

**UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA  
PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM INGLÊS: ESTUDOS  
LINGUÍSTICOS E LITERÁRIOS**

Matheus André Agnoletto

**TEACHER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH COLLABORATIVE  
PEDAGOGICAL REASONING: A SOCIOCULTURAL STUDY**

Dissertação submetida ao  
Programa de Pós-Graduação  
em Inglês da Universidade  
Federal de Santa Catarina  
para obtenção do Grau de  
mestre em Estudos  
Linguísticos e Literários.

Orientadora: Prof.<sup>a</sup> Dr.<sup>a</sup>  
Adriana de Carvalho Kuerten  
Dellagnelo

Florianópolis

2019

Ficha de identificação da obra elaborada pelo autor,  
através do Programa de Geração Automática da Biblioteca Universitária da UFSC.

Agnoletto, Matheus André  
Teacher development through collaborative  
pedagogical reasoning : a sociocultural study /  
Matheus André Agnoletto ; orientadora, Adriana de  
Carvalho Kuerten Dellagnelo, 2019.  
106 p.

Dissertação (mestrado) - Universidade Federal de  
Santa Catarina, Centro de Comunicação e Expressão,  
Programa de Pós-Graduação em Inglês: Estudos  
Linguísticos e Literários, Florianópolis, 2019.

Inclui referências.

1. Inglês: Estudos Linguísticos e Literários. 2.  
desenvolvimento docente. 3. teoria histórico  
cultural. 4. mediação responsiva. 5. manual do  
professor. I. Dellagnelo, Adriana de Carvalho  
Kuerten. II. Universidade Federal de Santa  
Catarina. Programa de Pós-Graduação em Inglês:  
Estudos Linguísticos e Literários. III. Título.

Matheus André Agnoletto

**TEACHER DEVELOPMENT THROUGH COLLABORATIVE  
PEDAGOGICAL REASONING: A SOCIOCULTURAL STUDY**

Esta Dissertação foi julgada adequada para obtenção do Título de “Mestre em Estudos Linguísticos e Literários” e aprovada em sua forma final pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação em Inglês

Florianópolis, 15 de fevereiro de 2018.

---

Prof. Dr. Celso Henrique Tumolo  
Coordenador do Curso

**Banca Examinadora:**

---

Prof.<sup>a</sup> Dr.<sup>a</sup> Adriana de Carvalho Kuerten Dellagnelo  
Orientadora e Presidente (Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina)

---

Prof.<sup>a</sup> Dr.<sup>a</sup> Maria Ester Wollstein Moritz  
Membro da banca (Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina)

---

Prof.<sup>a</sup> Dr.<sup>a</sup> Karen E. Johnson  
Membro da banca (Universidade do Estado da Pensilvânia)  
Via interação virtual

---

Prof.<sup>a</sup> Dr.<sup>a</sup> Ina Emmel  
Suplente (Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina)



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I believe that thinking of everyone who has been here for me is a great way to remind me that we never conquer anything by ourselves. Thus I am truly grateful for having so many people to thank.

To start off, I would like to thank my mom and dad for bringing me to life. Although we have had moments of disagreement along these 24 years and things seem to be confusing sometimes, I know you have always given me your best. Also, I want to thank my grandmother, Jane (or “Naninha”), for being my first inspiration to pursue a career as a teacher, as well as for being the shelter for me and my mom when we needed most. Carol, the best stepmom I could ever ask for, your love, strength, and persistence have always inspired me to go beyond what I thought I could. Thanks for being my mom, so many times, during all these years. Tine, my beloved godmother, I always tell everyone that I would not be who I am without all your love and support. You are the one who have always been here for me, no matter what. You were the one who stood up for me when I could not, and I know you would do it a million times again if necessary. You taught me what true love is. I will never forget that.

To my American friends, Becky, Meagan, and Katy, you were so generous to me when taking your time to patiently help me with your language. The year we spent together in Brazil is one of the best years I have had so far. You showed me that different cultures can go beyond their own boundaries, nurturing mutual respect and love. Thank you so much for that. To my other dear American friends, Sophia and Kathryn, as I told you before, you were like coming up for fresh air. During the year you spent in Brazil I faced some fears I had been holding back inside, and you were the ones who showed me that life is really great when you have genuinely good people by your side. Besides English, you taught me about companionship. You allowed me to see that there is way more to life than daily obligations. You have inspired me to live life at its fullest and taught me that opening up to others can be extremely rewarding. Thanks a million.

To my childhood friends: you will always be in my heart. Andressa, I do not have words to describe what you mean to me. You are the “brain” I have the biggest respect for. You were the one who helped me when I needed most during the beginning of my graduate studies. The way we have always understood each other still amazes me nowadays. Thanks for being such a role model of persistence and faith. Victor and Mauricio, my only two male friends, having you by my side

is a gift I will never be able to thank enough. Thanks for the unparalleled support and your never ending compliments (hehe) because sometimes I think nobody sees me the way you do. Thanks for that.

Now it is time to call the ones who have taught me the meaning of true friendship. Roberta, your strength and willingness to be the best you can be fascinate me. Thaís, the way you see hope at the end of the tunnel always makes me keep believing. And Thainá, the gentle way of observing what goes by around you and the way you naturally touch people's hearts is proof that goodness really exists. The 4 of us have saved each other many times along these eleven years of friendship. I am pretty sure we will continue to do that – but with a little more money in our pockets in the future (hehe).

To the best person I could ever pair up with during the undergrad studies, Carlla, thank you for being so supportive, patient, and caring with me during the 4 years we studied together. I think that there is no assignment handed in by me in which you did not participate. We were great together, as they say, and I am really thankful for that. Mônica, my dear friend, our friendship started only 2 years ago, but you have become one of the most important people in my life. You are a very strong and powerful woman who, in spite of all adversities, has always prevailed. Thanks for being such a great inspiration and for always saying the right words to calm me down (hehe).

To my dear professor Maria Ester W. Moritz (or “Nica”), your joy and the way you live your life are two of the things that keep me moving forward to pursue my dreams. You are one in a million, a genuinely kind human being, and a strong woman who has taught me a lot. To my advisor, Professor Adriana Dellagnelo (or “Aninha), you are definitely one of the most generous and extraordinary people I have ever met. It is a great pleasure to have the opportunity to be your advisee, friend, and sometimes “son”. The way you care for the ones around you makes you even more beautiful than you are. I owe much of my academic and personal achievements to you two, Nica and Aninha. Thank you for everything.

Now last but not least, Ana Maria, how can I start this? Well, I have never believed in soul mates until I met you. In fact, it took me some time to understand that a friend can be a soul mate. Then I met you and I understood what a soul mate really is: someone that does not demand anything from you but true love, respect, and support. A soul mate is someone that admires you and that loves you even when you are not that lovable. You are this person for me. You are my person in this life. Thank you for being you and for allowing me to be part of what

you are, because you are, for sure, one of the best parts of this messy (but handsome, hehe) me.

All in all, I am so very grateful to live at the same time as the people cited above. I love you all.





## ABSTRACT

When it comes to teacher development, a sociocultural approach claims that it is by participating in the social practices of learning and teaching in particular classrooms and school situations that teacher learning takes place (Johnson, 2009), this process being dependent on a variety of aspects that revolve around the profession. Among them, textbooks and teacher's manuals stand out as teacher's primary resources (Richards & Farrell, 2011) as they are part of many institute's curriculum. However, it may be troublesome for novice teachers to make the most out of these materials due to lack of experience and/or theoretical knowledge. In this scenario, it is important for teachers to understand the aspects that lie behind these resources in order to make informed decisions as regards their use. With this in mind, drawing on Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978, 1987), the present study aims at investigating the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher, *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual. In order to do so, 9 classes of an English as a foreign language novice teacher were observed, being followed by mediator-mediatee interactions in which I (a more expert other) inquired into the reasoning behind the teacher's choices when not following the manual. As classes and interactions progressed, I attempted to provide responsive mediation to the teacher's maturing needs so as to allow her to revisit her practice and, consequently, redefine her views of the aspects lying behind the manual. Besides that, two questionnaires were applied to the teacher: the first one, applied at the beginning of the semester, aimed at raising the teacher's perceptions of some aspects of the profession, while the other one, which was applied at the end of the semester, aimed at investigating possible reverberations of the mediator-mediatee interactions. Results indicate that the teacher's view of teaching has moved from a grammar-oriented one to a communicative one, her conceptualization of "focus on function" having developed due to the mediator-mediatee interactions held with me, as both her practice and speech reverberated such moments. The findings support Vygotsky's (1978, 1987) claim about the essential role of social interaction in fostering human cognitive development, adding to the pool of research in the area which advocates that a sociocultural approach has the potential to positively (re)conceptualize teacher education.

**Key words:** Teacher development, Sociocultural Theory, responsive mediation, teacher's manual.

## RESUMO

Uma abordagem histórico-cultural defende que é ao participar das práticas sociais de ensino-aprendizagem em salas de aula e situações escolares específicas que o desenvolvimento docente acontece (Johnson, 2009), sendo que esse processo depende de vários aspectos da profissão. Dentre eles, livros-textos e manuais do professor se destacam como recursos primários desse profissional (Richards & Farrell, 2011), pois fazem parte do currículo de muitas instituições. Porém, pode ser problemático para professores em início de carreira utilizar esses materiais devido à falta de experiência e/ou conhecimento teórico. Nesse cenário, torna-se importante que os professores entendam os aspectos por trás desses recursos para que possam tomar decisões informadas em relação ao seu uso. Dito isso, tendo como base a Teoria Histórico-Cultural (Vygotsky, 1978, 1987), o presente estudo visa investigar a influência da interação entre professora e um par mais experiente no desenvolvimento de uma professora de inglês como língua estrangeira em relação ao seu uso do livro-texto e manual do professor. Para tal, 9 aulas de uma professora de inglês como língua estrangeira foram observadas. Além disso, as aulas foram seguidas por interações entre a professora e eu, nas quais questionei as razões por detrás de suas escolhas ao não seguir as sugestões do manual. No decorrer das interações, eu procurei mediar responsivamente a professora para fazê-la revisitar sua prática e, conseqüentemente, redefinir suas visões sobre os aspectos que regem o manual. Também foram aplicados dois questionários: um ao início do semestre, com o intuito de desvelar as percepções da professora sobre aspectos da profissão; e outro ao final do semestre, visando investigar possíveis reverberações dos nossos momentos de interação. Os resultados indicam que a professora mudou sua maneira de ver o ensino de línguas, afastando-se de uma visão focada na forma e aproximando-se de uma abordagem comunicativa. Além disso, o seu conceito de “foco na função” parece ter desenvolvido como consequência das interações entre nós, reverberando tanto em sua prática como em seu discurso. Os resultados somam-se aos estudos de Vygotsky (1978, 1987) que afirmam ser essencial o papel da interação social no desenvolvimento cognitivo humano. O estudo também contribui com as pesquisas na área que entendem uma abordagem histórico-cultural como tendo grande potencial de (re)conceituar a formação de professores.

**Palavras-chave:** Desenvolvimento docente, Teoria Histórico-Cultural, mediação responsiva, manual do professor.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>15</b>
1.1 Context of investigation .....	15
1.2 Motivation of the study: undergraduate thesis .....	18
1.3 Significance of the study .....	20
1.4 Organization of the thesis.....	20
<b>CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>22</b>
2.1 Introduction .....	22
2.2 Sociocultural Theory .....	23
<b>2.2.1 Mediation .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>2.2.2 Internalization .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>2.2.3 Zone of proximal development.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>2.2.4 Intersubjectivity .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>2.2.5 Thinking in concepts .....</b>	<b>30</b>
2.3 Sociocultural Theory and teacher development .....	33
<b>2.3.1 Responsive Mediation .....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>2.3.2 Cognitive/emotional dissonance and teacher development .</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>2.3.3 Reasoning teaching.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>2.3.4 Sociocultural Theory and research on teacher education ...</b>	<b>39</b>
2.4 A brief summary of the study's main theoretical constructs .....	43
<b>CHAPTER III: METHOD .....</b>	<b>45</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	45
3.2 Participants .....	46
3.3 Context of investigation: the English Extracurricular Program ...	49
3.4 Instruments and procedures for data collection and analysis .....	51
<b>CHAPTER IV: DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>57</b>
4.1 Introductory aspects .....	57
4.2 Analysis of the mediator-mediatee interactions: the teaching of grammar .....	58
<b>CHAPTER V: FINAL REMARKS .....</b>	<b>95</b>
5.1 Introduction .....	95
5.2 Main findings .....	95
5.3 Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.....	99
5.4 Pedagogical implications.....	100
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>APPENDIXES .....</b>	<b>106</b>



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Context of investigation

In the past few decades, research in teacher education has been changing the way the process of learning to teach is understood, moving away from epistemologies which claim that teacher knowledge is decontextualized and generalizable to the study of the ways the various aspects involved in teaching shape teachers' professional activity. Therefore, learning to teach is no longer conceived as an isolated process which happens in the teacher's mind but as a series of processes which depend on the different aspects that revolve around the profession.

Among these series of processes, Johnson (2009) believes that it is by participating in the social practices of learning and teaching in particular classrooms and school situations that teacher learning takes place. In other words, it is by engaging in social interaction with students, other teachers, and the school community in general – in actual contexts of learning and teaching – that teachers become teachers. In this vein, there has been a growing body of research in the past few decades whose focus lies on the role of social interaction in fostering teacher development (Johnson & Dellagnelo, 2013; Vieira-Abrahão, 2014; Biehl & Dellagnelo, 2016; Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Dellagnelo & Moritz, 2017). These studies are based on the premise that teachers may develop in the profession by interacting with more experienced peers who provide assistance that is directed at these teachers' maturing capabilities.

The aforementioned idea is rooted in Sociocultural Theory, developed by the Soviet Psychologist Lev S. Vygotsky (1896 – 1934) as a way to account for human psychological development. The theory posits that social interaction (both with others and context) offers the basis for one's psychological development, whose origin lies on interactions with other individuals (i.e. on the *interpsychological plane*) until it is internalized (i.e. it moves into the *intrapsychological plane*) through the relations established with people and the world (Vygotsky, 1978). Along those lines, Vygotsky claims that the human mind is mediated by socially constructed artifacts, language – either social or private – being the most pervasive of them all (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

However, not every interaction results in cognitive development: according to vygotskians, it is the quality of *mediation* (i.e. assistance directed to one's maturing capabilities) provided that fosters the development of human cognition, meaning that mediation needs to be contingent on one's "readiness" to understand – with the help of tools and/or more expert *others*<sup>1</sup>– what is around them, or in vygotskian terms, on one's *zone of proximal development* – ZPD<sup>2</sup> (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

In order to provide one with such sort of mediation, their reasoning needs to be externalized so as to become explicit and thus open to be explored – through language – by more expert others. It is essential to highlight the role of language in this process, being a “[...] a vital means that represents thought [...]” (Johnson, 2009, p. 44), and responsible for communication and the generalization of humans' thinking, providing “[...] people with the concepts and forms of reality organization which constitute the mediation between the individual and the object of knowledge.”<sup>3</sup> (Oliveira, 2001, p. 43).

Thus it seems fair to consider that inquiring into teachers' practice provides them with opportunities to externalize their reasoning, which may foster their understanding of how and why they do what they do. In this vein, Johnson (1999) advocates for the importance of allowing teachers to engage in critical reflection upon their practices. The author introduces the concept of *reasoning teaching*, describing it as how teachers think about what they do, which involves a variety of aspects related to the profession. Therefore, the aforementioned movement of inquiring into teachers' practice may contribute to their reasoning teaching process as they revisit it and imbue their practice with meaning through mediation provided by a more expert other, corroborating Johnson's (2009) claim that “[...] teacher cognition

---

<sup>1</sup> Vygotsky states that one is *other*-regulated when they are mediated by other people rather than themselves (Lantolf, Thorne & Poehner, 2015). In the present study, the expressions *expert/experienced peer* and *other* are used interchangeably.

<sup>2</sup> In short, the zone of proximal development is the distance between what one is able to perform independently and what one performs only with assistance of a more expert peer. This concept is further developed in Chapter II.

<sup>3</sup> Translated from Portuguese: “(...) a linguagem fornece os conceitos e as formas de organização do real que constituem a mediação entre o sujeito e o objeto de conhecimento.”



originates in and is fundamentally shaped by the specific social activities in which teachers engage.” (p. 17).

Along with that, Johnson and Golombek (2016) advocate that being sensitive to teachers’ emotions is essential for teacher education, since moments of dissonance between what they know and how they feel may foster professional development. From a vygotskian perspective, the authors assert that when there is a clash between what teachers envision and what actually happens while they teach, they experience a cognitive/emotional dissonance that may be reflected on teachers’ “[...] indexing language and behavior in such moments [...]” (p. 45), signaling a possible *growth point* (McNeill & Duncan 2000), or “[...] a moment or series of moments when teachers’ cognitive/emotional dissonance comes into being.” (Johnson & Golombek, 2016, p.45). In accordance with the sociocultural perspective to second language<sup>4</sup> teacher education, mediation directed at such growth points may foster teacher development, which will depend on how responsive (i.e. directed) this mediation is to such moments. In this vein, it seems like the very social activities teachers engage in need to be put on the spot and reflected upon, their reasoning being externalized so that *responsive mediation* – mediation that is responsive to learner’s responses and emergent needs (Johnson & Golombek, 2016) – focused on their pedagogical practices is provided, possibly allowing them to better understand the range of aspects that influence their practice.

Among these aspects, both the textbook and the teacher’s manual stand out as teachers’ primary resources (Richards & Farrell, 2011) since such materials are part of many language schools’ curriculum, the latter being one of the means that help teachers plan and introduce the activities presented in the textbook. However, these materials do not always correspond to students’ needs or to teachers’ expectations, leading these professionals to change some or many of the activities presented and/or even use additional teaching resources. Despite the importance of such materials, there is a lack of research on how teachers deal with them, especially when it comes to the teacher’s manual, including the changes made in class as regards the manual’s suggestions and the teachers’ understanding of its pedagogical implications. When it comes to novice teachers, this scenario becomes

---

<sup>4</sup> Although the conceptual differences between second and foreign language are recognized by the researcher, these terms, along with L2, are used interchangeably in this work due to such differences not being pertinent for the discussions raised here.

concerning since lack of experience and/or theoretical knowledge may lead them to feel at sea when using the manual, possibly resulting in choices that overlook important implications of the suggestions given. In light of that, inquiring into these choices allows teachers to revisit and externalize their reasoning, which can be accessed by a more expert other who, through responsive mediation, has the potential to foster the development of teachers' understandings of the pedagogical aspects behind the manual. Consequently, this may allow them to make informed decisions when choosing between following the material's suggestions or skipping them.

All things considered, the present study aims at investigating the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher, *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual. The research question thus textualizes as

RQ – What is the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual?

As a manner to reach this objective and answer this main question, the following specific research questions (SRQ) were designed:

SRQ1 – What changes were made in the teacher's classes in comparison to the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions?

SRQ2 – What mediated this teacher's reasoning in relation to the changes made in class *vis-à-vis* the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions?

SRQ3 – Are there any didactic-pedagogical aspects of the textbook/manual initially overlooked and subsequently incorporated in the teacher's class and speech that may indicate reverberations of the past interactions with the researcher? If so, which and how?

## 1.2 Motivation of the study: undergraduate thesis

This study draws on another piece of research carried out as my undergraduate thesis. In one of my first experiences as an English teacher, I faced some trouble whenever I felt the need to change my classroom practice in relation to the suggestions given by the teacher's manual: at times I felt like the manual's suggestions would not be beneficial to my students, however, I did not feel comfortable with

changing these suggestions since the manual is a material developed by experts in the area. On the other hand, other teachers I knew seemed to do quite the opposite: they would change the activities suggested in the manual without any feeling of distress. I was then curious to understand the reasons and (lack of) concerns that eventually lead teachers to act one way or another. This led me to conduct a study which aimed to investigate the extent to which a novice teacher changed the classroom practices suggested in the teacher's manual, focusing on how this teacher justified his choices (Agnoletto, 2017). In this study, the participant answered a semi-structured questionnaire that was used to raise his perceptions about the role of the teacher's manual. Besides that, semi-structured interviews were conducted with the teacher after each of the three classes observed along one academic semester. During these interviews, I inquired into the changes made in class in relation to the manual's suggestions, allowing the participant to externalize the reasoning behind his choices and consequently what mediated them, leading him to a better understanding of his own teaching. It seems fair to add that although the present study also considers the changes a novice teacher makes in class *vis-à-vis* the manual's suggestions, its main focus is on the interactions established between a novice teacher and a more experienced other who inquires into the teacher's reasoning for doing so, bearing in mind the developmental paths that she goes through as a result of such interactions.

It is also relevant to mention that, at the time I conducted the aforementioned study, I felt as if I had no legitimacy or enough knowledge to carry out the interventionist approach that is proposed now. However, even though I was not at all intrusive in the teacher's decisions, I always formed a critical opinion of the classes and commented my impressions with my advisor, whose feedback was that I was prepared to move a step forward and go beyond asking questions. Thus the idea of pursuing the present study became very exciting.

At the end of my undergraduate thesis, it was concluded that the means by which data was collected and analyzed were effective, since no problems were faced during both of these procedures, resulting in fruitful data and discussion that motivated me to keep doing research in the area of teacher education. Thus, this study's instruments for data collection and the data collection procedures served as the basis for the present study's method, being further described and explained in Chapter III. Besides that, I experienced the movement of allowing teachers to revisit their practices and (re)construct understandings of what and how they do what they do, meeting the theoretical knowledge I

had on this subject, realizing the potential such moments have to foster teacher development when these are guided by the assistance (mediation) of a more expert teacher.

All in all, the pursuit to better understand and foster teachers' developmental paths was the starting point of the present work.

### **1.3 Significance of the study**

A sociocultural perspective on teacher education advocates for providing teachers with moments in which they can, with the assistance of a more expert other, revisit their practice and both unveil and make sense of what goes through their mind while planning and teaching. Such process, triggered by comments and inquiry of a more expert other, allows teachers to come to understandings of their profession which they would not probably come by themselves. Therefore, by being responsive to teachers' ZPDs, more expert others provide mediation that may foster teachers' professional development. That said, this study may illustrate the importance of providing L2 teachers with opportunities to engage in critical reflection upon their practices, emphasizing the social character in the development of one's cognition, a central aspect of Sociocultural Theory.

Besides that, the present study may help uncover a novice teacher's perceptions of her practices, allowing her to externalize the reasoning lying behind the use of the textbook and the manual and consequently better understand it. This may shed light on the quality of her pedagogical choices and actions when both planning and teaching, having the potential to positively impact the teaching-learning relations established between her and her students.

Summing up, this study may be helpful for novice teachers who find themselves in trouble whenever they feel like changing what is suggested in the teacher's manual. Apart from that, it is common sense that studies that trigger teacher reflection – and the methodology used for data collection in this work – is potentially powerful in that sense – are valid not only for novice teachers in this particular situation, but also for continued education programs that aim at any kind of professional development.

### **1.4 Organization of the thesis**

The present thesis is organized in five chapters. In Chapter I, "Introduction", the problem investigated is presented, together with the research questions, the motivation of the study, the significance of the study, and organization of the thesis. In Chapter II, "Review of the

Literature”, the study’s theoretical framework is presented and developed, which includes a review of Vygotsky’s Sociocultural Theory, how it is applied to the area of teacher education so as to foster teacher development, empirical studies carried out in the area through a sociocultural perspective, and the importance of reasoning teaching in the development of teachers’ professional activity. In Chapter III, “Method”, the study’s participants, context of investigation, and instruments and procedures for data collection and analysis are detailed. In Chapter IV, “Data Analysis and Discussion”, the study’s findings are presented, discussed, and interpreted *vis-à-vis* its theoretical framework. Finally, in Chapter V, “Final Remarks”, the study’s conclusions and pedagogical implications are drawn, together with its limitations and suggestions for further research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### 2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents and draws parallels among the theoretical perspectives that underlie the present study, being mainly based on Sociocultural Theory, which was developed by the Soviet psychologist Lev Semionovich Vygotsky (1896 - 1934). After some of its main constructs are explored (i.e. *mediation, internalization, zone of proximal development, intersubjectivity, and thinking in concepts*), attention is drawn on how the Theory informs the area of teacher education so as to foster teacher development; then, the concept of *reasoning teaching*, which is in alignment with Sociocultural Theory's main tenets, is introduced and developed; and at the end of the chapter, some studies are reviewed in order to illustrate how empirical research through a sociocultural perspective has been carried out.

Sociocultural theory, contrary to what one might suppose, is not a theory of culture or of the social, but rather a theory of mind which aims at explaining how human psychological thinking originates and develops. Vygotsky's (1978) work focused on the development of higher forms of mental functioning in children, investigating the ways interaction with the world (adults and objects) around them fostered psychological development. Although his theory was established *vis-à-vis* children's cognitive development, thus focusing on adult-child interaction, this notion has been traditionally extended to the relation between expert and novice. In the present study, the relation expert-novice is represented by the pair *more experienced peer teacher-novice teacher*.

According to Wertsch (1985), Vygotsky believed that human cognition should be studied in light of its genesis (i.e. history). Thus it is the process rather than the final product that is the focus of a vygotskian approach to human cognitive development. In light of that, Lantolf and Thorne (2006) highlight four domains of genetic research<sup>5</sup> explored by Vygotsky: *phylogenesis*, which concerns the development of our species; *sociogenesis* (i.e. sociocultural history), which concerns the history of human culture; *ontogenesis*, which concerns the individual or group of individuals (when the phylogenetic and sociocultural domains

---

<sup>5</sup> For more information on the four domains of genetic research see Lantolf and Thorne (2006) and Wertsch (1985).

merge); and *microgenesis*, which concerns the development of specific processes. It is important to mention that since the present study focuses on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher, *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual, it is the microgenetic domain<sup>6</sup> that is under investigation. In the words of Werstch (1985), research in this domain can be seen as a "very short-term longitudinal study" (p. 55), focusing on the development of a process within a short period of time.

After this brief introduction to SCT, the following section further explores the Theory and its main concepts and principles.

## 2.2 Sociocultural Theory

The central claim of sociocultural theory (SCT) is that human cognition is formed through people's engagement in social activities (Vygotsky, 1978). In other words, the author posed that it is through participation in social life that human cognitive development takes place. Human language is essential in this process, due to its twofold function: it is used for social interchange (i.e. it is through language that people communicate); and it is responsible for generalizing thought (i.e. language provides people with concepts that allow them to organize and understand the real world) (Oliveira, 2001). For instance, when using the word *teacher* to refer to one's occupation, people group this profession within elements related to it, also differentiating it from elements detached from it.

By emphasizing that the relations people establish with the world around them are essential for their cognitive development, language being the most pervasive means that enables such interactions, SCT brings into light the notion of *mediation*, claiming that people's relations with the world are not direct, but mediated by mediational means (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Mediation is a central concept in Vygotsky's work, being essential to understand how participation in social life fosters human *higher mental functions*' development.

### 2.2.1 Mediation

Vygotsky's work focused on the development of higher forms of mental behavior rather than elementary ones. These higher mental functions are understood as the most robust psychological mechanisms present in human mind, involving voluntary control over behavior, intentional actions, and one's capability of acting upon the world

---

<sup>6</sup> Microgenesis will be further explored in Chapter III.

beyond the current situation (Oliveira, 2001). For instance, people can make plans, remember past experiences, and talk about things that are not part of their context of speaking, being able to do so because of such robust forms of mental behavior. Elementary functions, on the other hand, are represented by involuntary responses to the environment (e.g. jumping when someone scares you). In short, the main difference between these types of functions is that the former is voluntary and social-cultural-historically constructed, while the latter is not under one's voluntary control. It is worth mentioning, however, that lower mental functions, biologically endowed, are preconditions for the formation of higher mental functions.

According to Lantolf and Thorne (2006), higher forms of human mental functioning are mediated by culturally constructed auxiliary means. In the words of these authors, mediation can be defined as “[...] the process through which humans deploy culturally constructed artifacts, concepts, and activities to regulate (i.e. gain voluntary control over and transform) the material world or their own and each other's social and mental activity” (p. 79). To put it differently, humans make use of means/tools so as to act both upon the world and themselves, reflecting a dialectical relation: at the same time that cognitive development enables one to use such means to act both upon the world and themselves, the development of one's cognition is fostered by these very means. Furthermore, such mediational means are culturally constructed and passed down along human history, being shared through social interaction (Johnson, 2009; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Oliveira, 2001).

When exploring the indirect relations people establish with the world, Vygotsky presents the concepts of *physical tools* and *psychological tools*, both serving mediational functions (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). On the one hand, physical tools are mediational means directed outwardly, towards the physical world, shaping the natural environment (e.g. when a teacher uses a marker to write on the whiteboard – the marker being the physical tool that mediates this teacher's relation with the world). On the other hand, psychological tools “[...] imbue us with the capacity to organize and gain voluntary control over our biologically specified mental functions.” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 25). Moreover, the authors claim that psychological tools entail a dual directionality: they are both outwardly directed at others and inwardly directed to the self. As previously mentioned, language is used both for communicating and organizing/regulating thought, which illustrates the twofold nature of psychological tools. In



the present study, externalizing their reasoning is meant as a way to help teachers organize and regulate their thought, thus leading them to a better understanding of their practices and contributing to their professional development.

SCT advocates that the use of such tools changes along one's developmental process: at first, one's relations with the world are mainly externally mediated in the interpsychological plane, until they become intrapsychological and thus internally mediated (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Vygotsky names this process *internalization*, a central concept of his theory that is further explored in the next subsection.

### **2.2.2 Internalization**

Vygotsky believed that every psychological function appears twice: when people interact – on the interpsychological plane – and within the individual – on the intrapsychological plane (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Along with that, Oliveira (2001) states that “[...] it is through concrete interpersonal relations with other people that one will internalize the culturally established forms of psychological functioning”<sup>7</sup> (p. 38). With this in mind, the concept of internalization can be defined as “[...] the process through which a person moves from carrying out concrete actions in conjunction with the assistance of material artifacts and of other individuals to carrying out actions mentally without any apparent external assistance” (Lantolf, 2000, p. 14). For instance, a novice teacher might have a high dependence on the teacher's manual when using it for the first time, since it is a brand new tool for them as well as a new experience. As time goes by and the teacher gets more acquainted with this tool and with the classroom – understanding the tool's pedagogical implications and how they relate to each other – the dependence lowers and the teacher is able to internally mediate themselves. To put it differently, the teacher becomes able to self-regulate, without the need of using the manual to mediate how they teach.

