 36:58.6 | Moderator: So do you mean you see a disconnect between the can-do statements in the coursebook and /PEG2: the actual activities/ the actual activities?
PEG2: Yeah

| 118 36:58.6 - 38:14.9 | PEG3: Or on the back they'll say, this book will take you from B1 to B2 [PEG3: frowns] ... It's like, how? It's not, it's not a teacher, it is just a book, presenting stuff that you need boxes to tick in order to get there but, it doesn't mean that they will be that level, it just means that they will have been exposed to that language which is considered by someone that wrote it however long ago that this is what people at that level can do, and it feels a bit, yeah disconnected /PEG2: Arbitrary/ Yeah, and not the reality of learning because it's so individual, it depends on how much they putting themselves, the coursebook is not the answer it's just a facilitator, and it shouldn't claim to be anything else- just for advertising 'do this book and you will therefore go up a level' because then they have these expectations that we have to manage, so we're seeing you for 20 hours a week in our school, and how many hours are there in the week, right so it's a small percentage therefore I cannot do it for you. [PEG2: And it's at the end of the course, 'I finished this book, therefore I go to next level']

| 126 39:53.2 - 40:26.6 | PEG3: Yeah it's okay if it's language for agreeing and disagreeing...
[PEG5: In many activities students have to respond not have to produce anything, so if there like questions they have to answer questions, not necessarily like, ask the questions, especially at lower levels, may be, and I don't know if they can do something if they can only respond to some questions, so not necessarily generate the language.]

| 127 40:26.6 - 40:59.1 | Moderator: Okay so sometimes you're saying it's difficult for you to see, to really know if they can do /PEG5: Yeah/ what is being described? [PEG5: You can ask them the questions, but the book doesn't provide activities which allow me to say, okay, this person can have a conversation, the can ask me some questions, so I have to produce, I have to make sure that, um, they can do it.]


PEG.Theme3.2 Course books should provide a good quantity and choice of activities

54  13:05.4 - 13:51.9  PEG4: So say if, I mean we were looking at one earlier, erm, it was a language for writing page, and two exercises were about noun phrases and two exercises were about cohesion, but no lead-ins to the activities, no controlled practice, no freer practice, um, the texts themselves were unrelated to anything that would be relevant for the students, so, um, whereas you get some books which are very motivating, who kind of, kind of build-up on topics, um, they, you can, you can see that everything connects, um, and yes those books I would use a lot more when I'm planning.

56  14:05.7 - 14:33.1  PEG2: I think you’re right because some books, um, they feel like self-study it’s just like exercise, exercise, exercise with no lead in practice or development, and you’re right they are quite difficult books to use, but students like to, I think, have a book. It gives some kind of the grounding /PEG3: A record that they can.../ they haven't just got thousands of hand- outs /PEG4: mm/

60  15:07.4 - 15:24.9  PEG5: Um, you mentioned that some course books are 'bitty' and also that some books are 'meaty', basically which means that you have a lot of practice also not just one unit where you'll have just one listening for instance, so there is like more practice, I like such course books

61  15:24.9 - 16:17.7  [PEG3: Like repetition /PEG5: yeah, yeah/ of skills not just repetition of a narrow topic, which happens with some of the general English books I think, the topic is for example this week 'mysteries' /PEG4: yeah/ and I just... It's not meaty and it's just /PEG4: quite childish/ childish..., it's, a very narrow amount vocabulary that perhaps isn't used that frequently, and then it's just like that's the bit that's repeated, repeated and repeated, not the skills that is that are so transferable to every part of English /Moderator: Okay/ So I feel like sometimes the balance in some of the course books is... Well they've just like had the idea of mysteries and they've run with it. It's like 'how much are they going to talk about this?', 'Why isn't it something like the news?' - There will be a topic on that but it's like, they've chosen topics to fill up units.

PEG.Theme3.3 Coursebooks are the main provider of course structure

112  35:39.9 - 35:50.1  Moderator: How much do you think the Common European framework has influenced course content in the teaching that you do?

113  35:50.1 - 35:57.8  PEG4: A lot, it's on the front of every coursebook /PEG2: Every coursebook, yeah/.

170  53:46.8 - 53:57.5  Moderator: Well, how much does the use of can-do style aims help or support your teaching?

171  53:57.4 - 54:10.9  PEG4: Only in so far as the course books try to incorporate it. Moderator: Try and succeed or... PEG4: Sometimes they succeed.

PEG.Theme3.4 Students want to see the course book used

55  13:51.8 - 14:05.7  PEG5: And those books there are also a lot more useful for the students, I think they want to have a book and, you know, they have most of the resources there instead of just hand- outs /PEG2: Yeah/ basically.
### Theme 3.4 Students want to see the course book used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:05.7 - 14:33.1</td>
<td>PEG2: I think you're right because some books, um, they feel like self-study it's just like exercise, exercise, exercise with no lead in practice or development, and you're right they are quite difficult books to use, but students like to, I think, have a book. It gives some kind of the grounding /PEG3: A record that they can.../ they haven't just got thousands of hand- outs /PEG4: mm/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme 3.5 The influence on coursebooks of CEFR principles is not always obvious

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56:02.7 - 56:08.6</td>
<td>PEG3: It levels, levels each playing field as it were, generally, there are some exceptions [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56:08.5 - 56:11.4</td>
<td>PEG1: So perhaps it's made my job easier than I thought. Moderator: Okay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Theme 4: 'CEFR *can-do* statements are a useful roadmap and reflection tool'

### Theme 4.1 Can do statements can provide a roadmap for learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30:19.0 - 30:25.3</td>
<td>PEG5: Well I actually like studying languages in a formalised way, so that's how I would learn probably because that's how my brain works /PEG1: Yes/ , so yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54:10.8 - 55:08.2</td>
<td>PEG3: It can be a good basis to build from./PEG4: Yeah/ It's nice to have a framework, so that you're not always looking at a blank canvas, it's tiring teaching let alone planning so having a basis that can be used as it is albeit not always great, and it's good to have, but yeah, it's good to have something to adapt from [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55:08.1 - 55:26.1</td>
<td>PEG3: And even though it feels restrictive, I don't think it's harmful, you know it's not it's not - I find it restrictive but I don't think it's detriment /PEG4: No/ I'm not sure the students see, would see the negative aspects of it, because they're just happy to be learning English, and so if it's like 'this topic's a bit repetitive' - it's like 'right let's change it' - we are not bound to use it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PEG.Theme4.1 Can do statements can provide a roadmap for learning**

174 5:26.0 - 56:02.8 PEG1: I suppose chosen the level of, of materials to suit the level that I'm teaching, I suppose it's all based on the framework when I'm looking at coursebooks [PEG4: indicates agreement], and er and in that case I suppose it has been useful, because it's been quick, you know I can say 'I need intermediate' and I'm pulling out intermediate, I'm not thinking [...] [PEG1: Because actually it's not too common that I'm thinking this is way too difficult, or this is far too simple so perhaps from this things have been pitched pretty well.]

**PEG.Theme4.2 Can dos are more for course design reference than everyday use**

165 2:22.7 - 52:34.7 PEG4: A course designer, somebody who comes up with exams, an examiner maybe not, not the can dos anyway /PEG2: Not the can dos/ um...

166 2:34.6 - 52:41.9 PEG5: Yeah but I would use it as a teacher rather than as a student, I guess [laughs]

**PEG.Theme4.3 Can do statements work better for reflection than as learning objectives**

111 5:15.5 - 35:39.9 PEG5: Um, I sometimes simply ask my students what was the aim of this exercise, what did you learn today? And this is the aim of the lesson, and if we plan our lessons based on what students want, they need, in a way we do achieve this aim you know, this is what we did and why we did it, hopefully.

169 3:22.7 - 53:46.8 PEG4: I think it's useful for assessment purposes, say um you teach somebody and when they leave they know they are B1 and everybody in the world knows what B1 is, I think for that for those purposes it's great. In terms of, what was, sorry, the specific part of the question you were looking for?

**PEG.Theme4.4 Can-do statement lists can highlight what a learner can't yet do**

147 4:25.4 - 48:55.7 PEG5: I sometimes, I sometimes feel frustrated because I have students who think they know it all, but I know they don't, and then that's when I show them the band descriptors. You know, um, you didn't do this, you didn't do that, so kind of play devil's advocate, because there is no other way to show them that you are far away from where you should be /PEG4: Mmm [showing interest] I'm thinking about IELTS again, I'm not going to give them an ace [General agreement from A, C and D]

**PEG.Theme4.5 Deficit needs inform planning**

49 11:39.2 - 12:10.2 PEG1: Yeah, I find that, er, certainly the classes are good at telling you what they want and I find myself writing a plan for the week, sort of from the book - maybe the bit that I feel that I'd like to do, but it changes, I get an essay and I think 'oh God, we need to do this, we need to do this!' And I'll perhaps suggest that in class and they will say 'Oh yes'. So I find it sort of builds itself, like the week and the plan goes out the window really. [D laughs]

71 17:48.3 - 17:56.0 PEG5: And at the same time the difficulties the student might have, because you might want to address them [PEG3: Yeah that's true.]

93
APPENDIX P: Main Eurocentres Group (MEG) transcript coding of themes and viewpoints

**Theme 1: 'CEFR Can-do statements represent an overgeneralisation of language use and improvement.'**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEG.Theme1.1 Can dos are not accessible to lower level learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 21:36.1 - Moderator: Of course cos we're reading it in our first language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 21:37.9 - MEG4: Yes exactly, I was thinking 'what if I was reading this in the language that I was thinking of when I was trying this out' [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 21:45.7 - MEG1: Yeah that would just be impossible for me [general laughter] In Chinese...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 21:45.7 - MEG6: Or would you prefer to do it in the target language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 21:46.2 - MEG2: I think that would be clear actually to pick where you are. [Lots of laughter]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 21:46.2 - MEG1: Well you can't find us, there's no column for it, like [laughs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141 48:10.3 - MEG5 I think it's harder to, it's just really hard to describe, learning, learning goals to low level students, really it's, I don't think they understand what it actually means, and with the higher-level learners of course, they kind of want that, but even if I try with the lower levels I don't think it would get through it's just, they just need to know what the learning is on a day-to-day basis, and I don't think that they'd be able to comprehend that kind of information in my experience, I don't know how you feel [indicates MEG3:] about that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 48:54.8 - MEG3: I think so, I think um and awful lot of time in the lesson would be taken up [general laughter], why are we doing this it's time for a break now, [general laughter] it's in a sense pointless, it's, I think that's part of having the relationship with your student where they trust you to take them through.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEG.Theme1.2 Can dos can promote artificial simulations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122 41:56.2 - MEG6: So it would be very easy to apply that one too a lot of lessons, but perhaps not so much for quick inspiration. [long pause while people look again at the list]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 42:29.4 - MEG2: How about understanding conversations between native speakers. That would be quite difficult to set up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 42:29.4 - MEG4: Which one is this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 42:53.2 - MEG4: Recorded media, so, well it's quite difficult to find natural conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123 42:53.2 - MEG4: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:04.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEG.Theme1.4 Can dos encourage an over-simplified tick box approach to learning achievement

69 22:19.5 - MEG3: Not in this form, no, it's, for the reasons we've already said. And for me it strays into the area of tests checking and ticking, so it doesn't really get my vote in that context.

75 24:15.2 - MEG1: Yeah so evaluate yourself, 'can you do this?', 'Yeah', 'Er, so what's the next, how can you improve, what is the next step, so to get to a level VII you need to, can you do that yet?', 'No', 'So how do you do it? How would you go about, um, learning that?
Moderator: Mmm.

76 24:34.6 - MEG5 Yeah like for example, if you, if you used maybe an extract from, um, I mean like a contemporary literary quote, any kind of writer of today, and um, you did that is a part of the activity in class, and you just have that the end of it you can say 'Look, this is ticked off, this is boundary then you're B2. So that is, so that is what, if you can understand this text, you are at B2.'

119 40:50.3 - MEG6: I think things like, pronunciation, being intelligible, I'd have to think of a particular type of pronunciation, because that doesn't quite leap, a particular lesson doesn't leap so readily to mind. All the, um, or following extended speech again it lends itself to 'okay maybe, er, watching, listening to talk or program' that er. I don't know, do specific lessons come to mind straightaway?

120 41:28.1 - MEG1: Um, yeah well the vocabulary range as well, 'has sufficient range of vocabulary express himself...', On which topic? [General laughter]. Um, yeah the, you can't do that in five minutes obviously, that will take a while to build up.

121 41:45.6 - MEG4: Pretty wide topic, /MEG1: Yes/ everyday life, family hobbies, interests...
[general laughter]. /MEG1: Come on you've got five minutes! Which one do I start with?! [General laughter].

122 41:56.2 - MEG6: So it would be very easy to apply that one too a lot of lessons, but perhaps not much for quick inspiration. [long pause while people look again at the list]

125 42:59.2 - Moderator: Would you consider using these types of statements, um, at the beginning of a lesson with your learners or...How might you actually use them if you were, um, teaching in these areas?
MEG.Theme1.5 Competence development does not fit neatly into lesson blocks

126 43:17.6 - MEG3: I suppose I might use them as part of an introduction, but not in a prescriptive way, so I might introduce like 'we're going to do listening between two people in a pub' because um... But I probably wouldn't say 'so do can therefore, blah, blah, blah' /MEG4: Yes/

Moderator: Ah ha

127 43:40.6 - Moderator: Why would you stop short of doing that do you think?

MEG3: I don't know I keep coming back to my dislike of containing it [general laughter]

Moderator: Ah ha

MEG.Theme1.6 Self-assessment can dos are too wordy

39 15:15.5 - MEG1: It took me more than one reading. 15:23.7

MEG3: Yes, it's quite dense.

MEG1: I'm trying to think, 'can I do that, can I do that?' [laughs]

MEG4: Yeah

45 16:12.8 - MEG4: At some of the writing, like, I can write short messages, but thanking someone a letter? That would, that would be a bit more tricky, so there are two very different, think I could write simple note if I had to... But then a whole, a formal letter like that?

/MEG3: Yeah, that's exactly my response/ They seem very, two very different things I think to do.

60 20:17.5 - MEG3: But I think that it needs to be simplified.

20:19.6 MEG2: Mm

61 20:19.5 - MEG5 Yeah it's too wordy at the moment I think. Either it's the setting, I mean, I don't know whether that's, um, it could be set out in the different way, but for me reading it it's just, it's just a bit too much, is just the layout. And you know, I think it would be confusing for students definitely.

92 31:32.3 - MEG3: Well I suppose it puts more flesh on it, um, to have the descriptors, rather than just having contents page of the book. Um, it's, it is pretty wordy again, so what's here: 'sufficient vocabulary to express herself with some cir-cum-lo-blah' [general laughter].

93 32:05.6 - MEG3: Yes, yeah it's, it's, I just exactly like this I see a sea of words, I don't read very fast...[...]

Moderator: I see.

MEG3: It, it loses me, but I, it is useful it's, you know, it's got, if I was teaching something here I would think 'Ah ok', it's kind of a springboard of like, 'Well what can I bring into the lesson then?', um, it can, as I say flesh out these headings on the, this side of the paper.

98 33:33.5 - MEG6: And there isn't an equivalent checklist for students?

33:45.1 Moderator: Well, that's a good question, do you think that would be a good thing to have?

99 33:45.1 - MEG6: Well just, I think, firstly when you're saying how could you use it, if you first think I was thinking about how could you use this with students, I'd, don't think I could use this list in its present form. Um, some of the can-do bits would be quite useful,
### MEG.Theme1.6 Self-assessment can dos are too wordy

because they can see things come again, um, passing on information, checking information, so things they need to work on regularly, but again the wording of it and, I think the word, um, 'major errors' leapt out at me as well, I didn't really see that as a motivational one [laughs]

### MEG.Theme1.7 Self-assessment scales can dos need to be broken down to separate tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15:49.9</td>
<td>MEG6: Did you find it difficult to separate so maybe, part of this could be [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:57.3</td>
<td>MEG3: Mm yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEG1: Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:57.2</td>
<td>Moderator: Within the same descriptor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00.6</td>
<td>MEG6: Within the same descriptor maybe I think, ooh think I can do this, you know I can cope with most situations while travelling, however would I be able to talk about current events and [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12.8</td>
<td>MEG2: Mm hhm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEG1: Yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:12.8</td>
<td>MEG4: At some of the writing, like, I can write short messages, but thanking someone in a letter? That would, that would be a bit more tricky, so there are two very different, think I could write simple note if I had to... But then a whole, a formal letter like that? /MEG3: Yeah, that's exactly my response/ They seem very, two very different things I think to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEG.Theme1.8 Learners judge competence in relation to others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:33.1 - 8:51.0</td>
<td>MEG2: I think they compare themselves to of the students class, and they always think 'oh okay I speak better, I'm much better, my level's much higher', then when they compare their own grammar results, that can be shattered a bit [MEG4: laughs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:51.0 - 9:14.0</td>
<td>MEG3: Yes, there quite, they can get quite competitive as well. Yes especially at the lower levels, they don't really understand this so much the framework, so they are very much looking at each other and well you know 'I'm better than him, therefore I'm going to move up' [general laughter]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:13.9 - 9:26.2</td>
<td>MEG6: But how do you think they measure themselves against the of the students? I would say speaking is one that they all choose...[...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEG2: Speaking yeah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEG3: Yes, and also range of vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEG1: Fluency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEG4: You know the answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEG2: Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:26.2 - 9:47.7</td>
<td>MEG2: And I suppose to a certain degree they're probably looking at my reactions as well, if I'm following what they're saying and encouraging them that must give them information as to how well they're doing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEG.theme2.1 Can dos should work independently of topics

103 34:44.7 - MEG2: I was thinking of a different approach, um, for example you've got football, a text about football and I'm thinking, okay, they might be fed up with that, so if I look at the aim er, on page 58, which is reading for orientation, I could find a different text, um, to cover the same aim as well. So basically replacing, or substituting that's, that the course book provides, and finding something different that would actually cover the same aim.

MEG.theme2.2 Control of form is a benchmark for judging competence

25 7:05.5 - 7:42.0 MEG6: Yes I mean often, the same people who say that speaking is the most important for them, and that they're here really only to, for fluency, and then when they go back home, er, and often never school environment you want to measure something you can measure, and that's often easier in a test where you have some results, not only grammar but of course grammar and vocabulary items lend themselves to you know tests which give fixed numbers which they can compare, to other classmates [general laughter] or to their brother, not always to their own progress actually.

MEG.theme2.3 Expressing aims as assessment scores

23 6:37.6 - 6:54.3 MEG6: Tests would be another influence, because you're giving progress tests or, or, you know, evaluative tests still often focus on, or seem to focus on grammar quite heavily, it might be another influence.

MEG.theme2.4 Functional can dos are the most easily realised

117 39:50.5 - MEG4: I was thinking about the first one, 'can express and respond to feelings', which [...], there was a thing we did recently er, where we talked about this kind of how to respond different kinds of news, and we went through that, but then I did a simple game where I put, two, three statements on the board about me, and things I've done in my lifetime and then two of them were true and one of them was not true, and then they have to ask me the argumentative questions, and then, and they did the same thing. We had all sorts of stories, like one guy was like 'I got shot, and I had a scar' and everyone was like 'Ahhh' [general laughter] like this you know, you know responding to them.
MEG.Theme2.5 Students have pre-conceptions about the importance of form focus

20 5:50.2 - 6:09.2 MEG5 Er, some of my students, um, you know they'll say, I'm very good you know I understand a lot but I need to know grammar, that's kind of that's the thing that they asked for, grammar, and I'm not sure, kind of if they, if they're kind of right thinking that, I'm not sure but, that's the kind of thing they think they want grammar when they come here so that's what I found.
Moderator: Yeah

21 6:09.2 - 6:17.0 MEG6 Moderator: Um, how do you, how do you interpret that, what leads them to ask for that you think?

22 6:17.0 - 6:37.7 MEG5 I think it's, er, educational background, I think it's the way they've been taught, um, and they think that perhaps the way to fluency is through the grammar, the grammar focus, whereas you know the way we learn in England is kind of the opposite to that, so for me it's, if I want to learn a language I wouldn't really think about that, but I think that it's to do with their educational background.
Moderator: Right

MEG.Theme2.6 The course book is often the starting point before identifying the aim

79 25:50.7 - 25:56.5 MEG2: What's the purpose of the lesson? 25:56.5
MEG3: Yes, the aims.

80 25:56.5 - 26:03.7 Moderator: And how was that usually expressed to you? [MEG2: laughs]

81 26:03.7 - 26:12.7 MEG1: 'Page 25!' [general laughter] 26:12.7
MEG4: Yes.
MEG2: Page 25 and then you have to work out what the, what the aim is.

82 26:12.7 - 26:25.7 MEG6: It's interesting first you said purpose, but then most people if you actually prefer, what would you prefer, then you want, you actually think of a specific bit of material almost before the purpose sometimes, picking up...

83 26:25.7 - 26:37.5 Moderator: And so you just mentioned you, you been given this piece of material and you work out the aim from that. Um, how do you normally work out the aim from the materials?

84 26:37.5 - 26:54.4 MEG2: Um, just try to see whether I can work with the material or not [laughs] and what it's trying to achieve, and if I'm happy with the material given I'll use it, and if I'm not I will use something else to cover the same aim.
Theme 3: 'Integration of CEFR *can-do* statements with course content is problematic.'

**MEG.Theme3.1 Can dos can inform course objectives if materials are created by the teacher**

| 47 | 17:10.7 | MEG2: I think it would be quite useful to set the objectives as well of the course. So have the aims, and then come up with the materials, and maybe prepare, find the materials that you could use to get to those objectives. |

**MEG.Theme3.2 Can dos need to be properly integrated in to the course**

| 158 54:13.1 | MEG5 But, I, I started a course and was given this. I started a language course, and I was given this at the start, like, what level are you? And sort of I wanted to know what class to start at, and it wasn't very helpful for me, I just feel, again now I feel a bit too wordy, and it would be good if it was broken, broken down and then, as you do the course, you do it in a periodical way, and it's, well you know it's ok 'I'm going for A2, I'm starting at A1 and I'm looking to progress, so er, or starting at A1 I'm looking to complete all of this,' so, and then you can go back at the end, and you say 'right, I've ticked I have done all this now'. I think, really it should be incorporated rather than just presented to start, it needs to be made more accessible for students I think. |
| 159 54:56.3 | MEG6: Was this a foreign language course, that you took? |
| 55:13.0 | MEG5 Yes |
| 55:13.0 | MEG6: And how did you feel at the end? |
| 55:13.0 | MEG5 No, it was just, it was just at the start, and I just felt like what I actually learnt on the course had no relation to that, I felt. |

**MEG.Theme3.3 The influence on coursebooks of CEFR principles is not always obvious**

| 96 | 33:00.7 | MEG4: I think it would be quite nice to see the thinking behind the activity, or thing that we've prepared, to see what they, what the thought process that went into it was, what the...yeah. |
| 97 | 33:14.5 | MEG6: And can students access that list, access this? |
| 33:33.6 | Moderator: No they can't. no, although anyone who was determined and pretended to be a teacher could login and access it. But no it's not, it's not something that is published to the students, it's in the teacher's resource area. |
| 138 47:15.2 | MEG6: Or the other way maybe you're looking at some material and you're thinking what's this doing? Then you go and read this bit, and say 'Ah, okay that's how we doing this, because that helps us to read, scan along a text, exchange information...[...]
MEG.Theme3.4 Can do statements can justify an activity

MEG4: It might be good for reading, reading activities, you know they want to know why they are reading a text, well what's the point of reading this? So I'm looking for, you're looking for specific information, you're looking to summarise points of something...

Moderator: Right...

Theme 4: 'CEFR can-do statements are a useful roadmap and reflection tool'

MEG.Theme4.1 Can do statements can provide a roadmap for learning

MEG5 So, 'can give or seek personal views or opinions in discussing topics of interest', basically I was just, um, for the first part of the lesson we um, research the topic of the computer, and the topic was a favourite film, um, so we had the first lesson just researching and preparing PowerPoint presentations, at the second lesson was a group discussion where they introduced their favourite film why they liked it, so they had a group discussion about it, whether they'd seen it. I think perhaps that would cover 'seek personal views or opinions in discussing topics of interest'. Moderator: Ah ha.

MEG5 Um, and obviously, when they're doing it, before they do it, I could say to them well this will cover this section of your B1 area of the CEFR, /Moderator: Mm hmm/, and perhaps er yeah that, that could be incorporated by just having it on the screen or upon the wall or...yeah.

EG3: I mean surely, the measure of progress is how you're actually feeling, and the response between, from other people, you know you can tell whether you're communicating something.

EG5: But we have to incorporate these, in some way, I mean they're created for a reason so surely we should try and incorporate them into, otherwise what are they for? /EG3: Exactly/ [general laughter]

Moderator: Okay yeah so an important question there.

MEG4: It depends what they, what they want to achieve, if they just go for the summer that I think 'oh I'm just going to go for a few months, and see, improve myself, so then, I don't know, I'll learn some stuff and go home', but if they are doing it for a career or something they might think I need to achieve this level, because then I can show that to my, my employer or something like this.

MEG1: It maps it out so I guess it's easier, having a destination rather than a blank map [laughs]. [pause]

MEG3: I suppose in a nutshell for me I think it's probably a good thing, if it was hugely
MEG.Theme4.1 Can do statements can provide a roadmap for learning

54:13.2 simplified. Um, so it, it would make it easier for me and also for the student, given what
I've just said, and it does provide some sort of structure to work from as opposed to
nothing.
Moderator: Mm.

MEG.Theme4.2 Can do statements work better for reflection than as learning objectives

128 43:51.6 - MEG6: What about then, saying it like 'I can now do it', would that be any better?
129 43:56.1 - MEG3: Yes, yes, it's almost celebratory at the end, like 'well we've done this, so now
44:05.6 we can'. [...] 
130 44:05.6 - MEG2: I think something that we usually do, we do put up our aims on the board,
44:26.4 - MEG3: We do put the aims up yeah/ that saying that we will be able to exchange
information, and then at the end you can recap and just ask them 'so which of these
parts have we covered and which activity, did, actually we use to cover that? /MEG3:
Yes/ And then tick it off, and you've got your tick [laughs]

MEG.Theme4.3 Can-do statement lists can highlight what a learner can't yet do

72 23:23.3 - MEG5 I think it would be a benefit with higher-level students, because I've been in
23:49.8 situations where they said to me, 'Oh do you think I'm C1 or C2?' , Because they've
obviously, when they're at that level they are more aware of the kind of boundaries. And
if I kind of sat down with some and said well 'can you do this, can you do this?' And
actually showed them, broke it down for them, maybe, maybe it could be helpful.
But definitely with the, with the lower level learners I think it's a bit of a... It could be
difficult, but with higher-levels possibly yeah.