The concept of internalization does not exclude the use of mediational means, since one is still mediated, internally instead. Moreover, it does not mean that what was external to the individual was merely duplicated to their intrapsychological plane, being separate from the external world (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). In fact, Vygotsky proposes

---

<sup>7</sup> Translated from Portuguese: “[...] é através da relação interpessoal concreta com outros homens que o indivíduo vai chegar a interiorizar as formas culturalmente estabelecidas de funcionamento psicológico.”

that the objective external and the subjective internal worlds are fused into a unique system, being intrinsically dependent on each other. Psychological tools (signs) allow “[...] for the idealization of objective reality in the material world and for the objectification of subjective activity in the mental world of the individual.” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 154). For instance, when internalizing the concept of *communicative language teaching (CLT)*, a teacher is able to plan their classes in a way that meets such approach, taking into account its principles, and then visualize the activities they will use as a manner to teach so as to actually perform their professional activities following it. This illustrates how “[...] internalization forms an inseparable unity with externalization.” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 154).

The process of internalization happens due to people’s contact with the world around them, which meets SCT’s assumption that social interaction promotes cognitive development. Thus one’s thinking is shaped by what is around them, being mediated by artifacts and other individuals. Together with that, it seems fair to mention that the influence of others in one’s development will only be effective if attuned to the individual’s aforementioned “readiness” to understand what is around them. According to Oliveira (2001), SCT claims that it is within one’s *zone of proximal development (ZPD)* that others’ interference is more transforming. The next subsection explains the importance of this concept to Vygotsky’s theory.

### **2.2.3 Zone of proximal development**

In order to explore such essential concept to SCT, two other concepts need to be explained: *actual developmental zone* and *potential developmental zone*. The former encompasses what one has already internalized. It is related to what an individual is able to do without external assistance (self-regulation). The latter, as the name itself suggests, is related to actions one has the potential to perform when counting on artifacts (object-regulation) or more expert others (other-regulation). That said, the zone of proximal development is seen as the distance between the actual developmental level and the potential developmental level (Vygotsky, 1978). In the words of Johnson and Golombek (2011), the ZPD is “[...] the metaphoric space where individual cognition originates in the social collective mind and emerges in and through engagement in social activity [...] a space where we can see what an individual might be able to do with assistance.” (p. 6). Thus instead of merely looking at what learners are capable of doing at the

present time, the concept of ZPD indicates learners' future independent functioning (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

The same authors acknowledge Vygotsky's claim that one's ZPD may either afford or constrain their development due to the aforementioned idea of "readiness". As they suggest, mediation should happen in accordance with the learner's responses to help provided by a more expert other. Such responses are the means by which this other can access one's developmental level and stay attuned to it as it changes so as to continuously provide mediation that aims at the ceiling level of their ZPD, which according to the authors, is most effective. Needless to say, this process also brings into light the dialectical unity between externalization and internalization.

Thus accessing one's ZPD cannot be done beforehand, since it is the very interactions between learner and expert which will allow the latter to determine the former's developmental zones. This concurs with Lantolf and Aljaafreh's (1995) statement that determining one's ZPD happens through "[...] negotiated discovery that is realized through dialogic interaction between learner and expert." (p. 620), a process in which every individual involved needs to engage in. Furthermore, the help provided by the expert should be *graduated* and *contingent* on the learner's ZPD, the mediation provided moving from more implicit to more explicit (Lantolf & Aljaafreh's, 1995; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

Overall, mediation should not be too easy so the learner does not need it, or too difficult so the learner is not able to benefit from it, but *strategically/responsively*<sup>8</sup> directed at their ZPD. When moving from more implicit to more explicit mediation, the expert other is endowed with a better understanding of the novice's view on what is being addressed in their interaction, which also enables the novice to become more sensitive to the expert's view, fostering the development of a collaborative understanding between them. Thus this establishes a

---

<sup>8</sup> *Strategic mediation* and *responsive mediation* are concepts coined by Wertsch (1985) and Johnson and Golombek (2016) respectively, which translate Vygotsky's idea that mediation provided to learners should be directed at their ZPD, highlighting the nature of the assistance that should be provided by expert to novice during interaction so as to foster development. Although the present study presents both concepts, it chooses Johnson and Golombek's due to the fact that the term *responsive* is more straightforward and circumscribed to its meaning. In other words, *responsive mediation* denotes the idea of being *responsive* to one's *response*. The concept will be further explored in a subsection to come.

sort of “harmony” as individuals engage in *interpsychological functioning* (i.e. as they dialectically constitute the dialogic interaction in which they are involved). Such harmony is defined by Wertsch (1984, 1985) as *intersubjectivity*, a key concept in Sociocultural Theory that is further explored in the next subsection.

### 2.2.4 Intersubjectivity

As Wertsch (1985) discusses, when it comes to interpsychological functioning, one should take into account that individuals may have different understandings of a certain aspect being addressed when interacting, and that such understandings may also change in the course of interpsychological functioning. In order to explain such differing understandings, the author coins the concept of *situation definition* (1984), which is understood as “[...] the way in which a setting or context is represented – that is, defined – by those who operate in that setting.” (p. 8). For instance, when discussing the main tenets of CLT in a teacher education program, the teacher educator will most certainly hold a view of language that best concurs with such approach than a teacher that is being introduced to it, both individuals conceptualizing “language” according to their different private (intrapsychological) worlds.

The concept of situation definition is paramount to better understand the aforementioned notion of ZPD, since it acknowledges that expert and novice are able to collaborate in this zone while holding different views/definitions/representations of what is involved in their interaction. According to Wertsch (1984), individuals do so by collaborating on a third situation definition, allowing communication between expert and novice, and constituting what the author calls “intersubjectivity”. In his words, intersubjectivity “[...] exists between two interlocutors in a task setting when they share the same situation definition and know that they share the same situation definition.” (Wertsch, 1984, p. 12). Cerutti-Rizzatti and Dellagnelo (2016) point out that intersubjectivity establishes a collaborative activity between individuals who negotiate meanings regarding what is addressed during interaction. The authors go on to say that when such meanings start operating similarly, individuals start to communicate in an abbreviated manner, which corroborates the aforementioned idea that they know they are sharing a mutual understanding. For instance, when an advisee starts doing research on teacher education from a sociocultural perspective, they will need things to be thoroughly explained (e.g. detailed descriptions of concepts) by their advisor whenever they meet

to discuss the work in progress. In the course of the interactions with the advisor, the advisee's understanding of Sociocultural Theory develops, enabling the individuals to engage in discussions that no longer need to be detailed and/or elaborated. In this case, as both parts involved start sharing situation definitions regarding the Theory, the previously mentioned abbreviation takes place, advisor and advisee interacting on the basis of what each of them know about what is being discussed.

Along with that, one should bear in mind that different levels of intersubjectivity may exist, going from a minimal shared representation of the objects and events in a setting by the people involved to an identical representation of such objects and events. Thus it becomes essential to understand that intersubjectivity does not only exist when individuals share an exact situation definition, but also when they share at least some aspect of their situation definitions. In the words of Wertsch (1985), "[...] this overlap [typically] may occur at several levels, and hence several levels of intersubjectivity may exist." (p. 159). The author goes along to claim that individuals enter into a communicative context with different situation definitions which represent their intrapsychological functioning, and through "[...] semiotically mediated negotiation [...] they create a temporarily shared social world [...]", that is, a state of intersubjectivity (p. 161). In other words, expert and novice transcend their private worlds during interaction so as to meet each other on a third world that represents a shared situation definition between them, language being the means by which such intersubjectivity is often created.

Drawing on Wertsch's (1984) discussion, this process often requires the novice to change their situation definition since there is negotiation of a shared understanding with the expert, though the latter does not change their opinion of what is being addressed during interaction. One can say that the expert accepts to temporarily "change" their situation definition so as to allow the novice to redefine theirs, thus fostering intersubjectivity. It seems fair to mention that negotiation between expert and novice depends on having both participants engage in interaction, the former providing mediation that is directed to the latter's ZPD, which is accessed when the novice externalizes their understandings. In other words, externalization is needed so the expert can access the novice's ZPD, consequently reaching levels of intersubjectivity when both of the individuals negotiate a shared situation definition, which may foster the novice's intrapsychological development when situation *redefinition* takes place. As Wertsch (1984) claims, growth in one's ZPD is fostered when they give up "[...] a

previous situation definition in favor of a qualitatively new one.” (p. 11).

This process clearly illustrates Vygotsky’s claim that human higher mental functioning originates on the interpsychological plane so as to only then be internalized (i.e. to become part of one’s intrapsychological plane). Johnson and Golombek (2016) contribute to the discussion presented by advocating that “[...] a learner needs to understand the objects and events in a learning situation from the expert’s point of view in order for their interactions on the external plane to move to the internal.” (p. 30), which becomes possible during expert-novice interaction, when the latter externalizes their reasoning and the former provides mediation directed at their ZPD.

As could be seen, speech has an essential role for human cognitive development since it is through social interaction, mainly mediated by language, that human higher mental functioning originates so as to be internalized. At this point, it becomes essential to bring into light a discussion on how language fosters such movement by enabling individuals to use concepts to think about and act upon the world around them. This development of conceptual thinking is of paramount importance for Sociocultural Theory as it allows individuals to move beyond their everyday notions when using language as a psychological tool for self-regulation. The next subsection addresses this issue.

### **2.2.5 Thinking in concepts**

According to Vygotsky (1987), the *word* is decisive in the process of concept formation. The author goes along and states that “It is through the word that the child voluntarily directs his attention on a single feature, synthesizes these isolated features, symbolizes the abstract concept, and operates with it as the most advanced form of the sign created by human thinking.” (p. 159). Thus having a name to refer to something fosters one’s cognitive development by allowing them to make sense of experience and act upon the world through the use of language.

Vygotsky (1987) identifies two types of concepts: *spontaneous* or *everyday* and *scientific* or *abstract*. By spontaneous concepts, the author refers to the concepts one informally learns and develops through practical activity and everyday interaction; on the other hand, scientific concepts are those formally learned through instruction (i.e. school instruction). As Smagorinsky, Cook, and Johnson (2003) explain, scientific concepts are valorized by the Russian psychologist as “[...] the height of intellectual activity because formal, abstracted knowledge

of a concept enables one to reapply it to a new situation [... while spontaneous concepts] tend to be situated in the context in which they are learned and thus less amenable to abstraction to new situations.” (p. 5), circumscribing one’s understanding of a concept to the immediate context in which it is learned.

Nevertheless, when interpreting Vygotsky’s view on concepts, one should know that although he claims for the major role of scientific concepts in the development of a true concept (i.e. a fully formed one), the author makes it clear that both types of concepts are essential, one being dialectically related to the other for concept development, in its fullest, to take place. Furthermore, he states that the scientific concept “[...] begins with the verbal definition [...] descends to the concrete [...] to the phenomena which the concept represents [...] while the spontaneous concept tends to move upward] toward abstraction and generalization.” (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 168). In other words, the scientific concept is introduced to the individual through formal instruction, but it needs to come into contact with everyday experience, being applied to practical activity, to the concrete world; on the other hand, the spontaneous concept is introduced to the individual through everyday interaction and practical activity, being context dependent and not able to be generalized (i.e. it lacks abstraction). According to Vygotsky (1987),

[...] the weakness of the *everyday* concept lies in its *incapacity for abstraction*, in the child’s incapacity to operate on it in a voluntary manner. Where volition is required, the everyday concept is generally used incorrectly. In contrast, the weakness of the scientific concept lies in its *verbalism*, in its insufficient saturation with the concrete. (p. 169)

One can say that these types of concept complement one another, constituting a unity that represents a fully developed concept, which ultimately happens when the scientific proceeds downward and the spontaneous upward, enabling them to meet and merge, allowing the individual to think in concepts, consequently being able to self-regulate. Drawing on Vygotsky’s ideas, Wertsch (1985) claims that

To say that the source of regulation is located entirely within the subject [...] means that the subject is able to operate on word meanings and the systemic relationships among them independently of the relationship of sign tokens to their context. That is, one must be dealing with completely decontextualized mediational means. It is

precisely when children are capable of operating with decontextualized word meanings alone without being distracted by the nonlinguistic context that one can speak of [...] thinking in genuine [...] concepts. (p. 106)

The discussion presented is of paramount importance to the long-standing debate around the theory-practice binary. Vygotsky's notions on scientific and spontaneous concepts can be respectively extended to the ones of *theory* and *practice*, highlighting the interdependent relation between these fields of knowledge. As Johnson (2009) states, at the same time that the scientific concept (theory) should be presented to learners, this move should take place on the basis of their concrete practical activities (practice), scientific knowledge being connected to learners' everyday experiences/knowledge/activities. Needless to say, this view converses with Freire's (2005) construct of *praxis*, which he equates with the idea of *true word*. In this conception, the true word is constituted by two dimensions: reflection and action. As the author claims, such dimensions should coexist, making it possible for humans to transform the world. In the same way that Vygotsky (1987) presents the weaknesses of scientific and spontaneous concepts when existing apart from each other, Freire (2005) claims that

An unauthentic word, one which is unable to transform reality, results when dichotomy is imposed upon its constitutive elements. When a word is deprived of its dimension of action, reflection automatically suffers as well; and the word is changed into idle chatter, into *verbalism*, into an alienated and alienating "blah." It becomes an empty word, one which cannot denounce the world, for denunciation is impossible without a commitment to transform, and there is no transformation without action. On the other hand, if action is emphasized exclusively, to the detriment of reflection, the word is converted into *activism*. The latter—action for action sake—negates the true praxis and makes dialogue impossible. Either dichotomy, by creating unauthentic forms of existence, creates also unauthentic forms of thought, which reinforce the original dichotomy. (p. 87)

In short, one fully understands the world around them and is able to act upon it when they conceptually think about it, the development of *true concepts* only being enabled when scientific and spontaneous ones are intertwined, thus being dialectically related to each other. At this point, it is worth mentioning that the development of a concept does not happen in a linear mode. Rather, appropriating a



concept happens through a twisting path (Smagorinsky, Cook, & Johnson, 2003) as it is marked by movements back and forth. This means that in the process of formation of a concept, one may think that they already own it, but it may go back into challenge, thus causing the need to revisit the concept and gain more agency towards it.

By wrapping up the theoretical constructs presented so far, bridging them to the area of teacher education, one can affirm that accessing a teacher's ZPD uncovers their potential to learn something new. Moreover, interaction with a more experienced other creates a space through which this teacher's potential for learning and capabilities can be identified while they emerge (Johnson & Golombek, 2011), providing the more expert other with opportunities to mediate, through language, this teacher so as to help them move beyond their situation definitions in ways that can promote their professional development. Furthermore, as claimed by Johnson (2009), it is during this sort of interaction that a more expert other may build on teachers' everyday concepts regarding the profession through new scientific concepts, fostering concept development. Provided that, the next section aims at illustrating how Sociocultural Theory aligns with the area of teacher education, also bringing examples of studies that emphasize the impact of social interaction on teacher cognitive development.

### **2.3 Sociocultural Theory and teacher development**

From a sociocultural perspective on teacher development, “[...] teacher cognition emerges out of participation in external forms of social interaction (*interpsychological*) that eventually become internalized psychological tools for teacher thinking (*intrapsychological*).” (Johnson, 2015, p. 516). Therefore, teacher development depends on the various relationships teachers establish within their communities of teaching, involving many aspects such as pedagogical meetings, talks with more experienced professionals, lesson planning, and the activity of teaching itself. Johnson (2009) states that when adopting a sociocultural perspective on human learning to teacher education, it becomes essential to understand both the “cognitive and social processes that teachers go through as they learn to teach [...]” (p. 3), the interactions between learners, teachers, and the objects in the learning environment having “[...] the potential to create opportunities for development [...]”. (p. 4).

Although such interactions are essential for fostering professional development, this process does not take place by simply having teachers interact with other teachers, students, and objects within

their communities of teaching. As previously mentioned, the quality of mediation provided during interaction is of paramount importance, the need for more expert others to be sensitive to how teachers participate in and respond to such moments playing a central role in promoting development. Therefore, it becomes central to the present study that the peer-teacher provides mediation that is responsive to the teachers' responses when inquiring into their practice. Drawing on Sociocultural Theory, Johnson and Golombek (2016) coined the term *responsive mediation* so as to account for this sort of interaction, a concept which will be developed in the next subsection of this study.

### **2.3.1 Responsive mediation**

Coined by Johnson and Golombek (2016) as responsive mediation, this concept aligns with the aforementioned vygotskian claim that mediation should be graduated and contingent on one's ZPD. When exploring the dialogic interactions that take place within the practices of L2 teacher education, the authors state that, as these interactions unfold, responsive mediation emerges, enabling teacher educators to "[...] understand, support, and enhance L2 teacher professional development." (p. 16).

The concept captures the idea that "[...] the quality and character of mediation must be negotiated, cannot be predicted beforehand, and is dependent on the ability to recognize and target teachers' emergent needs as well as utilize their responses to mediation and/or requests for additional support." (Johnson & Golombek, p. 34). This aligns with a sociocultural view on human development by highlighting that the moment-to-moment interactions in which teachers engage with more expert others have the potential to foster their development once the mediation provided is responsive to their ZPD, which can be accessed by more expert others when teachers have their reasoning externalized. Moreover, the authors suggest that the term "responsive mediation" emphasizes the need for the more expert other to be responsive to the teacher's responses during their dialogic interactions, thus establishing a dialectical relationship which allows the expert to stay attuned to the learner's ZPD.

This responsiveness is critical to enhance teacher development, since it is within such dialogic interactions that the more expert other introduces scientific concepts to teachers. Furthermore, being responsive to the teachers' responses may enable them to internalize the concepts introduced by the expert other as teachers use such new knowledge to make sense of experience (everyday knowledge), so the concepts can

“[...] become psychological tools that teachers use to enact their agency and regulate their mental and material activity of teaching in locally-appropriate, theoretically and pedagogically sound instructional practices for their students and contexts.” (Johnson & Golombek, 2016, p. 24), fostering teacher/teaching expertise. According to Johnson (2009), this is the main goal of teacher education: to provide teachers with relevant scientific concepts and unveil their everyday concepts so they can meet and merge so as to be internalized.

In short, for responsive mediation to take place, the more expert other needs to access teachers' maturing needs, which is only possible through language: it is by having teachers externalize their reasoning that the more expert other accesses their ZPDs and provides them with responsive mediation that may lead to internalization. During this process, the parts involved engage in joint intellectual activity as they try to make joint sense of experience. In other words, they think together about the aspects being addressed during interaction. This “thinking together”, what Littleton and Mercer (2013) call *interthinking*, is paramount in allowing humans to make sense of experience and develop.

As stated by Littleton and Mercer (2013), humans' ability to interthink results from our evolutionary history, playing an essential role in our daily lives since much of what we successfully do is achieved by working with others. Mercer (2000) defines interthinking as “[...] the joint, co-ordinated intellectual activity which people regularly accomplish using language” (p. 17). Therefore, in convergence with Sociocultural Theory, people do not use language only to talk, but also to think about and make sense of experience.

As Johnson and Golombek (2016) state, interthinking enables “[...] humans to combine their intellectual resources, via language, to achieve more than they would be able to do on their own.” (p. 48), which concurs with the vygotskian idea that language enables people to move beyond what they can achieve alone when combining what they individually know. Mercer (2000) also meets Vygotsky's work when suggesting that collective use of language supports the development of the ways one thinks individually: by saying so, the author brings into light Vygotsky's claim that every psychological function appears twice, first on the interpsychological plane so as to later on be internalized on the intrapsychological plane (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006).

One aspect that deserves attention when it comes to interthinking is that, for it to be effective (i.e. to foster development), levels of intersubjectivity need to be established and kept between the

ones involved in the process. In other words, the individuals need to be attuned to each others' attunement as regards what is understood and known about the aspects being addressed (Mercer, 2000). In the present study, therefore, it is essential for me to keep attuned to the participant's situation definitions of the aspects being discussed so as to provide her with responsive mediation and thus foster productive interthinking that may lead her to redefine her reasoning.

In this context, Johnson and Golombek (2016) add one more aspect that more expert others need to be attuned to during interaction: teachers' emotions. During moments of interaction between experts and teachers, the insertion of new scientific concepts may make teachers revisit and (re)conceptualize their everyday concepts, which may also lead to a clash between what they envision and what actually happens in their practice. According to Johnson and Worden (2014), this contradiction creates "[...] a sense of instability, or cognitive/emotional dissonance [...]" (p. 130), which from a sociocultural perspective has paramount importance since Vygotsky (1987) claims that one's emotions are an inseparable part of their cognition. Thus as a manner to understand one's cognition we must be attuned to their emotions and "[...] acknowledge the dialectic unit between the two." (Johnson & Worden, 2014, p. 127). The next subsection aims at further developing the dialectic unit of cognition and emotion, claiming that mediation directed at moments of teachers' *cognitive/emotional dissonance* may contribute to their professional development.

### **2.3.2 Cognitive/emotional dissonance and teacher development**

As Vygotsky (1987) suggests, human emotional reactions are intimately connected to human mind. The author advocates for a dialectical relation between cognition and emotion since there is a "[...] dynamic meaningful system that constitutes *a unity of affective and intellectual processes*." (p. 50), thus arguing against the separation of intellect and affect.

When considering teachers as life-long learners of teaching, one should bear in mind that among the various aspects which influence the way they develop teaching expertise, emotions are of paramount importance since teacher education is "[...] fundamentally about people [...]" (Johnson & Golombek, 2016), one's ideas always containing "[...] some remnant of the individual's affective relationship to that aspect of reality which it represents." (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 50.). Moreover, as presented by Johnson and Worden (2014), when the emotional

dimensions of learning to teach are considered as resources rather than distractions, novice teacher development can be fostered.

Since development does not happen in a linear way, it is expected that teachers may experience some sort of clash between what they think and know about their profession and what actually happens when they teach. Such moments may lead teachers to be at sea by creating “[...] a sense of instability, or cognitive/emotional dissonance, that may be both mystifying and debilitating for novice teachers.” (Johnson & Worden, 2014). In other words, teachers come to class with preexisting conceptions about the profession through which they envision what is supposed to happen, however, what they encounter in the actual activity of teaching may not concur with such idealization, resulting in moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance.

When highlighting the importance of such moments in the development of teacher/teaching expertise, Johnson and Golombek (2016) draw on McNeill and Duncan’s (2000) notion of *growth point* (GP), which can be understood as “[...] an analytic unit combining imagery and linguistic categorical content.” (p. 144). This notion of GP embraces a view in which two opposing categories (i.e. language and imagery) dialectically interact, constituting a speech-gesture synchrony that allows one to organize thinking while they speak. Putting it differently, McNeill and Duncan (2000) draw a parallel between this convergence of speech and gesture and Vygotsky’s (1987) view on the dialectic relation between thought and language, claiming that

As image and language interact, they are able to influence one another – the “continual movement back and forth” of which Vygotsky spoke in his evocation of the dialectic of language and thought [...] the GP with its dual imagistic–categorical nature, is the mediating link between individual cognition and the language system. (p. 146)

With this in mind, Johnson and Worden (2014) state that the GP constitutes a starting point for a thought as it “comes into being” (i.e. as it happens). The authors claim that just as the imagery-language dialectic (McNeill & Duncan, 2000; McNeill, 2005) is manifested through gesture and speech, the dialectic of teachers’ cognition and emotion becomes evident when teachers experience a contradiction between what they know and what actually happens when they teach. Therefore, the notion of GP is taken in this case as “[...] a moment or series of moments when novice teachers’ cognitive/emotional dissonance comes into being.” (Johnson & Worden, 2014).

As claimed by Vygotsky (1987), abrupt change in emotional processes results in change in consciousness. At this point, it is essential to mention that mediation which is responsive to such cognitive/emotional dissonance moments has the power to promote teacher development (Johnson & Worden, 2014; Johnson & Golombek, 2016). According to these authors, the teacher educator (or the more expert other, in this study) should be attuned to moments of teacher's cognitive/emotional dissonance so as to provide them with the sort of mediation they need.

This attunement between teacher and teacher educator may be fostered when teachers externalize their reasoning, since this is likely to be the moment in which the more experienced other is able to access the teacher's ZPDs and, consequently, provide them with responsive mediation. Moreover, having teachers revisit their practice and externalize what is behind it has the potential to help them organize their thought, language being the means by which this process takes place. Following those lines, it seems fair to add that the externalization of their choices may allow teachers to explore not only what but how they think about what they do. This "how" is the focus of Johnson's (1999) concept of *reasoning teaching*, which will be covered in the next subsection.

### **2.3.3 Reasoning teaching**

As Johnson (1999) suggests, any questions regarding teaching can be answered by the following sentence: it depends. The author states that there are no simple answers to the complexities of teaching, since their professional activities depend on various aspects, being the way teachers think about their teaching "[...] at the core of both learning to teach and understanding teaching." (Johnson, 1999, p. 1). She names this process "reasoning teaching", which represents the cognitive activity behind teachers' practices, being defined as "[...] the complex ways in which teachers conceptualize, construct explanations for, and respond to the social interactions and shared meanings that exist within and among teachers, students, parents, and administrators, both inside and outside the classroom." (Johnson, 1999. p. 1). In other words, reasoning teaching represents the complexity of teachers' reasoning regarding their profession, which involves the different aspects they take into account when carrying out their professional activities.

In her book "Understanding Language Teaching: Reasoning in Action", Johnson (1999) illustrates different ways in which teachers conceptualize themselves as teachers, think about their contexts of

teaching, face classroom dilemmas, make decisions, and consider the plurality of complexities involved in teaching, providing them with opportunities to (re)shape the nature of their reasoning. By doing so, the author enables teachers to expand the *robustness* of their reasoning, this meaning how thoroughly they engage in reasoning teaching.

The concept of reasoning teaching meets SCT tenets, since it is intrinsically related to the experiences teachers have had along their lives as both teachers and students, being grounded on their knowledge and beliefs and illustrating the influence of social interaction on the individual. Moreover, allowing teachers to externalize the reasoning that undergirds their practices concurs with SCT's idea of externalization, which fosters cognitive development since it is essential in the process of internalization.

Overall, providing novice teachers with moments for externalizing their reasoning allows them to revisit their practice, which may foster professional development. From a sociocultural perspective on teacher education, the role of a more experienced other is essential for these moments to happen, since inquiry into teachers' professional activities triggers their reasoning upon why and how they do what they do.

Empirical research on teacher development from a sociocultural perspective has spread out in the past few decades, results corroborating Vygotsky's main claims. In this vein, the next subsection presents an overview of studies that illustrate how Vygotsky's work has been applied in the area of teacher education.

### **2.3.4 Sociocultural Theory and empirical research on teacher education**

When considering the various means by which teachers come to learn/understand/internalize what they need to perform their professional activities, there is a growing body of research that emphasizes the importance of interaction with a more experienced peer for teacher development. Vieira-Abrahão (2014) explored the actions developed in collaborative sessions with teachers of English and the extent to which these sessions may foster teacher education. As part of an action-research project, teachers discussed relevant issues related to the teaching and learning of English in public schools in Brazil during the sessions held. At the end of the study, the author concludes that it is not an easy task to reconstruct concepts within one's zone of proximal development, which may be explained by the sort of mediation provided during the sessions. In other words, mediation needs to be strategic,

which did not happen in many moments during the sessions, thus signaling that – as sociocultural theory posits – not every sort of interaction has the power to foster one’s development. However, she affirms that although sessions like those cannot be predictable, they do have the potential to foster the professional development of the parts involved.

Johnson (2015) explored the collaborative teaching-learning relationships that unfold in the practices of L2 teacher education and the role of a more expert-other (a teacher educator) mediation in supporting a group of novice teachers to enact L2 teaching. These teachers participated in a team-teaching project and were supposed to work with *parallelism* with their students. The project counted on different stages that aimed at creating mediational spaces that unveiled the novice teachers’ potentialities (ZPD). For instance, on one of these stages the teachers participated in a one-hour video-recorded *practice teach*<sup>9</sup>, in which they taught their teacher educator and fellow classmates, who could ask questions and give suggestions when they felt the need to do so. At the beginning of the study, the teachers admitted that they did not know what parallelism was, being uncomfortable with teaching something they were not familiar with. After some time, the students started shaping their own understanding of parallelism, as a response – among other aspects – to the teacher educator’s mediation. By the end of the study, the team’s conscious awareness of the concept and how to teach it emerged, supporting their teaching expertise development.

Dellagnelo, Silva, and Rocha (2015) investigated the conceptions of two English teachers regarding the teaching and learning of activities that aimed at developing students’ academic skills for delivering oral presentations. Data was analyzed through these two teachers’ written reports that aimed at exploring the experience they had with collaborative planning and implementation of a one-month course on academic presentations. After planning the course, the teachers got together with the pedagogical coordinator of the program they taught so as to revisit the course’s content, engaging in critical reflection upon the reasoning behind those teachers’ goals when developing the activities. After that, the teachers wrote reports that aimed at justifying the activities proposed for the course. By analyzing such reports, it was seen that both teachers were concerned with having students integrate their

---

<sup>9</sup> This stage was used for students to “*practice* their teaching” with their teacher educator and classmates of the team-teaching project, before having the *actual teach* stage – when they would teach an *actual* group of L2 learners.



everyday knowledge on academic presentations to scientific knowledge so as to help students move beyond their everyday notions, (re)conceptualizing what they know about oral academic presentations. Besides that, the study shows the role of social interaction – both with the pedagogical coordinator and with each other – on teachers' engagement in critical reflection upon what they do, allowing them to bridge what they know (theory) to what they do (practice).

Biehl and Dellagnelo (2016) traced the development of the concept of *contextualization* of a novice teacher who was mediated by a teacher educator (a more experienced other) via feedback sessions after class observations. At the beginning of the study, the novice teacher did not acknowledge the concept at all. After some time, she was able to talk about it and sometimes refer to it in planning. Then, the concept was finally explored in her practice as well: she could actually contextualize her classes in relation to students' lives and reality, as well as contextualize the class activities within the realm of the topic of the lesson as a whole.

Cerutti-Rizzatti and Dellagnelo (2016) conducted a study focusing on the way levels of intersubjectivity were established during interaction between them and their students, and the impact such interactions had on these students' development of theoretical constructs that revolve around their profession. Data was analyzed through field notes written by the professors in which they interpret moments of interaction between them and their students that impacted the development of these students' knowledge in relation to such constructs, highlighting the importance of being sensitive to students' ZPDs during moments of interaction. Results show that the aforementioned interactions fostered higher levels of intersubjectivity between the professors and their students in relation to the theoretical constructs discussed by them. Besides that, the study also contemplates the need for mediation which is directed at students' ZPDs so as to foster their development.

Johnson and Golombek (2016) examined responsive mediation provided by a teacher educator to an ESL teacher during her teaching internship. The teacher educator and teacher had meetings in which they collaboratively reflected on whether the teacher's conceptions of teaching were in alignment with what actually happened in class, fostering moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance that, with responsive mediation provided by the teacher educator, allowed the teacher to articulate her knowledge of teaching. Besides that, the researchers analyzed journal entries in which they responded to the

teacher's comments on her cognition and emotions before teaching, also to the externalization of her thinking, doing, and feeling as regards her interactions with students. Then, the teacher engaged in narrative inquiry into the whole process of teaching and having such interactions with the teacher educator, allowing her, one more time, to reflect upon her practice. In short, this process allowed the teacher to revisit her practice, critically reflect on what was behind it, and eventually (re)conceptualize her learning-to-teach experience.