150 51:25.3 - MEG5 Obviously something, the students with good motivation they come, they say I
51:58.5 need to get to B2 or C1 or whatever, and obviously students who are just here on
holiday they don't care about kind of, what like being [...] And the point but, people who
come up to me and then, well then I can say can you do this then? Let's look at, er,
let's look at our structure can you do this, you know. I know obviously this tick box
thing is just an idea, but, um, the reason you're not there at the moment is because
you can't do this, um, and because this is not, this is not something we've covered so far.
151 51:58.5 - Moderator: So actually there's an important aspect of this you think in terms of defining
52:05.2 what people can't do as well?
152 52:05.1 - MEG5 Yeah, yeah... I mean obviously, and that gives them a goal then, it gives them
52:19.8 something, 'ah okay, yeah I can't do that, I'll work on, and it's 'looking it to work on this
area, okay you're good at this area, but it's something we can work on' - and then tailor
activities in the future for that. So I mean, maybe as a work activity.
153 52:19.8 - MEG3: I suppose it's, it is a good tool in that sense, to, if someone is saying, 'I really
52:50.4 want to move up to the next level', and as a teacher are thinking, 'No, you're not
ready.' Instead of just saying no you're not ready because I judge, you know brackets
because I judge, you're not ready, it's if we have something there that says, well can
you do this? You're including that student in the process - it's self-diagnosis for the
student isn't it?
### MEG.Theme4.3 Can-do statement lists can highlight what a learner can't yet do

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEG3:</th>
<th>Um, it's a way of keeping it level, a level relationship. [pause]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>52:51.0 - 53:00.1</td>
<td>MEG6: And also like with their self-study as well, if you're saying it's a 'can't', 'I can't do this yet'. If they can express that, 'I can't do this yet, what do I need to do?' And then, we can still help with the 'how can I'...[...].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEG.Theme4.4 A deficit approach can be demotivating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEG4:</th>
<th>I think if you're quite a load learner and you saw all these things that you couldn't do, I might be a bit overwhelmed [general laughter] with all of this is all, this is these things that you can achieve, but ah you're only here [laughs] It's what I'm thinking of at the moment looking at mine! [General laughter] so many things I can't do.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>19:19.3</td>
<td>MEG6: But do you think, were you thinking about those before you looked at the piece of paper? I think again going back to the start when you arrive, the amount of times, 'okay I want', you know, asking the student on the first day what would they like... And it's really a job I don't know what they're good at, would this help to focus you now...[...].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEG.Theme4.5 Self-assessment against can-dos raises awareness of learning needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEG4:</th>
<th>Trying to find, yeah what things you need to improve on absolutely, what areas you actually are better at, say, listening rather than writing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>19:32.1</td>
<td>MEG2: It could be used as a diagnostic actually, and then with, with all that information you can, you can put a course together for the student. Moderator: Mm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MEG.Theme4.6 The wording I can personalises self-assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>MEG3:</th>
<th>Well my first response is I like it because it says 'I can' as opposed to distancing me from somewhat from the script of it. Um...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>14:39.3</td>
<td>MEG3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX Q: Post-graduate Group (KG) transcript coding of themes and viewpoints**

### Theme 1: 'CEFR *Can-do* statements represent an over-generalisation of language use and improvement.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG.Theme1.1 Can do statements are too general and at the same time not specific enough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| KG1: I think it's trying to just over simplify, well simultaneously making things complicated and trying to oversimplify, I don't know, um, I don't know quite how to explain it, um. It's trying to describe something that is indescribable, language is so multidimensional and complex, and it doesn't fit into a grid, I don't know where this grid came from, where the research was, or what the foundations are of it.[...]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG.Theme1.2 Can dos are mainly functional in focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG4: Um, and it could be very much /KG1: And what they can't do/ And what they can't do yeah, yeah. So there would be a whole list of things that they are expected to be able to do within that level, and a lot of it is very functional, so 'I can', you know I don't know, 'Read a menu in the restaurant', 'I can ask the waiter for, you know, a drink or...'. So being able to highlight that in a very functional, you know, in a very functional way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderator: And this is something you've used?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KG: It's something i've used with students though I didn't use it for very long, um, but it did seem to motivate the students because they can actually see what they are achieving. Because that's sometimes quite difficult to measure, if you're just ploughing through a course or...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG.Theme1.3 Can dos are not accessible to lower level learners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KG3: The notional functional syllabus I would say, I was going to say before it's assuming that, um, um, functions are everything. If you can, you can do these certain things, then you're good language, which I think it's drawing on the, Halliday, Halliday functional language? Moderator: Okay KG3: Yeah [...]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| KG: But yeah, I see what you're saying, if they're really low level than it might be a bit pointless to just give them things like that. Statements like this. |
| KG4: Mmm. |
### KG.Theme1.4 Can dos are overly theoretical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33:08.3</td>
<td>KG1: I, mm, I find to a certain extent it's a bit pretentious and wordy not very useful d/or practical, um, yeah, I could see that if I was writing a coursebook and I believed it I'd think it was an accurate portrayal of levels, which I'm not sure it is, I might find it useful to help write a syllabus, but as a teacher I don't think I'd, I find it that useful. Moderator: Okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:00.8</td>
<td>KG1: But in general I just find can do statements a bit patronising, there is something out the way they're written that makes me cringe? Moderator: Ah ha/ and um, I don't know if anyone else feels that way? No? KG5: They don't make me cringe. KG4: No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48:15.1</td>
<td>KG2: Yeah, if I can express and respond to feelings, you know, such as surprise and happiness... KG1: It's like you're talking about a child or an animal KG2: Mm, it's very personal isn't it, it's very personal, it's very /KG4: Cultural mm/ culturally different how you would respond to happiness and sadness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51:21.9</td>
<td>KG5: Well I put a big cross against 'can enter unprepared /KG1: That was hilarious!/ into conversations unfamiliar topics'. How would you set that up? [A; and KG3: laugh] KG4: Well will how do you know whether or not they prepared, /KG1: prepared/ yeah exactly how do you know so prepared it or not? [A laughs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52:51.5</td>
<td>KG3: This reminds me of an activity I did recently, where it's a fluency task and, er, as a group they have to imagine that there at a restaurant waiting for a meal to arrive, and they have to make small talk, as part of the communication course. And, um, they're given some phrases for starting a random conversation, or, kind of stopping what somebody else said, and moving in, things like 'by the way', and 'incidentally', the got the stock phrases and then they're given like - it's like a typical board game type TEFL-y task where they have to move around the board and between different topics, so now you're bored of the weather so move on to the next topic, and, um, they didn't manage very well with it, I found it very artificial, because it does seem artificial...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KG.Theme1.5 Can dos can promote artificial simulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:19.9</td>
<td>KG5: Well I put a big cross against 'can enter unprepared /KG1: That was hilarious!/ into conversations unfamiliar topics'. How would you set that up? [A; and KG3: laugh] KG4: Well will how do you know whether or not they prepared, /KG1: prepared/ yeah exactly how do you know so prepared it or not? [A laughs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:53.8</td>
<td>KG3: This reminds me of an activity I did recently, where it's a fluency task and, er, as a group they have to imagine that there at a restaurant waiting for a meal to arrive, and they have to make small talk, as part of the communication course. And, um, they're given some phrases for starting a random conversation, or, kind of stopping what somebody else said, and moving in, things like 'by the way', and 'incidentally', the got the stock phrases and then they're given like - it's like a typical board game type TEFL-y task where they have to move around the board and between different topics, so now you're bored of the weather so move on to the next topic, and, um, they didn't manage very well with it, I found it very artificial, because it does seem artificial...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KG.Theme1.6 Can dos don't sufficiently reflect individual differences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50:06.9</td>
<td>KG3: There are practical issues with it, such as a pair of students where one is very dominant, and the other one is very passive, and so just because the passive one isn't speaking as much does that mean that they can't do these things as well, so, so that's something that you'd, maybe you could bear that in mind when you're pairing them up, but, um...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**KG.Theme1.6 Can dos don’t sufficiently reflect individual differences**

133 2:46.5 - 53:22.8 KG2: That kind of thing with giving, it's, I suppose it's the difference between commutative competence irrelevant of level sometimes isn’t it? Some of the things here, um... / KG5: Yes you're right, if somebody, yeah/ It's not just language level, um, as well... so... [KG3: It depends on their level of, level of sociability, [...] ] [KG2: Yeah, you might have someone who can do a lot of these things are different levels depending on... /KG3: Just confidence to interrupt someone... / Or they might have scanning skills are other reading skills but they just don't have enough vocabulary or, awareness of the structures to get it as well.

135 3:46.2 - 54:16.3 KG4: I think the other thing just that the can do one underneath that, so it’s still under the 'overall spoken interaction': 'can exchange check and confirm information and deal with a less routine situations' but there's nothing there which describes what a less routine situation is. / KG3: Mm/ So how do you define what those less routine situations are, because something that's less routine four you may not be less routine for me. [KG2: and KG4: laugh] / Moderator: Okay/ So I think challenges like that, how would you....?

**KG.Theme1.7 Can dos encourage an over-simplified tick box approach to learning achievement**

97 38:29.4 - 38:55.5 KG4: I guess there's an argument for using those can do statements, because I've used them as I said before the British Council, but if you're not actually assessing them, then it's just the student saying 'oh yes I can do this, I can do this', they're just tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, and there's actually no measure of... Can the student actually do that? Can the student actually use the present perfect correctly?

98 38:55.5 - 39:20.0 KG2: So it's more for their own, kind of motivation, their own need to know where they are, or what they're doing, to have... [KG4: But then I think some students will actually take it more seriously than others, so some students will actually look at that and go 'oh actually I can't do that teacher can I have some more practice?', And you'll get the other smart alec in the corner just going tick, tick, tick, tick, tick, next [laughs] / KG2: Yes it's quite individual differences/ You knows so it’s, quite...

99 39:20.0 - 39:31.3 KG3: It has to be monitored than by the teacher / KG4: Yeah/ as well and then you have to intervene if they are way off track, or, um, maybe modify their attitude [laughs] KG4: Yeah, yeah.

**KG.Theme1.8 Can dos impose artificial distinctions**

52 23:19.0 - 23:41.1 KG1: Yeah, and actually one other thing that I, um, it does have its benefits, but another thing that I don't particularly like which has always irritated me in the past about the common European framework is this, the way it's bunched, the way it's separated spoken interaction and spoken production which I find very artificial, and um I can't really see the point in that.
KG.Theme1.8 Can dos impose artificial distinctions

KG1: Like, um, they haven't done it for writing have they? They haven't written 'written interaction' and 'written production' and separated those two, and um, and I found that that is an awkward thing when it comes to if you're expected to use that in lesson planning, that's jumping ahead a little bit of think...

KG.Theme1.9 Competence development does not fit neatly into lesson blocks

KG2: I think the word 'can do' /KG5: [In sing song voice] 'By the end of the lesson you will be able to.../ /KG4: Yeah/ is a bit controversial because, yeah, maybe not use can do, by the end of the lesson you can do or will be able to /KG5: But it's just a synonym!/ yeah ..[...] /KG1: But how do you know that they can do it anyway!

KG2: Yeah because it's, it's in such a short time, just because you taught it doesn't mean, and they've used it in the lesson, doesn't mean /KG1: Definitely! I completely agree with you/ What does can do actually mean? Will be able to? I, the only thing I do is, what the lesson has been a focus on and why that is relevant to their, the bigger picture, so we're going to look at this or, because of last week we noticed this, that's it but um, I think if I say this to them, I would feel a bit arrogant...

KG5: So how would you feel if you went into.. /KG2: [in sing song voice] 'By the end of this lesson you will be able to, do this and do that'/ if you were the student, if you were the student, what would you think if you went into a lesson and your teacher had written this on the board ..[...] /KG2: I'd say, no I don't think I will, /KG5: That's a bit ambitious love! /laughs/ I think it's still going to take me three months to get, to get this or a few more lessons, maybe it's just those phrases with 'can do' ...