Agnoletto (2017) investigated a novice teacher's reasoning in relation to the changes made in class *vis-à-vis* the suggestions given in the teacher's manual. The teacher and I had meetings in which I inquired into his explanations for having changed such suggestions. It was concluded that externalizing his reasoning after being inquired into such changes allowed the novice teacher to better explore his conceptualization of teaching. Moreover, this externalization process helped him understand the implications behind some activities in the book that at first did not appear to be meaningful for him.

Dellagnelo and Moritz (2017) investigated the extent to which mediation provided to a future teacher by her professor and classmates along one academic semester impacted her class planning in relation to the concept and the teaching of reading. The study was conducted in an elective course, in which each student had to work on four class plans and present them in class so the professor and classmates asked questions and eventually gave suggestions in relation to what was proposed, thus expecting that the aspects pointed out would be present in the subsequent plans. Results show that each of the participant's class plans reverberated the feedback received, indicating her professional development as regards the concept and the teaching of reading, showing the transformation of her teaching activity after being mediated by her classmates, professor, and assigned readings during the course.

Dallacosta (2018) aimed at tracing the development of a non-novice English teacher as regards her understanding and use of pedagogical principles and tools of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) as this teacher engaged in three microteaching sessions of a pre-service English teaching program of a language institute. During these sessions, peer-teachers and teacher educators commented on didactic-pedagogical aspects of the teacher's practice, bearing in mind the principles and tools of CLT, in order to allow the teacher to better understand them. Dallacosta (2018) focused on the extent to which such mediation provided by the peer-teachers and teacher educators reverberated in the subsequent classes taught by the teacher in the

language institute. The author concluded that the mediation provided to the teacher might have not played a significant role in fostering her development as regards the pedagogical principles and tools of CLT, since such mediation focused on behavior evaluation. Thus the study signaled that mediation should foster conceptual thinking, intersubjectivity, and interthinking instead.

Dall'Igna (2018) traced the development of an EFL teacher as he was mediated by a more experienced other who inquired into the reasoning behind his planning and practice. The data collection procedures consisted of pedagogical conferences in which the teacher presented his class plan to a more experienced other who inquired into his reasoning. Besides that, Dall'Igna (2018) observed and recorded the teacher putting such class plan into practice in a real classroom setting. The results show that the pedagogical conferences influenced the teacher's professional activity, such moments of interaction with the more experienced peer reverberating in the teacher's discourse and practice, as well as in his self-analysis. All in all, the findings support the importance of mediation – which is strategic and goal-directed – provided by an experienced other for teachers' professional development.

Silva (2018) investigated the relation between the teaching of a professor of a foreign language teaching methodology course and the teaching of a student-teacher in the classes of methodology and practicum of an English language and literature undergraduate program of a Brazilian university. The researcher looked into possible (co)constructions of concepts in the theoretical-practical activities developed during the course. Based on diaries, drawings, audio recordings, interviews, questionnaires, and lesson plans produced by the participant of the study, Silva (2018) identified that construction, co-construction, and reconstruction of academic and everyday concepts in the action of the student-teacher in relation to the teaching of the teacher education took place.

The studies aforementioned illustrate how Sociocultural Theory has been explored in the area of teacher education, showing the role of social interaction and the Theory's main constructs in the development of teachers' professional activities. Due to the extent of theory reviewed so far, the next subsection aims at summarizing the main theoretical aspects presented.

## **2.4 A brief summary of the study's main theoretical constructs**

This chapter has presented and explored Sociocultural Theory's main constructs as well as how it has been applied to the area of teacher education. In short, the Theory posits that human psychological functioning originates and develops through people's participation in social activity (i.e. on the interpsychological plane), which – through mediation – moves into one's intrapsychological plane. During this process, language stands out as the most important and pervasive means, allowing us to communicate and both organize and understand reality.

Besides that, it was seen that mediation needs to be directed at one's maturing capabilities, captured by Vygotsky in the concept of zone of proximal development. It becomes essential to highlight that such developmental levels are accessed through one's response to mediation provided, thus showing the importance of externalization for internalization to take place. Along with that, it was discussed that establishing levels of intersubjectivity while interacting with more expert peers is essential for fostering learner's redefinition of their previous conceptions, the process of interthinking contributing to such change.

Also, the importance of spontaneous concepts to go hand in hand with scientific ones was highlighted. In this vein, it was presented how the Theory can be applied to the area of teacher education as well as how important it is to have teachers revisit their practice and understandings, the more expert peer offering responsive mediation that has the potential to foster the (re)conceptualization of teachers' everyday knowledge. It was then discussed that this process may not occur in a smooth way, sometimes leading to a clash between teachers' cognition and emotion. Drawing on Vygotsky's view of the intrinsic connection between emotion and cognition, it was seen that such moments are of paramount importance in the development of teacher/teaching expertise.

All things considered, the next chapter explains how this study was designed so as to bring into light the theoretical perspectives explored so far.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD

#### 3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims at presenting and further elaborating on the methodological aspects of the study, such as its nature, participants, context of investigation, and instruments and procedures for data collection and analysis.

The present qualitative piece of research is characterized as a case study, having two participants and being carried out in one single context. As Dornyei (2007) advocates, qualitative studies present an emergent research design, being flexible to any possible changes that emerge during the investigation. Since the study deals with the developmental process of a novice teacher as regards her interaction with a more experienced peer, it seems fair to consider that an emergent research design best fits its purpose, taking into account that there is no way for making straightforward predictions about the results, due to participants' idiosyncrasies. Furthermore, the study was conducted in a natural teaching setting, meeting Dornyei's (2007) idea that qualitative studies "[...] describe social phenomena as they occur naturally [...]" (p. 38). Besides that, considering the qualitative studies' interest in individuals' idiosyncrasies rather than in generalizations, it seems like case studies contribute to a better understanding of one's individualities, as they allow "[...] one aspect of a problem to be studied in some depth." (Bell, 2005, p.10).

Together with the idea presented above, this study meets the research methodology proposed by Vygotsky as a manner to investigate the development of higher forms of mental behavior as they unfold: the genetic method. Briefly speaking, this method focuses on human development, aiming at "[...] understanding how the human mind functions as a consequence of its formation in cultural activity." (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 57). Wertsch states that a genetic analysis is necessary when studying human mental processes, since it "[...] examines the origins of these processes and the transitions that lead up to their later form." (p. 55). Thus, it does not follow a synchronic approach to research, but a diachronic one, in which the genesis/history of one's development is emphasized: as previously mentioned, the genetic method is interested in the process of development rather than in its results. With this in mind, the human cultural formation domain emphasized in this study is microgenesis, which concerns the study of

specific processes during one's development (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). According to these authors, Vygotsky "[...] considered study of the processes that arise in the movement from thinking to speaking as part of the microgenetic domain [...]" (p. 52), meeting this study's objectives which revolve around the development of a novice teacher's reasoning process while she interacts with a more experienced peer.

Considering its main objective – to investigate the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher, *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual – information on the study's context and participants are detailed in this chapter, together with the instruments and procedures that were used for data collection and analysis.

### 3.2 Participants

The participants were a *novice teacher*<sup>10</sup> of the English Extracurricular Program of the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC) and myself, also a teacher in the same Program. In order to choose a novice teacher to participate in the study, I sent emails to the teachers that would start to teach in the Program in the first semester of 2018<sup>11</sup>, explaining the study and inviting them to participate. Besides that, I attended the first meeting these teachers had with the Program's coordinators, before classes started, so as to have a face to face encounter with these professionals. Unfortunately, I got no yeses. It was during an informal talk with a coworker (another Program's teacher) that I could get in touch with a potential participant. After some email exchanges, the potential participant and I made an appointment, in which the study's goal was briefly<sup>12</sup> explained to her, who seemed to be very excited to participate. Besides accepting the invitation, she emphasized the fact that she thinks the sort of interaction proposed by the study is very important for teacher professional development. Thus she seemed to be very open and motivated to be part of the process, which made me myself get motivated and anxious for conducting the

---

<sup>10</sup> This study understands novice teachers as professionals that have up to two years of experience with teaching.

<sup>11</sup> The initial idea was to have teachers that had never taught English before, but this had to be changed since it was very difficult to find participants with such profile.

<sup>12</sup> In order to avoid biasing the participant during the study, the exact focus of investigation was not thoroughly explained to her.

study. As a manner to protect the novice teacher's identity, she will be referred to as Linda.

Linda was 25 years old when the study was conducted. Besides that, she was in the last year of Letras Undergraduate Program and had been teaching in the Extracurricular Program for two years (her first experience with the teaching of English). Therefore, it was expected that she would already have, at least, some familiarity with the textbook and teacher's manual she worked with. She was very excited to start having the interviews, since she felt there were many things about her teaching that should be explored. Also, she said she was not used to taking time to reflect upon what she did in her classes, so the study would provide her with the opportunity to do so. As regards her experiences with learning English, Linda had never taken classes before entering the University. Her contact with the language started when she was a child, through music and videogames. Besides that, she also attributes her learning process to the talks she has with her boyfriend, who, according to her, has "great English", so when she met him they started to have conversations for her to practice the language.

One aspect that deserves attention is that Linda had not had a student-teaching experience by the time data was collected. In UFSC's Letras Undergraduate Program, students can choose, when they get to the fifth semester, whether they want to conduct a study to get a bachelor's degree (write an undergraduate thesis), or have a student-teaching experience and get a license to teach when they graduate. When students choose the first option, as Linda did, they do not take courses that deal with the teaching of English, but with academic writing and research methodology so as to prepare them to write their undergraduate thesis. When choosing the second option, the courses students take are focused on teaching theories and methodology designed to prepare students for their student-teaching experience, which usually happens in the final semester of the program. Taking this into account, it is important to mention that Linda had had some everyday knowledge as regards the textbook and manual at the time data was collected, but was expected to lack the scientific counterpart lying behind these materials.

As regards me, I was 23 years old at the time data was collected and had had about five years of experience with the teaching of English in three programs at UFSC by then: PET Letras; Languages without Borders; and Extracurricular. The acronym PET stands for "Program of Tutorial Education" ("Programa de Educação Tutorial", in Portuguese). It is an opportunity for the University's language department students voluntarily teach, being known for allowing these students to have their

first experience(s) with teaching. This program does not count on a pedagogical coordinator, meaning that teachers who step into the classroom with either little or none experience do not have the opportunity to get pedagogical orientation with a more experienced other. I taught a group of beginners in the Program for one academic semester.

In relation to Languages without Borders, it is a renowned program in Brazil for being a national endeavor from the Ministry of Education that aims at the internalization process of the country's universities thus focusing on enhancing the linguistic proficiency of potential candidates for outbound mobility as well as faculty and staff for inbound mobility. The courses offered at UFSC concentrate on language proficiency tests preparation, academic written and oral skills, and English for specific purposes within the academic sphere. At the time I was part of the Program, it counted on two coordinators – a general and a pedagogical one – with whom I had discussions about teaching on a regular basis. Moreover, there were monthly meetings with the coordinators and the other teachers (there were nine teachers in the Program at that time) in which we discussed previous teaching experiences and theoretical constructs related to the profession. I taught at Languages without Borders for two years and a half, from beginners to upper-intermediate students, considering this experience the most fruitful one for my professional development.

As regards my experience as a teacher in the Extracurricular Program, I had been part of it for about two years and had taught from beginners to intermediate level students by the time this research study started to be conducted. Moreover, I was currently teaching in the Program at the time data was collected. As this extension program is actually the context in which this study developed, additional information on it is further detailed in the next subsection.

Besides having had these teaching experiences, it is important to mention that I hold the two aforementioned Letras' degrees: I have got a license to teach and a bachelor's degree. Thus I had both had a student-teaching experience and conducted a research study in my undergraduate program. Furthermore, this study – conducted by me as my undergraduate thesis – was in the area of teacher education, also based on Sociocultural Theory and on the use of the teacher's manual by a novice teacher, as explained in Chapter I. It seems fair to mention that by the time the present study was carried out, I was in the second year of my master's studies, and had already taken the mandatory and elective courses of this graduate program which helped deepen my



understanding of my field of study and, more specifically, of Sociocultural Theory and how it has the potential to foster teacher development. The information provided above illustrates the reasons why I position myself as a more expert peer/other in this study.

After presenting the study's participants, the next subsection aims at providing detailed information on the extracurricular program in which the study took place.

### **3.3 Context of investigation: the English Extracurricular Program**

The Extracurricular Program is an extension program of foreign languages that has run since 1970 and is held by the Foreign Languages and Literatures Department of UFSC, offering paid courses of eight different languages, including Arabic, Brazilian Portuguese for Foreigners, English, French, German, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish – English being the only language offered at the Program's beginning. It started as an initiative of the languages' department professors, aiming at both offering high-quality and low-cost courses, as well as providing the University's language graduate students – who would teach in the Program – with scholarships.

In order to take any of the language courses offered, students need to be 15 years old or over, classes being composed of UFSC's students (in majority) as well as people from the local community. As a manner to be a teacher, candidates have to be students at the university who either hold a degree in languages or are seeking for one, most teachers being students of the University's language graduate programs. Currently, there are around 120 teachers and 3.300 students in the whole Program.

The English Extracurricular Program<sup>13</sup> is composed of a general coordinator (who deals mainly with bureaucratic issues), a pedagogical coordinator (who assists the general coordinator, organizes pedagogical meetings, and attends the classes of the new teachers of the Program so as to provide them with feedback on their teaching activity), around 50 teachers, and around 1.500 students, the English program being the one with the biggest number of teachers and students among all languages offered. When applying for being an English teacher, candidates go through a selection process in which they choose one of the Program's textbook contents, prepare a lesson plan for a one and a half hour class, and send it to the program's coordination. Besides that,

---

<sup>13</sup> Since the study was conducted in the English Extracurricular Program, detailed information about the other language programs is not provided.

candidates have to teach part of the class prepared – from ten to fifteen minutes – to a committee composed of three experienced teachers, two of them being part of the department’s faculty, one being the program’s coordinator. The third component is the pedagogical coordinator, who is usually a graduate student with plenty of teaching experience. The role of this committee is to assess the candidates’ practice regarding the class taught, as well as their résumés.

When entering the program, in their very first semester, teachers have to observe six classes of experienced teachers and write reflective reports on them. It is interesting to mention that the program is well known for being a good laboratory for teacher education, since pedagogical support is provided, specifically for novice teachers: the pedagogical coordinator assists these teachers, observing their classes and giving feedback on their practices. Moreover, the coordination organizes three pedagogical meetings with all the program’s teachers during each semester. In these meetings, teachers are encouraged to discuss their classroom practices and controversial topics related to the profession. These moments are great opportunities for them to share experiences, contributing to their professional development.

Regarding the material used, the program works – among others – with the textbook *Interchange*, which includes a teacher’s manual. The material follows – just as the program does – the principles of the communicative approach to foreign language teaching, which views language as a tool for communication, focusing on function over form and on student-centered classes (Larsen-Freeman, 2000). Every unit presents two cycles, each of them containing a specific theme, grammar point, and linguistic function. Besides that, the units are composed of different sections that have different pedagogical aims: Snapshot – introduces either the unit’s or the cycle’s main topic, also presenting important vocabulary related to it; Conversation – provides structured listening and speaking practice, using pictures that are explored by teachers so as to help students better understand the passage (eg. students make predictions and guesses about what they will listen to); Pronunciation – focuses on developing students’ pronunciation in relation to the cycle grammar presented; Grammar Focus – summarizes the main grammatical aspect being studied in the cycle, presenting controlled grammar practice; Listening – develops students’ listening skills through listening activities related to the unit’s topic; Speaking – allows students to get engaged in group/pair oral tasks that deal with the target grammar and vocabulary presented in the cycle; Word power – presents vocabulary related to the unit’s topic; Perspectives – provides

structured listening and speaking practice, introducing the second cycle's grammar; Writing – proposes a written task that is related to the unit's topic, grammar, and vocabulary; Reading – allows students to develop their reading skills and strategies (eg. scanning, skimming, etc) through the use of various text types; Interchange Activity – further explores the topic, vocabulary, and grammar dealt with in the unit; and Grammar Plus – further explores the grammar studied in the unit through the means of controlled exercises. (Richards, J., Hull, J., & Proctor, S., 2013).

This particular extracurricular program was chosen taking into account practical, personal, and methodological reasons: (i) it belongs to the same university in which I study; moreover, I currently teach in the program, having contact with coordinators and workmates on a daily basis, making it easier to contact participants; (ii) it was the context of a previous investigation I carried out, motivating me to further explore its possibilities; (iii) it adopts a textbook that has a teacher's manual; and (iv) it is known for giving novice teachers the opportunity to teach and thus develop in the profession. These last two reasons constitute *sine qua non* conditions of this study.

It is important to mention that Linda was teaching two different groups of students at the time the study was conducted. Both of them were groups of beginners and since they both used the textbook Interchange in class, any of them could be observed. The group chosen was the one that best fit into my schedule. There were 9 regular students in class and they were all very welcoming and had a very good relationship with Linda.

After having the context of investigation described and explained, the next subsection presents and explores the instruments and procedures for data collection and analysis.

### **3.4 Instruments and procedures for data collection and analysis**

Since this study involved human subjects, a project was sent to UFSC's human research ethics committee (CEPSH), granting the approval under number 86591518.3.0000.0121. In accordance with the University's committee, the novice teacher read and signed a consent letter<sup>14</sup> that explained the activities she would have to perform once she accepted participating in the study. In order to follow the rules

---

<sup>14</sup> See Appendix A (all the appendixes of this work can be found in the CD-ROM attached to the last page of this book).

established by this committee, this process happened prior to the start of data collection procedures.

Before the class observations began, the novice teacher answered an open-ended questionnaire<sup>15</sup> that intended to raise her perceptions of herself as a teacher, of teaching itself, and of how she sees the role of the teacher's manual on the planning and performance of her professional activity. Dornyei (2007) states that open-format items permit "[...] greater freedom of expression [...] and can] lead us to identify issues not previously anticipated." (p. 107). Moreover, considering the questionnaire's aim, participants can better explore their own ideas when using their own words, not being limited by any pre-determined options. The questionnaire was shared with the participant on an online survey software and questionnaire tool called *Survey Monkey*.

Considering Vygotsky's focus on process instead of product, it should be taken into account that the most adequate methods for tracing development are the ones that capture one's transformation (Oliveira, 2001). Therefore, I accompanied her every other class<sup>16</sup> for almost one academic semester. The first month of class was not attended since I wanted to give the teacher some room to get to know her students. Besides that, I believed that being with the teacher from the very first class could have made her somehow uncomfortable. By the end of the semester, a total of nine classes were observed.

Right after each class observation, interviews<sup>17</sup> were conducted with the teacher as a manner to inquire into the reasoning behind her choices in relation to the changes made, allowing her to externalize it and – possibly – expand its robustness. Following a Vygostkian approach to teacher development, these interviews will be referred to as “mediator-mediatee interaction”, since this term captures the dialectical nature that propels human psychological development, a central aspect in the author's work. It is essential to bring into discussion the process I went through so as to foster the teacher's professional development. In the first three mediator-mediatee interactions held, I inquired into different aspects of the participant's teaching – always in relation to her use of the manual – in order to identify specific pedagogical choices she made that deserved attention and could be explored and further

---

<sup>15</sup> See Appendix B.

<sup>16</sup> The researcher chose not to observe every class taught by the teacher so as to not be too invasive.

<sup>17</sup> Every interview was recorded with a cell phone.

developed through mediation. As class observations and interactions progressed, I was able to narrow down aspects of the teacher's practice, and thus provide her with sustained mediation, which from a sociocultural perspective to teacher education, is necessary if teacher development is to be fostered (Johnson, 2009). This signals the importance of providing teachers with different opportunities to (re)visit their reasoning in relation to the aspects being addressed, so they have multiple opportunities to imbue their practice with meaning, possibly building a better understanding of what they do. The reason that led me to narrow down the aspects to be tackled is that it would have been difficult to provide sustained mediation had I not limited the focus of the manual's pedagogical aspects during the moments of interaction with the teacher. In short, such movement reflects the teacher and me staying attuned to each other's attunement along the semester<sup>18</sup>. It is also important to add that the questionnaire answered by the participant before observations started helped guide me during the mediator-mediatee interactions. Since the questionnaire raised information about the participant's perceptions of herself as a teacher, of teaching itself, and of the role of the teacher's manual on the planning and performance of her professional activity, it was used as a starting point. In relation to that, I felt the need to sometimes confront her answers of the questionnaire with what actually happened in class. When realizing that some of the teacher's actions did not meet what she had previously written in the questionnaire, I found it important to bring this into light in order to allow the participant to reason about her professional activity and consequently make sense of such moments of dissonance. Needless to say, these moments have the potential to foster teacher development when a more experienced other provides mediation that is responsive to them.

At the end of the class observations, the participant answered a very similar questionnaire<sup>19</sup> to the one from the beginning of the study, as a manner to investigate any possible changes regarding her perceptions in relation to the manual's use that could indicate reverberations of the interactions between her and me. Some of the questions in the first questionnaire were repeated in the second one so as to prevent the participant from realizing what the main focus of the study was. Moreover, this questionnaire aimed at allowing me to access

---

<sup>18</sup> This movement will be further explored in Chapter IV "Data Analysis and Discussion".

<sup>19</sup> See Appendix C.

the participant's view on the experience of participating in the study in order to better understand how she felt during the whole process. This, I believe, can help me improve methodological aspects of further research I will carry out from the same perspective.

As regards the data analysis procedure, concurring with the interpretative nature of this study, special attention was given to how the teacher's reasoning took place during the mediator-mediatee interactions after the class observations as a result of my inquiry into her practice. Moreover, attention was drawn to the way she externalized such reasoning so as to account for any transformations in its nature and/or expansion of her zones of proximal development. When it comes to such externalization, it seems essential to highlight that it is the interactions with a more experienced peer – in this case, with me – that may open mediational spaces to access teachers' ZPDs, this being fostered in this study by my inquiry into the teacher's practice, allowing me to responsively mediate her reasoning process. Moreover, as illustrated in the previous paragraph, the quality of such mediation cannot be predetermined, being "(...) emergent, contingent, and responsive to (...) moment-to-moment interactions with teachers" instead (Johnson, 2015, p. 518). In other words, throughout the whole process, I attempted to be sensitive to the teacher's responses so as to provide her with mediation that was likely to foster the development of her maturing capabilities. It is important to mention that whenever I had doubts about the sort of mediation I should provide to the teacher and/or the interpretations I drew from our moments of interaction, I talked to my advisor and showed her the classes' transcripts so as to check my assumptions. This helped me feel more confident during the process of data collection.

Given these points, this study presents three specific research questions that will be answered so as to investigate the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher, *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual. As a manner to answer the first of these questions – what changes were made in the teacher's classes in comparison to the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions? – I contacted the teacher, on a weekly basis, so as to know what unit she would teach in the class I would observe. Then, I read the teacher's manual before attending every class. During class observations, I took notes whenever she changed the textbook activities and/or did not follow the teacher's manual suggestions in order to compare what she actually did in class to these

materials. As regards the second question – what mediated this teacher’s reasoning in relation to the changes made in class *vis-à-vis* the textbook activities and the teacher’s manual suggestions?– during the mediator-mediatee interactions, I inquired into the teacher’s reasoning whenever she changed the textbook activities and/or manual’s suggestions so as to have her externalize it. Then, I transcribed<sup>20</sup> the interactions and read all of them, focusing on her responses, in order to find the aspects that mediated her choices. Finally, in the third question – Are there any didactic-pedagogical aspects of the textbook/manual initially overlooked and subsequently incorporated in the teacher’s class and speech that may indicate reverberations of the past interactions with the researcher? If so, which and how? – whenever I noticed that the teacher incorporated a didactic-pedagogical aspect in her practice that was initially overlooked by her, I inquired into her reasoning so as to figure out if she were aware of the aspects once overlooked by her when she did not follow the activities and suggestions presented in the textbook and/or manual. Besides that, whenever I felt the need to do so, I introduced to her the scientific concepts lying behind the textbook and teacher’s manual in order to allow her to (re)organize her everyday knowledge through the scientific knowledge being presented, following a sociocultural approach to teacher development. In other words, I focused on responsively mediating this teacher’s development as regards using these materials, providing her with assistance that aimed at both unveiling and fostering her understanding of their pedagogical aspects. Also, I investigated whether my inquiry into and the aforementioned introduction of concepts to her reasoning shed light on the classes that followed the interactions. Whenever such reverberations were found in her practice, I inquired into her motives for doing so, in order to investigate whether the aspects were consciously incorporated by the participant or not. This process is of paramount importance when following a sociocultural perspective to teacher education since one’s ability to think in concepts can be seen when they are able to apply a concept in different situations and articulate the reasons for doing so (Johnson, 2009). This meets Vygotsky’s (1987) view of concept development, which considers that both everyday and scientific concepts should complement each other, the latter being the means by which one can voluntarily (i.e. consciously) act upon the world in different situations (i.e. different contexts). Besides that, when analyzing the transcripts, I looked for moments of interaction between the teacher

---

<sup>20</sup> See Appendix D

and me – from classes 1 to 9 – that fostered the (re)conceptualization of her practice. In other words, I looked for any possible reverberations in her class and speech that could show the impact of such moments on her development. When doing so, I ended up focusing on one aspect of the teacher's practice that may have been (re)conceptualized due to the moments of interaction between us: the teaching of grammar. This will be further explained in the next chapter which aims at thoroughly discussing and interpreting, through a sociocultural perspective, the study's main findings in order to reach its main objective.



## CHAPTER IV

### DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

#### 4.1 Introductory aspects

The present chapter is split into two subsections: (i) **4.1 Introductory aspects**, in which an initial discussion of the data analysis process is provided in order to provide the readers with contextualization; and (ii) **4.2 Analysis of the mediator-mediatee interactions: the teaching of grammar**, in which the data collected are discussed in light of the aspect of the teacher's practice approached in the analysis.

The data collected in this study consist of about 13 hours of class observation and about five hours of interaction between the mediator and the mediatee that happened throughout 8<sup>21</sup> meetings, each of which having occurred within 48 hours after class. Along these hours, a variety of aspects popped up regarding the participant's practice during the mediator-mediatee interactions, thus the data collected ended up being too vast to be thoroughly analyzed in a master's thesis. As a study guided by a sociocultural perspective to teacher education, only two of these aspects were explored along the meetings so as to provide the participant with responsive mediation and sustained opportunities to revisit her practice. This does not mean that her anxieties were ignored in our interactions, but rather that not all of them were focused on, meaning we talked about whatever the participant-teacher brought to the conversation, aiming at mediation, but I focused attention on the two aspects that she apparently needed more mediation on, namely the teaching of grammar and the teaching of listening. At this point, when starting to put "pen to paper", it was also necessary to leave one of these aspects out – the teaching of listening – and this way fit within the limits of a master's thesis. Therefore the aspect that the teacher was more often inquired into for the purposes of this work was the teaching of grammar. This particular aspect was chosen because it is the one that most seemed to have been (re)conceptualized as a result of moments of interaction with me, reverberations of these moments being strongly present in the teacher's class and speech as the observations and meetings moved on.

---

<sup>21</sup> Since the study's focus was narrowed down to the teaching of grammar, class 7 was not analyzed due to the fact that Linda did not teach grammar in this class.

As previously presented, the study's main objective is to investigate the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher, *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual. Thus the main research question textualizes as "What is the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual?". In order to answer this question, the following specific research questions were designed: (i) What changes were made in the teacher's classes in comparison to the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions?; (ii) What mediated this teacher's reasoning in relation to the changes made in class *vis-à-vis* the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions?; and (iii) Are there any didactic-pedagogical aspects of the textbook/manual initially overlooked and subsequently incorporated in the teacher's class and speech that may indicate reverberations of the past interactions with the researcher? If so, which and how?

After this brief introduction, the next subsection analyzes, in light of the aspect chosen, the moments of interaction between mediator and mediatee. The following table presents and explains the conventions adopted for transcription:

Table 2	
<i>Transcript conventions</i>	
<u>Codes</u>	<u>Explanation</u>
R	- Researcher
L	- Linda
...	- Short hesitation/pause
(...)	- R or L continues to develop and idea after being interrupted
[...]	- Omitted information
[ ]	- Words added by the researcher
/	- Interruption
(!)	- Counter-expectation (e.g. surprise)
Uhum	- Agreement

#### **4.2 Analysis of the mediator-mediatee interactions: the teaching of grammar**

This subsection presents and discusses excerpts of the mediator-mediatee interactions in which Linda and I dealt with aspects related to the teaching of grammar. Also, some parts of her answers to the questionnaires<sup>22</sup> applied in the beginning and end of the whole process are used to illustrate some points made in the present discussion. To start off, in the first class observed<sup>23</sup>, the teacher did not use either the teacher's manual or textbook. The whole class consisted of Power Point presentations in which Linda presented rules for using the present perfect tense, followed by exercises that required students to fill in blank spaces of some sentences and transform others that were in the simple present tense into the present perfect tense. The grammatical content covered by Linda in this class was: the differences between “yet” and “already” and “for” and “since”; and how to use frequency adverbs in the present perfect tense (e.g. I've always wanted to have a car). The following excerpt presents Linda's explanations for having taught the class this way

**R:**<sup>24</sup> [...] **Can you tell me why you decided to present it this way... explain it to them the way you did?**

L: Yeah. Because when I show them... when I open the digital version of the book they already make that face like “oh, the book again”. They don't seem encouraged.

**R: In the previous class?**

L: Every time I open the book, they don't seem interested.

**R: Ok.**

L: So I try to bring things from other sources. When I prepare a presentation they even look more vivid [...] I think they know it's something that may not be that boring... Because I... I personally don't like the book... the format of the book.

**R: Oh... You don't like it.**

L: I don't like it.

**R: You think that they don't like it either.**

L: Yeah.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 1, excerpt 1)

---

<sup>22</sup> Appendix D

<sup>23</sup> It seems important to remind the readers that the first month of class was not attended. Thus, the first class observed was not the first class taught by the teacher during the semester.

<sup>24</sup> “R” stands for “researcher” while “L” stands for “Linda”.

By analyzing Linda's answer, her reasoning seemed to be mediated by two aspects: (i) the idea of making students interested in class; and (ii) the fact that she does not like the book. In her point of view, the book is "boring" and students do not get interested in learning when working with it. This is later corroborated when she was invited by me to keep exploring the reasoning behind her choice

**R: [...] you said that they seem more vivid when you bring activities...**

L: yeah... they seem interested [...]

**R: [...] things that go beyond the book.**

L: Yes. They seem more interested.

**R: [...] Do they participate more? How do they react?**

L: They participate more... they seem to pay attention more closely because it's something that breaks that idea of boring classes every day with the same book. They already know the book. They've had probably looked at the book... right? [...]

**R: Uhum... got it. I think they paid a lot of attention, I was very impressed [...]**

L: That only happens with... Power Point presentations [...] When it's the book... they look, but they don't participate as much. They don't make as many questions.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 1, excerpt 2)

In this excerpt, Linda once again emphasized the fact that the book is boring and stated that only Power Point presentations make students "participate as much" in class, which is another aspect behind her reasoning. As the interaction went on, I inquired into the class' main goal in order to better understand her choice of focusing solely on grammar

**R: Can I say that your main focus in this class was grammar?**

L: Yes. Absolutely.

**R: Did you do it on purpose? Can you tell me why?**

L: Because I see that when I explain something more explicitly, then I present other activities that are not as explicit, they get the idea more easily. They don't get frustrated.

**R: [...] you prefer to present rules explicitly (...)**

L: yes.

**R: (...) then they have conversation... some other activities in which they can talk... about it... using that grammar.**

L: Yes.

R: Ok.

L: Because they... I don't know if... of course it changes, from class to class, but when I did the opposite, when I used to do the opposite in my other classes... they got really frustrated because they want to go through the grammar... structure already... they want to understand what's going on... they don't seem to like the idea of trying to grasp the concept from the conversation... they like to know what's happening. What the structure is [...] So when I present it to them, and then I use another activity where there's interpretation involved... then they get comfortable to understand the conversation, the context... At least that's the impression I have.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 1, excerpt 3)

This passage illustrates that Linda feels like her students do not like it when she implicitly teaches grammar, leading her to explicitly present the grammatical topic in order to have her students not to feel “frustrated”. It is important to highlight that although Linda focused solely on formal aspects of grammar, the Extracurricular Program and the textbook *Interchange* follow a communicative approach, thus not being aligned with the way she chose to present the content in this class. Besides that, Linda's response to the second question of the first questionnaire also goes against her practice

I try to teach in a way that is meaningful for the students. I know some people prefer to learn in a more structured manner, with explicit grammar and so on, but I tend to believe a more contextualized, communicative learning is more motivating and productive in the long run.

(Linda, questionnaire 1, question 2)

The words “meaningful”, “contextualized”, and “communicative learning” signal that Linda is aware of some teaching principles of CLT. These aspects are also present in her speech when she explained the reasoning behind her choice, at the end of excerpt 3, by mentioning that students “[...] don't seem to like the idea of trying to grasp the concept from the conversation” and that they are only “[...] comfortable to understand the conversation, the context [...]” after having grammar explicitly taught. It seems that these aspects of CLT are within Linda's ZPD, but are not fully understood because a communicative approach to language teaching favors function over form and meaningful and contextualized learning, while Linda actually

favored form when explicitly presenting/explaining the content and in the activities proposed to students.

Linda's externalization of her reasoning opened up a mediational space as it unveiled that she is aware of the aforementioned principles. Unfortunately, I did not offer responsive mediation in order to better explore the way she teaches grammar, this sort of mediation having the potential to foster her professional development (Johnson & Golombek, 2016). Since it was the first class observed, I inquired into many aspects of her practice in order to explore her potentialities as much as possible and in order to make sure that I would focus on something that she would indeed benefit from. Yet, as the teaching of grammar is an aspect that very often requires attention and at a first sight, Linda would be no exception, I decided to inquire into the last activity she had her students do, which had a huge appeal to form: the activity consisted of a bunch of sentences in the simple present tense (e.g. Sarah never smiles) that students should turn into the present perfect tense, which clearly focused on form. I thus offered ideas to make it more communicative and invited her to externalize her thoughts on my contribution

**R: do you think that... well... the ideas of the sentences were not connected to the students, specifically.**

L: No, they were not.

**R: I remember one example... it was something like "Jane always cooks..." something like that.**

L: "Sarah never smiles".

**R: Yep. What do you think of... if you could go back... and you did something like "Ok, I'm going to use sentences in the simple present that they can turn into present perfect... but to say meaningful things about them..." For example: You have like a "never... go to work". Or "never... study". And they had to use this idea, in the present perfect... I mean, turning the sentences in the simple present to present perfect, but to say something about them. For example "I haven't studied English this week". I mean... something connected to them... the students' answers. Their idea. Do you think it'd be better... or... it would have different outcomes? It'd be more meaningful? Any ideas on it?**

L: Yes, of course, I even thought about it when I was preparing the material... I usually get examples from other websites and stuff... and I don't... I don't make the extra effort to connect the sentences to their lives... or... to give examples even from my experience... I think it's one of the things I should... I agree with the idea of connecting the

learning environment... the learning experience to their experience...  
I think it's... more profitable.

**R: Why do you think it's more profitable?**

L: Because people tend to relate more. When they relate to something, when they think of themselves doing something... or how they feel about something they learn more [...]

**R: Ok... but do you consider that sometimes? Do you think of it sometimes? Or you just forget and then you're "oh... I forgot it..."**

L: Yeah, I just forget it. It's something that it's not... within me... I know it's important, but when I prepare something I just wanna... I think more of the structure/

**R: ok...**

L: ... Than on... "how can I convey this and make it meaningful?"

**R: Ok...**

L: It's something that I have to actively... think of.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 1, excerpt 4)

My main goal when presenting a different alternative to Linda was to mediate her towards a more communicative way of working with the activity. I do acknowledge that I could have done it more implicitly, by asking her what she could have done to make the activity not that focused on form, but after inviting her to externalize her ideas on the alternative presented, she confirmed that meaning and context, CLT's principles cited by her in the questionnaire's answer shown above, are within her ZPD. Along with that, when mentioning the idea of connecting students' learning experience to their experience (i.e. everyday life experience), Linda appeared to be aware of the role of a meaningful context in a communicative class, as she herself stated this is "more profitable". When being inquired into why she thinks so, Linda answered by saying that "People tend to relate more", concurring with CLT as her reasoning seemed connected to the idea of context being part of communicative activity. Also, it is interesting that she sort of posed a question to herself by asking "How can I convey this and make it meaningful?" meeting, again, CLT's view of teaching. Besides that, there is one more aspect that really caught my attention during this moment of interaction: Linda explicitly said that although she is aware of the importance of activities that are related to students' reality, this is not within her yet. Furthermore, she said that whenever she plans her class, she "(...) [thinks] more of the structure", which clearly demonstrates that the principles of CLT addressed during this moment

of interaction with me have not been internalized by her yet. In other words, she appears to know what they are in theory and to acknowledge their importance, but thus far she could not bring these theoretical concepts into the concrete classroom time. Putting these concepts into play was something that she desired, but that did not come easily.

This first interaction illustrates that by having had Linda externalize her reasoning, I was able to access her ZPD, which indicates her future independent functioning (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). This signals aspects of her teaching I should mediate in order to promote her professional development since it is within these very zones that one's interference is most transforming (Oliveira, 2001).

In the second class observed, although Linda did not teach grammar she corrected an activity she had sent students by email. It was supposed to be a review of the grammatical content taught – present perfect. The review consisted of a list of activities that aimed at having students practice the present perfect tense. The following excerpt presents her explanation for doing so

L: They [students] asked me.

**R: Did you feel like they needed it?**

L: Yes, because I think that they still don't feel confident that they know what the present perfect is.

**R: Uhum.**

L: I think they know how to use it, but they didn't understand how or when.

**R: Uhum.**

L: I know the review was really about structure, and I've tried to talk about the meanings and the uses of present perfect many times... and I did it during the explanation, during the correction of the review, but I still don't feel they get it.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 2, excerpt 1)

This passage demonstrates that Linda had the review because students had asked for it. However, it is interesting to see that she contradicted herself by saying that students “[...] know how to use it, but [...] don't] understand how or when”, which did not make her point any clear. Besides that, it seems like Linda tried to explain herself, as if she were questioned about the focus of such review: although nothing was mentioned about the review being focused solely on grammar, she said she knew it was about the “structure”, but that she had tried to talk about the “[...] meanings and uses of present perfect many times [...]”.



This might be due to the fact that it was mentioned, in the first mediator-mEDIATEE interaction, that grammar was the main focus of her class. It is interesting to see, again, that although she chose a formal approach to review the content studied, she mentioned the “meanings and uses” of present perfect – concurring with a functional approach to teaching – when explaining her reasoning, which signals a clash between what she seems to know and what she actually did in class. Since Linda once again focused on form over function when working with grammar, but referred to functional aspects of language when explaining her reasoning, thus I started becoming more sensitive to this particular aspect of her teaching. To this point, it is essential to reiterate that instances of clash between what teachers envision and what they actually do may lead them to experience moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance, mediation responsive to such moments being of great value to foster professional development (Johnson & Golombek, 2016).

In the third class observed, the grammatical topic taught was the use of modal verbs (“can” and “should”) for asking for advice and giving suggestions. This was the first class observed in which Linda seemed to use the teacher’s manual in order to explain grammar to her students. However, she made some changes as she both adapted some suggestions from the manual and skipped others. The following description presents the manual’s suggestions

Focus Ss’ attention on the Conversation in Exercise 7. Ask: “How does Thomas ask for advice about Mexico City?” Write his question on the board “Can you tell me a little about Mexico City?” Ask: “How does Elena suggest what to see?” Elicit the answers and write them on the board: *You should definitely visit... You shouldn’t miss the... You can...* Point out that *can* and *should* are modals. They show a speaker’s attitude or “mood”. People use *can* and *should* to ask for and give advice.

(Interchange 1, teacher’s manual, unit 11, p. 75)

Since Linda changed the way she presented this grammatical aspect to her students in comparison to these suggestions, I inquired into the reasoning behind her choice

**R: [...] when you got to the grammatical explanation [...] you said “guys, pay attention to the way they are giving suggestions...”, then you went over the ideas, the listening, and the grammar box.**

**This is different from what the manual suggests. Can you tell me why?**

L: I don't even remember what the manual suggests.

**R: It says "focus students' attention on the conversation. How does Thomas ask for advice about Mexico City? Write this question on the board..." Well, you kinda did this, the first part, but you didn't write "you should definitely visit... you shouldn't miss... you can...". You just showed them the conversation." Any thoughts on that?**

L: It's just that they've had just seen the conversation, they'd be more familiar with the context, and how they could use these structures to ask for suggestions or give possibilities. Simpler. Easier to understand.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 3, excerpt 1)

It seems like what mediated Linda's reasoning was the idea that focusing on the conversation (context) would make it easier for students to understand the grammatical topic being studied. Although she did not follow the manual's suggestions to the letter, she sort of kept the material's pedagogical aims of drawing students' attention to the functional aspects of language: she did not ask or write down the questions suggested by the manual, however, she had students focus on the way speakers were giving suggestions, that is to say, on the functions of "can" and "should".

When being inquired into the reasoning behind her choice, Linda clearly focused on functional aspects of language in her response by mentioning the context and the use of the structures presented for giving suggestions and presenting possibilities, just like in mediator-mediatee interactions 1 and 2. However, her externalization appears to unveil some lack of understanding as regards the pedagogical aspects behind the manual's suggestions, due to the simplicity of her answer. She did not mention the CLT's concepts which lie behind the suggestions (i.e. the idea of focusing on function over form) after being inquired into her reasoning by me (implicit mediation). Rather, she simply said that doing what she did would make it "Simpler. Easier [for students] to understand", thus pointing to a need for mediation from a more expert peer in order to have her develop robust reasoning (Johnson, 1999) as regards such concepts.

Once again, I did not invite her to explore her reasoning in relation to the aforementioned aspects, not providing her with responsive mediation. According to Johnson (1999), this is essential since asking teachers to engage in the process of thinking about their

teaching allows them to “[...] expand their knowledge of their professional landscapes [...]” (p. 2), which may foster the development of robust reasoning. By now, it seems clear that Linda has been overlooking the way the teacher’s manual directs teachers to draw students’ attention to function rather than to form so as to maximize students’ understanding of the grammatical aspects being addressed.

One aspect that deserves attention here is that, as explained in the methodological chapter of this work, the three first classes were of paramount importance to allow me to narrow down the focus of my investigation. By the end of the third mediator-mediatee interaction, it was clear to me what aspects of a communicative view of the teaching of grammar were within Linda’s ZPD, signaling that responsive mediation would potentially foster her professional development towards a better understanding of the principles behind the manual’s suggestions. Therefore, together with the mediator-mediatee interactions 1 and 2, this last one helped me narrow down an aspect of her practice that could be potentially developed through interaction with me: the teaching of grammar.

In class 4, the grammatical topic taught was the use of adjectives followed by infinitives to give suggestions (e.g. if you have a cold, **it’s good to take** some vitamins). When presenting and explaining it to students, Linda did not follow the manual’s suggestions. The following passage illustrates the material’s instructions

Books closed. Write these sentences on the board:

*You should get a lot of rest.*

*You should eat garlic soup.*

Point out that these sentences give suggestions with *should*. We can also give suggestions using an adjective or noun followed by an infinitive. Cross out the words *You should* and replace them with *It’s important to* and *It’s helpful to*.

(Interchange 1, teacher’s manual, unit 12, p. 79)

The manual goes along and suggests going through the grammar box, drawing parallels among this part and the conversation about advice for health issues students had just listened to. Instead of following the suggestions presented above, Linda went straight through the grammar box, presenting the rules for using the adjectives and infinitives when giving suggestions. The following excerpt presents the moment in which we started discussing her practice

**R:** [...] you went through the grammar box. You showed it to students and said “Here we have the structures people used in the conversation”. Then you started explaining it, giving other examples and using the ones in the grammar box.

L: Uhum.

**R:** It’s different from the manual. You just pointed straight to the grammar focus... Why?

L: Instead of?

**R:** Instead of/

L: Going back to the conversation?

**R:** Maybe... yes... The manual suggests “Books closed. Write these sentences on the board: You should get a lot of rest; You should eat garlic soup. Point out that these sentences give suggestions”... etc. Like... doing something else before going through the grammar box. Maybe, as you said, going back to the conversation...

L: Yeah. My initial idea was to go back to the conversation and point. And I think I did that. Didn’t I? After the conversation, before going through the structures/

**R:** You pointed it once, but not when you were explaining grammar...

L: No, no, no... It was before [...] Not talking about the structures.

**R:** Not connecting it to the structures.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 4, excerpt 1)

When starting to discuss what Linda did as opposed to what was suggested by the manual, I did not remind her of what the material suggested right away, simply telling her that what she did was different from what was suggested. It is interesting to see that although she asked me what she should have done, she interrupted me in order to answer her own question by asking “Going back to the conversation?”, signaling that she was aware of a manual’s suggestion overlooked by her when choosing to go straight to the grammar box. I took this opportunity to read to her what was suggested in the manual, not explaining the reasoning behind the material’s suggestions, but telling her that maybe she could have done “[...] **something else** before going through the grammar box”. As suggested by Lantolf and Aljaafreh (1995) and Lantolf & Thorne (2006), the movement from implicit to explicit mediation enables a more expert peer to provide mediation that is contingent and graduated on one’s ZPD, thus this explains why the pedagogical aspects behind the suggestions were not immediately given to her.

As a result of the implicit mediation provided by me, Linda said she had referred to the conversation when explaining the grammatical topic, stating that this (going back to the conversation) was her initial idea. Later on, she was reminded that she had indeed done that, but not when explaining the grammatical topic of the lesson. Although Linda seemed to be aware of the idea of going back to the conversation so as to connect it to the grammatical topic being addressed, she did not do it at the moment she explained such topic, focusing solely on formal aspects of language when presenting the grammar box, which shows another instance of clash between her speech and practice.

The moment she interrupted me and posed the question “Going back to the conversation?” shows she was aware of the manual’s suggestion even before I explicitly mentioned it to her, the fact that I simply said that her practice was different from the book leading her to come up with such questioning. Moreover, we were clearly operating with different situation definitions of the topic being addressed (the teaching of grammar) since she stated that she had referred to the conversation when teaching, but the point was to use the conversation in order to teach grammar, focusing on the context and function of the expressions studied, which she did not do, as agreed by her, when she answered “no, no, no... it was before”, meaning that she referred to the conversation, but “Not [when] talking about the structures”. At this moment, Linda seemed to come to the realization that what she did was not the same as what was suggested by the manual, situation redefinition (Wertsch, 1984) probably taking place as a result of our interaction.

As Linda and I continued discussing her practice, I inquired into the reasoning behind her action. The following excerpt presents her answer

L: (silence) I don’t remember what went through my mind when I did that, why... maybe I just skipped, maybe I rushed as I always do. Maybe I thought they’d connect it by themselves. They probably didn’t connect it to the conversation. They probably didn’t pay attention that the conversation uses those same structures. Maybe I should’ve... maybe... explained the grammar box, and went back to the conversation to point the same structures.

**R: And why do you think it’s a good idea?**

L: Cause then they’d connect to the context they just had. It’d be more fruitful.

**R: There’d be like context and grammar together.**

L: Yeah, yeah.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 4, excerpt 2)

It is clear that Linda did not know, for sure, what made her change her practice as regards the manual's suggestions. When talking about what went through her mind, she attempted to come up with explanations and mentioned that she maybe had thought students would connect the structures and the conversation by themselves, which she later said they probably did not accomplish. It is essential to mention that Linda visually seemed pretty frustrated and confused when responding, which was probably transferred to her answer by the short moment of silence before explaining her reasoning and the amount of possibilities she came up with, none of them being assertively presented.

Another aspect that deserves attention in this passage is that, at the end of her answer, Linda mentioned the movement of going back to the conversation in order to point the structures presented in the book. When being inquired into why she would do that, she said that students could "[...] connect [the structures] to the context they just had [and this would be...] more fruitful". "Context" had already popped up in the previous interactions when Linda explained the reasoning behind her practice. Although I did not mention it in this moment of interaction, Linda used the concept to explain the idea of going back to the conversation in order to show students the structures presented in use. It seems like the way we were thinking together (Mercer, 2000; Littleton & Mercer, 2013) helped her connect the dots, moving beyond what she was thinking by herself. Therefore, "context" seems to be a concern that Linda really cares for, and as such, it is a concept for which she needed responsive mediation in order to connect it with the practice proposed in the manual. This excerpt illustrates the importance of being responsive to teacher's responses, since it was my inquiry "and why do you think it's a good idea?" into her answer that made her further explore her reasoning, showing the role of responsive mediation in exploiting the potential of the symbolic tool's (i.e. the teacher's manual) suggestion, which, as suggested by Johnson and Golombek (2016), may enable Linda to appropriate it as a psychological tool (i.e. a tool for thinking). Needless to say, this excerpt also indicates that Linda's situation definition of the teaching of grammar has started to become closer to mine as it seemed to be moving towards a more communicative view of the teaching of grammar.

Besides that, Linda seemed to experience a moment of clash between what she knew and what she actually did when having her practice inquired by me. As mentioned above, her reaction and answer

indicated she was frustrated and confused, which ended up drawing my attention to this moment. After noticing such clash, I attempted to explore it since mediation that is responsive to moments like these tend to result in growth points that create “[...] the potential for the development of L2 teacher/teaching expertise” (Johnson & Golombek, 2016). The following excerpt<sup>25</sup> illustrates how our interaction developed

**R: You know, this idea of communication, context, what’s involved in the conversation with grammar.**

L: Right.

**R: This caught my attention because I went back to the questionnaire you answered, and I just wanna read something you wrote down. The question was “Do you like the Interchange manual? Could you comment on any advantages or disadvantages of it?”. When you mentioned the disadvantages you said “I really don’t like the way the book focuses on grammar, always presenting tables which call a lot of attention.” This caught my attention because you went straight to the table.**

L: I’m hypocritical.

**R: Don’t say that/**

L: [laughs]

**R: And you go along “This doesn’t look communicative enough for me, it almost seems like the Snapshots and Conversations are only excuses to get to the grammar focus.”**

L: That’s what I do (!) [laughs]

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 4, excerpt 3)

Since I noticed Linda was probably experiencing a moment of clash between what she knew and what she actually did, I decided to bring into discussion part of her answer to one of the questions in the first questionnaire since it went against what she did. My intention was to have her reason upon both her speech and practice in order to develop robust reasoning and consequently better understand these aspects since it is clear that they did not meet each other. The moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance came into light and could be perceived by Linda’s use of the word “hypocritical” when describing herself, and by her physical reaction (i.e. her laughs), corroborating Johnson and Worden’s (2014) claim that such moments are reflected on teacher’s emotional use of language and behavior. As Linda continued laughing, I finished reading her own words as she seemed surprised and a little in

---

<sup>25</sup> This excerpt is the sequel of the previous one.

shock, which could be seen by her nervous gestures and effusive response “That’s what I do(!)”, accompanied by laughs.

It is clear that a growth point “came into being” (Johnson & Worden, 2014; Johnson & Golombek, 2016) as Linda came to the realization that she was doing what she said she was against, the following moments of interaction also illustrating how she felt about it

L: [...] It’s easy to criticize the manual, and not do something about it. And even the manual says we should connect the conversation with the grammar, it’s just that I like to criticize things, without understanding them.

**R: That’s human beings in general.**

L: YES (!) [effusively]

**T: We all do that. [laughs]**

L: [laughs]

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 4, excerpt 4)

Linda criticized herself when mentioning how she positioned herself in relation to the book. I attempted to be responsive to her emotions by explicitly saying that human beings in general enjoy “criticizing things”, as she herself stated, in order to make her feel more comfortable with the situation since she seemed to be frustrated and shocked. Moreover, it was important to allow her to express how she felt about it as a manner to maximize this opportunity so as to have her better understand her feelings and, consequently, cognition (i.e. what she envisions) since a sociocultural approach to human development views emotions and cognition as two inseparable units (Vygotsky, 1987). The following excerpt illustrates the moment I asked her to externalize her emotions

**R: [...] You did what you said you didn’t like.**

L: Yes.

**R: How do you feel about it?**

L: I feel ashamed [nervous laughs]. It’s something that... When I answered the questionnaire I was really sure of myself, I was really “Oh, I’m so communicative”, then I wanted the textbook to give me everything, but I didn’t take the time to read the suggestions, the teacher’s instructions, so I was shocked once we started having these interviews. I could see how the book<sup>26</sup> could guide me. It was not just

---

<sup>26</sup> Linda seems to use the words “textbook” and “book” to refer to the manual, since the latter is part of the textbook itself. Thus one should bear in mind that



the structure of the book that I should follow, it's the suggestions given.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 4, excerpt 5)

Linda explicitly mentioned she felt ashamed, once again signaling a growth point as she nervously laughed while externalizing her emotions. It is interesting to see that although I did not explicitly tell her she was not teaching in a communicative way by overlooking the manual's suggestions and teaching the way she did, Linda said that she found herself "[... so communicative]" before having the interactions, indicating that she came to the realization she was not actually teaching in accordance with a communicative approach. Moreover, Linda acknowledged being shocked after the start of the study, which shows that our moments of interaction have been allowing her to (re)visit her reasoning and (re)consider aspects once overlooked.

The previous excerpt brings into light another aspect of Linda's reasoning, which has to do with her perceptions of the teacher's manual: she explicitly said that she "[...] didn't take the time to read the suggestions", which led her to feel shocked when she was invited by me to explore the material. Moreover, when saying that it was not just the textbook's structure that should guide her practice, she seemed to acknowledge that the manual's suggestions are also valuable aspects that can guide her professional activity. It looks like she started to realize that her preconceptions about the uselessness of teachers' manuals are not so accurate and that manuals have in fact reasons for proposing activities the way they do. The discussion here presented illustrates that within only 4 mediator-mediatee interactions Linda has already (re)considered the way she sees the role of the manual in her classes, expanding the robustness of her reasoning (Johnson, 1999) as regards her understandings of such tool. Needless to say, this move seemed to be fostered by my inquiry into her practice, Linda herself mentioning the interactions when externalizing her emotions. Therefore, one can say that interaction with a more expert peer seems to have been allowing Linda to expand her reasoning, possibly contributing to her cognitive development, as Vygostky (1978) advocates for.

By considering the role of responsive mediation in fostering one's development (Johnson & Golombek, 2016), right after Linda

---

sometimes when she refers to "book" she means "manual", which can be clearly seen by the context in which she uses such words.

externalized her feelings I attempted to provide this sort of mediation by wrapping up what we had just discussed

**R: Just to wrap up... This idea of having students go back to the conversation, you'd take grammar from the context, then go through the grammar box. I'm not saying that you should not go through the grammar box, I'm just saying that maybe instead of just presenting something that is separate from the conversation, take it from the conversation, maybe using the sentences suggested in the manual, saying "Do you see the function of these things? Of that..." Maybe making this connection, to be more meaningful to them.**

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 4, excerpt 6)

In short, I explicitly told her what she could have done in order to help her see how she could present and explain grammar in a more communicative way. When doing that, I focused on the idea of using the context to explain the grammatical topic, connecting these two aspects, and even illustrated a way in which she could draw her students' attention to functional aspects of language, concurring with a communicative approach to the teaching of languages. By being responsive to instances of Linda's cognitive/emotional dissonance, I helped her (re)visit her reasoning teaching and possibly (re)consider some aspects related to it. Furthermore, considering the powerful nature of mediation that is directed at these moments (Johnson & Worden, 2014; Johnson & Golombek, 2016), the discussion drawn above may reverberate in Linda's practice and/or speech in the moments of interaction to come.

In Class 5, the grammatical topic taught was the use of modal verbs "can", "may", and "could" for making requests and giving suggestions. This topic was in the same unit as Class 4, which dealt with common health issues. In order to explore the grammar focus, the manual suggested the following

Explain that it's impolite to say Give me or I want when asking for things in a store. People usually use modal verbs such as can, could, and may.

Focus Ss' attention on the Conversation in Exercise 8. Ask: "How did Mrs. Webb ask for things?" Ask Ss to underline the examples [... then] Focus Ss' attention on the Grammar Focus box [...]

(Interchange 1, teacher's manual, unit 12, p. 81)

The following excerpt illustrates the moment in which we discussed the way Linda chose to introduce and explain the ideas mentioned above

**R: After working with the conversation, you said “I’ll show you some things about grammar, then we’ll go back to the text.”**

L: Uhum.

**R: Can you tell me how you connected grammar and the conversation? What was your intention to say what you said? Why did you tell them you’d later go back to the conversation?**

L: So they’d not forget about the text. They’d connect... That was the idea, it was very rudimentary [laughs]. The idea was that, they didn’t just go on as we have already discussed, I tend to just go for grammar and forget about the conversation. I wanted them to think “Ok, this is not the focus. We’ll go back to the conversation, so maybe there’s some connection.”

**R: So you wanted them to keep in mind that there was a connection.**

L: Yeah. Probably, they would think about it, but the basic idea was that they didn’t forget about the conversation.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 5, excerpt 1)

At this point, we can affirm that what made Linda introduce the grammatical topic the way she did was the intention to have her students keep in mind the conversation (i.e. context), reverberating what we had discussed in mediator-mediatee interaction 4, which is corroborated by the fact that Linda referred to our previous moments of interaction in order to answer my inquiry. Therefore, there seemed to be a change in the way Linda deals with grammar in class: it was the first time – since the beginning of the observations – that Linda appeared to consider the conversation as an important element when teaching grammar, the assertiveness of her response signaling that she had thought of the conversation when planning her class. Besides that, it is interesting to see that she mimicked what she wanted her students to think of, showing she aimed at having them understand that “[...] this [form] was not the focus [...]”, reverberating our past interactions.

Although Linda did not mention it, another interpretation can be drawn from this moment of interaction, which is supported by a sociocultural view of human cognitive development: it is possible that by saying “I’ll show you some things about grammar, then we’ll go back to the text”, Linda was using her own speech to mediate her

actions, the movement of focusing on the conversation so as to later go through the grammar box not being internalized by her yet. Psychological tools – in this case, language – allow humans to organize and gain voluntary control over their mental functions (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Thus it seems like Linda’s speech allowed her to act upon the world (i.e. to draw her students’ attention to the conversation) at the same time as it allowed her to remind herself of the role of such aspect in explaining grammar, exemplifying how language can mediate human cognition (Vygotsky, 1987).

Although Linda had the idea of connecting the conversation and the grammatical topic in mind, she again focused on form by dividing these two aspects when teaching, not using the conversation to explain the structure presented by the textbook, telling her students that they would see “[...] some things about grammar”. As a response to that, I attempted to offer responsive mediation in order to see whether she would notice that she had, once again, focused on form over function and separated context and grammar

**R: So, in our last session we talked about the fact that you did like... “So, this is the structure that we used in the conversation”. Right?**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then we talked about this idea of separating things, and going straight to grammar. Do you think that what you did in this class was different from what you did previously?**

L: Not much.

**R: Why?**

L: Cause I just gave more importance to structure again. No big difference. Do you think there’s a big difference, because I/

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 5, excerpt 2)

Only by reminding her of our previous interactions and asking her if she thought there was a difference between what she did in Class 5 from the previous ones, Linda was able to respond, assertively, that she had, again, focused on form. What comes into light in this excerpt is the way Linda and I engaged in interaction, enabling us to stay attuned to each others’ attunement: by inquiring into her practice after noticing that Linda aimed at having her students have the conversation in mind, though she again focused on form, I had her externalize her reasoning, which allowed her to redefine her situation definition of the aspect being addressed (i.e. the use of the conversation – context – when teaching

grammar) by us, as she came to the realization that she had again separated context and grammar. In short, our situation definitions of a communicative way to teach grammar have become closer, consequently leading to the establishment of a higher level of intersubjectivity between us.

In order to provide Linda with responsive mediation and possibly allow her to move beyond her current situation definition, I responded her request “Do you think there’s a big difference [...]” with another question, which ended up in another moment of cognitive/emotional dissonance

**R: Can you think of any ways you could’ve done it differently, so as to give less attention to the structure?**

L: Maybe if I... you mean, still going to the grammar focus, explaining, and then coming back?

**R: Yes. Cause you said “I’ll show you some things about grammar, then we’d go back to the text.”**

L: Yes, I divided those things.

**R: You divided.**

L: As if they were not connected.

**R: Yes, and we talked about it in our last interview, remember?**

L: Yeah.

**R: So, I wanna know if you can think of any ideas to connect those things, not separating them, like “This is the conversation and this is grammar”.**

L: Yeah... Maybe not presenting it that... Well, presenting it in relation to the conversation. Just saying “Oh, can you see that those structures are used in the conversation?”. Something like that. Maybe elaborate a little more on that.

**R: But then do you see you’d, again, go to the structure so as to go back to the conversation?**

L: Yes. It’s not the conversation that is the focus, again [sighs]. Oh, I’m really bad at it.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 5, excerpt 3)

By providing her with implicit mediation I aimed at having Linda come up with ideas to connect the conversation and the grammar, not splitting these two aspects. Although I referred to our previous moments of interaction and she herself realized she had “[...] divided those things [i.e. conversation and grammar]”, the possibility she thought of once again focused on the structure. When she was told that she had repeated the same movement, Linda seemed to experience

another moment of cognitive/emotional dissonance, which is reflected in her physical reaction (as she sighed) and language (by saying “I’m really bad at it”). Considering the importance of such moments for fostering one’s development (Johnson & Worden, 2014; Johnson & Golombek, 2016), I attempted to provide her with responsive mediation, leading Linda to move beyond her current situation definition of a communicative way to teach grammar

**R: [...] Stop saying that. So, can I show you the manual’s suggestion?**

L: Uhum.