KG1: I can remember, um, in secondary education, because I did part of the PGCE, they had this like gold, like different schools did it differently, this like medal system, like 'If you're going for gold, buy this lesson you will be able to', 'If you're going four silver, you'll be able to do this', and then like the really weak students were meant to aim for bronze [general laughter] which was like a really watered-down version of the lesson aim. Or you could do it, yeah [laughs]

KG4: Um, the other thing that we do which sort of goes back to the can do statements, because, and this is more on our lesson plans as we um, for differentiation, of different levels in, in, within one class, so you wouldn't actually write your, learning objectives like this, it would be written that 'some students would be able to do this, all students would be able to do this, most students would be able do this'. /KG1: Mm/ Because if you give them 'all students can do this by the end of the lesson' and that is completely unrealistic, because they wouldn't all be able to do that. /KG1: yeah/
### KG.Theme1.9 Competence development does not fit neatly into lesson blocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152:00:55.8 - 1:01:20.3</td>
<td>KG3</td>
<td>We have to, yeah if we get inspected, um, then we have to do lesson plans, but not for the rest of the time, and our aims would be kind of similar to DELTA aims, um, so I think it's, rather than will, they will be able to, it's they will be better able to, and that kind of, you kind of cover your back that way /KG4: Mm/ /KG2: Unless that aim, well that's the new one isn't it 'better able' / yeah...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KG.Theme1.10 Level boundaries are ambiguous on the self-assessment scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35:17:54.3 - 18:26.9</td>
<td>KG3</td>
<td>Yeah it was a bit difficult at times to choose between bands for me. Um, so for example B1 and B2, I chose French because I studied it from school up to university and I use it now and again, um these days and I found B1 and B2 fairly similar places, so I had to put myself in different situations think could I do this or not. Um, sometimes it's difficult to choose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36:18:26.9 - 18:28.1</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Did you find yourself choosing different levels for different skills?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37:18:28.1 - 18:40.9</td>
<td>KG3</td>
<td>Yeah , yeah, writing was the lowest and um, spoken interaction was the highest, and the others were in the middle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38:18:40.8 - 19:02.8</td>
<td>KG4</td>
<td>Yeah, I, I totally agree with you actually. I chose French as well. I studied French at university and then lived there for a while, and yeah so I've done exactly the same summer spoken interaction is highest, my written is lowest. And then the other three are in the same band. But I actually also agree that it's quite difficult to distinguish at times between them. Um.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39:19:02.7 - 19:09.2</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Can you pinpoint what made it difficult?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:19:09.1 - 19:42.1</td>
<td>KG4</td>
<td>I think it's just the ambiguity a little bit with the language, because at times... You know with listening for example I could say I have no difficulty understanding any kind of spoken language, then it's, you know if you look across them, you see 'I can understand extended speech even though it's not clearly structured'... What does that mean? [laughs] You know, it's... That's quite unclear, um...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:19:37.1 - 19:41.1</td>
<td>Moderator</td>
<td>Any other comments from...?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42:19:41.0 - 20:16.7</td>
<td>[KG5: Um, I got the opposite of you two, because I've done Spanish, and er for writing I gave myself a higher score, and for speaking even though I think I'm quite good at speaking, um, spontaneous. Whereas writing if I have homework, I will spend ages doing it so therefore I would tend to think that my writing is of a better quality than my speaking. /Moderator: Yes well that could be possible/ There is no distinction, between, yeah - the difference is planned and unplanned isn't it?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Level boundaries are ambiguous on the self-assessment scale

KG2: When I, yeah, was first looking at this - because I've never done it before, and I've, its Spanish but I haven't - it's been about 10 years since I've done in the Spanish - I was like 'ooh' I was actually enjoying it at first, um, thinking about what I could do, and, and then I think going the in between was difficult, and then... And I can see how some of the 'I can' sentences... I'm like well yeah I can kind of do that, but then when it said 'I can understand the main points of many radio and TV programmes', and I was like actually I don't think I can get TV, so I'm still here, you know um, so that certain aspects that may be, just certain words that I'd then, put, I'd go back down, but yeah I can see that that would be quite difficult, so I thought somewhere between here, maybe here for writing, um...

Moderator: Because of certain phrases in there?

KG2: Yeah, um, yeah the reading one's a little bit similar so I'm not sure that, that one, um, hmm.

KG4: I just think some of like, I mean just focusing on the writing is well C1 and C2. You know, 'I can express myself in clear well-structured texts'. And then the last sentence it says 'I can select style appropriate to the reader in mind'. What's the difference between that and 'I can write clear smoothly flowing texts in an appropriate style'?

KG4: Is that not just, you know, synonymous? [laughs] [KG1: and KG2: agree] /KG2: A bit of paraphrasing going on yeah yea that's right/ KG4: [Echoing KG2:] A bit of paraphrasing going on /KG3: Yeah, hmm/ KG4: Because, you know, because if you actually put, I mean they've separated the 'I can', you know can-do sentences C1, but then they've just written that in er, in one sentence in C2, so that to me is just saying the same thing.

KG3: It uses complex in the one, C1 as well/ KG4: It does, 'I can write about complex subjects in a letter', what's the difference?

KG2: I wonder if that gets, as it gets to this level, the kind of, you know.../KG4: Just grey areas/ KG2: Trying to, yeah, /KG4: Yeah/ /KG3: Just splitting hairs/ KG2: use a bit of different language or, you know, when it gets higher.

Moderator: That's an interesting comment.
KG1: Um, I chose to do it about Russian, and um, I did better in, well it's not surprising, better in speaking and listening, and not so very well in writing despite the fact that I was writing notes to myself in Russian, when I was doing it, but, but, I would say the thing that I found particularly about the writing that I found not very helpful is that it doesn't talk about spelling accuracy at all. So I can, so I've had far more speaking practice and listening practising Russian and I haven't really had to, I haven't really had to write in Russian in Cyrillic for a native speaker audience since I left university, which was a long time ago, so I've had no one to assess my success on it, no one to check my spelling, and it doesn't mention spelling anyway I don't think, and you would have thought if you would using a different alphabet that would be quite important wouldn't it?

Moderator: Ah ha

KG1: Um, and it doesn't mention accuracy. So I mean to what extent can you write clear detailed text? If it's, if there is no accuracy, I mean it's not, I think it makes quite big generalisations without going into any detail. For example like an IELTS grading scale for writing, you would break it down into lexis, structure, and cohesion and... You know it would have, I think this, it's not detailed enough. So is there another table that is more detailed?

Moderator: There are more detailed tables yeah /KG1: That's what I thought yeah/ so this is an overview /KG1: this is just a summary one isn't it yeah?/ yeah.

KG5: But that's a good point the word fluency comes up a lot here, but even in speaking accuracy is relevant, so /KG4: Mmm/ I haven't seen accuracy...

KG3: Um, very simplistic and I'm not sure how useful it was for them, it was literally five boxes for each unit, um, it's too black-and-white, um, because within each can do statement as a whole range of other sub things that they can or can't do. And plus again it's kind of just focusing on functions, and ignoring all the grammar work that we'd done, and vocabulary, um, yeah.

KG5: I do notice from that, 'cos I did, for my first assignment, I did a review of treatment of pronunciation in course books, and I did this one, although I've never had a chance to work with these books, but it does have a very strong focus on communication, like that little bit there for intonation and stress, and clearly hear there's a very strong emphasis on discourse, isn't there? Like there is two categories devoted to speaking, and very strong emphasis as we've already said on fluency, so um, it seems that fluency is really prioritised over accuracy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32:07</td>
<td>KG2: Um, I mean, using this with the higher levels, I mean, if you were going to, I would have to with the students take the sentences apart. So if there kind of C1, C2, literally 'I can understand extended speech even when it is not clearly structured', and put that into maybe more concrete terms, more, what does that actually mean? Or if there were videos of each one [laughs] or some kind of concrete way to show it, rather than this ambiguous quite abstract way,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 32:39 | KG2: [continued] so I can understand television programs without too much effort, and then I discuss what films to watch, you know, just invest a bit of time if you're going to be using them, break those down...[...]
| 54:25 | KG5: Well it says there 'explain why something is a problem', so I would assume that things like problems with your accommodation, problems with opening a bank account. KG4: So just, okay...KG2: And over the years they become routine /KG5: Problems with a tube |
| 54:28 | strike/ [general laughter] |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39:31</td>
<td>KG2: And a lot of it's sort of in your head now, after so, you know, it depends on how many years you've been teaching, it's just a part of, what's a better way to say it, a part of you. /Moderator: Ah ha/ It's just now, I can't remember the last time I properly looked at the common European framework that we could probably list grammar, for this level, this level, this level, we could list the type of vocab, just you know, like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:03</td>
<td>KG2: [continued] And I've not actually used a lot of general English course books for a long time, but that's obviously the system I've internalised, through books, the test, criteria test, probably more IELTS criteria testing. That's kind of a bit /KG4: No it's true/ strange that, you know, when I'm looking at this I'm thinking, you know what you'd have to do for that level /KG4: Yeah/ probably anyway, there wouldn't be any surprises /KG4: That's the thing you'd know, yeah/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:29</td>
<td>KG4: You to know that kind of elementary level that they'd do to cover, 'there is/there are' /KG2: Yeah/ But you know all of that, all of that language, so you get used to that, you get very aware of what's expected, to know, that's that level...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:46</td>
<td>[KG4: do you think teachers would, I mean I don't think I would actually look at this though, it's like you were saying earlier, earlier Julia, where you, you become so familiar with a particular level, that you actually know what is...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
required of your students at elementary level or pre-intermediate level or intermediate level before they move up to the next one. And I'd actually find this quite, I mean, with, my experience of teaching, I would know I think that, you know, informal discussions reading and speaking 'what do you think', I'm aware that that is so that students can give or seek personal views and opinions. So it's almost a bit, I'm just, I don't think, I mean maybe you'd find it useful for teachers who are just starting, who maybe don't necessarily see the relevance of an exercise, because that's /KG5: That might be more useful for the students than the teachers/ possibly, yeah.

KG2: I do think our, sorry one last thing, that the methodology I know has come through coursebooks for me over the years like this, and through IELTS, and through IELTS criteria, so maybe now I'm kind of moving out of that little bit of that, so again I think it's this internal methodology that for me it's 'skimming and scanning skills, IELTS'/Moderator: Ah ha/ You've got these questions, what skills do need to be able to answer these questions, you've got, you've got to look at these, you've got to look at keywords. So probably maybe a lot of the methodology talk of how we're going to do things, probably goes back to when I started teaching and was heavily dependent on these books, which would have been written in the common European framework way...

Moderator: So you were saying you have internalised it?

KG2: I, I think so actually, yeah so actually a lot of the talk of 'we've got to get them to do this, there you go, we've got to get them to do this and do that 'all stems from the levels of ...[...]

In our institution we, um, we've recently been Ofsted inspected, /Moderator: Have you?/ Ofstedded [laughs], and um, Ofsted actually does require lesson objectives, or learning objectives to be put on the board and to be visible throughout the lesson. Um, and I know it's like, quite controversial because it's like you were saying, you know it's, some people agree with it some people don't, um, I know certainly with EFL lessons we used to have quite a few difficulties with it because sometimes if you actually teaching something or trying to elicit language from them, if you put [laughs] 'Oh today we're going to look at the present perfect - oops I just told you what we going to study' [laughs], and I wanted you to actually recognise it, then that
**KG.Theme2.1 Can do objectives can interfere with inductive approach**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00</td>
<td>Can do objectives can interfere with inductive approach completely destroys your lesson in that sense, but we are actually required to put lesson objectives up on the board...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KG.Theme2.2 Control of form is a benchmark for judging competence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00:00</td>
<td>[KG2: Yeah, I think it's just over time knowing a few you know, complex sentences, compound sentences and a bit of writing / Moderator: Ah ha/ you know these kind of signs that you just are aware of that they've got to reach in both the speaking and writing, yeah maybe speaking and writing...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:15</td>
<td>KG4: I guess what you could do as a teaching resource, um for students to, in terms of highlighting what they can do for them, is if you've completed this unit, you could actually get the students to write the can do statements. So they could actually go through, you know, 'I can talk about something in the present perfect', 'I can use the adverbs 'just yet, an 'already' /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:30</td>
<td>KG3: Or maybe um/ 'I can discuss some likes and dislikes'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:45</td>
<td>KG4: You to know that kind of elementary level that they'd to cover, 'there is/there are' /KG2: Yeah/ But you know all of that, all of that language, so you get used to that, you get very aware of what's expected, to know, that's that level...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:60</td>
<td>KG5: I agree with you but, like, if you're doing a task, like a production task at the end of the lesson, and you can measure if they using them in that, but you can't measure if they using them in real life spontaneously can you? /KG3: No/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:75</td>
<td>KG2: That range...I... Mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00:90</td>
<td>KG3: Compared to things like reading, which I find it difficult to teach someone how to read properly, or to understand the different concepts...[...] [KG5: Because it's all about the lexis, generally speaking isn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:05</td>
<td>KG4: Mm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>KG2: I think the grammatical accuracy or phonological control just because just because you can hear instantly if they are right or wrong, um, well not right or wrong, um, easy, yeah, what am I trying to say? Yeah when I looked, when I looked at the others, like listening comprehension it's really hard to know because it's, how do you know how much they've really understood you've got your questions but, you know, I'll be covering everything?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:35</td>
<td>KG2: Um, good control of elementary vocabulary... You think it was more the grammar and pronunciation is clear, well if I yeah, you can see that quite evidently suppose because it's, may be concrete evidence, you can get in a...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### KG.Theme2.2 Control of form is a benchmark for judging competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>KG4: I think that's the thing you can give them lots of stock phrases to, you know, give personal opinions and seek personal opinions, and if they're using, if you then set up a productive task, spoken task at the end then you've got your evidence that they can do that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>KG1: Yeah I think that's, that's actually something you can do in a lesson /KG4: Yeah/ the doesn't mean that they'll then be able to give opinions real-life afterwards necessarily, but by the end of the lesson they should be up to use some of the target language /KG4: Mm/ /KG3: Yeah/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>KG4: But could you not measure it's therefore the same way that you would do in informal discussion? In that if you pre-teach them the functional language that they need in order to interview and be interviewed, then it's almost like a tick box of, I mean you could almost get the students to assess whether or not that students said that word and get them to tick /KG2: Yeah/ ticket against a list? /KG3: Mm, I mean yeah/ Have you heard these phrases, yes, you know I can do that...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KG.Theme2.3 Expressing aims as assessment scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>KG2: An exit score for them language wise, and then they've got their portfolios and, for the kind of fashion side for the undergraduate courses. But language wise it's to get that score. Moderator: Okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>KG1: Um my current teaching context is quite similar, I'm teaching on a pre-sessional course at the same university, and um, my students are, I've got to classes and one is um, comprises of design students mainly in the other is fashion management and marketing students, and then, but they're going on to do Masters, it's um a pre-sessional course so they didn't get the IELTS score that they needed to progress onto their masters degree so they're trying to improve their level for that. Um, that's where I work at the moment but I've worked in different places over the last year or so, so... [laughs] Moderator: Okay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>KG4: Um I also teach students on a foundation course, um, in international college in London, um, most of the students coming to they arrive at the college with an IELTS 5.5, on their foundation course they will actually study other subjects but their language objective is to um, leave with an IELTS 6.5, so that they can proceed onto an undergraduate course at University. Moderator: Okay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17    | KG4: Um, my situation is quite different we actually do have a scheme of work that we, um, should follow, um... And it's quite, because our students are following a foundation course they have certain assessments throughout the
KG.Theme2.3 Expressing aims as assessment scores

year. Um, and those assessments for the English component would be, you know in the first six weeks they have to, um, write a 3000 word essay so the input for the first six weeks is academic writing input. So the IELTS is actually, really is focused on for about six weeks of the whole course, so ours is actually quite tight, in that sense of we have to follow a scheme of work.