**R: It says “Focus students’ attention on the conversation. Ask ‘how did Mrs. Web ask for things?’ Ask students to underline the examples ‘Could I have some aspirin?’ ‘May I have...’.” What is happening here?**

L: I’m focusing on the function.

**R: On the function.**

L: Not the structure.

**R: Starting from the conversation to go to/**

L: Within the context.

**R: Uhum.**

L: Not taking it out from the context, on the board, and then going back to the text.

**R: So they’d focus on function over form/**

L: Yeah.

**R: Which is one of the principles of the CLT/**

L: Yeah.

**R: Then they’d notice these things, the functions – when these things are used, then you could go to the grammar box.**

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 5, excerpt 4)

Even though I did not tell Linda what the pedagogical aspect lying behind the manual’s suggestions was, she was able to notice it after I read them. Also, this excerpt illustrates our thinking together and shows how productive collective thinking may be. By being attuned to each others’ attunement, Linda and I engaged in interthinking (Mercer, 2000; Mercer & Littleton, 2013) which can be seen when she answers my inquiry and interrupts me while I speak in order to complement my reasoning. As a consequence, the expansion of Linda’s ZPD seems to be taking place as her situation definition of a communicative way to the teaching of grammar becomes a new qualitative one, which shows the

role of thinking together in allowing one to move beyond what they individually know.

In order to provide Linda with responsive mediation, I explicitly mentioned one of CLT's main principles (i.e. function over form), focusing on the concept of function as it is of paramount importance in a communicative approach to teaching a foreign language. With this in mind, Linda and I continued to discuss her practice as she, after focusing on structural aspects of language, had her students go back to the conversation in order to see how the structures were used, as she herself mentioned in the excerpt that follows

L: I tend to do this, but after [...] I always do it after. I think it doesn't matter. They'll get the idea (laughs). But the order of things changes it completely.

**R: But do you see a difference between doing this way or the other way?**

L: Yeah. Absolutely.

**R: I have it written down "She did it, but in a different order."**

L: Yeah (nervous laugh).

**R: Cause there's this idea, when following CLT, that you present grammar to the attention of learners as part of communicative language practice [...] So there's the conversation, the communicative language practice, they'd identify the functions, they you'd draw students' attention to grammar [...] So students start focusing on function. This idea.**

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 5, excerpt 5)

Linda was not yet able to teach in accordance with a communicative approach to the teaching of grammar, constituting what Vygotsky (1987) calls "verbalism". Drawing on the discussion presented in the literature review chapter of this work, both scientific and everyday knowledge should meet and merge in order to allow one to think in concepts. By being responsive to Linda's ZPD, I might have had her merge the idea of focusing on function (i.e. scientific knowledge) to its practical counterpart (i.e. everyday knowledge), allowing her to see how this move should happen, which was signaled by her when she said that "[...] the order of things changes it completely". As Johnson (2009) advocates, it is of paramount importance to connect one's scientific knowledge to their practical activity, concurring with Vygotsky's (1987) and Freire's (2005) aforementioned claim for the interdependence between theory and

practice. Therefore, the concept of function was a central part of my speech when mediating her, as can be seen through the whole excerpt just presented.

Right after this moment of interaction between us, I inquired into another aspect of Linda's practice that caught my attention, since it focused students' attention on functional aspects of language

**R: [...] after explaining grammar, you had students go back to the conversation and identify the modal verbs, and you said "I want you to tell me if those sentences are requests or suggestions". This is not in the manual. Why did you do it?**

T2: Because then I wanted them to focus on the function. I did it the other way around [laughs]... It'd be more interesting if we could identify first the idea, the function, and then identify the modal verb, the structure itself. But that was the idea: to identify how those structures were used in the context... How the same modal verbs are used to make suggestions or requests.

(Interview Mediator-mediatee interaction 5, excerpt 6)

Both Linda's action and explanation make it clear that she aimed at drawing her students' attention to functional aspects of language, possibly reverberating our past interaction since she did something pretty similar to what was suggested by me in mediator-mediatee interaction 4 "[... you could say] **Do you see the function of these things? Of that...**". It is essential to have in mind that this suggestion was given as a response to Linda's moment of cognitive/emotional dissonance during the fourth interaction, which corroborates Johnson and Golombek's (2016) idea of the powerful role of mediation that is responsive to such instances. Moreover, it is also possible that her answer reverberated the moments of interaction she had just had with me, since it was the first time, along the five mediator-mediatee interactions, that Linda explicitly and assertively mentioned "focus on function" as her goal, indicating a movement of internalization of such communicative aspect to the teaching of grammar as she both mentioned the concept of function and was able to identify it in her practice. The exact same action was repeated by her when students did an exercise, right after her explanation, as illustrated below

**R: Then you had students do another exercise, students had to circle the words, like students had to choose between "can/could",**



**for example “Can/could I help you...”. Again you asked them to identify whether the sentence was a request or a suggestion. Same reason?**

L: Uhum. Same reason. They had to understand what they were doing. It's easier to get the structure than to just blindly go... continue... just choosing correctly but not understanding.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 5, excerpt 7)

The exercise was in the textbook, but neither this material nor the manual required that students distinguished between requests or suggestions. At this time, Linda agreed with me by saying her intention was the same as the one we had just discussed, her answer leading to the interpretation that only by choosing “correctly” (i.e. focusing on form) would not lead students to an understanding of the grammatical aspects being studied. All in all, mediator-mediatee interaction 5 demonstrates that Linda has been redefining her understandings of a communicative approach to the teaching of grammar, this being fostered by the moments of interaction with me as we both attempt to stay attuned to each others’ attunement and as I provide her – through language – with mediation that is responsive to her emergent needs.

In the 6<sup>th</sup> class observed, the grammatical topic taught was the use of the modal verbs “would” and “will” for ordering food in restaurants (e.g. I would like a small salad; I’ll have a small salad). The following excerpt presents the manual’s suggestions for teaching such topic

Write these sentences on the board:

1. *What kind of dressing do you want?*
2. *And do you want anything to drink?*
3. *I want a mixed green salad.*
4. *I want a large iced tea, please.*

Explain that people don’t usually say *want* in formal situations.

Focus Ss’ attention on the Conversation on page 88. Ss find and underline sentences with the same meaning as those on the board. Ask different students to write them on the board [...] Focus Ss’ attention on the Grammar Focus box [...]

(Interchange 1, teacher’s manual, unit 13, p. 89)

For presenting and explaining this grammatical topic, Linda’s choice was again not to follow the textbook to the letter. She both adapted the manual’s suggestions and used supply material. The

following excerpt illustrates the moment in which we started discussing her practice

**R:** [When introducing the grammatical topic, you said] “I want you to have a look at the way he [server] asks the questions to the customer and how the customer orders the food.”, focusing on the conversation. Then you did something the manual doesn’t suggest. You said “have a look at the conversation in your books and compare it to the other one I’ll project”. What was different about this other one? Can you tell me?

L: Uh... Instead of using the modals, I only used the verb “want”, in a very direct way so they could compare. And you know how it went... [laughs].

**R:** Ok/

L: I was really happy that they got it.

**R:** Why were you really happy? [laughs]

L: Because they got the difference in formality.

**R:** How do you know? What tells you that? [laughs]

L: Cause one of the guys, that one guy, he said “oh, it’s very informal, right?”

**R:** Uhum.

L: In Portuguese, but/

**R:** I really loved it when he said “essa aqui eles falam no boteco”.

L: YES, YES (!) [effusively].

**R:** That was amazing.

L: YES (!) That was amazing (!) [cheerfully]

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 6, excerpt 1)

Many aspects deserve attention in this initial part of our interaction. First, it is important to explain the context of the conversation students had in their textbooks: it was a talk between a server and a customer at a restaurant. The modals “would” and “will” were repeated in both the server and customer’s speech, since these words serve the communicative function of both taking orders and ordering food at restaurants. The manual suggested writing those questions on the board, substituting “would” and “will” (characteristic of formal speech) by “want” (characteristic of informal speech) in order to explain to students the different levels of formality between such expressions. Linda did not do what the manual suggested when introducing the grammatical topic to her students, coming up with supply material (i.e. slides) in which she projected the same

conversation students had in their books, but substituting every instance of “will” and “would” by “want”. Thus it seems like she kept the manuals’ intention at the same time she changed the way she worked with the suggestions given. The manual’s intentions seemed to be clear to Linda as she herself stated that “[...] Instead of using the modals, [she] only used the verb “want”, in a very direct way so they [students] could compare.”

Before exploring the reasoning behind Linda’s choice, it is important to focus on how pleased she felt by the way her choice impacted her class. Linda explicitly mentioned she was very happy because her students were able to grasp the “[...] difference in formality” between the two conversations she had them compare, showing what her intention was: to have them understand that different levels of formality are expressed by different expressions, focusing on functional aspects of language. This very first excerpt illustrates reverberation of our past interactions, which was already seen in Class 5 when she attempted to join the conversation and the grammatical topic. Differently from Class 5, though, Linda did not separate context and grammar, neither through her speech nor through her actions. Besides that, Linda’s effusive responses and reactions to my comments are evidence of how proud she seemed to be of herself, since she saw her goal was achieved by the way her students responded to what she proposed.

As we continued discussing her practice, I invited Linda to keep exploring the reasoning behind what she did

**R: You substituted the modals in the conversation for “want” and you had them discuss what the differences were [...] were you focusing on form?**

L: No, function (!) [laughs – L and R give a high five]. Finally (!)

**R: I really liked it. I found it very, very good. I found it very nice because you were able to use the manual’s suggestion but you did it on your way, you know?**

L: Uhum.

**R: Can you tell me why you changed the conversation?**

L: Because they already knew the conversation, like, I showed them, they had it in their books, and why would I take parts of the conversation if I could have the whole thing and they could see how it changed? The interaction, how it sounded. So I used the conversation and the image, the same image, the same situation but using different terms.

**R: I really like it. So after that, you went back to the original conversation, showed them the differences from the one you changed and the original one, focusing on the function... “This is too direct...” etc... “‘Would’ is more formal”... etc. Then you showed the grammar box and said “So, these are the examples in the conversation”.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Right?**

L: Uhum.

**R: What did you do in this class that is different from the previous classes?**

L: I didn't use the grammar box as a separate thing, I went back to the conversation. It was the center of attention. I got the conversation to explain the grammar box.

**R: Are you happy about it?**

L: Yes (!) [effusively]. Really happy.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 6, excerpt 2)

By Linda's answers, it seems like she did have the intention to focus on function when she planned the class. It is essential to highlight Linda's emotional responses during this moment of interaction, since both her physical reactions (happy laughter) and effusive language (e.g. “finally”) showed her content with how the class developed. Besides that, I found it important to praise her by the way she worked with the manual's suggestions, making it clear that she was able to keep the material's intention at the same time she changed her practice in relation to the manual's suggestions. Since our cognition and emotions are intrinsically related (Vygostky, 1987), it seemed important to provide mediation to Linda's positive emotions in order to recognize the effort she has been putting on her professional development, acknowledging what she has done so far, which concurs with Johnson and Golombek's (2016) claim that “Our mediation is shaped by the complex interplay of cognition and emotion [...]” (p. 43).

When being inquired into the reasoning behind the way she chose to introduce the grammatical topic to her students, it is interesting to see how Linda drew on contextual aspects to explain her choice. She explicitly mentioned that having her students focus on the “whole thing” (i.e. the whole conversation) would be better than using isolated parts of it, which shows how context was taken into account by her when planning the class, even though she did not use the concept itself to explain her reasoning. In spite of that, it is clear that the process Linda

went through when both planning and teaching has shifted from a formal approach to grammar to a more functional one, both her practice and speech reverberating our past interactions. When externalizing the differences between what she did in the present class when compared to the previous ones, Linda easily explained that she did not separate grammar and the conversation (i.e. context), making the latter the center of students' attention, which concurs with a communicative approach to the teaching of languages.

In short, Linda has been experiencing a movement of focusing on functional aspects of language so as to later on draw students' attention to form. Her speech and practice presented in the excerpt above reverberated the interactions we had in the previous meetings, and particularly in the 5<sup>th</sup> one, when, as a response to her moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance, I highlighted how CLT sees the importance of presenting grammar to the attention of learners as part of communicative language practice, focusing on functional aspects of language rather than on form. Needless to say, this shows the potential mediation that is responsive to instances of teachers' cognitive/emotional dissonance has to foster their professional development (Johnson & Worden, 2014; and Johnson and Golombek, 2016). Furthermore, it appears that responsive mediation has been allowing Linda to expand the robustness of her reasoning. According to Johnson (1999), who sees the process of learning to teach as a long-term developmental one, reflection and inquiry into why teachers teach as they do is essential for exploring and expanding their reasoning teaching, this being depicted by how the moments of interaction between Linda and me have been allowing her to deepen her understandings of her professional activity.

In the 8<sup>th</sup><sup>27</sup> class observed, the grammatical topic taught by Linda was the use of the words “ask” and “tell” for giving messages. The following passage shows the way the manual suggested Linda to introduce the topic

*Tell* with statements<sup>28</sup>

Focus Ss' attention on the “statement” box part of the Grammar Focus box. Ask these four questions:

---

<sup>27</sup> As previously mentioned, since Linda did not work with grammar in class 7, the discussion here presented moved from class 6 to class 8.

<sup>28</sup> The manual suggested repeating the same steps with the “request” part of the grammar box (with “ask”).

1. What is the message? (the meeting is on Friday)
  2. Do we use *tell* or *ask* with statements? (tell)
  3. Does the message change when we use tell? (no)
- What are three ways to ask someone to relay a message? (Please tell X.../Could you tell him/her...?/Would you tell him/her..?)  
Elicit the rule for forming messages...

(Interchange 1, teacher's manual, unit 15, p. 103)

Students had just listened to and worked on a conversation between two people talking on the phone. In this conversation, one of them had to give a message to a third person, thus the passage introduced the words “ask” and “tell” with this communicative function. As mentioned above, Linda did not follow the manual's suggestions when introducing the grammatical topic to students

**R: [...] you told them “I want you to identify the messages“, then you pointed to the conversation and asked “Can you see a difference between them?”**

L: uhum.

**R: And students were like... dead.**

L: [laughs]

**R: [you said] “It's about function. The first is about doing something and the second is about getting something.”**

L: uhum.

**R: Then you had them discuss the different functions of those sentences. This is not in the manual, can you tell me why you decided to do so?**

L: Because before going to the grammar box, I wanted them to understand the difference between a request and a statement. So I wouldn't need to explain all these concepts.

**R: So your focus was on the function?**

L: On the function.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 8, excerpt 1)

In the excerpt above, we can see Linda repeating steps she had taken in Class 6. She had students focus on the conversation and on functional aspects of language by asking “Can you see a difference between them [the messages]?” and by explicitly using the word “function” to let her students know what she wanted them to pay attention to, which signals the concept of focus on function is under development. Later on, when being inquired into the reasoning behind her choice, Linda said that she wanted students to understand the

difference between a request and a statement. Although she did not mention “focus on function” when explaining her reasoning, she agreed with me when I asked her whether her focus was on functional aspects of language.

Linda’s response opened up a mediational space to which I stayed attuned, allowing me to keep exploring the reasoning behind her choice. In other words, although it became clear she wanted to draw students’ attention to function, I wanted her to explain why she chose not to follow the manual’s suggestions – which directed her straight to the grammar box – in order to have her externalize, as thoroughly as she could, the reasoning behind her choice. As the next excerpt illustrates, reverberation of our past interaction was, once again, found in both her practice and speech

**R: The manual suggests “Focus students’ attention on the statements in the grammar focus box.” It asked you to open the grammar focus and go through it. Why didn’t you do it this way?**

L: I think we’ve had enough conversations about this [laughs]. I wouldn’t continue doing the same thing, like... Just pointing to the grammar box and explaining those things while students could just see them in the conversation, in the context, understand the function of these things, instead of me pointing them out.

**R: I really like that. The manual, in fact, is not being communicative here. [laughs...] And I really like the fact that you went back to the conversation, you asked students to focus on the messages, on the functions of the messages, to talk to their classmates so as to see what these different functions were... I found it very nice. I wanted to praise you for that.**

L: Thank you.

**R: It was really, really nice. I mean... you have this manual, which was written by experts, you know? But in this case, it’s not very communicative.**

L: I thought it was really not consistent with what they normally say. The instructions are normally in the same way, right? Like, they don’t direct you straight to the grammar box.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 8, excerpt 2)

Linda explicitly mentioned our previous interactions when responding to my inquiry, using concepts previously introduced and explored to justify her pedagogical choices. It seems like the idea of presenting grammar to the attention of learners as part of communicative language practice, focusing on functional aspects of

language rather than on form and using the context for doing so, has been moving from the interpsychological plane to the intrapsychological plane, which can be corroborated by the fact that she has been appropriating concepts of a communicative approach to the teaching of language (in this case, “context” and “focus on function”) to her speech, as well as enacting them in her practice, showing the dialectical unit between scientific and everyday knowledge Vygostky (1987) advocates for.

One aspect that deserves attention in this specific excerpt is the fact that the manual, which usually presents suggestions that lead teachers to focus on the conversation and work on functional aspect of language so as to later on move towards the Grammar Focus box, recommends drawing students’ attention to grammar, clearly separating it from the conversation just studied by students. Although the examples in the Grammar Focus box are the ones from the conversation, there are not any suggestions for teachers to introduce the grammatical topic to students that have the conversation as a starting point. It is only after having the teachers explore the grammar box with the students, presenting the rules to form messages with statements and requests, that the book suggests “Focus Ss’ attention on the Conversation on page 102. Ask: “What structures does Mr. Kale use when he gives his two messages?”. I wanted to make sure she had consciously chosen not to follow the manual’s suggestions so as to teach grammar in accordance with a communicative approach, which she made it clear by referring to our previous interactions and by, at the end of the excerpt, stating that the manual was not being really consistent in its suggestions when compared to the previous ones.

It seems like Linda’s previous interactions with me have been leading her to internalize some important concepts of a communicative approach to the teaching of language, allowing her to use them to qualitatively (re)define (Wertsch, 1984) her teaching. This excerpt illustrates that Linda was able to use such concepts to reason upon her practice and perform her professional activity when facing a new situation – this was the first time she had come upon manuals’ suggestions that would possibly lead her to separate grammar and context (as she used to do in the first few classes observed), however, she consciously chose not to follow them and came up with a strategy that drew her students’ attention to functional aspects of language, being able to articulate the reasoning behind her choice when asked to do so. This may indicate that Linda has merged the scientific knowledge provided to her with her everyday knowledge, since, as Johnson (2009)



suggests, one's ability to think in concepts can be seen when they are able to apply a concept in different situations and articulate the reasons for doing so. According to the author, when teachers "[...] begin to link this 'expert' knowledge to their own 'experiential' knowledge, they tend to reframe the way they describe and interpret their lived experiences." (Johnson, 2009, p. 15). In other words, the word – as Vygostky (1987) claims – allows one to go beyond concrete activity, being the means through which human experience can be organized in our minds and allowing us to voluntarily act upon the world, illustrating the dialectical unit between human thought and language.

This idea is later corroborated when we continued discussing her practice as Linda, once again, instructed her students to focus on functional aspects of language when doing an exercise in the book

**R: Well, let me see, then you explained the grammar box, going back to the conversation, making links between these parts. After that, you had students do the exercise below the grammar box, and after you corrected you asked them to classify the sentences into "requests" and "statements". Why?**

L: So they could go back to the idea, because they were really confused. I wanted them to get the idea that, most times, when you use "tell" it's something, and when you use "ask" it's something different. Then next class it's going to be a little more complex, but I wanted them to get the idea. They could relate these verbs to the functions.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 8, excerpt 3)

The textbook activity consisted in having students unscramble sentences in order to form messages. The manual did not, at any time, suggest students to classify the messages into statements or requests. Linda consciously chose to do so and explained that her intention was to have students connect those verbs (form) to their functions, and she herself mentioned. This is similar to what she did in Class 5, when she had her students focus on functional aspects of language and tell her whether the sentences in the exercise were requests or suggestions. The main difference between Class 5 and 8 lies in the fact that, in the former, she only directed students' attention to functional aspects of language when they did the exercise, not when introducing and explaining the grammatical topic. In Class 8, however, she was able to keep focusing on function from the grammatical explanations to the correction of students' activities, signaling a better situation definition of what a communicative approach to the teaching of grammar is. To this point,

one can say that the very opportunities Linda has had to externalize the reasoning behind her choices, being provided with mediation that is responsive to her maturing capabilities, have allowed her to (re)define the way she understands and enacts her practice, contributing to expand the robustness of her reasoning, or in other words, the complex ways in which she thinks about her teaching.

In the 9<sup>th</sup> and last class observed, students studied how to talk about changes, the Grammar Focus box focusing on different tenses people can use to do so (i.e. with the present tense; with the past tense; with the present perfect; with the comparative form of adjectives). The following suggestions are the ones given by the manual in order to introduce the topic

Write these four categories on the board

*Present Tense*                      *Present perfect*

*Past Tense*                              *Comparative*

Focus Ss' attention on the conversation on page 106.

Ask Ss to find examples in each category. Call on Ss to write them on the board...

(Interchange 1, teacher's manual, unit 16, p. 107)

Linda, once again, did not follow the manual's suggestions, doing something very different to introduce the grammatical topic taught. In the first part of the class, when introducing the theme of the unit (i.e. changes), one of the activities she had students do was to write down some changes they had been through in their lives. When students finished writing, she had them share their changes with the class, writing them down on the board. After that, she did some other activities (she worked with some supply material and with the Conversation), but she did not erase the changes she had written on the board. In fact, Linda used the students' sentences to introduce the grammatical topic studied, which is illustrated in the following excerpt

**R: [...] you opened the conversation and said “So, there are different manners to talk about changes. Then you showed students their answers for that first activity. Was it intentional? I mean, to make this connection?”**

L: Yeah.

**R: Why did you decide to do that?**

L: Because they'd see that, sometimes, you naturally use different kinds of structures to talk about the same thing, the same theme...

That was “changes”. I wanted it not to sound formulaic. That was the idea. It sounded natural that they’d produce something, it makes sense that they’d use that or other kinds of structures.

**R: Nice. I remember someone said something in the present, then most of them used the present perfect.**

L: Yeah.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 9, excerpt 1)

Instead of focusing on the 4 different categories the manual suggested for explaining the grammatical topic of this part of the unit, Linda used the students’ own sentences of a previous activity in order to show them that one can “[...] naturally use different kinds of structures to talk about the same thing [changes...]”. It seems clear that she focused on functional aspects of language when doing so, aiming at having her students see how we use different forms to realize different communicative functions. As our moment of interaction went on, Linda explored the reasoning behind her actions, as a response to my inquiry

**R: Then you went through their answers so as to show we can talk about changes in different ways, and had them underline the changes in the conversation, classifying them between present and past. The manual suggests writing four categories on the board: present tense; past tense; present perfect; and comparative. Focus students’ attention on the conversation and ask them to find examples of each category. And you didn’t do this. Why?**

L: I think it’d be too focused on these tenses. I wanted them to perceive, more naturally, let’s say, that there are differences, but not to classify those differences. I didn’t even ask them to classify them in detail.

**R: Yes.**

L: Right? I wanted them to talk about past and present. And that’s it. And if they could get that there was a comparative in the present tense... yeah, nice.

**R: Ok. You made it more like... Focused on the function rather than on the form.**

L: Yeah, yeah.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 9, excerpt 2)

It is interesting to see how Linda has distanced herself from an approach that focuses solely on form to explain grammar. Besides using her students’ sentences to explain how differently they could talk about changes, she had them find such different ways in the conversation and

only classify them between past tense and present tense. In her response to my inquiry, she highlighted the idea of having them naturally perceive such different ways to talk about changes, lessening the importance of form by lessening the amount of categories students had to fit those changes into. Once again we can see Linda's movement of starting from functional aspects of language so as to later on bring up form to the discussion. In the following passage, I invited her to further explore her reasoning so as to have her externalize it and provide me with a better understanding of it

**R: I know we've talked about it before, but can you tell me why you decided to do it this way? Like, do you think it's better for them or/**

L: Yeah. I think it's better for them that they perceive that things are different, but they're all connected. They're not parts of a machine that you can just combine or you try to make this... This kind of/

**R: Form? System.**

L: Yeah, form. Very rigid system of rules, right? I didn't want them to think of this as four different ways, but different manners you can do that, the same thing, but not to classify. Right? I think if I did that, if I classified in four different manners, they'd think those are the only manners they can do that. Those are the main ones, but this is not the idea.

**R: Uhum.**

L: So I wanted them to focus on the different manners that changes are described, and it flows, it flows.

**R: So you're focusing on function.**

L: Yes.

(Mediator-mediatee interaction 9,excerpt 3)

Linda's response to my inquiry clearly positioned herself against an approach to the teaching of grammar that prioritizes form over function, which, together with her practice, is totally different from what she did in the first classes observed, as previously presented and discussed. The use of the words "machine" and "very rigid system of rules" corroborates this interpretation, Linda favoring in her practice and articulating in her speech the focus on different ways (i.e. functions) students can talk about changes. It is fair to mention that the manual, just like in Class 8, focused on form in order to have teachers introduce the grammatical topic by suggesting them to write down the four categories to talk about changes on the board. In spite of that, Linda voluntarily chose not to follow such suggestions, articulating what was

behind her choice. This signals an expansion of Linda's ZPD, and consequently of the robustness of her reasoning, which may be the result of our moments of interaction throughout the semester as she has both changed the nature of her practice and her speech, meeting Johnson's (2009) claim that "[...] the nature of language use within the ZPD is critical to shaping opportunities for learning that in turn create the potential for cognitive development". However, differently from interaction 8, Linda did not use the scientific concept dealt with in order to justify her choices; she did not use the term "function" to talk about the "different ways" students have to refer to changes, which may signal a twisting path (Smagorinsky, Cook, & Johnson, 2003) in the development of the concept. Since the display of thinking in concepts depends on the use of the word (Vygotsky, 1987) – which is what ultimately links verbal behavior to thought – it looks like it cannot be affirmed that Linda has indeed internalized the aforementioned concept as a mediational means.

Along the 9 mediator-mediatee interactions, Linda appears to have redefined the way she understands a communicative approach to the teaching of grammar, both her speech and practice reverberating our moments of interaction, which corroborates Vygotsky's (1987) view on human psychological development that places social interaction as the key element of this process. Besides that, her perceptions of the textbook and teacher's manual seem to have changed as well, which is seen in mediator-mediatee interaction 4 when she acknowledged that she should not only follow the book's structure, but also the suggestions given. In relation to that, in the final questionnaire, when inquired into whether the experience of having the moments of interaction with me contributed to her professional activity, Linda came up with the following answer

[...] The most important part of the experience was having someone questioning my choices and making me see I was underestimating the manual's instructions, also I was blaming the textbook for being too grammar-focused but I was the one rushing to the Grammar Focus after a Conversation. I started to pay more attention to my choices, planning before classes and focusing on function instead of grammar.  
Thanks, Matheus :)

(Questionnaire 2, question 8)

The change in the way Linda sees the manual is presented when she mentioned she was underestimating the material, implying that now she is able to see how it can benefit her practice. Besides that, she acknowledged she was blaming the textbook for something she herself was doing: focusing on form instead of function. This clearly reverberates mediator-mediatee interaction 4 when I read to her parts of her answer to one of the questions of the first questionnaire in which she said she did not like the way the book focused on grammar. Along with that, Linda mentioned the changes she has been through in another answer of the same questionnaire

[...] I changed my mind over grammar being the focus, as I was not reading the manual with attention and was not focusing on the functions of the language presented in dialogues [...] Sometimes, though, the manual gives some instructions that are very structural, such as the students practicing the dialogue of Conversations in pairs.

(Questionnaire 2, question 5)

Once again, she mentioned she has changed her mind over the way she teaches grammar, acknowledging she was overlooking the teacher's manual, which implies that doing so led her to not fully grasp the pedagogical aspects lying behind the material. A discussion that deserves attention here is the fact that, although she seems to have understood the didactic-pedagogical reasoning behind the textbook and manual and changed her perceptions of these resources, Linda – at no time – followed the materials to the letter; rather, she always changed some of its suggestions and/or added supply material (i.e Power Point Presentations). One can say that, even though she got to perceive the advantages of the textbook and the manual, she was able to filter some of the materials' suggestions and reason about them being beneficial or not to her classes. The last part of her answer signals she is able to critically think about the manual, assertively saying that there are moments in which the material – in spite of following a communicative approach to teaching – leads to focus on form.

After having presented and discussed the data collected, the next chapter compiles the study's main findings as well as presents the study's limitations, suggestions for further research, and pedagogical implications.

## CHAPTER V

### FINAL REMARKS

#### 5.1 Introduction

The present chapter is divided into three sections that aim at concluding the study carried out: Section 3.1 summarizes the main findings of this study, discussing its research questions and drawing parallels between them; Section 3.2 presents the study's limitations and gives suggestions for future research; and Section 3.3 raises pedagogical implications that can be drawn from the study's main findings, such section being paramount when it comes to research in teacher education.

#### 5.2 Main findings

The main goal of the present study was to investigate the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher, *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher's manual. In order to pursue this objective, the 3 following specific research questions were designed: (i) What changes were made in the teacher's classes in comparison to the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions?; (ii) What mediated this teacher's reasoning in relation to the changes made in class *vis-à-vis* the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions?; and (iii) Are there any didactic-pedagogical aspects of the textbook/manual initially overlooked and subsequently incorporated in the teacher's class and speech that may indicate reverberations of the past interactions with the researcher? If so, which and how?

As regards the first research question, (i) *what changes were made in the teacher's classes in comparison to the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions?*, it was seen that in the first two classes Linda did not use the textbook or the manual, replacing these resources by materials she herself produced. From class 3 to 6, although she used the textbook and manual, she did not – at any time – follow them to the letter. Initially, the changes she made after that were mainly about the way she introduced the grammatical topic to her students: not using the questions the manual provided in order to focus the students' attention to functional aspects of language, thus bringing a disconnect between the Conversation and the Grammar Box. As classes and interactions went by, Linda stopped overlooking the manual's suggestions and started adapting them in ways that kept its intent to

draw the students' attention to the aforementioned aspects. Finally, in classes 8 and 9, Linda chose not to follow the manual's suggestions. At this time, though, she came up with different ways to direct her students' attention to function as the manual did not do so.

When it comes to the second research question (ii) *what mediated this teacher's reasoning in relation to the changes made in class vis-à-vis the textbook activities and the teacher's manual suggestions?*, it was seen that the aspects that seemed to mediate Linda's practice considerably changed from the first to the last class observed. In the first class, she seemed to be mediated by the idea of motivating students and engendering their participation, her perception that the students liked the explicit teaching of grammar, and the fact that she did not like the textbook *Interchange*. In Class 2, Linda was mediated by her students' request, as she herself stated. In Class 3, what seems to have mediated her practice was the idea of facilitating students' understanding of the grammatical aspect being taught, her reasoning already signaling some aspects of a communicative approach to teaching (e.g. her concern with "context"). In Class 4, Linda seemed to be confused when trying to explain the reasoning behind what she did, further interaction revealing that some principles of CLT seem to have influenced her choice. From the fifth class on, there is evidence that the mediator-mediatee interactions have started to influence the ways Linda approached grammar, her answers pointing to her willingness to have her students focus on function over form. In spite of that, the aspects addressed during our interactions still seemed to be blurred to her in Class 5. It was in Class 8 that her everyday experience and the theory explored with her seemed to merge: she both taught in accordance with a communicative way to the teaching of grammar and used the scientific concept we discussed along the interactions to justify her choices, signaling that the concept of "focus on function" has also mediated her practice.

Finally, regarding the third research question (iii) *are there any didactic-pedagogical aspects of the textbook/manual initially overlooked and subsequently incorporated in the teacher's class and speech that may indicate reverberations of the past interactions with the researcher? If so, which and how?*, the movement from a grammar-oriented approach to teaching to a communicative one, as well as her externalization and the exploration of her reasoning, show that "focus on function" was indeed incorporated in both her class and speech. The following discussion aims at summarizing the way this process took place.



As previously presented, by having Linda externalize the reasoning behind her choices in the first mediator-mediatee interactions, I was able to access her ZPD, this movement signaling that despite some aspects of a communicative approach to the teaching of grammar (i.e. context and function) were within her zone, there was need for further development. Basically, Linda stated her disapproval to grammar-oriented lessons, but had grammar as the starting point of her classes. Such verbalism (Vygotsky, 1987) indicated the sort of mediation she needed in order to expand her ZPD and possibly the robustness of her reasoning (Johnson, 1999).

As observations and interactions progressed, the simplicity of her answers to my inquiry unveiled some lack of understanding as regards the manual's suggestions, revealing that Linda was not making the most out of the way the manual directs teachers to teach in accordance with a communicative approach, overlooking its suggestions. It was in this context that, by providing her with implicit mediation (Lantolf & Aljaafreh, 1995; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), I helped uncover a clash between her speech and her practice. As Linda and I established levels of intersubjectivity and engaged in thinking together (Mercer, 2000), she started to redefine (Werstch, 1984) her understanding of a communicative way to the teaching of grammar, meeting Mercer's (2000) claim that "[...] language provides us with a means for *thinking together*, for jointly creating knowledge and understanding." (p. 15). What also came into play were the interactions in which Linda's practice was confronted to her speech, leading her to experience moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance (Johnson & Worden, 2014; Johnson & Golombek, 2016), to which I offered responsive mediation in order to foster her development.

During our mediator-mediatee interactions, I also used the scientific concepts lying behind the manual's suggestions to offer her responsive mediation, possibly allowing her to merge them with their practical counterpart, which has the potential to foster thinking in concepts (Vygotsky, 1987). As classes went by, Linda's externalization kept reverberating my responsive mediation to her moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance, until it came to a point in which she stopped separating grammar and context when teaching, pointing to a qualitative redefinition (Wertsch, 1984) of the way she understands a communicative approach to the teaching of grammar.

Linda's development comes into light once again in the last classes observed and during the interactions held when she refused to accept some manual's suggestions that would lead her straight to the

Grammar Box. When justifying her choice, she mentioned the role of “focus on function”, using the concept (i.e. scientific knowledge) to explain her practice, and thus signaling a movement of internalization, which points to a merge between her scientific and everyday knowledge (Vygotsky, 1987; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). Besides that, using the concept in a new situation (i.e. a situation in which the manual, differently from previous occurrences, sort of directed her to a more formal approach to teaching) and explaining the reasoning for not following the manual, may reveal that Linda has started a move towards thinking in concepts (Johnson, 2009). Also, this shows she has been reasoning about the manual’s pedagogical aspects, not only accepting the suggestions for the sake of doing so, which points to an expansion of her robust reasoning (Johnson, 1999). I see this moment as a significant display of Linda’s development. So far, our interactions had converged with the suggestions provided by the manual. At this moment, however, the manual also deviated from a communicative stance to the teaching of grammar, and Linda was able to identify that disconnect and come up with a way to put things back in track.

At this point, it is valid to bring into discussion that after this moment of developmental display Linda did not use the concept of “focus on function” to justify her practice in the last interaction held, which may reveal that, although the concept’s internalization has started, it has not been completed yet. However, as regards her answers to the second questionnaire, she acknowledged that she has changed her mind over grammar being the center of her class, mentioning “focus on function” to explain the change she has been through. Moreover, her view of the manual and textbook has moved from one that, as she herself stated, underestimates these materials to one that acknowledges that they may be beneficial to her planning and practice. This clearly illustrates the back and forth movement of the twisting path of concept development (Smagorinsky, Cook, & Johnson, 2003).

To conclude, when considering the study’s main goal, which was to investigate the influence of interaction between teacher and a more experienced other on the development of an English as a foreign language novice teacher, *vis-à-vis* the use of the textbook and the teacher’s manual, one can say that the moments of interaction between Linda and me indeed allowed her to move beyond her understanding of these materials. This was reflected on practice and speech as she both moved away from a grammar-oriented approach to teaching to a communicative one, “focus on function” being mentioned in some moments when she externalized the reasoning behind her choices. It

seems like the ways Linda and I interacted enabled her to move beyond her previous situation definition (Wertsch, 1984; 1985), allowing her to expand the robustness of her reasoning (Johnson, 1999), which consequently shed light on her professional activity. Together with that, Dellagnelo and Moritz' (2017) claim that "[...] it is in the core of peer interaction (between novice and more experienced other) that teaching is resignified and becomes relevant."<sup>29</sup>(p. 299), evidences the way Vygotsky's (1978, 1987) work is of paramount importance to guide and inform the way teacher education is thought of.

### **5.3 Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research**

One of the main limitations of this study was the fact that, due to length constraints of the thesis, it was conducted with one teacher only. Having more participants would be interesting to compare the sort of mediation provided as well as the main findings of the study. Furthermore, I believe this would allow me to evaluate whether the methodology proposed needs further improvement. Another limitation of the study, also motivated by length constraints, is that although more than one aspect of the teacher's practice was touched during the mediator-mediatee interactions, only one of them was brought into discussion.

Last but not least, it could have been insightful to observe eventual classes taught by Linda in the subsequent semester in order to look for further evidence that could indicate internalization of the concept discussed in the interactions. This is something that did not cross my mind before now. Yet, it appears that this is not lost. I will definitely eventually go back to her class so as to see how she has been approaching grammar, which is actually my first suggestion for further research.

Also, replicating the study with experienced teachers could contribute to their continued education, bearing in mind that experience *per se* does no guarantee a scientific counterpart.

After discussing the study's limitations and giving suggestions for further research, the next section aims at discussing the pedagogical implications that can be raised by this work.

---

<sup>29</sup> Translated from Portuguese: “[...] haja vista ser no bojo das interações entre pares (de menor e maior experiência) que a atividade docente é resignificada e ganha contornos de relevância.”

#### 5.4 Pedagogical implications

When it comes to research in teacher education, it is important to raise a discussion about the pedagogical implications that can be drawn from the study's main findings, since they can contribute to inform the practice of both teachers and teacher educators.

The present study adds to the pool of research knowledge in the area, by claiming the important role of social interaction in fostering teachers' professional development, which illustrates "[...] the fundamentally social nature of teacher learning and the activities of teaching." (Johnson, 2009, p. 13). Drawing on Vygotsky's (1978, 1987) SCT, the study revealed that one is indeed capable of moving beyond their current levels of development when interacting with a more expert other, interthinking (Mercer, 2000; Littleton & Mercer, 2013) promoting this movement as the parts involved in interaction stay attuned to each others' attunement.

Although the role of a more expert other is essential, this by no means neglects the role of the less experienced peer in the whole process, the dialectical quality of the interactions established being what enables development to take place, pointing again to the importance of mutual attunement. The study brings into light the importance of this dialectical relationship by showing the way teachers' externalization of their reasoning may open up mediational spaces to be explored, through responsive mediation, by a more expert other, allowing teachers to revisit their practice and possibly redefine the situation definitions they hold as regards the aspects of their profession. As Johnson & Golombek (2016) advocate, this sort of mediation plays "[...] a crucial role in exploiting the potential of what Vygotsky called symbolic tools—social interaction, artifacts, and concepts—to enable teachers to appropriate them as *psychological tools* in learning-to-teach and ultimately in directing their teaching activity." (p. 21).

Another aspect that deserves attention is teachers' emotions. As Johnson and Worden (2014) and Johnson and Golombek (2016) claim, moments of clash between teachers' emotions and cognition may come into being when they are invited to reason about what they do, these moments constituting a great opportunity to propel teacher development as the more expert other provides them with responsive mediation. With this in mind, the present study claims for moving away from a view that sees teachers' emotions as drawbacks that disturb the process of becoming a teacher to a view that embraces teachers' emotions as an intrinsic part of the process that may trigger development. Making the

most out of these emotions, as corroborated in this study, may positively impact teacher education.

This work also touches the long-term discussion as regards the “theory-practice” divide, showing that these two aspects need to meet and merge in order to help teachers truly understand the aspects that revolve around the profession and finally achieve the so called *praxis* (Freire, 2005). In other words, by showing the way the teacher could use scientific concepts (theory) to reshape her everyday concepts (practice) when revisiting what she did, the study brings into light Vygotsky’s (1987) contribution to finish the dichotomy “theory-practice”, pointing to the potential that the merge of these aspects have to allow teachers to qualitatively move beyond what they currently know.

A word in reference to textbooks/manuals is also necessary. By no means this study aimed at leading the teacher to uncritically follow the teacher’s manual. Rather, by using the manual to inquire into the teacher’s reasoning I aimed at having her understand the didactic-pedagogical aspects which lie behind the material so as to allow her to make informed decisions when either following or not the suggestions given. Needless to say, the manual, together with our interactions, was a means that helped her redefine the way she understood the teaching of grammar. Therefore, this signals the potential of such materials in providing a basis for teachers to lean on when needed and in pushing their development. As Johnson (2009) states, the manual may eventually “[...] sit on the shelf, although symbolic remnants of it may remain in the ways the teacher thinks about and engages in the activities of L2 teaching.” (p. 19).

All in all, this study gives a glimpse into how a sociocultural approach may contribute to the area of teacher education by illustrating ways in which social interaction potentially fosters teacher cognitive development. Hopefully, teacher education programs can benefit from the idea that it is precisely inside the situated practices of teaching that teachers can potentially grow as informed professionals who make sound choices about the whats and hows of foreign language teaching.

## REFERENCES

- Agnoletto, M. A. (2017). *Beyond (or not) the teacher's manual* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC.
- Bell, J. (2005). *Doing Your Research Project: a guide for first-time researchers in education, health, and social science*. New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Biehl, P. G., & Dellagnelo, A. C. K. (2016). "Contextualization" in development: A microgenetic study of an English as a foreign language teacher. *Fórum Linguístico*, 13 (4), 1599-1615. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/1984-8412.2016v13n4p1599>.
- Cerutti-Rizzatti, M. E., & Dellagnelo, A. C. K. (2016). Implicações e problematizações do conceito de Intersubjetividade: um enfoque na formação do profissional de línguas. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, 16 (1), 117-132. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1984-63982015XXXX>.
- Dall'Igna, C. (2018). *The professional development of an EFL teacher: a sociocultural approach* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC.
- Dallacosta, A. (2018). *Tracing teacher development within a sociocultural perspective: microteaching component in a pre-service English teaching program* (Unpublished master's thesis). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, SC.
- Dellagnelo, A. C. K., Silva, L., & Rocha, N. V. (2015). Para Além do Conceito Cotidiano: a concepção de atividades de ensino-aprendizagem com vistas à (re)conceitualização de apresentações acadêmicas. *Brazilian English Language Teaching Journal*, 6, 50-61. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/2178-3640.2015.3.21020>.
- Dellagnelo, A. C. K., & Moritz, M. E. W. (2017). Mediação e (res)significação docente: a repercussão na prática pedagógica. In L. M. B. Tomitch & V. M. Heberle (Eds.), *Perspectivas atuais de*

*aprendizagem e ensino de línguas* (pp. 285-302). Florianópolis, SC: LLE/CCE/UFSC.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford, OX: Oxford University Press.

Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. (M. B. Ramos, Translation.). New York, NY: The Continuum International Publishing Group.

Johnson, K. E. (1999). *Understanding Language Teaching: Reasoning In Action*. Boston, MA: Heinle Cengage Learning.

Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2011). A Sociocultural Theoretical Perspective on Teacher Professional Development. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 1-12). New York, NY: Routledge.

Johnson, K. E., & Dellagnelo, A. C. K. (2013). How ‘sign meaning develops’: Strategic mediation in learning to teach. *Language Teaching Research*, 17 (4), 409-432.

Johnson, K. E., & Worden, D. (2014). Cognitive/emotional dissonance as growth points in learning to teach. *Language and Sociocultural Theory*, 2(1), 125–150.

Johnson, K. E. (2015). Reclaiming the Relevance of L2 Teacher Education. *The Modern Language Journal*, 99 (3), 515-528. doi: 10.1111/modl.12242

Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (2016). *Mindful L2 Teacher Education: a Sociocultural Perspective on Cultivating Teachers’ Professional Development*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Lantolf, J. P., & Aljaafreh, A. (1995). Second language learning in the zone of proximal development: a revolutionary experience. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23 (7), 619-632. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355\(96\)80441-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0883-0355(96)80441-1).

Lantolf, J. P. (2000). Introducing sociocultural theory. In J. P. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Learning* (pp. 1-26). Oxford, OX: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford, OX: Oxford University Press.

Lantolf, J. P., Thorne, S. L., & Poehner, M. E. (2015). Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Development. In B. VanPatten & J. Williams (Eds.), *Theories in second language acquisition* (pp. 207-226). New York, NY: Routledge.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles of language teaching*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Littleton, K., & Mercer, N. (2013). *Interthinking: Putting talk to work*. London: Routledge.

Mercer, N. (2000). *Words and Minds: how we use language to think together*. New York, NY: Routledge.

McNeill, D., & Duncan, S. D. (2000). Growth points in thinking-for-speaking. In D. McNeill (ed.), *Language and gesture*, 141-161. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oliveira, M. K. (2001). *Vygotsky: Aprendizado e desenvolvimento, um processo sócio-histórico*. São Paulo, SP: Scipione.

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2011). *Practice Teaching: A reflective approach*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., Hull, J., & Proctor, S. (2013). *Interchange 1*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Silva, K. M. 2018. *A (co)construção de conceitos acadêmicos na formação inicial do professor de língua estrangeira – inglês em aulas de metodologia de ensino e no estágio supervisionado em um curso de Letras*. Retrieved from Repositório Institucional UNESP.



Smagorinsky, P., Cook, L. S., & Johnson, T. S. (2003). The Twisting Path of Concept Development in Learning to Teach. *Teachers College Record*, 105 (8), 1399-1436.

Vieira-Abrahão, M. H. (2014). Sessões colaborativas na formação inicial e em serviço de professores de inglês. *Horizontes de Linguística Aplicada*, 13 (1), 15-39.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: the development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1987). *The collected works of LS Vygotsky: Problems of General Psychology. Including the Volume Thinking and Speech*. R. W. Rieber & A. S. Carton (Eds.). New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Wertsch, J. V. (1984). The Zone of Proximal Development: Some Conceptual Issues. *New Directions for Child Development*, 23 (1984), 7-18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cd.23219842303>

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

**APPENDIXES**

## APPENDIXES

### Appendix A



#### UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA

##### Centro de Comunicação e Expressão

##### Departamento de Língua e Literaturas Estrangeiras

#### **Formulário do Consentimento Livre e Esclarecido Elaborado de Acordo com a Resolução 510/16 (dirigido ao/a professor/a participante)**

Gostaria de lhe convidar a participar de uma pesquisa intitulada *O desenvolvimento da competência docente através da (re)significação colaborativa da prática pedagógica*. Você está sendo convidado(a) a participar deste estudo por ser um(a) professor(a) iniciante de língua inglesa nos cursos Extracurriculares da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina..

A presente pesquisa enfoca no desenvolvimento de professores de língua estrangeira em relação às suas práticas, com particular atenção a sua relação com o livro didático e o manual do professor, visando melhor entender a maneira com a qual professores iniciantes de língua estrangeira usam tais recursos. Dito isso, a pesquisa em questão pode servir como apoio a professores em início de carreira ao usar o manual do professor. Além disso, o estudo almeja mostrar a importância de dar oportunidades a professores de língua estrangeira para refletir criticamente sobre o que fazem em sala de aula, visto que as interações entre pesquisador e participante podem ajudar a desvelar os processos de tomada de decisão do(a) professor(a) pesquisado(a). O estudo será conduzido por mim, Matheus André Agnoletto, sob a orientação da Professora Doutora Adriana de Carvalho Kuerten Dellagnelo.

Se você aceitar participar do estudo, será solicitado(a) a (1) permitir a presença do pesquisador em sala – em apenas uma de suas turmas – uma vez por semana durante o período letivo de um semestre, (2) responder a dois questionários (um ao início e outro ao fim da pesquisa) sobre a sua visão do uso de materiais didáticos em sala de aula de língua estrangeira, bem como a sua visão do trabalho de um professor de língua estrangeira e (3) participar de entrevistas – que serão gravadas em áudio – nas quais eu irei fazer algumas perguntas sobre a aula observada. As entrevistas ocorrerão após cada aula e o local será combinado com você, de acordo com suas preferências.

A participação na presente pesquisa não envolve riscos de alto nível, porém, devido a presença do pesquisador em sala, você poderá se sentir nervoso(a), ansioso(a) e desconfortável ao lecionar. É

importante salientar que os resultados do estudo serão tornados públicos, mas sua identidade será totalmente preservada e não será incluída nenhuma informação pessoal que possa identificá-lo(a). Somente o pesquisador e sua orientadora farão uso dos dados para análise. Apesar de todo o cuidado, há uma remota possibilidade de quebra de sigilo, visto que seus colegas professores e seus alunos poderão associar o estudo, quando publicado, a sua imagem. Os resultados da pesquisa poderão ser apresentados em conferências, reuniões pedagógicas, congressos e outros eventos relacionados à área em questão, mas seu nome e quaisquer informações relacionadas que possam ferir sua privacidade serão mantidos em sigilo. Ao final da pesquisa, o pesquisador irá lhe mostrar os resultados obtidos e as conclusões do estudo, o que poderá lhe ajudar a ter uma melhor percepção de suas práticas pedagógicas e do seu desenvolvimento como professor(a).

É importante mencionar que você poderá desistir da pesquisa a qualquer momento por qualquer motivo, sem necessidade de justificativa, não acarretando em prejuízo algum para a sua pessoa. Além disso, você poderá esclarecer qualquer dúvida que surgir antes, durante ou depois da pesquisa diretamente comigo, pesquisador, ou com a minha orientadora.

Para esclarecimentos, você pode entrar em contato comigo através do e-mail [matth.ufsc@gmail.com](mailto:matth.ufsc@gmail.com), através do número (48) 9 9930-1381, ou no seguinte endereço: Rua Prefeito Waldemar Vieira, 635, Ap. 504, Bairro Saco dos Limões, Florianópolis – SC (CEP 88045-501). Se preferires, podes entrar em contato com a minha orientadora pelo e-mail [adrianak@cce.ufsc.br](mailto:adrianak@cce.ufsc.br), através do número (48) 9 9188-0453, ou no seguinte endereço: Rua Alves de Brito, 442, Ap. 401, Bairro Centro, Florianópolis - SC (CEP 88015-440). Além disso, você poderá contatar o Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa com Seres Humanos da UFSC através do telefone (48) 3721-6094, do e-mail [cep.propesq@contato.ufsc.br](mailto:cep.propesq@contato.ufsc.br), ou presencialmente no seguinte endereço: Rua Desembargador Vitor Lima, nº 222, Prédio Reitoria II, 4º andar, sala 401, bairro Trindade, Florianópolis.

Eu e minha orientadora nos comprometemos a conduzir a pesquisa de acordo com as exigências da Resolução CNS 510/16 que trata dos preceitos éticos e da proteção ao participante da pesquisa. A resolução não permite compensação financeira pela sua participação, porém, os seguintes direitos lhe são assegurados: ressarcimento de quaisquer gastos oriundos da participação na pesquisa; e indenização por possíveis danos resultantes da participação na pesquisa.

Sua participação na seguinte pesquisa é de grande contribuição para a formação de professores de inglês no Brasil, porém a decisão de participar é exclusivamente sua, por livre e espontânea vontade. Se você aceitar participar, por favor, assine este consentimento em duas vias - uma cópia ficará comigo, pesquisador, e outra com você – e rubrique em todas as páginas. Ao assinar esse documento, você estará consentindo com o uso dos dados coletados para a pesquisa. Obrigado pela participação.

**Declaração de consentimento:**

Eu, \_\_\_\_\_, RG \_\_\_\_\_, declaro que li as informações do presente Formulário de Consentimento Livre e Esclarecido, referente à pesquisa intitulada *O desenvolvimento da competência docente através da (re)significação colaborativa da prática pedagógica*, e concordo em participar da presente pesquisa por livre e espontânea vontade, bem como autorizo a divulgação e a publicação de toda informação por mim transmitida. Além disso, declaro que quando necessário, fiz perguntas e recebi esclarecimentos.

Assinatura do(a) participante \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Matheus André Agnoletto  
Pesquisador

\_\_\_\_\_  
Adriana de C. Kuerten Dellagnelo  
Orientadora

**Florianópolis, \_\_\_\_ de \_\_\_\_\_ de 2018.**

## Appendix B

**Questionnaire 1 and the participant's answers**

*Dear teacher, I would like to invite you to answer these questions about your past experiences as a student, your understandings of your profession, and your perceptions on the use of textbooks and the teacher's manual in language classes. Please, answer the questions on the basis of your own beliefs, experience, and knowledge. Feel comfortable to write as much as you want.*

**1. Tell me a little bit about your previous experiences with learning English.**

My first memories of the English language come from songs - my mother used to play vhs tapes with English sing-along songs for children. I was probably six at that time, but I still remember some lyrics and images from the videos. Some years later I started going to my father's workplace because he had a computer, then I played a lot of video games - all of them in English: the game installation instructions and the in-game language (tutorials, dialogues, signs, letters and whatnot) was English. I don't remember a lot from school, only that there was a lot of repetition of the verb 'to be' through the years. From my teenage years onward I continued to listen to songs and play video games in English, because I really enjoyed them, not because I wanted to learn the language. Five years ago I met my boyfriend and we started practicing conversation. When I got to the English course my learning process became a conscious one, and I really enjoyed developing my writing abilities, which was something I had never done before.

**2. Do you see any influence of these experiences on your professional activity? If so, explain your answer.**

Yes, huge influences. I try to teach in a way that is meaningful for the students. I know some people prefer to learn in a more structured manner, with explicit grammar and so on, but I tend to believe a more contextualized, communicative learning is more motivating and productive in the long run. As I learned English through pleasurable experiences of immersion instead of consciously studying the language, I tend to believe this is a good manner of learning vocabulary, for example. But I believe people respond to different things so I try to vary my practices.

**3. What does someone need to be a foreign language teacher?**

First of all, knowledge of the language they are to teach. I do not know how to define or measure knowledge, but without some level of understanding of the target language it is not possible to teach. Second but not less important is the approach: it is not enough to know to teach. I do not believe a "native" speaker is able to teach solely based on their knowledge of the language. There are four language skills to be considered when learning/teaching a foreign language, which is not something any native is proficient in, and it is also necessary some kind of preparation to become a teacher. I don't believe a formal education is irreplaceable, but it is a chance to develop a conscious practice of teaching.

**4. What kind of teacher do you aspire to be?**

The kind of teacher that knows how to balance being fun and motivating without losing track of the learning goals of my student(s). I want to be a firmer in my decisions and plan my classes more carefully. In sum, I want to improve my overall organization to better structure the teaching process. I want to make more conscious choices that will enhance my students' learning.

**5. Can you think of advantages and disadvantages of the use of textbooks in language classes?**

The advantages are the structural guidance the textbook provides: there is a vocabulary, grammar structures, even themes to work already established. This also improves time management in the sense that there is a blueprint of what the teacher needs to plan their classes. The disadvantages are overestimating the guidance of the textbook and the possible dependence on the latter in preparing classes. Relying too much on textbooks tend to cause boredom in the classroom.

**6. Before starting to teach, had you had contact with other language textbooks for some reason? If so, why?**

No, I had never.

**7. Can you think of any differences and/or similarities between the Interchange textbook and other language textbooks you came across before Interchange?**

No, I have never had contact with other language textbooks. I only peeked at the American Inside Out, but I could notice that they were very similar.

**8. Do you like the Interchange's manual? Could you comment on any advantages and/or disadvantages of it?**

I like its simplicity, its organization. I like its sections and the idea of a Snapshot in the beginning of almost all of the units, most students get really interested when we discuss the images and the information they bring. But I really don't like the way the book focuses on grammar, always presenting tables which call a lot of attention. This doesn't look communicative enough for me. It almost seems like the Snapshots and Conversations are only an excuse to get to the Grammar Focus.

**9. What is the role of the manual in your professional activity?**

It guides my classes in terms of structure: the vocabulary, grammar, everything comes from the textbook, but I try to give as many examples from real life as possible, eliciting information from students, talking about my own life, showing song lyrics and videos that are pertinent to the content I'm teaching. But I rely on the manual a lot.

**10. Have you ever felt the need to change/adapt/skip any activities from the Interchange textbook? If so, when? Why? Give an example.**

Yes, I skip a lot of activities because they are boring. I also adapt them to bigger groups (as the textbook suggests a lot of pair activities) and I tend to use the structure of some activities with other materials such as images, videos and songs. Most of the activities I skip are pair work.

## Appendix C

**Questionnaire 2 and the participant's answers**

*Dear teacher, I would like to invite you to answer these questions about your understandings of your profession, your perceptions on the use of textbooks and the teacher's manual in language classes, and your participation in the study. Please, answer the questions on the basis of your own beliefs, experience, and knowledge. Feel comfortable to write as much as you want. If you do not feel the need to add anything to the answers of the questions you already answered in the first questionnaire, just write down "go back to questionnaire one".*

**1. What does someone need to be a foreign language teacher?**

Go back to questionnaire 1.

**2. What kind of teacher do you aspire to be?**

Go back to questionnaire 1.

**3. Can you think of advantages and disadvantages of the use of textbooks in language classes?**

Go back to questionnaire 1.

**4. Can you think of any differences and/or similarities between the Interchange textbook and other language textbooks you came across before Interchange?**

Go back to questionnaire 1.

**5. Do you like the Interchange's manual? Could you comment on any advantages and/or disadvantages of it?**

I still like its simplicity and its organization in sections and the Snapshot in the beginning of almost all of the units. I changed my mind over grammar being the focus, as I was not reading the manual with attention and was not focusing on the functions of the language presented in dialogues, for example. Sometimes, though, the manual gives some instructions that are very structural, such as the students practicing the dialogue of Conversation in pairs.

**6. What is the role of the manual in your professional activity?**

Go back to questionnaire 1.

**7. Have you ever felt the need to change/adapt/skip any activities from the Interchange textbook? If so, when? Why? Give an example.**

Now I try not to skip pairwork, but I always skip dialogue practice after Conversation activities. I adapt some activities in order to make them more comprehensible and/or fun to my students.

**8. In what ways do you think the experience of having interviews with the researcher has contributed to your professional activity? If possible, give examples.**

In many ways. The most important part of the experience was having someone questioning my choices and making me see that I was underestimating the manual's instructions, also I was blaming the textbook for being too grammar-focused but I was the one rushing to the Grammar Focus after a Conversation. I started to pay more attention to my choices, planning better before classes and focusing on function instead of grammar. Thanks, Matheus :)

**9. How did you feel throughout the whole process? Were either the interviews or the presence of the researcher in class somehow threatening and/or a burden to you? If so, could you explain your answer?**

The whole process was really nice, Matheus made everything clear before he started the observations and interviews, he was in no way threatening to me and I believe the students even liked it better when he started coming to the classes. The process was for me one of self-assessment and growth.



**10. Would you like to suggest any changes for further research in relation to the way the researcher conducted the interviews and/or to his behavior while attending classes?**

Not at all.

## Appendix D

## Transcripts of mediator-mediatee interactions

## Mediator-mediatee interaction 1

**R:** So... today we're going to start our interviews. First of all, I want to explain to you how this is gonna work. Basically, I'll observe you classes... then, in the interviews, I'll ask you questions about things you do in class. I just want you to understand that I'm not here to judge you, or to tell you that you should've done things differently. As I told you before, I study teacher development, and I just wanna know what you think of when you plan your classes... how you go about the reasoning that informs your actions... Things like that.

L: Uhum.

**R:** We're gonna talk so as to unveil your thoughts and think about them together.

L: Alright.

**R:** I'm not a very experienced teacher... I want you to think of me as a peer teacher.

L: uhum...

**R:** Ok? So besides having the interviews, whenever you wanna talk about your classes you can reach me out, by email, WhatsApp...

L: Nice.

**R:** Even though we're kind of "on the same level", there's always going to be something that you know that I don't know, vice-versa, so I really like this exchange between peers.

L: yeah. Me too.

**R:** So I just want to make this clear... That I'm not here to tell you how to do your job. Ok?

L: Yeah.

**R:** Good. So let's start! First of all... you started the class talking about the present perfect, right?

L: Yeah.

**R:** You studied that in the previous unit...

L: Not in the previous unit. We were continuing the same unit.

**R:** Ok, ok. You were finishing that unit.

L: Yes, yes.

**R:** Then you had some slides about the differences between "already" and "yet" with the present perfect...

L: Uhum.

**R:** And... did you cover that before?

L: Very superficially.

**R:** What do you mean?

L: I showed them the book, but we hadn't had exercises using already and yet.

**R:** Ok.

L: But I'd had... some conversations and things that ... introduce it (*already and yet*) in the book... but I hadn't given attention to it... particularly.

**R:** Like... you hadn't really explained it, is that it?

L: Yes, yes.

**R:** Ok. I thought it was a review. But it wasn't.

L: Some people were not in the previous class, so they had no idea about what was going on so it was a review for some... and a continuation for others.

**R:** Ok. Got it. And can you tell me why you decided to do it? Like, the way you did it. You had like... a Power Point presentation and... you ... uh... you turned it into a game right? They had to complete the sentences... Can you tell me why you decided to present it this way... explain it to them the way you did?

L: Yeah. Because when I show them... when I open the digital version of the book they already make that face like "oh, the book again". They don't seem encouraged...

**R:** In the previous class?

L: Every time I open the book, they don't seem interested...

**R: Ok...**

L: So I try to bring things from other sources. When I prepare a presentation they even look more vivid...

**R: Uhum...**

L: They... I think they know it's something that may not be that boring... Because I... I personally don't like the book... the format of the book...

**R: Oh... You don't like it.**

L: I don't like it.