KG5: I think on a pre-session tend to be a lot of assessments don't there? So whatever you do as long as you're preparing your students for assessment, it's [KG1: Yeah, so you decide how to do that best.]

KG1: Um, so that's really good I like it. In contrast I've worked for places where they teach academic English without a course book, and where the teacher has to write all the materials, and where the main guidelines you have to prepare them for assessment. So it's very different. Moderator: Okay

KG2: Um, I think mine is not a lot of material available we're creating it all, /KG1: mm/ and we've, we have a scheme of work for the whole year, but that er is being reviewed at the moment. Actually we don't follow it a lot, what we do is we've got assessments that we need to prepare students for. So that is always in our mind is, 'what's the aim of the assessment and what have they got to do?'. We have to prepare them for that.

KG2: And then we've got two types of assessment that we are preparing them for. We then have a separate group for a bit of extra language support, the 5.5 students, but I think with those guys we can, I think it's open, there's no scheme of work for them at the moment. But I think in our heads we have what they need to get to, they need to be a 6, so we need, we know who the elements we need to teach them for 6 or a 6.5.. so...

KG.Theme2.4 Form focus is a concrete starting point for lesson plans

KG3: Um, I ticked the bottom one, vocabulary range, um, I find in terms of, because we're talking about teach-ability and learn-ability, and then I just automatically go for lexis because of how measurable it is and, um, you know, you can have lesson aims of 'I want to teach them this number of phrases' or new words. Um, and then you can listen out for if they are using those words or phrases in the speaking part, so I find that more teachable than most other things...um

KG1: I think, one that, I don't, sorry, one that I think looks easy, sorry I might have missed it if you've already discussed it, is 'can give or seek personal views and opinions in discussing topics of interest' /KG4: Yeah/ /KG5: I
### KG.Theme2.4 Form focus is a concrete starting point for lesson plans

Ticked that one as well. That's, that would be for me the easiest because you can just teach them lots of opinion language and then, give them topics to discuss. /KG4: Yeah I agree/ and help people from cultures where they aren't used to expressing opinions /KG5: Talk about shopping!/ Give them opportunities to give opinions /KG5: Talk about mobile phones!/ [laughs]

**KG4:** I think that's the thing you can give them lots of stock phrases to, you know, give personal opinions and seek personal opinions, and if they're using, if you then set up a productive task, spoken task at the end then you've got your evidence that they can do that.

### KG.Theme2.5 Planning should address learner preferences and expectations

**KG3:** Um, how do I prepare? Um normally just, just what I think they going to enjoy on that day and if something's been working up to now, maybe keep it going a bit longer, like it's fairly spontaneous planning at times /Moderator: Okay/ Um...

**KG2:** Put those kind of activities, that's what you, you still need them in some ways don't you though? Because that's what, that's what people want when they learn a language as well, they want phrases they want interactive activities as well.  
**KG4:** Yeah I totally agree with you.

### KG.Theme2.6 Receptive skills are difficult to plan teaching activities for

**KG1:** Um, and, and I think in terms of reading like this reading for orientation thing, to me that's a bit, related to reading skills that not language specific, so student in their first language could be a native speaker and think that they can read well, that doesn't mean that they're going to have academic reading skills and be able to gather specific information from different parts of the text, and I think it's a bit ambitious it's a bit hard to teach that, I think it's really just something you learn from practice I don't, I don't think...
KG. Theme 2.7 Topics provide course cohesion

KG5: I agree it just really depends where you're working, sometimes you have to do this unit this week, um, where I'm working at the moment the coursebook I've got specifically references the common European framework at the beginning of every unit, but I've only got two students - one girl is a French girl doing journalism, and a Korean girl doing theatre studies, and this whole book is geared towards IELTS - not explicitly - so I'm just doing what I want. I did a whole week of gender stereotyping and toys like Barbie dolls Lego, um, going on excursions, asking them to listen to radio programmes, and summarise them, and my school's fine with that.
Moderator: Okay

Theme 3: 'Integration of CEFR can-do statements with course content is problematic.'

KG. Theme 3.1 Can dos are difficult to measure in reality

KG2: Yeah, if I can express and respond to feelings, you know, such as surprise and happiness...
KG1: It's like you're talking about a child or an animal
KG2: Mm, it's very personal isn't it, it's very personal, it's very /KG4: Cultural mm/ culturally different how you would respond to happiness and sadness.
KG4: Well it's then how would you measure it as well? Everyone responds to those things differently, there's an assumption that they're going to respond in the same way.
KG3: Mm

KG. Theme 3.2 Course books only superficially employ can do statements

KG1: I wonder what their motivation was in creating this page, I'm a bit cynical and I kind of wonder if it's just so they can say that it's pegged to the common European framework, and I suspect that this activity book got written first, and then they went to the common European framework, and were like 'Ooh, what can be matched to it?' A bit like somebody doing a DELTA creating a lesson plan, or something you know when, or no, not the DELTA,
KG.Theme3.2 Course books only superficially employ can-do statements

something somewhere I've been where I felt the need to do that, oh yes now I remember! [KG2: and KG4: laugh] it was Eurocentres! Yeah that's it [laughs] so, that sounded really sarcastic but it was [KG2: and KG4: laugh] Yeah.

KG.Theme3.3 Course books should provide a good quantity and choice of activities

KG1: so there is, I would say on the one hand there is freedom you can do what you, you... Basically we are expected to use the coursebook, and were not actually necessarily expected to supplement it, and there's so much in it and it is actually very well written, so you don't actually really need to. So you just decide basically which bits of the coursebook you want to use, and when and in which order you want to do them. And nobody follows up on it so you have that freedom. So it's really good yeah.

KG.Theme3.4 Profiling does not fit with course expectations

KG4: I think as well it's also assuming that you are a B2 in all the skills. /KG3: Mm/ Because you don't get course books that are mixed across do you? Moderator: That's an interesting comment. KG4: You know, you get I mean I haven't, when I assess my level of French, you know, I've got one in B2 three in C1 and one in C2, so what coursebook do I use, as a learner? [Group is silent]

Theme 4: 'CEFR can-do statements are a useful roadmap and reflection tool'

KG.Theme4.1 Can do statements can provide a roadmap for learning

KG2: Yeah, think the, what you were saying about having motivation, having something, I think we need something don't we that we can kind of refer to, objectives or something for learning, or where we want to go to, you know, where do we want to be, what does that involve?

KG1: I think, I like, /KG2: no go on/ I like the idea of writing down what you're going to cover in a lesson on the board and I personally do do that and I think it's important, because I think sometimes that things that seem
**KG.Theme4.1 Can do statements can provide a roadmap for learning**

obvious to the teacher are not necessarily obvious to the student, but I don't use 'can do' language to do it. So, um, I mean to start with there is no space to do it on the whiteboard even if you wanted to...Yeah, so, yeah.

**KG.Theme4.2 Can do statements work better for reflection than as learning objectives**

| 160:03:21.9 - 1:04:10.5 | KG1: One thing I noticed, it sounds like you're about to stop but, one thing I actually wanted to say was I think that for me one key value of this kind of thing is for assessing proficiency. I think there's value in can do statements for that, but I don't necessarily know to what extent they useful for teaching, partly because, as we're told on our course, um, you can, what are student learns isn't necessarily what you intend to teach them. So you couldn't, just because you can use that to assess proficiency doesn't necessarily mean that you can decide 'I'm going to teach this today and that's what they going to learn', because people don't learn a skill or a language item in one isolated lesson, they learn it across a whole course and outside the classroom, and when you're not expecting them to, I think..yeah |
| :04:10.4 - 1:04:13.9 | KG2: That's right so, useful for assessment. |

**KG.Theme4.3 Can-do statement lists can highlight what a learner can't yet do**

| 82 31:18.7 - 31:45.2 | KG5: Exactly, and if you're somewhere like Eurocentres and you get one student who finishes like intermediate level, and that they just don't get it why they're not allowed to move up to the next level, you know that, you know as the teacher that they are not capable of the next level, just yet, they're saying 'why? I've done the course book, I've been through the coursebook, I've done all the units in the coursebook'. If you've got something like this to refer to, it's useful for you and for them. Moderator: Right. |

**KG.Theme4.4 Self-assessment against can-dos is motivational**

| 81 31:00.1 - 31:18.7 | KG4: It's something I've used with students though I didn't use it for very long, um, but it did seem to motivate the students because they can actually see what they are achieving. Because that's sometimes quite difficult to measure, if you're just ploughing through a course or... |
### KG.Theme4.5 Self-assessment against can-dos raises awareness of learning needs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG1:</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>25:22.9 - 25:35.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think it could be useful for self-assessment though, because it did make me think that if you gave it to students they would see what, where their line of progression is, and what their potential route is, they might, because they might not be aware of what the next stage ahead of them involves.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KG.Theme4.6 Teacher and learner perceptions of competence differ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG3:</th>
<th>74</th>
<th>28:41.5 - 29:09.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes I forgot to mention actually we do that as well, so, um, we give them the table and we ask them to say where they think they are for each skill first, and then we tell them where they actually are from a teacher's point of view. /Moderator: Ah, okay/ Um, but I think there is a downside of that, because it could be very demotivating if they think they're really strong in one area and then you go and tell them 'no actually, you're not B2, you're an A2'.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG5:</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>29:09.5 - 29:16.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know, and I wouldn't like to tell the Saudi male student that /KG3: Yeah/ information, I don't think that would go down very well [laughs]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG3:</th>
<th>76</th>
<th>29:16.1 - 29:25.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yeah, I think that's more to do with the particular way my school does things, rather than a critique of this scale itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It has to be monitored then by the teacher /KG4: Yeah/ as well and then you have to intervene if they are way off track, or, um, maybe modify their attitude [laughs] KG4: Yeah, yeah.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KG2:</th>
<th>100</th>
<th>39:31.3 - 40:03.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And a lot of it's sort of in your head now, after so, you know, it depends on how many years you've been teaching, it's just a part of, what's a better way to say it, a part of you. /Moderator: Ah ha/ It's just now, I can't remember the last time I properly looked at the common European framework that we could probably list grammar, for this level, this level, this level, we could list the type of vocab, just you know, like that.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level: B1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPONENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTOR</th>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY/EXERCISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conversation</td>
<td>Can express and respond to feelings, such as surprise, happiness, sadness, interest, and indifference.</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Everyday English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used ‘routines’ and patterns associated with more predictable situations.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>300 million books sold!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can give or seek personal views and opinions in discussing topics of interest.</td>
<td>56, 57</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can exchange, check, and confirm accumulated factual information on familiar routine and non-routine matters within his/her field with some confidence.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can carry out a prepared interview, checking and confirming information, though he/she may occasionally have to ask for repetition if the other person’s response is rapid or extended.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided speech is clearly articulated in a generally familiar accent.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>300 million books sold!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can enter unprepared into conversation on familiar topics, express personal opinions and exchange information on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel, and current events).</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Reading and speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can exchange, check, and confirm information, deal with less routine situations and explain why something is a problem.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Reading and speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronunciation is clearly intelligible even if a foreign accent is sometimes evident and occasional mispronunciations occur.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can scan longer texts in order to locate desired information, and gather information from different parts of a text, or from different texts in order to fulfill a specific task.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>300 million books sold!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around him/her, provided speech is clearly articulated in standard dialect.</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shows good control of elementary vocabulary, but major errors still occur when expressing more complex thoughts or handling unfamiliar topics and situations.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has a sufficient vocabulary to express him/herself with some circumlocations on most topics pertinent to his/her everyday life, such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel, and current trends.</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Vocabulary and listening</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(© Oxford University Press, n.d., accessed 2014)
JK Rowling
Author and billionaire
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PRACTICE

Discussing grammar
Work with a partner.

1 Look at the pairs of sentences. Which tenses are used? Why? Discuss the differences in meaning.
   1 I lived in Sydney for two years. I've lived in Sydney for two years.
   2 I work for an international company. I've worked for them since 2006.
   3 How long have you been working in Tokyo? How many countries have you worked in?
   4 Have you ever met anyone famous? Did you meet anyone famous at the party?
   5 I've already finished. I haven't finished yet.
   6 Who's been eating my chocolates? Who's eaten my chocolates?
   7 The President was shot in 1963. Have you heard? The President's been shot.
   8 How long are you here for? How long have you been here for?

2 Underline the correct verb form.
   1 His plane took off / has taken off a few minutes ago.
   2 The president has resigned / has been resigned and a new president has elected / has been elected.
   3 I work / I've been working in Dubai since last March. When did you arrive / have you arrived?
   4 How many emails have you sent / have you been sending?
   5 What did you do / have you been doing in the bathroom? You were / 've been in there for ages.
   6 A huge snowstorm has hit / has been hit New York. Over 40 cms of snow has fallen / has been falling in the past 12 hours. People have advised / have been advised to stay at home.

3 Where can the words in the box go in these sentences? Sometimes several words are possible.
   just yet already ever never

   1 I've read that book.
   2 I've been reading an interesting book.
   3 Has it been made into a film?
   4 He's learned to drive.
   5 The match hasn't finished.
   6 Have you been to Morocco?
   Compare answers with the class.

Unit 7 - Passions and fashions
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a passion for fashion

5. With a partner study the chart. Ask and answer these questions about Calvin Klein's life.
   1. How long has Calvin Klein been interested in fashion?
      Since he was 14.
   2. What different kinds of clothes has he designed in his career?
   3. How many times has he been married and divorced?
   4. How many children does he have?
   5. How many awards has he won?
   6. How long has he been making his own perfumes?
   7. Which famous people has he worked with and designed for?
   8. How long has he been selling cosmetics?

   T115 Listen and check your answers. What extra information do you learn about Calvin Klein's life?

Time expressions

6. Complete the sentences with phrases from the box.
   while he was studying at the Fashion Institute
   when he was 14
   in 1972
   for ten years

   four years after he got married
   since the 1970s
   between 1982 and 1986
   until he was 44

   1. His interest in fashion began ____________.
   2. He met his first wife, Jayne, ____________.
   3. The first Calvin Klein jeans were introduced ____________.
   4. His daughter was born ____________.
   5. His marriage to Jayne lasted ____________.
   6. He didn't marry again ____________.
   7. He's been designing sportswear ____________.
   8. ____________ he won the same award three times.

Roleplay

Imagine you are a journalist. You are going to interview Calvin Klein about his life. Write questions to ask him with your partner. Then roleplay the interview.

Interviewer: Where were you born?
CK: In New York. In the Bronx.

Interviewer: Have you always been interested in fashion?
CK: Yes, I have. Well, most of my life, since I was 14.

SPOKEN ENGLISH: How long...

1. Read the two conversations. What are the two questions with How long?
   1. How long are you here for?
      A. Just three days. I arrived yesterday and I leave tomorrow.
      B. I've been here a week already. I arrived last Saturday.
   2. How long have you been here?
      A. I've been here a week already. I arrived last Saturday.
      B. Which question refers to past up to the present?
         Which question refers to a period around now (past and future)?
   2. What is the correct question for these answers?
      1. Four more days. We came two days ago.
      2. Since Monday.
      3. Until Friday. We're leaving Friday morning.
      4. Over half an hour! Where have you been?
      5. We're staying a month altogether.

   T76 Listen and check. Practise with a partner.
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READING AND SPEAKING
Football – a global passion

1 Football – do you love it or hate it? Why? Have a class vote.
   How many famous footballers can you name? What teams do
   they play for?

2 Whether you love it or hate it, football is difficult to ignore.
   Read only the introduction and the final part of The
   Beautiful Game.
   1 What statistics are given? Do any of them surprise you?
   2 How did football become known as ‘The Beautiful Game’?
   3 In what ways is football a ‘simple’ game?
   4 Which famous players are mentioned? What do they have
      in common?

3 Read How football began. Answer the questions.
   1 What was tea chue?
   2 Which nationalities were the first to play a kind of football?
      When?
   3 What images do you have of ‘mob football’? Describe a game.
   4 How was the game played at English public schools?
   5 What caused chaos when the boys tried to play football at
      university?
   6 How did the idea of half-time start?
   7 Why is a London pub important to football?
   8 What was the ‘sticking point’? Which game was also born?
      Why?

4 Read Football around the world.
   1 Complete the sentences with the name of the continent.
      a _______ has become more enthusiastic about football
         since the 2006 World Cup.
      b _______ has the wealthiest football clubs in the world.
      c Not all countries in _______ have a passion for football.
      d _______ and _______ often lose their most talented
         players to rich European clubs.
      e In _______ football has become more popular with girls
         than boys.
   2 Which continents are most/least enthusiastic about football?
   3 Why is football called ‘soccer’ in North America?
   4 Why do some continents often lose players to European clubs?
   5 How and where has the World Cup increased interest in
      football?

What do you think?
• Football has totally changed the worlds of sport, media, and
  leisure. What does this mean?
• Does football unite or divide the world? How?
• Why are some clubs so famous worldwide? Which players
  are superstars today?
• Do you agree with the conclusion about why football has
  become a global passion?

58 Unit 7 • Passions and fashions
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Beautiful Game

Football around the world

Europe is home to the world's richest professional clubs: Manchester United, AC Milan, Real Madrid, Bayern Munich. These clubs are famous in many countries far away from their home grounds. Rickshaw pullers in Mumbai, tuk-tuk drivers in Bangkok, on discovering they have an English passenger respond with 'Ah, English, Manchester United. You know Manchester United?'

South America has produced some of the most exciting soccer on earth. Many of the world's leading players have come from poverty to play on the world stage. They have been snapped up by wealthy European teams after making their mark at home. Brazil has won the World Cup five times, Uruguay three times, and Argentina twice.

North America is the only continent where football (or soccer as it is called there to distinguish it from their own game) has become more popular with females than males. In 1991, the US won the first Women's World Cup. Interest amongst American men has been growing since the World Cup in Los Angeles in 1994, and more recently since the arrival of international stars such as David Beckham.

Asia: Over the past two decades heated rivalry among Japan, China, and South Korea has increased the passion for soccer across the continent, especially after Japan and Korea co-hosted the World Cup in 2002. However, not all Asian countries share the passion: India and Pakistan prefer cricket.

The Middle East: Countries such as Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and Qatar have lately been investing huge sums of money in football. They've hired the best players and coaches that money can buy.

Australia: Sport in Australia has long been dominated by cricket, rugby and surfing. However, since they qualified for the 2006 World Cup, Australians have become much more interested in the game.

Africa: South Africa has produced a number of soccer superstars, but many of them have been lost to the rich European clubs. Africa is poor in resources but rich in talent, with thousands of gifted young players dreaming of big time football. South Africa's hosting of the 2010 World Cup is very important for African football.

A global passion

The game of football is played in every nation on earth, not only by the 120 m regular team players, but also by countless others on beaches, in playgrounds and streets. The world's love of football is simple — it's because football is simple. All that is needed is a ball, a piece of ground, and two posts. The world's greatest players, George Best, Diego Maradona, and Pelé, all learned their skills on waste grounds. These are the places where the sport is born and why football has become a global passion.
VOCABULARY AND LISTENING

Things I’m passionate about

1. Work with a partner. Look at the words and expressions in the box. Which are positive, which are negative? Which are neutral?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>quite like</th>
<th>crazy about</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adore</td>
<td>can’t stand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loathe</td>
<td>don’t mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keen on</td>
<td>can’t bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not that keen on</td>
<td>fond of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Rewrite the sentences using the words in brackets.

1. She likes ice-cream very much. *(absolutely adore)*
   She absolutely *adores* ice-cream.
2. He likes all water sports. *(very keen)*
3. I hate opera. *(can’t bear)*
4. My brother loves playing video games. *(crazy about)*
5. My sister doesn’t really like any sports. *(not that keen)*
6. I don’t like people who always talk about themselves. *(can’t stand)*
7. My mum likes going to musicals. *(very fond)*
8. I quite like green tea but I prefer English breakfast tea. *(don’t mind)*
9. The thing I hate most is tidying my room. *(loathe)*
10. I don’t hate my job but it’s time I applied for another one. *(quite like)*

3. Look at the photos of the people. Read what they say about their passion. Can you work out what their passion is?

4. **Listen to the people. Were you right?**
   What are their passions?

5. **Listen again. Answer the questions about each person.**
   1. How long have they had their passion?
   2. What first created their interest?
   3. Why do they like it so much?

6. Use some of the expressions from the box in exercise 1 to talk about the people.

**What do you think?**

- Which of the people’s passions most interest you?
- Why? Which interest you least?
- Is there anything in your life that you feel passionate about? Tell the class about it.
EVERYDAY ENGLISH
Making the right noises

1. Look at the words in the boxes. They are all possible responses in conversation. What do they express? Write in the correct heading.
   - Agreement  - Sympathy  - Pleasure  - Surprise


2. T.7.8 Listen and repeat these expressions with a wide voice range.
   - How fantastic! Absolutely. Did you? What a pity!

3. T.7.9 Listen and practise.

   2.  TAP Listen and complete B’s responses. Practise the conversation with a partner.

   A My boyfriend’s just asked me to marry him.
   B ________ (surprise) ________ (pleasure)

   A Will spaghetti bolognese be OK for dinner?
   B ________ (agreement) ________ (pleasure)

   A There’s a strike at the airport so my holiday’s been cancelled.
   B ________ (sympathy) ________ (sympathy)

   A I failed my driving test again.
   B ________ (surprise) ________ (sympathy)

   A We’re expecting a baby.
   B ________ (surprise) ________ (pleasure)

   A So you think I should save to buy a car, not borrow the money?
   B ________ (agreement)

4. T.7.11 Listen and compare. What is B’s further comment?

5. Practise the conversations with a partner. Continue them if you can.

   5. Work with a partner. Have a conversation about a good or bad day you have had recently. React as you listen and talk.

   Last Sunday was the worst day of my life!
   Well, …
   Oh dear. What happened?
1. Think of someone in your family and write three sentences about them. Read your sentences aloud to the rest of the class.

2. Which relative did you choose? Why? Did you write about their character, their appearance, or both?

3. Read the description of crazy Uncle Joe. Which sentence below accurately describes the writer's opinion of him?

   - The writer likes Uncle Joe but is critical of his way of life.
   - The writer admires everything about Uncle Joe.

4. The text consists of factual description and personal opinions. Work with a partner and read through the text again. Underline the ______ word or words which are factual, and underline the ______ word or words which are personal opinion.

5. Find words and phrases which describe:
   - his physical appearance
   - his character
   - his past life
   - his current lifestyle

6. Find the following words:
   - much (line 2)
   - really (line 13)
   - such (line 4)
   - quite (line 13)
   - completely (line 10)
   - particularly (line 15)
   - absolutely (line 11)
   - extremely (line 18)

   How do they change the meaning of the adjectives which follow them?

7. Write a similar description of a member of your family in about 200 words. Include your sentences from exercise 1 and the following:
   - your relation to him/her
   - your opinion of him/her
   - a little about his/her past life
   - his/her physical appearance
   - his/her character
   - his/her current lifestyle

---
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### APPENDIX T: New Headway Intermediate 4th Edition Learner Portfolio