**R: You think that they don't like it either.**

L: Yeah. And I agree with... or at least I project that idea... but I see a difference when I bring something else. Especially when it's videos... or something else. I like to prepare Power Point presentations because I can bring my own images in an organized way... I don't need to go to Google Images to show my examples... I like to use graphics...

**R: Ok...**

L: To explain conceRns... Like "since" and "for"... and sometimes when I draw it... I don't feel like they get it...

**R: ok...**

L: ... as much as when there's an image.

**R: Ok. So you like to use visual material...**

L: Yes.

**R: ... to help them.**

L: Yeah. My main idea when I think of language... is visual. This is the way I've learned throughout my whole life. Through songs and images...

**R: Uhum...**

L: So I think, maybe... some people would benefit from that. I know that there are different kinds of stimuli that people can get more... But I like to use visual aids.

**R: And that's how you've learned, right?**

L: yes.

**R: So you are a very visual person?**

L: yes.

**R: And you like to bring that to your students...**

L: yes...l

**R: Nice... OK... so, going back a little bit, you said that they seem more vivid when you bring activities...**

L: yeah... they seem interested...

**R: ... things that go beyond the book.**

L: yes. They seem more interested.

**R: How do you think this reflects on your classes? Do you think that... like when you bring something different... they... like... Do they participate more? How do they react?**

L: They participate more... they seem to pay attention more closely because it's something that breaks that idea of boring classes every day with the same book. They already know the book. They've had probably looked at the book... right? So... at least for me, when I prepare something... I feel like I pay more attention to the details. I don't know... maybe... I research more... I try to bring more, more... clear examples.

**R: Uhum... got it. I think they paid a lot of attention, I was very impressed.**

L: Yeah.

**R: I was like "Oh, my God. They're really into it".**

L: yeah.

**R: ok...**

L: That only happens with... Power Point presentations.

**R: Really?**

L: yes. When it's the book... they look, but they don't participate as much. They don't make as many questions.

**R: Uhum... nice. Ok... so moving on... you brought some other slides explaining the differences between “for” and “since”, and... you basically... all things that you taught... you had similar activities after them, right?**

L: Yes.

**R: Having Ss write sentences and things like that, right?**

L: Yes.

**R: And... hm... can I say that you brought these activities this way for the same reasons that you brought the first one? That you wanted them like... to go beyond the book... and get them to participate more...**

L: yeah, yeah... It was basically the same idea. Because I feel that, and I've learned that... with a professor from our department... she told us that when people know they're gonna be tested, they pay more attention. And I don't like the idea of telling people that they have to pay attention because they'll be tested, but it works.

**R: Uhum...**

L: I don't know why... maybe people don't see... the learning process as something necessary unless you have a test...

**R: ok...**

L: But I tend to do it. Because with the exercise right after my explanation... I think they connect things better. So that was the point of the whole thing of... explanation, exercise, explanation, exercise...

**R: Uhum... I get it. Oh... in all of them... After the explanation they had two rounds of exercises... is there a reason for that?**

L: No reason (laughs). It was just a number of exercises I knew it'd not be too long, but also not too short as to not give them a change to have closure. Because I feel like they have to have time to digest the information.

**R: So maybe doing that one more time would help them.**

L: Maybe. Probably. Not just “Oh, I'll explain it to you, and you'll do a round of exercises and that' it.” I think that more exercises, more than a set of five sentences would be ideal.

**R: Uhum. Is it this idea of repeating it?**

L: Not repetition. But I divided it into two sets of exercises only because of the space. Because they had to write down each sentence...

**R: Oh... ok ok. It wouldn't fit on only one slide.**

L: Yes. And if I had only given them, like, five sentences I don't think it'd be enough.

**R: then... the last thing I remember... you worked with adverbs of frequency... and this is not in the unit, right?**

L: Yes, it is. I always use, as I mentioned in the questionnaire you sent me, I always use the book as a guide for the structures and vocabulary... so this very structural part I get from the book. Mostly... Not mostly... I always follow the book... but yeah... I'm not a hundred percent sure, but adverbs of frequency is something that is in the book. But the book has some exercises and explanations on... I think there are adverbs of frequency...

**R: But what I mean was like there wasn't a specific grammar focus session of the book in that unit about adverbs of frequency.**

L: Not that I remember. I know that the unit talks about frequency of activities. But I'm not sure about the use of adverbs of frequency.

**R: Ok...**

L: They say like... “once...” right? “twice”...

**R: Uhum.**

L: and there's a grammar focus that has something like that...

**R: I think you did it... maybe because when we talk about present perfect we have this idea of something that started in the past and still goes on... like... you do that repeatedly.. like “I've cleaned my house twice this week...”**

L: yes...

**R: Then you brought this whole explanation of adverbs of frequency. It was not suggested in the book, but you decided to bring it to them.**

L: Yeah. I don't know why (laughs).

**R: Yes. I was gonna ask you that.**

L: I think I saw exercises in the workbook that use these adverbs, because the last part of the unit focuses on present perfect and simple past. And when you use the simple past... at least in the exercises, most of the times you specify the frequency of some activities. So maybe that's why.

**R: ok. Got it. Can I say that your main focus in this class was grammar?**

L: yes. Absolutely.

**R: Did you do it on purpose? Can you tell me why?**

L: Because I see that when I explain something more explicitly, then I present other activities that are not as explicit, they get the idea more easily. They don't get frustrated.

**R: Ok, so you have like... an order in relation to how you do things.**

L: Yes.

**R: I mean, you prefer to present rules explicitly...**

L: yes...

**R: ... then they have conversation... some other activities in which they can talk... about it... using that grammar.**

L: yes.

**R: Ok.**

L: Because they... I don't know if... of course it changes, from class to class, but when I did the opposite, when I used to do the opposite in my other classes... they got really frustrated because they want to go through the grammar... structure already... they want to understand what's going on... they don't seem to like the idea of trying to grasp the concept from the conversation... they like to know what's happening. What's the structure. What's happening.

**R: Ok, ok...**

L: So when I present it to them, and then I use another activity where there's interpretation involved... then they get comfortable to understand the conversation, the context... At least that's the impression I have.

**R: So... now I wanna give you one idea... and I wanna know what you think about it... ok?**

L: Ok?

**R: Maybe... if you had, for example, after doing those activities that were more focused on grammar... Like, the one that called my attention the most was the last one. The one about adverbs of frequency. You had some sentences on the board, they were in the simple present, and I had to turn them into present perfect...**

L: yes.

**R: and... do you think that... well... the ideas of the sentences were not connected to the students, specifically.**

L: No, they were not.

**R: I remember one example... it was something like "Jane always cooks..." something like that.**

L: "Sarah never smiles"...

**R: Yep. What do you think of... if you could go back... and you did something like "Ok, I'm going to use sentences in the simple present that they can turn into present perfect... but to say meaningful things about them..." For example: You have like a "never... go to work". Or "never... study". And they had to use this idea, in the present perfect... I mean, turning the sentences in the simple present to present perfect, but to say something about them. For example "I haven't studied English this week". I mean... something connected to them... the students' answers. Their idea. Do you think it'd be better... or... it would have different outcomes? It'd be more meaningful? Any ideas on it?**

L: Yes, of course, I even thought about it when I was preparing the material... I usually get examples from other websites and stuff... and I don't... I don't make the extra effort to connect the sentences to their lives... or... to give examples even from my experience... I think it's one of the things I should... I agree with the idea of connecting the learning environment... the learning experience to their experience... I think it's... more profitable.

**R: Why do you think it's more profitable?**

L: Because people tend to relate more. When they relate to something, when they think of themselves doing something... or how they feel about something they learn more.

**R: Uhum...**

L: and it's something that I have to... pay attention more closely to... because... I don't know, I'm a little bit lazy...

**R: Ok... but do you consider that sometimes? Do you think of it sometimes? Or you just forget and they you're "oh... I forgot it..."**

L: Yeah, I just forget. It's something that it's not... within me... I know it's important, but when I prepare something I just wanna... I think more of the structure...

**R: ok...**

L: Than on... "how can I convey this and make it meaningful?"

**R: Ok...**

L: It's something that I have to actively... think of.

**R: and do you think it'd be good for you as a teacher to start considering that and think more about that?**

L: Yeah... I think it'd be a little extra work... in the beginning, because it's something I'm not used to...

**R: More time consuming?**

L: more time consuming maybe, at the beginning... because it's not something I think it is that different from getting examples from the internet, right? I can think of other examples... to to... I just have to think quickly of ways I can relate that structure or that idea to their lives.

**R: ok.**

L: It's not that difficult. It's just something that I have to pay attention to.

**R: ok...**

L: But I... I think it'd be more productive. To do that.

**R: Ok... Ok. I think that's it for today.**

L: I'm really happy with this because... as I said... most of the times I just prepare things. I know what's important... but I don't put the effort, you know? Sometimes I just think I'm lazy... (laughs)

**R: and do you think this "laziness" that you mentioned negatively impacts your work?**

L: Yes. Because I sometimes don't focus as much on their learning as I could. I think "no, I just have to... give them explanations... and examples... then they'll get it." No! It's not that simple. Then anyone could be a teacher. I don't believe that. I don't believe it's just me as an information holder. I have to think about the steps... and how they receive it... this is a back and forth situation. It's not something that I just present. So I think this is my biggest fault as a teacher. I really need to think critically about what I do.

**R: Thank God we have plenty of time to think about what we do (laughs).**

L: yesss.

#### Mediator-mediatee interaction 2

**R: So this is our second interview. Let's start it!**

L: Yes!

**R: So, just to start... at the beginning of the class, you did a review of unit 10. Can you tell me why?**

L: They asked me.

**R: Did you feel like they needed it?**

L: Yes, because I think that they still don't feel confident that they know what the present perfect is.

**R: Uhum...**

L: I think they know how to use it, but they didn't understand how or when...

**R: uhum...**

L: I know the review was really about structure, and I've tried to talk about the meanings and the uses of present perfect many times... and I did it during the explanation, during the correction of the review, but I still don't feel they get it.

**R: uhum.**

L: Because there's no such a thing in Portuguese.

**R: yeah, yeah, yeah, of course. So they asked you last class, then you prepared it.**

L: Because I said “I think today we can finish unit 10 and next class we can start unit 11. Do you feel confident?” and they answered no. Then I thought “No, let’s not continue this unit. It’s been going on for some classes already...” We didn’t necessarily have to continue it, then they said “so send us a review.”

**R: ok. Thanks. Then you started unit 11. You said “Do you think we can start unit 11 today? Do you know what unit 11 is about?”. You got no responses (laughs). Then you said “it’s about cities”.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then you had some slides with pictures on them... and you just like... you described those pictures. They were all related to cities, there were people in the streets etc... “This city is crowded, since there are many people...”. Why did you bring those slides?**

L: As I said, I like images. I think they convey a lot of meaning. It’s better to illustrate a conceR than to explain it. And the idea was to evoke, the, the... describing the image and then getting them to understand what the image means.

**R: ok, and the images were related to what they were going to see in unit 11, right?**

L: yes, yes.

**R: And you used some words they were going to use in the first activity of the book.**

L: Yes, yes.

**R: Can you tell me why you did it?**

L: I thought I’d be nice for them to see the ideas illustrated by the images, and I tried to make the images be a little contrasting to one another. So I could really get them to understand the conceR. It’s not just “Oh, an emRy city”. It was an emRy city, then a crowded street, so they could see the difference. And I brought the images to illustrate the conceRs because the book doesn’t have a lot of images. It only brings “beautiful” and “ugly”. The words and the images to illustrate them. And I think they are not familiar with most words. So how would they see the opposites?

**R: Got it. Then you brought more pictures.**

L: Yes.

**R: Ok. So... the manual says something like “Elicit adjectives that describe cities. Write them down on the board”. And what you did was – you brought the pictures, described them and elicited vocabulary, introducing new words to describe places...**

L: uhum...

**R: So you did it differently from the book, and there’s another thing that you didn’t do that the manual suggests and I wanna know if you considered that or not. The manual says “Elicit adjectives that describe cities.” You did that in a different way.... Using pictures. Then the manual suggests “write them on the board”. And you didn’t write them on the board while you were eliciting and introducing these new words to students. Did you consider that?**

L: I thought about it. And I thought about...not writing, because I think it wastes a lot of time, when I could just put the words on the slides together with the images. I thought about it, because I chose specific images and I had the names of the places. So they could situate themselves.

**R: ok.**

L: It’s not just an image. A random image. I thought about putting the name of the place, so they could identify it and like... create a context for the image. And then the adjectives that would describe the image.

**R: Uhum...**

L: But I don’t know. I thought about it... Maybe they’d pay attention to what I’m saying, in how to pronounce it. Then in the book they’d see the words.

**R: Ok.**

L: Maybe it would be good for me to write the words on the slides, but then I thought “no, maybe it’s better that I just say them. That I describe the places and they pay attention to the words, then identify these words in the exercise.”

**R: Can you think of any possible advantages of having written them down on the slides?**

L: Uhum. I think they’d remember more. I think that, ah... they would associate...

**R: Remember the meaning?**

L: The word itself. Because I used many words in the same picture. For example, I used “beautiful”, “clean”, and they also used other words... like the guy who said “flowers” (laughs)... so maybe if they had the words I really wanted to use to describe the image, maybe they would associate better.

**R: You mean... the sound and the word? Is that what you mean?**

L: No. I did this on purpose. So they could associate the sound without the word there on the board. Then when they got to the exercise they could relate. They could try to remember the sound, the word, and see it written. Maybe it was not the best idea. I don't know.

**R: Ok. I have some comments on it and I wanna know what you think about them. So English is not like... phonetically speaking, it's not a transparent language, you know?**

L: No, it's not.

**R: Like... in Portuguese if you say “porta”, you know how to spell it. But then if you say “cheap”, if you think of Portuguese, maybe they'd probably think it's “T – X – I...” like, to make this “cheap” sound...**

L: Uhum.

**R: You know? So maybe sometimes when you have this idea of writing words down on the board, or even when they ask you questions in class like “teacher, how do you say ‘água’ in English?”, maybe for these beginning levels it'd be nice to write the words on the board, because many times they cannot associate the sound to the word, you know? In this case, even though they'd see the words later, it wouldn't be at that moment, you know? They'd be like “oh, what she said before... in that picture... is it this word here?” you know?**

L: Uhum.

**R: So I think it'd be nice... I really like the way you introduced it, because the book doesn't give any ideas on that, it just asks you to elicit adjectives used to describe cities. So I like what you did. But I just think it'd be like... better for them to associate the sounds of the words to the words themselves. You could've just written them on the slides, or on the board...**

L: Yes. I thought about it, I should've done it.

**R: Does that make sense to you?**

L: Yeah, yeah. Just... sometimes I think of ways I can make them think more, but then it's the opposite... sometimes I try to be hard on them... but it doesn't work.

**R: What do you mean by “be hard on them”?**

L: hm... cause sometimes I think they're really... they want me to give them all the explanation. They don't try to see the context, for example. And try to understand what's being said... in conversations, for example, when they read after we listen to the conversation... for example, the sentence... ahmm... “She lived in... whatever... as a child.” Maybe it's not that hard for them to understand “as a child”. Cause it's something from a context, when they're talking about past.

**R: ok.**

L: So they ask... this is an example that really happened. They asked me “what does ‘as a child’ mean?” And I said “when she was a child. It's the same idea”. So I sometimes think they don't put the effort to understand something just because they don't know it. They can see from the context. I think. So I try to do these things and I sometimes confuse ideas...

**R: No, no problem, I'm just like showing you another possibility of something that... although I also don't like the way the book presents it. I think this part is valuable. Like, if you had the words written on the board/slide, so they could see how they're spelled.**

L: Uhum.

**R: thanks.**

L: Welcome.

**R: let me see... So now I wanna talk about the listening. So, they had a listening about “Puerto Rico”...**

L: Yes...

**R: and you said “so, let's listen to the conversation. Close your books.” First question: how do you think they felt about it? About the activity itself. I mean... do you think it was easy for them or not... how do you feel?**

L: They were really quiet. And that's not usual. I don't get it. I don't know why.



**R: They usually speak or ask questions?**

L: Yes, they normally listen to the conversation and I don't even need to ask something. I don't even need to elicit... I don't even need to say "oh, what words can you understand from the conversation?". I normally just ask, when they don't say anything "What is the conversation about?". Then they start saying things like "Oh, they're talking about food...". Right? So normally they say words that are really central to the ideas of the conversation. And they were really quiet. I don't know what happened. Maybe they didn't get the conversation.

**R: Uhum.**

L: Maybe it was a difficult one.

**R: Uhum.**

L: But I don't know. As I saw they didn't understand, probably... or they were just quiet, I asked them to say the words they could understand so then we could get the idea from the words.

**R: got it. Ok. So then you asked them what they understood from the conversation, right? And whenever they said something, you wrote the words down on the board.**

L: Yeah.

**R: then you went through the meanings of the words with the whole group.**

L: Yes.

**R: Do you think like... they could've learned something new only by listening to it?**

L: Only by listening?

**R: Yes.**

L: I don't know, because they were really quiet. I don't know what they got from the conversation.

**R: Ok, because I felt like you went straight to it...**

L: yeah.

**R: You know? And they didn't know what it was about. You know what I mean?**

L: Uhum.

**R: You went straight to it while you, in my opinion, you could've told them that the listening was about "Puerto Rico" and they'd listen to two people talking about something... you know?**

L: Hm... yeah...

**R: The manual gives you some suggestions... I'm not saying that the manual/book is God, I just wanna know what you think about this, that's why I always compare...**

L: Uhum.

**R: The manual says "Set the scene. Erick is asking Carmen about her hometown, San Juan, in Puerto Rico..." And you didn't do that.**

L: No.

**R: Can you tell me why?**

L: Because I don't usually read the suggestions of the book. As I said, I use the vocabulary and the structures of the unit as a guide, and I try to have my own class. I don't usually follow these instructions. But I think I should (laughs).

**R: Why do you think you should?**

L: (laughs) Cause I think they're valuable. I'm starting to see it... how they could help me, right?

**R: How do you think that this idea of like... setting the scene could've helped you?**

L: They would... Because when we don't know what something is about, there are a lot of possibilities. When you narrow it down (laughs), alright? You can narrow down the possibilities of vocabulary... and you can imagine the scenario, right? So, as you said... I jumped straight to the conversation with no context.

**R: So here in the manual you also have some focus questions like. After having them listen to something more general, you have "write the following questions on the board. Weather: is it ok or great?" etc. Then they'd have to listen to these specific details about the conversation. As you said, they'd focus their attention on something.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Have you ever heard of "gist" and "listening for details"?**

L: Yeah. When you look for specific words in a text or listening passage.

**R: That'd be listening for details. And have you ever heard of gist?**

L: No.

**R: It's like the general idea.**

L: Oh, yeah, yeah.

**R: So we have the idea of students listening for gist, which is the main idea... For example "So they're talking about Puerto Rico. Are they talking about beaches or food?"**

L: yes, yes.

**R: Then you have focus questions, listening for details, which would be these other examples I gave you. So maybe this would help them understand what's going on. Also, when they know what it is about they just activate previous knowledge...**

L: yes...

**R: there's another suggestion in the manual related to this idea... it says "What do you know about Puerto Rico? Where is it? What is it like? Do you know anything about it?" So maybe they knew something about it that would help them if they shared with the whole group... Ten might not know, but one may know, you know?**

L: Yes.

**R: So they'd just like share the information with the whole group, and it would help them activate previous knowledge on that topic, and this would make it easier for them to listen to it, to understand the ideas...**

L: yeah... and to engage. "Why is it important? Why Puerto Rico?" It could be any place.

**R: Yes. Great. Does that make sense to you?**

L: Yeah, a lot.

**R: Yes? Ok. Thanks.**

L: Thank YOU (laughs).

**R: I know how hard it is for us. Sometimes we look back at things and we're like "oh My God, I didn't think about that."**

L: I feel dumb all the time... in a good way.

**R: But that's...**

L: I feel dumb, and I know I have to improve and it's not that difficult, I just need to focus.

**R: uhum...**

L: I need to think.

**R: Taking time to do that is very profitable. Ok... let me see what we have next... Well, you told them, I don't know if you remember, you told them what the listening was about after they had listened to it.**

L: Yeah.

**R: yes.**

L: (laughs).

**R: Is there any reasons for that?**

L: No. it's just... My crazy idea. (laughs)

**R: no problem.**

L: That was not planned. And I – I made some mistakes. I think you noticed them. About the... describing another place that's not Floripa... I made some mistakes.

**R: ok. Let's see later on if I have something written down. Well, I just wanna say something else. It's about this part, and about the beginning of the unit. How you started it. So as a manner to introduce the unit you said "Do you know what unit eleven is about? It's about cities." Then you opened the presentation.**

L: Yes.

**R: And here, in the listening, you said "let's listen to the conversation." Then you played it.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok? In none of them you contextualized what was about to happen.**

L: Not at all. It was just a class.

**R: Like, the first one... "do you know what unit 11 is about? It's about cities." That wouldn't be really contextualizing, right?**

L: No.

**R: This doesn't give them.. like... "what about cities?" "Are we gonna talk about how big they are? Are we gonna talk about beautiful cities?" you know?**

L: Uhum.

**R: And something that called my attention is that in your questionnaire you said that contextualization is something important. You said something about that.**

L: BUT I DON'T DO THAT (nervous laughs)

**R: have you seen that before?**

L: What?

**R: That you haven't been doing that?**

L: Yes.

**R: And do you still think it's important?**

L: Yes. Yes (almost whispering).

**R: Can you elaborate a bit more on that? like, why do you think it's important? If you could go back, would you try to contextualize the activities?**

L: Yes. As I said. I'm really lazy. I try to just plan my class and deliver it.

**R: Uhum.**

L: Right? But I don't think of the details. And how they could be improved.

**R: uhum.**

L: It's a process.

**R: yes, of course it is. That's why we're here.**

L: I'm really ashamed because...

**R: No, you don't need to be ashamed.**

L: No, it's something I'm conscious of, but it's... Whyyyy? Why don't I change it?

**R: But it's already good that you see it. You know?**

L: Yeah.

**R: Then, there's this other activity... The second part of the first activity. Pair work. "Choose two places you know to describe to your partner, using the words..." You didn't do it, but then at the end you did something similar.**

L: Uhum.

**R: You had them get together and describe Floripa, after presenting some slides about your hometown.**

L: That was the mistake (laughs).

**R: So I wane know why. And then you had them in groups to talk about Floripa. Where is the mistake?**

L: The chronology. I should've shown them the images of my city before the other conversation activity. Because we were talking about Floripa all the time, right? I was showing the images and asking "Oh, do you think Floripa is like this? Beautiful..." etc, so we were – at least I thought – we were all the time relating those images with Florianopolis, which is something we all have knowledge about.

**R: uhum...**

L: and then, the idea was to use those adjectives to describe Floripa, in their opinion. Maybe each of them would describe it in different ways, maybe they would have different ideas... and then... I should've shown the images of Teresina, to make them think about other places.

**R: Because that's what the final activity was about.**

L: YESS! (effusively)

**R: To describe a different place.**

L: Yes. I just rushed it.

**R: So why do you think it'd be better to have presented the pictures about Teresina before that final activity?**

L: Because then they would see an example from another place, a specific place, and they'd take their minds away from Floripa. Because the previous activity was about describing Floripa, and I'd show another place, and they'd think "oh, I'm from another place. I can describe it using this, and those words..."

**R: You would be modeling , right?**

L: YESSS! (effusively)

**R: What they'd have to do.**

L: That was the idea. It was what I had planned, but I rushed.

**R: but that's what you thought of? That's what you had planned?**

L: Yes, that's my plan.

**R: It was just a matter of managing things.**

L: Yes. I just rushed it.

**R: Ok. And do you see how this modeling is important?**

L: yes.

**R: can you think of any other contexts in which it'd be helpful to model activities?**

L: hm... for example, in another class, with another group... we were talking about prices, what we think about prices, like "oh, that's expensive, or reasonable...". I think in this case, before you have a pair activity in which they have to use the vocabulary to talk about these things, it's good to have a model. These kinds of activities where they have vocabulary but not a lot of interaction.

**R: ok.**

L: Before they do the conversation. I think it's very important. That they have a model. How to start the conversation. How to connect the vocabulary... how to form sentences...

**R: so they understand what they have to do...**

L: yeah! Not just "expensive... price" they have to know how to deal with this.

**R: So another questions related to that... did you notice that you didn't model the first activity? The one in which they had to match the words with opposite meanings. The book doesn't treat it as "modeling" but it says "Explain the task and elicit the first example." Then you'd do the first example with them, so you'd model what they'd have to do.**

L: Uhum.

**R: You just said "So guys... you just have to match the words in column A with their opposites in column b". Then they did it. In this part (R shows the activity to L).**

L: uhum.

**R: Maybe some of them understand, but some of them don't.**

L: Yeah.

**R: That's why like... as you said for the final activity. It's very important. You know? You know what it is, you've done it, I think it'd just nice for you to remember this is important... also in other situations... as you just said, you just described a similar situation.**

L: uhum.

**R: because sometimes, I don't know if this happens to you, we teachers are like "oh, this is very easy to understand, what they have to do..."**

L: Yes, I thought it was easy.

**R: But sometimes it's not. You know? So modeling would not guarantee, but it'd at least help explain what they have to do.**

L: Yes.

**R: Do you agree with me?**

L: Yes, but I think maybe, another alternative would be, as I did in a previous group, the same activity I asked them to make a drawing of the conceRs... of all the conceRs... in pairs... then I asked for examples of ideas and then I draw on the board the images they chose to represent these conceRs. So maybe, instead of presenting a model, I could have the idea represented by images, so the group would kind of get the same feeling. I don't know (laughs). What do you think?

**R: I think you'd be dealing with vocabulary. But not with the idea of what they'd have to do with that vocabulary, you know?**

L: Oh... so... so the idea of modeling for the exercise itself.

**R: yes.**

L: What they should do.

**R: Yes. Yes.**

L: I don't know. I don't know.

**R: cause when you model, you just like give them one example of what they have to do...**

L: yeah...

**R: Cause sometimes when you just explain, when you read the directions of the exercise... for example, the directions say “Match each word in column A with its opposite in column B.” Let’s pretend you said “So, guys... you have two columns... you just have to match these words here, to their opposites in the other column. Ok?” Maybe, even by doing that some of them may not understand... and I’m not only talking about your students, ok?**

L: Hm...

**R: I’m talking about students in general. So this idea of modeling would show them what they have to do. We use English as the means of instruction... we give instructions in English, and maybe adding this modeling would help them see in practice what they have to do. This would be nice... and that’s basically... at least from what you said, your intent when you showed them pictures of Teresina. They’d see you describing it, and be like “Oh, that’s what I have to do...”**

L: uhum...

**R: Sometimes you explain... “Oh, now I want you to write about two other cities...” and then do you remember that one of the groups wrote about one city?**

L: They didn’t get the idea.

**R: They didn’t get the idea.**

L: Because they didn’t have the model. But... I’m sorry to disagree, but...

**R: no, feel free...**

L: I think it’s not necessary... they have a lot of these kinds of exercises... matching columns...

**R: Uhum...**

L: I know sometimes I rush, but in this case I don’t see why.

**R: no problem. But you understand this idea of modeling, right?**

L: yeah, yeah. Sometimes it seems that it’s not important, but I should pay attention to it.

**R: Some food for thought.**

#### Mediator-mediatee interaction 3

**R: So this is out third interview, and as usual, I just wanna ask you some questions about your class. So, the first activity you did with them was the listening on page 74. Then you said “Now we’re going to talk about specific places. So, listen to these people, they’re talking about their hometowns... If they are big, if they are interesting...” Then you showed students these specific characteristics they had to pay attention to. That’s how you did it.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Hm... Can you tell me how you felt about it? If you felt like they understood what they had to do... if it was ok for you... Like, if the activity developed the way you expected it to...**

L: Yeah. If I’m not mistaken they understood, and they looked for the details in the conversation, and they got the idea. Yeah.

**R: And do you think you did anything different if you compare this listening activity to the one from last week, in the class that I observed?**

L: Oh, my memory is very bad, but I’m sure... well, I’m not sure, but it’s probably different...

**R: Uhum...**

L: Because this time I followed the manual’s instructions.

**R: Which were?**

L: Elicit... not elicit... contextualize the conversation, say people are talking about their hometowns. Then I said their names...

**R: Uhum...**

L: So I gave, hm, a context before I “Oh, let’s listen to this conversation”, as I usually do.

**R: Ok. And why did you decide to do that?**

L: I really got excited to follow the manual’s instructions and see what happens.

**R: Uhum...**

L: And I really think there’s some good advice there I should follow.

**R: Ok. Nice. Thanks. Hm... So, you basically contextualized, set the scene, doing what the book suggested.**

L: Yes.

**R: Ok. And do you see the advantages of doing that?**

L: Yeah! Absolutely!

**R: Can you tell me a little bit about them?**

L: Basically I see two advantages: people, they visualize better, they can imagine the scene better if they know what the conversation is going to be about, so they prepare themselves, right? They already have an idea of what will happen. And they care more.

**R: Uhum...**

L: They may be motivated to listen to the conversation if they know what it is about.

**R: Ok. Can I say they pay more close attention to it?**

L: Yes, yes.

**R: Ok...**

L: Specially when I give the... not only the context, but when I say what they have to look for...

**R: Uhum...**

L: ... in the conversation, not just the contextualization.

**R: Uhum. Do you think this makes it easier for them?**

L: Yes. Yes. They don't get lost. They know what to look for.

**R: Yes, cause they know what to look for. They focus more. Ok. Thank you. Like, you basically had them listen for the details, right?**

L: Yes...

**R: To focus...**

L: ... that was the objective.

**R: ok. Nice. Thanks. Then you went to the other activity... Oh, the snapshot. It was about six popular cities and some sites and events.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Then you said "So now we're going from their hometowns to different places." Then you had students close their books, which is something that the manual suggests, right?**

L: Yes.

**R: And you wrote down names of cities on the board and questions. The questions were "Would you like to visit them or not? Why?"**

L: Yes.

**R: And this is the manual's suggestion.**

L: Yes.

**R: Right? And you had students think about them. You had students think about their answers before sharing their ideas.**

L: Yes.

**R: And this is not a books suggestion. Can you tell me why you did this? Why you followed the book's instructions, and why you did this part a little bit differently.**

L: Because I see when they interact, not just doing things individually, they may have more information that... for example, there were some cities that most people didn't know, like Jakarta. And some people had similar opinions on Paris, for example, and as some people had the idea that Beijing would be a terrible place to go, another student had Beijing as the first place, the most desired place to go, so maybe if they got together to discuss they could not only get the information that maybe individually they wouldn't, but they could see things from different perspectives.

**R: OK.**

L: So they could change their ideas on what could be interesting to do in those places.

**R: Ok, I understand. But why did you have them think about these things individually, before having them talk to each other? Because first you had them think about these things individually...**

L: yes. I don't know why (laughs).

**R: No idea?**

L: No idea.

**R: Ok. No problem.**

L: Maybe to contrast their individual ideas with the group's.