**Unit 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Framework level: B1</th>
<th>I can do this with difficulty</th>
<th>Easily</th>
<th>New Headway Intermediate Unit 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can do statements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand a short biography of a famous writer.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 54, 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand an interview with a child about a book.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand people talking about their passions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand everyday comments, expressions and responses.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify the main points of biographical information.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 54–57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand a short biography of a famous writer.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 54, 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand a chart of events in the life of a famous designer.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand a description of a family member.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can distinguish between facts and opinions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand an article about football.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 58, 59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can understand short extracts of people talking about their passions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can ask and talk about personal information and experiences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 54, 57, 60, 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can share ideas and knowledge on a subject.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 54, 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can ask about, and give, biographical information.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 54, 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can ask and talk about likes and preferences.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can find the answer to problems or questions through discussion.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 56, 57, 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can take part in a discussion about football.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can maintain simple everyday conversations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk about a family member.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can explain my views and give reasons to support them.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>pages 58, 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can talk about people I don’t know.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can plan what I want to say.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can ask for and give opinions.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can agree and disagree.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can react appropriately in everyday conversation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can write biographical questions to ask a famous designer.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can write a description of a family member.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>page 109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(© Oxford University Press, n.d., accessed 2014)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers / Section / Topic</th>
<th>Skills / language areas identified in student coursebook contents or CEFR map for each section</th>
<th>Learner-oriented can-do statements for the section (in online accessed pdf learner portfolio only)</th>
<th>CEFR illustrative can-do statements for the unit section stated in teacher's online accessed pdf resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Pages 54-55 (J.K. Rowling topic) | **Grammar**  
Present perfect simple and continuous  
Passive | No descriptor given | Grammatical accuracy (CEFR Table 3)  
Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used 'routines' and patterns associated with more predictable situations. |
|                               | **Listening**  
An interview: Jack, aged 10, talks about Harry Potter | Listening  
I can understand a short biography of a famous writer.  
I can understand an interview with a child about a book. I can identify the main points of biographical information. | Understanding conversation between native speakers  
Can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around him/her, provided speech is clearly articulated in standard dialect. |
|                               | **Reading**  
300 million books sold! (CEFR map only) | Reading  
I can identify the main points of biographical information. I can understand a short biography of a famous writer. | Overall reading comprehension  
Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension |
|                               | **Speaking**  
Starter (CEFR map only)  
300 million books sold! (CEFR map only) | Spoken Interaction  
I can ask and talk about personal information and experiences.  
I can share ideas and knowledge on a subject.  
I can ask about, and give, biographical information. I can ask and talk about likes and preferences. | Overall spoken interaction  
Can enter unprepared into conversation on familiar topics, express personal opinions and exchange information on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel, and current. |
| Pages 56-57 (Practise, Calvin Klein topic) | **Grammar**  
Adverbs: just, yet, already  
Time expressions: for...since...  
Spoken English: How long...? | No descriptor given | Grammatical accuracy (CEFR Table 3)  
Uses reasonably accurately a repertoire of frequently used 'routines' and patterns associated with more predictable situations. |
|                               | **Reading**  
'Practise' (CEFR map only) | Reading  
I can identify the main points of biographical information.  
I can understand a chart of events in the life of a famous designer. | Reading for orientation  
Can scan longer texts in order to locate desired information, and gather information from different parts of a text, or from different texts in order to fulfil a specific task. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers / Section / Topic</th>
<th>Skills / language areas identified in student coursebook contents or CEFR map for each section</th>
<th>Learner-oriented can-do statements for the section (in online accessed pdf learner portfolio only)</th>
<th>CEFR illustrative can-do statements for the unit section stated in teacher's online accessed pdf resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Page 103 (Describing a person - facts and opinions: My Crazy Uncle Joe)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong>&lt;br&gt;Role-play: Interviewing Calvin Klein&lt;br&gt;Have you ever?: Conversations about your life experiences</td>
<td>Spoken Interaction&lt;br&gt;I can ask and talk about personal information and experiences.&lt;br&gt;I can ask about, and give, biographical information.&lt;br&gt;I can find the answer to problems or questions through discussion.</td>
<td>Information exchange&lt;br&gt;Can find out and pass on straightforward factual information.&lt;br&gt;Can exchange, check, and confirm accumulated factual information on familiar routine and nonroutine matters within his/her field with some confidence.&lt;br&gt;Interviewing and being interviewed&lt;br&gt;Can carry out a prepared interview, checking and confirming information, though he/she may occasionally have to ask for repetition if the other person’s response is rapid or extended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing not listed in contents map or CEFR map</strong></td>
<td>Writing&lt;br&gt;I can write biographical questions to ask a famous designer.</td>
<td>No writing descriptor given</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pages 58-59 (Reading and Speaking: The Beautiful Game)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Writing</strong>&lt;br&gt;Describing a person - facts and opinions&lt;br&gt;Writing a description of someone in your family</td>
<td>Writing&lt;br&gt;I can write a description of a family member.</td>
<td>No writing descriptor given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading not listed in contents map or CEFR map</strong></td>
<td>Reading&lt;br&gt;I can understand a description of a family member. I can distinguish between facts and opinions.</td>
<td>No reading descriptor given</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading Football - a global passion</strong></td>
<td>Reading&lt;br&gt;I can understand an article about football.</td>
<td>Overall reading comprehension&lt;br&gt;Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speaking</strong>&lt;br&gt;What do you think?: Your feelings about football and its place in the world</td>
<td>Spoken Interaction&lt;br&gt;I can share ideas and knowledge on a subject.&lt;br&gt;I can take part in a discussion about football.</td>
<td>Overall spoken interaction&lt;br&gt;Can enter unprepared into conversation on familiar topics, express personal opinions and exchange information on topics that are familiar, of personal interest, or pertinent to everyday life (e.g. family, hobbies, work, travel, and current.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spoken Production</strong>&lt;br&gt;I can explain my views and give reasons to support them.</td>
<td>Strategies&lt;br&gt;I can plan what I want to say.&lt;br&gt;I can ask for and give opinions. I can agree and disagree.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Numbers / Section / Topic</td>
<td>Skills / language areas identified in student coursebook contents or CEFR map for each section</td>
<td>Learner-oriented can-do statements for the section (in online accessed pdf learner portfolio only)</td>
<td>CEFR illustrative can-do statements for the unit section stated in teacher's online accessed pdf resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Page 60 (Vocabulary and Listening: Things I'm passionate about) | **Vocabulary**  
Likes and dislikes: *adore, loathe, keen on, crazy about, fond of* | No descriptor given | Vocabulary control  
Shows good control of elementary vocabulary, but major errors still occur when expressing more complex thoughts or handling unfamiliar topics and situations.  
Has a sufficient vocabulary to express him/herself with some circumlocutions on most topics pertinent to his/her everyday life, such as family, hobbies and interests, work, travel, and current trends. |
|  | **Listening**  
Things I'm passionate about: five people talk about their passions | Listening  
I can understand people talking about their passions. | Overall listening comprehension  
Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details, provided speech is clearly articulated in a generally familiar accent. |
|  | **Reading** (CEFR map only) | Reading  
I can understand short extracts of people talking about their passions. | Overall reading comprehension  
Can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension |
| Page 61 (Everyday English: Making the Right Noises) | **Listening**  
Agreement, sympathy, pleasure and surprise | Listening  
I can understand everyday comments, expressions and responses. | No descriptor given |
|  | **Speaking**  
Agreement, sympathy, pleasure and surprise | Spoken Interaction  
I can maintain simple everyday conversations.  
Strategies  
I can react appropriately in everyday conversation. | Conversation  
Can express and respond to feelings, such as surprise, happiness, sadness, interest, and indifference. |
|  | **Phonology**  
Music of English - wide voice range | No descriptor given | Phonological control  
Pronunciation is clearly intelligible even if a foreign accent is sometimes evident and occasional mispronunciations occur. |
### APPENDIX V: English Unlimited B1+ Intermediate CEFR map unit 10
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#### UNIT 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Unlimited Intermediate goals and materials</th>
<th>CEF goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.1 talk about memory, talk about what you remember</td>
<td>can enter unprepared into conversations on familiar topics (Conversation, B1) can reasonably fluently relate a straightforward narrative or description as a linear sequence of points (Describing experience, B1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Listening: Hiromi witnesses a crime</td>
<td>can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details (Overall listening comprehension, B1+) can understand the information content of the majority of recorded or broadcast audio material on topics of personal interest (Listening to audio media and recordings, B1+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Reading: The problem with witnesses</td>
<td>can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension (Overall reading comprehension, B1) can identify the main conclusions in clearly signalled argumentative texts (Reading for information and argument, B1+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2 talk about complaining, complain about goods and services, ask for a refund or replacement and explain why</td>
<td>can enter unprepared into conversations on familiar topics (Conversation, B1) can make a complaint (Transactions to obtain goods and services, B1) can deal with less routine situations in shops, banks, e.g. returning an unsatisfactory purchase (Transactions to obtain goods and services, B1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.2 Listening: Complaining in different countries, Listening: Mariah makes a complaint</td>
<td>can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details (Overall listening comprehension, B1+) can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around him/her (Understanding conversation, B1) can understand the information content of the majority of recorded or broadcast audio material on topics of personal interest (Listening to audio media and recordings, B1+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.T make a complaint politely</td>
<td>can compare and contrast alternatives, discussing what to do, where to go, who or which to choose, etc. (Informal discussion, B1+) can explain why something is a problem (Informal discussion, B1+) can explain why something is a problem, discuss what to do next, compare and contrast alternatives (Goal-oriented cooperation, B1+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.T Listening: Good neighbours?</td>
<td>can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives (Overall listening comprehension, B1) can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around him/her (Understanding conversation, B1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.S add comments to say how you feel</td>
<td>can give detailed accounts of experiences, describing feelings and reactions (Describing experience, B1) can express and respond to feelings such as surprise, happiness, sadness, interest and indifference (Conversation, B1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**APPENDIX W**: English Unlimited B1+ Intermediate CEFR map sample by competence  
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**LISTENING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEF goals</th>
<th><em>English Unlimited Intermediate</em> listening materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall listening comprehension</strong></td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details (B1+) | 4.2 Stories: tsunami; eclipse  
4.3 Megan's accident  
5.1 Locked out  
6.2 Vernal phones a computer helpline  
6.5 Managing money  
7.1 Interview with a dancer  
7.2 Five different pets  
7.3 Tara talks about her role models  
8.3 Alice and Javier's nightmare journey  
9.1 What shall we do?  
9.2 A new business  
9.3 Flatmates  
10.1 Hiromi witnesses a crime  
10.2 Complaining in different countries  
10.3 Mariah makes a complaint  
11.1 Suresh's secret  
12.1 The Stunt Training Centre  
12.2 Talking to strangers  
12.3 The treasure hunter  
14.1 Local news (goal: understand news stories)  
14.2 What's interesting is ...  
14.3 Selecting a news story |
| can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives (B1) | 1.1 TV and radio habits  
1.1 What's on TV?  
1.1 Four people describe books and TV shows  
2.1 Keeping in touch  
2.2 Eric and Graham discuss a management decision  
3.1 I've always wanted to ...  
3.2 I'm most proud of ...  
3.3 Ola's 'easybag'  
4.1 Ouch! Five accidents  
5.2 Pierre and Munizha talk about fate  
5.5 Carolina and Iqbal catch up  
8.3 Lost property  
10.1 Good neighbours?  
11.2 Two lies  
11.3 Did you hear about ...?  
13.1 He shouldn't have ...  
13.3 Lost in Athens  
14.2 Melek and Tom discuss a news story |
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10.1 goals
- talk about memory
- talk about what you remember

Impressions

Witness

LISTENING

1 How good do you think your memory is? Think about:
   - names  
   - places  
   - faces  
   - phone numbers  
   - conversations  
   - song lyrics

2 a If you saw a crime, would you be a good witness? Look at this CCTV image for 30 seconds. Then close your books, listen to the questions and take notes.

b Compare your notes with a partner. Then look at the picture to check. What did you remember? What things didn’t you notice?

3 a Listen to one of the witnesses, Hiromi, telling her friend what she saw. Do you think she has a good memory of what happened?

b Listen again and look at the CCTV image. What four things does Hiromi get wrong?

4 Have you or has anyone you know ever witnessed a crime? What happened?

5 a Complete the sentences from Hiromi’s account. Look at the script on p156 to check.

b Discuss the questions. Try to use the highlighted expressions in 5a.

(REA et al., 2011, © Cambridge University Press)
**False memories**

**READING**

1. You’re going to read about witnesses in court cases. Discuss the questions.
   - What do these people in the courtroom do?
   - the judge  • the jury  • a lawyer  • a witness
   - What do you think are the most difficult things they have to do?

2. Read this article from a journal for law students. According to the article, what is the problem with using witnesses in court?

**The problem with witnesses**

The history of witnesses is the basis for the judicial process in many countries around the world. But research has shown that you can’t always rely on these witnesses to give an accurate account of events.

Several studies have shown that people frequently not only forget the details of things that happened but also remember things that didn’t happen at all. In one study, people were shown a picture of a car accident. Later, some were asked what they saw when the cars ‘hit’ each other, while others were asked what they saw when the cars ‘smashed’ into each other. People who were questioned using the word ‘smashed’ were more likely to recall seeing broken glass in the original picture.

The introduction of false information changes people’s memories. It can make us believe something that didn’t happen or exist.

The problem is made worse by the effect of telling a story on our memory. When we tell a story, we always have a particular audience, so we change certain details.

When we tell a friend about our day, for example, we want to make it interesting so we might exaggerate some things and leave out boring details. And every time we tell the story, our memory of it changes. In court, once witnesses have given an account of an event, they tend to remember what they said in their account rather than the actual event. Even more worryingly, once a witness has identified a person as guilty, he is likely to identify that same person later on, even when the person identified is not actually guilty.

**3**. Read the article again. Find three reasons why you can’t always rely on witnesses.

**4**. Discuss the questions.
   - What’s your opinion about using witnesses in court?
   - What do you think would help to solve the problems discussed in the article?

**GRAMMAR**

**Verb patterns**

5a. Verbs are followed by different patterns. Complete the sentences with the correct word from the article or the script, then check your ideas above and on p156.

1. They tend to remember ______ they said in their account.
2. I can remember ______ he was wearing a red shirt.
3. Then I remembered ______ pick up the phone.
4. I remember ______ how he got in.

5b. In which sentence 1–4 is remember followed by:
   - a) -ing?  • c) a question word?  • d) that?

6. When you learn a verb, it’s important to know which patterns follow it. Look at the dictionary entry for forget. Which patterns from 5b does it have?

7. Which patterns can follow these verbs?
   - a) keep
   - b) remember
   - c) understand
   - d) find

**Grammar reference and practice, p141**

** SPEAKING**

7a. Complete these questions with your own ideas.

1. Can you remember what ______?
2. Have you ever forgotten ______?
3. Can you remember seeing ______?

7b. Ask and answer the questions in 7a.

(Rea et al., 2011, © Cambridge University Press)
It’s scratched

10.2 goals
- talk about complaining
- complain about goods or services
- ask for a refund or replacement and explain why

LISTENING

1 a Talk together. What kind of behaviour annoys you? What would you do if:
1 someone went to the front of a queue without waiting in line?
2 someone broke the rules on public transport?
3 you got poor service in a restaurant, a café or a shop?

b What do most people do where you live?

2 a Listen to Tariq talking about complaining in the UK and France. What difference does he mention?

VOCABULARY

Problems with things you’ve bought

1 It’s the wrong size.
2 It’s faded.
3 It’s chipped.
4 It doesn’t work.

b Cover 3a. In pairs, take turns to point at a picture and say what’s wrong.

c What other things can be the wrong size, faded, etc.? Think of two more examples for each highlighted expression.

3 a Match problems 1–8 with A–H in the pictures.

1 It’s dented.
2 It’s torn.
3 It’s cracked.
4 It’s scratched.

b Match problems with the things.

So can a T-shirt.
An old photo can be faded.

Making a complaint

1 Read the email Mariah wrote to Anybooks.com. What complaints did she make?

Dear Sir/Madam,
I am writing to complain about the poor service I’ve received from Anybooks.com. I ordered a book from your website recently. When it arrived, several pages were missing and one page was torn. I wrote to you on 12th June asking for a replacement, but have received no reply. Could you please confirm that you received my earlier email, and that you will send me a new copy of the book? My account number is 18635P.
Yours faithfully,
Mariah Dewey

2 a Mariah doesn’t get a reply to her email so she phones the customer service department. What do you think will happen?

b Listen to the phone call. Were you right?

3 a Listen again and answer the questions.
1 How does Mariah feel? Why?
2 What two things does the customer services person do?
4 a) **Listen to the questions from the phone conversation. Which questions, A or B, end with a falling intonation? Which end with a rising intonation?**

A  I’ll have to put you on hold. Is that OK?
Is that 39PCK?
B  What’s your order number, please?
And when will I get the new book?

b) **Complete the rules with:**
- yes/no questions: **wh** questions
- usually end with a rising intonation. They’re often used to check something.
- usually end with a falling intonation. They’re often used to ask for information.

c) **Practise asking the questions in 4a.**

5 a) **You work in customer services. A customer phones you to complain about a service or product they’ve ordered online. Write questions to ask for or check the following information:**

- name
- email
- order number: 26493FR
- order date: 16^{th} July

b) **Ask and answer the questions together. Try to use the correct intonation.**

6 a) **The present perfect simple and progressive link the past and present. Read the sentences and discuss the questions below.**

**A**
The present perfect simple: have/has + past participle
I’ve written two emails but I haven’t received a reply.
I’ve just ordered you a replacement copy.

**B**
The present perfect progressive: have/has + been + -ing
I’ve been waiting to speak to someone for ten minutes,
I’ve been trying to contact you for two weeks now.

1) In which sentences, A or B, does the speaker want to emphasise:
- how long something takes?
- the result of a finished activity?

2) Which form can you use to talk about the number of times something happened?

7 a) **Complete this extract from a complaint to a music website. Which verbs are present perfect simple? Which are present perfect progressive?**

... I ordered an MP3 player from your site on February 12 this year. Unfortunately, when it arrived, I found that it didn’t work. Since that time, I ¹ ___ (write) three emails asking for a refund, but so far I ² ___ (not have) a reply. For the last two days, I ³ ___ (phone) the number given on your website but I ⁴ ___ (not get) through. I’m not at all happy with the service your company ⁵ ___ (provide) on this occasion. In fact, this is not the first time I ⁶ ___ (have) problems with Music.com. I ⁷ ___ (buy) CDs and DVDs from your site for many years, and on more than one occasion they ⁸ ___ (arrive) with the cases cracked. I ⁹ ___ (not complain) before because ...**

b) **Discuss your choices with a partner. Do you agree?**

8 a) **Work in A/B pairs.**

A, you want to complain about something you’ve bought from a website. Look on p127 and complete the information on the first role card.
B, you work on the helpline. Look on p131 and complete the information.

b) **A, phone B and have a conversation.**

c) **Now change roles and look at the next role card. Have another phone conversation.**

d) **Listen to another pair’s conversation and answer the questions.**

1) What problem did the customer have?

2) Has the customer services person solved the problem?
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10.3 Target activity

Resolve a dispute

10.3 goal

(a) make a complaint politely

1 Task listening

a. Make a list of possible problems between neighbours.
   loud noise, parking...

b. Talk together.
   1. What would you do if you had a problem with a neighbour?
   2. Would you find it easy to discuss the problem?
   3. What do you think you’d say?

2. (2.4) Listen to two neighbours, Ian and James, talking. What’s the problem?

3. a. Match 1–6 with a–f. (2.4) Then listen again to check.
   1. I’ve been meaning to talk to you.
   2. It’s just that
   3. It’s a bit
   4. Well, to be honest, we’d like to
   5. Well, to be fair, he has
   6. I’d be grateful if

   a. have a bit of peace and quiet.
   b. kicked the ball quite close to our windows.
   c. his ball ruins our plants and flowers.
   d. you could have a word with him about it.
   e. annoying.
   f. actually.

b. The highlighted expressions help to soften the complaint. Look at the script on p.157 and find two more softeners with the same meanings as 1 and 6.

c. In pairs, add the highlighted softening expressions to these complaints.
   1. a. Is everything OK? How’s your food?
   b. Well, the soup is a bit cold.
   2. a. Could you lend me some money?
   b. OK, but you haven’t paid me back from last week.
   3. Your music is very loud. If you could turn it down,
   4. You never do the washing up. It’s quite irritating.
   5. I borrowed some books from you a few months ago, and I need them.

   Well, to be honest, the soup is a bit cold.

4. Task

a. Work in A/B pairs.

   a. you’re going to speak to your neighbour about a problem. Look on p.129 and think
   b. about what language you need to use.
   A. look on p.130 and prepare to talk to your neighbour about a problem.

   b. Now change roles. Look at the next role card and have another conversation.

   5. Talk in groups. Did you resolve the disputes with your neighbour?

(Rea et al., 2011, © Cambridge University Press)
APPENDIX X (continued) Pages from English Unlimited B1+ Intermediate Unit 10

10 EXPLORE

Keyword of

Adjectives with of

1 Listen to a conversation between Hiromi and her new neighbour, Gill. Did they make a good impression on each other?

2 Some adjectives go with of. Match 1–3 with responses a–c from the conversation.

   1. I’ve made you some cakes.
   2. Would you like to come round and play?
   3. We’ve just moved here from Japan.

   a. Really? That’s so brave of you!
   b. Oh, that was very kind of you. They look delicious.
   c. How thoughtful of you. I’m sure he’d love that.

b Which highlighted expressions are used:

   1. to give a compliment?
   2. to say thanks?

   Can you think of more expressions like these?

   a That’s nice of you.
   b That’s clever of you.

   Listen to what five people say. Respond with a compliment or thanks.

3 Complete each sentence with an appropriate adjective.

   fond capable sick proud afraid

   1. I’m ______ of spiders. I always think they’re going to bite me.
   2. Real Madrid are ______ of winning the league. They’ve got a great team.
   3. I’m very ______ of Agata. She’s such a nice person.
   4. I’m very ______ of what we’ve achieved. We all worked hard on this project.
   5. I’m ______ of my job at the moment. I’ve been doing the same thing for ten years.

b Think of sentences about you with the expressions in 3a.

   I’m afraid of the dark.

   Really? It doesn’t bother me.

   Then talk together.

Verbs with of

4 Read this extract from an article about first impressions.
What four things does it say you can do to give a good first impression?

Making a good impression

Experts tell us that first impressions can be made in two seconds or less.
They can be nearly impossible to change, so if you want to get on in life, then creating a good first impression is a great place to start.

– Be open and confident. Everybody’s heard of the power of positive thinking. Get rid of any negative thoughts by thinking of all the positive results that could come from the encounter.
– Remind yourself of any nervous habits you have and make sure you avoid them.
– Be attentive, switch your phone off and get rid of all distractions. Anything less will instantly give a bad impression.
– Prepare for the encounter. Think of some interesting questions and find out if you have anything in common.

5 Some verbs go with of. Cover the article. Can you remember how these sentences continue?

   Everybody’s heard of the power ...
   Get rid of any negative ...
   Remind yourself of any nervous ...
   Think of some interesting ...

b Read the article again to check.

6 How many more ways can you think of to make a good first impression?

(Rea et al., 2011, © Cambridge University Press)
EXPLORE Speaking

1. When was the last time you had a long weekend? What did you do?

2. **Listen to two conversations between Mariah and Pat and answer the questions.**
   **Conversation 1 (Monday):**
   When do they decide to take a day off? Why?
   How much time do they get together in the end?
   **Conversation 2 (Friday evening):**
   She thinks she can finish it before Thursday.
   She thinks it’s better to take Thursday off.
   Mariah says driving was a bad idea.
   Pat didn’t enjoy his day off.
   Mariah is looking forward to the rest of the weekend.

3. **Listen again. Are the following statements true or false?**
   1. Mariah isn’t worried about writing her essay.
   2. She thinks she can finish it before Thursday.
   3. Pat thinks it’s better to take Thursday off.
   4. Mariah says driving was a bad idea.
   5. Pat didn’t enjoy his day off.
   6. Mariah is looking forward to the rest of the weekend.

4. **Read conversations 1 and 2 to check your ideas.**

5. **Look at the highlighted comments 1–7 in the conversations.**
   1. What is each comment about?
   2. Which express:
      - positive feelings?
      - negative feelings?

6. **Add expressions from the box to which was and complete the conversation below.**

   **great, excellent, important, nice, tricky, understandable, unfortunate, typical, shame**

   **a. How was your weekend?**
   **b. Nice. Some good friends who I don’t see much came to stay.**
   **c. Oh right. What did you do?**
   **d. Well, on Saturday Erin wasn’t very well, but on Sunday I cooked a nice meal and later we went for a long walk.**
   **e. Well, I had to go in to work on Saturday, because I was supposed to be going out with an old friend.**
   **f. Oh no. Why did you have to work?**
   **g. Well, somebody new was starting and they got in a mess, but nobody else was around, so I went in to help.**

7. **Compare with a partner. Did you choose the same expressions?**

8. **Write four more lines to finish the conversation.**
   Use two expressions with which.

9. **Listen to another pair’s conversation. Which ending do you prefer?**

10. **Take turns to start a conversation with the underlined questions in conversations 1 and 2. Make comments about how you feel.**

---

(Rea et al., 2011, © Cambridge University Press)
APPENDIX X (continued) Pages from English Unlimited B1+ Intermediate Unit 10
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**APPENDIX Y:** Researcher cross-referencing of resources for English Unlimited B1+ Intermediate (Rea et al., 2011) Unit 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers / Section / Topic</th>
<th>Skills / language areas in order identified in student coursebook contents or CEFR map for each section</th>
<th>Learner-oriented can-do statements for the section (in unit headings, self-assessment, and DVD Rom digital learner portfolio)</th>
<th>CEFR illustrative can-do statements for the unit section stated in teacher's online accessed pdf resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.1  
Pages 78-79  
Witness / False memories | **Vocabulary**  
Remembering an event  
**Grammar**  
Verb patterns  
**Listening**  
Hiromi witnesses a crime  
**Reading**  
The problem with witnesses  
**Speaking**  
Can you remember…? | No descriptor given  
No descriptor given  
No descriptor given  
No descriptor given  
No descriptor given  
No descriptor given  
Talk about memory  
Talk about what you remember | No descriptor given  
No descriptor given  
**Overall listening comprehension**  
• can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details  
**Listening to audio media and recordings**  
• can understand the information content of the majority of recorded or broadcast audio material on topics of personal interest  
**Overall reading comprehension**  
• can read straightforward factual texts on subjects related to his/her field and interest with a satisfactory level of comprehension  
**Reading for information and argument**  
• can identify the main conclusions in clearly signalled argumentative texts  
**Conversation**  
• can enter unprepared into conversations on familiar topics  
**Describing experience**  
• can reasonably fluently relate a straightforward narrative or description as a linear sequence of points |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers / Section / Topic</th>
<th>Skills / language areas in order identified in student coursebook contents or CEFR map for each section</th>
<th>Learner-oriented can-do statements for the section (in unit headings, self-assessment, and DVD Rom digital learner portfolio)</th>
<th>CEFR illustrative can-do statements for the unit section stated in teacher's online accessed pdf resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.2 Pages 80-81 It's scratched / Making a complaint</td>
<td><strong>Vocabulary</strong> Problems with things you've bought</td>
<td>No descriptor given</td>
<td>No descriptor given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grammar</strong> Present perfect simple and progressive</td>
<td>No descriptor given</td>
<td>No descriptor given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Pronunciation</strong> Intonation and questions</td>
<td>No descriptor given</td>
<td>No descriptor given</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|  | **Listening** Complaining in different countries Mariah makes a complaint | No descriptor given | • Overall listening comprehension  
  • Can understand straightforward factual information about common everyday or job-related topics, identifying both general messages and specific details  
  **Understanding conversation**  
  Can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around him/her  
  **Listening to audio media and recordings**  
  Can understand the information content of the majority of recorded or broadcast audio material on topics of personal interest |
|  | **Speaking** Complain about something you've bought | Talk about complaining  
 Talk about goods and services  
 Ask for a refund or replacement and explain why | Conversation  
 Can enter unprepared into conversations on familiar topics  
 **Transactions to obtain goods and services**  
 Can make a complaint  
 Can deal with less routine situations in shops, banks, e.g. returning an unsatisfactory purchase |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page Numbers / Section / Topic</th>
<th>Skills / language areas in order identified in student coursebook contents or CEFR map for each section</th>
<th>Learner-oriented can-do statements for the section (in unit headings, self-assessment, and DVD Rom digital learner portfolio)</th>
<th>CEFR illustrative can-do statements for the unit section stated in teacher's online accessed pdf resource</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10.3 Page 82 Resolve a dispute | **Vocabulary**
Softeners

**Listening**
Good neighbours? | No descriptor given | No descriptor given |
| | **Speaking**
'Target activity': Resolve a dispute | Make a complaint politely | **Overall listening comprehension**
Can understand the main points of clear standard speech on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc., including short narratives

**Understanding conversation**
Can generally follow the main points of extended discussion around him/her |
| 10 Explore Page 83 Keyword of | **Vocabulary**
Keyword of | No descriptor given | No descriptor given |
| 10 Explore Page 84 Speaking | **Speaking**
Add comments to say how you feel | Add comments to say how you feel | No descriptor given |
| 10 Look again | **Review**
Extension | **Self-assessment**
Talk about memory
Talk about what you remember
Talk about complaining
Talk about goods and services
Ask for a refund or replacement and explain why
Make a complaint politely
Add comments to say how you feel | n/a |