**R: Ok. Cause sometimes when they are... when they have to talk about something, and they first thing about it, it helps them prepare themselves to talk to the other people, right?**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: So this is like, something that I particularly like doing.**

L: Uhum.

**R: So just another thing... then, just to compare to what you... cause you did some things suggested in the manual, but you changed some of them a little bit. Basically, what the manual suggests is to write the six countries from the snapshot on the board, ask them which countries they'd like to visit or not, then have students open their books, read the snapshot and elicit or explain any new vocabulary. Then students would have to complete the tasks individually, and discuss their answers in small groups. You did this before showing the snapshot. Is there any reason for that?**

L: No reason.

**R: No?**

L: No, absolutely no reason (laughs). That was unconscious.

**R: Ok, it was unconscious. And do you think it'd be different, you'd have a different outcome if you did this after students had seen the snapshot, with the specific places?**

L: You mean, saying if they'd like to visit...

**R: yeah.**

L: Uhum, totally. Because they'd be, they'd probably connect the idea with those suggestions. So, for example, Orlando is really famous and most people already know that it's famous because of Disney, but one of the students didn't say Disney, she said "amusement parks", because there are more amusement parks than Disney. So, maybe, if they got exposed to these ideas, they wouldn't develop other interests.

**R: Cause on the board you wrote down... They wouldn't develop, you said?**

L: Yeah.

**R: Cause you wrote down on the board the countries and the cities, but not the specific places that the snapshot presents.**

L: Yeah. I wanted to elicit their knowledge on these places.

**R: So, you wanted them to get ideas of places and things they could see by considering the country and the city. Not limiting to these specific places.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Ok, nice. Thanks. And at the beginning of this activity, you did a very similar thing that you did in the first activity. In the first activity you said "so, we're going to talk about specific places...", telling students what they were going to see and do...**

L: uhum.

**R: ... and in the second activity you said "so, now we're going from their hometowns to different places", then you wrote down the names of the places on the board. Ok? Can you tell me why you did this?**

L: This transition?

**R: Yes.**

L: Not to be abrupt. Because I tend to do this.

**R: uhum...**

L: and I think it's good to have a transition, not to just say "oh, let's see this conversation..."

**R: You mean a link between one and the other?**

L: Yeah. Because we're talking about places.

**R: Uhum.**

L: So there's... there are some ways to connect the different activities. One is about hometown, so I should, now I feel I should have a transition between different aspects of the same theme. You know?

**R: Can I ask you why?**

L: Because I saw how it would break their concentration, it would like feel artificial if I didn't have a transition, if I didn't explain even when it's kind of subliminal. If I didn't make a connection between some things, right? It'd feel artificial.

**R: Ok. Cause this idea of like, connecting things, I think it's very good because also... it doesn't break the flow of the class, right?**

L: Yeah, yeah...

**R: They know what's happening, that now they're going to see something else, which is connected to that, but it's a little bit different. So you create a sort of pace, rhythm, right?**

L: Yes.

**R: Nice. Ok... then... oh, you asked students in the same activity, it's also one of the manual's suggestion, they had to... not the manual's suggestion, it's in the activity, students had to classify like "Which places would you like to visit? Put the places you'd like to visit in order, from most interesting to least interesting." Ok?**

L: Yeah.

**R: Then you explained it to them, and do you remember what you did after that? After explaining?**

L: I asked the trios their classification.

**R: Ok, but before that you did something else. You showed them how to do it.**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: You were like "So, the first one for me would be this one..."**

L: Yeah, I gave them the example.

**R: "... the last one would be this one." So you gave an example. You just modeled how they should do it.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok? Do you see it as something important?**

L: Yes.

**R: Yes? Because remember that in our last interview we talked about it, we had this conversation in relation to it...**

L: Yeah.

**R: So, do you think it really helps them?**

L: It helps, but in this case I don't think they did what I asked. Because they didn't say the least... they only said the first and the last. So I just asked "What is the first? What is the last?". I didn't see them coming up with a list of classification.

**R: Uhum, yeah. So maybe you could've just... maybe for next time, just show them the other possibilities. "For me, first would be Orlando, second would be this one, the third..." You know?**

L: Yes, yes.

**R: Just put the numbers in each of them.**

L: Yes.

**R: Cause I think sometimes we think something is so simple...**

L: no, it's not.

**R: ... that it's very basic, but sometimes they don't understand.**

L: Right.

**R: Thanks. Ok, then after that you had them, in trios, think about another place they'd like to visit. There's a question in the same activity which asks "What three other places in the world would you like to visit and why?". Ok? Then, you did it, but a little bit differently. You just asked them to think about one different place they'd like to visit and why. Then you had them share their ideas with the class. Can you tell me why you changed it a little bit?**

L: Because of time. I saw they researched instead of thinking of the places, so time was flying and I couldn't... I didn't see a big reason to elicit three different places, so maybe one for each group would be enough.

**R: Ok. I figured it was time. So, then you went to the listening activity about Mexico city. You said "now, guys, we have this other listening, there's Elena and Thomas a specific place, a specific city, and I want you to pay attention to what the place is."**



L: yes.

**R: Then you played the listening. Can you tell me why you introduced it this way?**

L: Because the first question, according to the book's suggestion, is "What place are they talking about?"

**R: ok.**

L: So I thought it'd be interesting, because it's a... it's an introduction to kind of a different subtheme in the unit, it's uh... activities, things to do... so I thought it'd be more... it'd be easier to follow the manual's instructions, and just have them pay attention to the place people are talking about.

**R: Ok, you were like limiting what they had to pay attention to.**

L: Yeah, because there are other names of places within the place people are talking about. So maybe it'd be confusing.

**R: Nice... so basically, this is a more general idea, right?**

L: Right.

**R: Remember we talked about gist last interview?**

L: Yes, yes.

**R: That's basically it, right?**

L: Yeah.

**R: They were just listening for the gist, which is the most general part, the big picture.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok, then after students listened to the passage, you wrote on the board... you said "Guys, I want you to pay attention to places you can visit and things you can do in Mexico City."**

L: Yes.

**R: So they had to pay attention to these two things. Then you played it again and students answered the questions. And it's different from the manual's suggestion, because it suggests asking them "What's the Palace of Fine Arts?"**

L: Really?

**R: "How are the paintings at the museum?". I'm not saying that the book is right and you're wrong, I just wanna know why. "How many free things does Selena recommend?". But you asked them to pay attention to places people can visit and things they can do there. Why?**

L: I don't know (laughs). I'm terrible at decisions...

**R: no problem.**

L: ... because I do most of them unconsciously. I don't know, it'd be simpler just to... for them to identify the things that she suggests, than paying attention to both the places she mentions and how they are characterized. That's what the manual suggests, right?

**R: Yeah.**

L: I, I get it. The idea for me was to make them think of the places and the other places like "Palace of Fine Arts" as things to do and places to go, in the same category. Not just the characterization.

**R: Of each of these places specifically.**

L: Yes, because the idea of this part is "suggestions", "things you can do", so I think it'd be more interesting not to characterize those places but to think of them as categories of things to do, places to go.

**R: Ok. Nice. And do you think that what you did is similar to what they suggest here?**

L: Similar, but from a different perspective.

**R: What do you mean?**

L: As I said, to think of these places as belonging to a category of things to do and places to go, I think it's more useful than giving the characteristics of these places. Because the unit and this part talk about suggestions and possibilities of activities.

**R: So you were already focusing their attention on that.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok. And you were also being specific, right?**

L: Yeah.

**R: You were giving them specific things to focus on.**

L: Yeah.

**R: We can say it's pretty much similar to the manual's suggestions...**

L: yeah, yeah.

**R: ... you just changed them a little bit.**

L: Just a perspective.

**R: Ok. Nice. Then, when you got to the grammatical explanation, you just had students... you said "guys, pay attention to the way they are giving suggestions...", then you went over the ideas, the listening, and the grammar box. This is different from what the manual suggests. Can you tell me why?**

L: I don't even remember what the manual suggests.

**R: It says "focus students' attention on the conversation. How does Thomas ask for advice about Mexico City? Write this question on the board..." Well, you kinda did this, the first part, but you didn't write "you should definitely visit... you shouldn't miss... you can...". You just showed them the conversation." Any thoughts on that?**

L: It's just that they've had just seen the conversation, they'd be more familiar with the context, and how they could use these structures to ask for suggestions or give possibilities. Simpler. Easier to understand.

**R: Ok. So last thing is... students did activity A, and you explained what they had to do, and you had them do it in pairs. The manual suggests having students do it individually, and you had them do it in pairs. Can you tell me why?**

L: Because I think when a person doesn't understand really well, they can help each other.

**R: Then you had them do it together.**

L: Yes.

**R: I understand. I also do that in my classes. And you did one thing here (referring to the Snapshot) that you didn't do in this activity (the current one – grammar). In the Snapshot, remember you told them "so for me, Disney would be the first one" etc... And here (the current activity) you had them do it, ok, but you didn't give the first example.**

L: Yeah, I didn't.

**R: Was it conscious?**

L: No. It was just times constraint (laughs). I was really in a rush.

**R: No problem. You just didn't think about it at that time?**

L: Yes. I forgot it.

**R: The book says "model the first conversation with the students..."**

L: I have a problem with modeling. I'm not used to it. I'm trying to consciously do it.

**R: But do you think it's good?**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah. It's good.

**R: Can you tell me, in your words, why you think it's good?**

L: Because then there's no doubt. What they should do. I can, not only explain the conceR and have them do the exercise with no guidance, I can show them how it works before they actually do it.

**R: ok. Just a final question, do you think your understanding of how the book and the manual work is getting clearer to you?**

L: Yes, absolutely.

**R: Can you give me examples?**

L: Contextualization before... specially before conversations. Before listening activities. I never did that before having these interviews and you pointing me how important it was for them to have contextualization, now when I read the book's instruction I really consider them... I really consider what the effect on my students minds would be when I give examples or when I contextualize... most of these things that I used to think were unnecessary, dispensable, now they're not.

**R: It's nice, right? To take the time to think about these things, reconsider them...**

L: yes...

**R: There's contextualizing, modeling...**

L: Yeah, I really thought it was unnecessary. I thought it was too easy for them... it was in my mind, my view of things that was taking me to these kinds of rushed activities, but now I see the importance.

**R: What did you do that helped you see this?**

L: These interviews. And when I started doing it, I saw how much easier it became for them, to understand and to get engaged. Specially to get engaged.

**R: Oh, you saw that? In practice?**

L: In practice. Not only in this class, in my other class. I see how differently they react when I do a listening activity. They get engaged, really easily.

**R: Nice. Would you like to comment on anything else?**

L: Just that I'm really happy.

**R: Nice! (laughs)**

L: Really, I'm really happy. I think I'm improving a lot.

**R: It's really nice to hear that. It's really nice to have someone I see is committed... I see that you want to think about what you do, and this is very nice. Cause it's our profession, right? It demands us to constantly think about what we do, right?**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: Usually we don't take the time and we don't have the time to think about these things...**

L: But some things, such as modeling and contextualization... they don't take time at all. They're just details we have to consciously... you know? You have to enforce on yourself... this idea of... it's more pedagogical if you do that. It's no effort once you do that.

**R: One you understand that you do that...**

L: The importance.

**R: The importance. It becomes, like... you were not used to doing that, but then it becomes something "ordinary", "normal" to you, right?**

L: Yes.

#### Mediator-mediatee interaction 4

**R: So, yesterday you started unit 12, which is about health problems. Do you remember how you started the lesson?**

L: Yeah. I told them that the unit was about health problems (laughs). Then I showed them the illustrations with the names of the health problems, then I asked them the kinds of health problems they had recently.

**R: Uhum. You went through all of them, then you asked students these questions.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Can you tell me why you did it this way?**

L: Because the book has these instructions, these suggestions, and I followed them. Not all of them but I followed the main idea.

**R: The beginning is a little bit different. You said "So, are you ready to start a new unit? So, this one's about health problems." Then you opened the first page of the unit.**

L: Uhum.

**R: The manual suggests "Books closed. Elicit common health problems from the class and write them on the board." You didn't do it. Can you tell me why?**

L: I don't have a reason for that, but when I read the book's suggestions I just thought "Hmmm... maybe this won't be as productive as I imagine...". Not that I underestimate my students, but sometimes they don't want to say anything at the start of the class. So I just ignored it.

**R: Ok. So then, you just said "This unit's about health problems."**

L: Yeah.

**R: By doing this... did you have any intentions?**

L: Maybe for them to prepare themselves for the vocabulary that would be connected to this idea. Basically.

**R: Ok. And do you think it'd be enough just to tell them "So, this unit's about health problems"?**

L: No, maybe... If I followed the manual's suggestions, maybe I'd get something, but I just chose to ignore it.

**R: uhum. Ok. Because I wanna make sure... For example, when you said it "So, this unit's about health problems", like you told them what it was about...**

L: uhum...

**R: But you... Do you think you gave a context or not?**

L: No, I didn't.

**R: Can you see that?**

L: Yes.

**R: Can you tell me what you could've done to give them a context?**

L: Hm... Maybe if I inverted the order, because I showed them a video about cold and suggestions for a cold. I saved it for later, because I wanted to work with the suggestions that people gave on the health problem. Maybe if I showed them a video, or something about health problems, common health problems, before I started the unit, then I think it'd be more interesting.

**R: I agree.**

L: Bring contextualization.

**R: Why do you think it'd be more interesting? Why do you think it'd be, in this case, contextualization?**

L: Then they'd immerse themselves more in the context, then just me saying "Oh, this is a new unit and it's about health problems". I didn't create an environment of immersion for them. It was just another unit. And I was aware of it.

**R: You were aware of it?**

L: Yes. When I do these kinds of things I'm like "yeah, I f\*cked it up".

**R: But like... were you aware of it when you planned or when you did it.**

L: When I did it.

**R: When it happened you...**

L: Yeah!

**R: Did you think about it, like "Oh, God..."**

L: Yeah... I just... There was a... I don't know if it was the second class... you told me during the interview that I just skipped the contextualization of a conversation, so every time I present something I think about the contextualization. I shouldn't just present it as a unit, I should create an environment of natural learning, right?

**R: Nice. Because you... I'd say that you kind of set the scene. You know what I mean? By saying "this one's about health problems"... and when I saw it I was like "it could be about 'cancer', 'aids'..." things like that, you know, very serious health problems...**

L: (surprised face).

**R: And it wasn't. Maybe if you had just... well, the manual suggests "Elicit common health problems from the class and write them on the board.", because it was about these common health problems, like not the ones I just mentioned...**

L: Yes... uhum..

**R: So maybe if you had done something like this you could've narrowed down the topic...**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**R: or... I really like the suggestion you gave, like showing the video first, then you could set the scene for the video "So guys, we're going to watch a video about this guy who has some health problems, do you know what health is?" Because, sometimes, some of them may not know what health is.**

L: I didn't pay attention to that. It was something that completely just "ooooosh" (shaking her hands).

**R: I'm not saying that you should've followed the book. You could've done what you suggested, like showing the video and explaining what it is about... "Do you know what health problems are?" "We have serious health problems and more common ones... Do you have any examples?" Then you'd be eliciting from them.**

L: uhum. Then I could play the video with two different purposes. The first one with the specific objective of knowing what problem he was talking about, then the suggestions. Right?

**R: Uhum. Maybe you could've used the video to contextualize the unit, then you'd go through the unit, like opening the first page and saying "so, we have some examples here..." and in the video that you used, there are some things that the unit covers, right?**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: So they would already, like... go to the book knowing some stuff.**

L: But I think this video wouldn't be ok, because they spend a lot of time talking about suggestions, not vocabulary... They'd probably have more questions than paying attention to the cold itself. So maybe another video.

**R: yes, yes, I agree. I'm sorry. What I meant was... another video, with those problems... or pictures depicting people with those problems...**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**R: Can you see that?**

L: Yeah. Absolutely.

**R: I just wanted to make sure you're not confusing the idea of contextualization with saying "So, unit 12 is about health problems, have a look at it." Cause you see that it's different...**

L: Yes.

**R: Like, doing this is vague... too brief...**

L: Yeah, it's not contextualization. It's just... a statement.

**R: Ok. Then, the second thing I wanna talk to you about is... for the listening you had students close their books, and you asked them to look at the image, and "What do you see here?". And it's the picture of a guy who's got a cold, who's at work, there's a woman standing right next to him with her hands on her waist, looking at him. Then you asked them "What do you see here?" Then a student answered "a cold". And you asked "do you think he's feeling good? Where are they? Look at her. What do you think she's doing? What's the context?" These are your own exact words. What was your intention?**

L: It was the contextualization. I wanted them to imagine the situation from the image. Also elicit some words and... there were some tissues on the scene, right? And I wanted them to imagine the workplace, because it was a specific situation at workplace. And this had a lot to do with the conversation itself, because there's the vocabulary related to work... "colleague", "coworker"... so "You shouldn't be working, you should be at home..." Something like that. I think they needed to imagine the situation at workplace.

**R: Was this a manual's suggestion?**

L: Yes.

**R: So I just wanna call your attention to one thing. I don't know if you noticed, but the book suggests "Elicit or explain vocabulary. Have students look at the picture. Ask Ss 'What health problem do you think Craig has? How do you know that?'. And you asked different questions.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Which is something that I really liked. Like, you did what the book suggested, but you were like "so, look at him. Do you think he's feeling good? Where are they? Look at her. What do you think she's doing?" Because it's about giving suggestions...**

L: Yes.

**R: And I remember that one of the students said "maybe giving suggestions... advice..."**

L: uhuh.

**R: So I really like the way you played with the suggestions. You used them, but on your own way. You changed the questions, that's very nice.**

L: Thanks. I try to do that. In the beginning I was really overconfident, I didn't follow the manual's suggestions at all. I always tried to reinvent the wheel, but now I follow the instructions with my own ideas.

**R: I particularly like that very much.**

L: Thanks.

**R: I don't want you to feel like I only see problems...**

L: Nah, I don't feel like that.

**R: So, still in the same activity, you asked them these questions, they gave their opinion, and you said "So, I'm gonna play the conversation'." You started playing it, and you stopped, suddenly, and wrote some questions on the board.**

L: Yeah, I forgot.

**R: What happened?**

L: I always have my scriR, now I have it. Because now I follow what the book suggests. It is something I don't have it... I don't have it inside me, right?

**R: Uhum.**

L: Like, I try to follow my scriR, to remember the steps, so I just rushed to the conversation. I did the contextualization, but I rushed to the interpretation of the conversation itself. But I didn't write the questions on the board. Because I've noticed, and you pointed out too, that sometimes it's good to write, because they don't fully comprehend what I say if I just say it. I forgot about it, then I remembered and wrote it.

**R: Then you stopped the listening to do that.**

L: Yes.

**R: So, let me see...**

L: If I didn't do that, they would have no... They wouldn't have something specific to focus on, right? So I think it'd be helpful to have these guiding questions.

**R: This pre-listening.**

L: Yes.

**R: Then you wrote down the questions on the board and said "we have an idea of what's happening, but let's check." This is very nice, before you asked those questions to students they could make predictions, which also helps them with listening, right? It's also a pre-listening strategy, to have them... like... "It seems to be a cold, but it can be the flu... we don't know...". In the conversation, the man could say to the woman at the end "oh, in fact it's the flu, but I don't wanna miss work..." something like that.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then, part B says "Listen to advice from two other coworkers. What do they suggest?". You explained it... the book suggests "Read the task and focus question." You did it. And "ask students to make predictions". You didn't do it. Was it conscious?**

L: I don't see why. Maybe if I got the idea of why we'd try to make predictions.

**R: uhum...**

L: But the book already says that they're more... that their colleagues would give more advice. What could I predict from that? I don't know. Maybe I'm being ignorant (laughs).

**R: No, don't say that.**

L: But I don't get why I'd ask them that.

**R: You know when you ask them to have a look at the pictures and imagine what's happening?**

L: Yes.

**R: Sometimes you ask them to predict what's happening...**

L: Uhum.

**R: Hm... for example, in this case you have "Listen to advice from two other coworkers". They already know, by now, what his problem is...**

L: Yes.

**R: Maybe one of the students would say something that is in the listening, in this part B, so this would help them better understand it.**

L: Yeahhh... (effusively)

**R: You know what I mean? Maybe a student could've said "Oh, drink some water...", and this would be in the listening so they'd understand it better, or... I'm not saying that they didn't understand, but making predictions can help them foresee something, helping them activate previous knowledge so they already think about it when they listen to the passage. So it might help them "oh, that's it." Or "Oh, I got it right, nice."**

L: Uhum.

**R: Something that is also nice about it is that when their predictions are correct, they feel like they got something right, you know?**

L: Yeah.

**R: Like "Oh, I participated, I was able to predict what would happen, in English..." you know?**

L: Yeah...

**R: This is nice for their...**

L: Confidence.

**R: Yes. Their confidence.**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: What do you think about it?**

L: I agree with that. It's just that I don't think about it (laughs)...

**R: No problem, we're here to think about it.**

L: Yes, yes. I didn't see it that way, I just thought it was a dull question.

**R: Can you see it now?**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: Then... you went through the grammar box. You showed it to students and said "Here we have the structures people used in the conversation". Then you started explaining it, giving other examples and using the ones in the grammar box.**

L: Uhum.

**R: It's different from the manual. You just pointed straight to the grammar focus... Why?**

L: Instead of?

**R: Instead of...**

L: Going back to the conversation?

**R: Maybe... yes... The manual suggests "Books closed. Write these sentences on the board: You should get a lot of rest; You should eat garlic soup. Point out that these sentences give suggestions"... etc. Like... doing something else before going through the grammar box. Maybe, as you said, going back to the conversation...**

L: Yeah. My initial idea was to go back to the conversation and point. And think I did that. Didn't I? After the conversation, before going through the structures...

**R: You pointed it once, but not when you were explaining grammar...**

L: No, no, no... It was before.

**R: When they were still working with the conversation. You were like "Here, you see, she's giving suggestions".**

L: Uhum, yeah. Not talking about the structures.

**R: Not connecting it to the structures.**

L: No, no.

**R: Can you tell me why you did it this way?**

L: (silence) I don't remember what went through my mind when I did that, why... maybe I just skipped, maybe I rushed as I always do. Maybe I thought they'd connect it by themselves. They probably didn't connect it to the conversation. They probably didn't pay attention that the conversation uses those same structures. Maybe I should've... maybe... explained the grammar box, and went back to the conversation to point the same structures.

**R: And why do you think it's a good idea?**

L: Cause then they'd connect to the context they just had. It'd be more fruitful.

**R: There'd be like context and grammar together.**

L: Yeah yeah.

**R: You know, this idea of communication, context, what's involved in the conversation with grammar.**

L: Right.

**R: This caught my attention because I went back to the questionnaire you answered, and I just wanna read something you wrote down. The question was "Do you like the Interchange manual? Could you comment on any advantages or disadvantages of it?". When you mentioned the disadvantages you said "I really don't like the way the book focuses on grammar, always presenting tables which call a lot of attention." This caught my attention because you went straight to the table.**

L: I'm hypocritical.

**R: Don't say that...**

L: (laughs)

**R: And you go along “This doesn’t look communicative enough for me, it almost seems like the Snapshots and Conversations are only excuses to get to the grammar focus.”**

L: That’s what I do! (laughs)

**R: Then you had two separate things in class, like “this is the conversation...” (I clapped by hands to signal change)...**

L: And that’s grammar...

**R: “And that’s grammar.”**

L: Yes.

**R: Can you see that?**

L: Yes, yes.

**R: So sometimes we don’t see these things at the time or by ourselves, right?**

L: It’s easy to criticize the manual, and not do something about it. And even the manual says we should connect the conversation with the grammar, it’s just that I like to criticize things, without understanding them.

**R: That’s human beings in general...**

L: YES! (effusively)

**R: We all do that. (laughs)**

L: (laughs)

**R: No problem. I just wanted to show you, like maybe you’re thinking about something but, in this case at least, you did something different. You did what you said you didn’t like.**

L: Yes.

**R: How do you feel about it?**

L: I feel ashamed. (nervous laughs). It’s something that... When I answered the questionnaire I was really sure of myself, I was really “Oh, I’m so communicative”, then I wanted the textbook to give me everything, but I didn’t take the time to read the suggestions, the teacher’s instructions, so I was shocked once we started having these interviews. I could see how the book could guide me. It was not just the structure of the book that I should follow, it’s the suggestions given.

**R: Just to wrap up... This idea of having students go back to the conversation, you’d take grammar from the context, then go through the grammar box. I’m not saying that you should not go through the grammar box, I’m just saying that maybe instead of just presenting something that is separate from the conversation, take it from the conversation, maybe using the sentences suggested in the manual, saying “Do you see the function of these things? Of that...” Maybe making this connection, to be more meaningful to them.**

L: Yes. And the really stupid thing is that sometimes I do that, but I’m not really consistent. I’m not, at all. And this is not good. I should think of the effect of this order of things.

**R: And why do you think you’re not consistent? Why do you think sometimes you do it and sometimes you don’t?**

L: Because I’m consciously trying to do this, they’re not really within me yet. (laughs) So sometimes I forget, because they’re not coming naturally.

**R: I get what you mean. Before we finish, I wanna know how you’re feeling about your teaching, comparing to before we started the interviews.**

L: Ok... Now I feel that I plan more carefully before classes. I don’t... Because, before I was like “Nah, I know the content. I know the unit. So I can just go there and... I don’t know... bring some videos, some other things.” I’d just to the rushed things. “Oh, look at the snapshot, what do you see?” “Oh, let’s listen to a conversation.” With no context. “Oh, let’s go to the grammar box... these are the structures that we use...” Not connecting to the conversation or whatever. Now I feel like I can connect these things more, I plan more carefully before classes... I plan during the class... I see the things I’m doing and I try to see if they’re following a good structure for them. Now I think more about how I present information to my students, not just “Oh, this is easy. Maybe I should just rush it.” I think of them, not as how I see things, but as how they’d see things. I feel like I’m getting more conscious. It’s being a really nice process of planning.

**R: Well, it’s a life-long process. We’re never complete.**

L: Yeah.



**R: That's it.**

L: Well, you don't wanna comment the end of the class? The video.

**R: Oh, we can do it. How did you feel about the activity?**

L: I think... because there was not a lot of time, I tried to change the activity really quickly. I don't know if they got what I wanted them to do.

**R: The video activity?**

L: Yes.

**R: What was your goal?**

L: The idea was to present the structures, right? Because they say "ah, you should... it's important to..." They'd see these structures in use, and then... the idea of the activity was to have them ask for suggestions. They'd imitate the video. And then they'd interview their colleagues. I'd give of the students a health problem, and it was nice because there were 10 students and I had ten health problems to distribute. Then they'd ask for suggestions and write them down. And the suggestions should be given using those structures. They'd write down the suggestions, then they'd choose the best one.

**R: And why did you use the video for this? Cause you played the video, then they'd have to do this. What'd be the function of the video?**

L: A MODEL! (laughs)

**R: (laughs). You'd give them a model.**

L: Yes.

**R: nice. Ok. I liked it very much. I think it was a nice way to wrap up and just continue what they were doing, and I saw that you rushed because you had no time.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Cause you wanted to do the other activities. Letter B. Cause that's what you did at the end. You had students do letter B, you explained it, you modeled the conversation and you had them write down the problems. But you didn't do what you had planned to do before that. Can you tell me why you decided to skip it and go to the book?**

L: Because I imagined they'd need to understand how to use the structures before they would put it into use, and... yeah, I just made them write because they'd be more comfortable with writing before going to the conversation. Because the idea of the activity was to have a conversation, then write down. So I think it'd be too complicated for them to do that, then I just rushed to the writing activity.

**R: Can I give a suggestion?**

L: Uhum.

**R: Maybe, after explaining grammar you could've done activity A...**

L: Yes...

**R: Then they'd have like... examples of suggestions and problems, then you could work with the video.**

L: But there'd be no time. I should've just had them do activity A and leave the video for next class.

**R: Leave the video for next class. They'd start reviewing what they studied in the previous class, using the video.**

L: Next class I'll do that. I'll bring the video and have them have a conversation.

**R: It's gonna be nice.**

#### Mediator-mediatee interaction 5

**R: So, this is our 5<sup>th</sup> interview... Let's do it! Well, in the previous class you had talked about medicine, right?**

L: Yes.

**R: Ok. So in this last class observed, the first thing you did, after correcting homework, you went to the book and said "So, we talked about medicines but we didn't talk about containers. Do you know what 'containers' are?" That's what you did.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Do you remember their answer?**

L: No.

**R: One of the students said “you mean like... ‘ship containers’?”**

L: Yeah? So that was a good guess.

**R: Why do you think that’s a good guess?**

L: Because that’s another meaning for the same term, but he didn’t the idea of “medicine” (laughs)... The whole context of medicine... It was a good guess, but out of the field.

**R: Uhum. Can you think of any other way you could’ve started it? I mean to help them guess that you were talking about medicine containers and not ship containers?**

L: I don’t know... Maybe if I showed them some images before...

**R: Some images of what?**

L: Of containers, but not focusing on containers, talking about the same vocabulary that we have already seen, like “cough drops”... So we saw “cough drops”, “aspirin”...

**R: I remember you talked about “Dorflex” and stuff like that...**

L: Yeah... We have more familiar examples. So I could show these images of the medicine we have already seen in the previous class, and I would ask the same question but now with the images, to kind of have a background.

**R: So you’d go from things they’ve seen before, and you’d use those images to present the idea of containers.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Do you think this would be more... “connected”, if compared to the way you did it.**

L: Yeah, absolutely. I just mentioned it... “We talked about medicine, but we didn’t talk about containers.” This sentence, to me, made sense at the time, because I thought “oh, they will connect it”... but they’re not necessarily connected.

**R: Cause remember that when he mentioned “ship container”, well... It was a “good guess”, but that is completely different from what you’re going to talk about, right?**

L: No relation to the context.

**R: No relation to the context. And, again, by saying “We talked about medicine, but we didn’t talk about containers. Do you know what containers are?” Were you trying to give context or not?**

L: I was trying. But it was not a good choice.

**R: I like the idea that you gave, like... bringing pictures, it’d be a good way to connect what they were about to see with what they had seen...**

L: Uhum...

**R: And , just to compare, one of the book’s suggestions was to write the name of the products of the word power on the board, like “deodorant”, “cough drops”... Then, “focus students’ attention on the pictures, elicit or present the words for container”... This is the manual’s suggestion, but I like your idea...**

L: It was the same idea but with a different... frame.

**R: I agree. It’s similar. You’d use it to link topics, right?**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok. Thanks. So, next thing I wanna ask you about... Well, there’s this listening with the man and the woman at the pharmacy, and you said “so, we talked about containers, and now we’re gonna talk about pharmacy...” You showed them the picture and said “we already know it’s a pharmacy, right?” Then you said “What’s happening here?”. And you yourself answered.**

L: Yes. (laughs).

**R: Yes? Why did you answer your question?**

L: I’m always rushing (laughs). The manual tells us to not say what it is about, to explore the images, and I was in such a rush that I already said “Oh, it’s a pharmacy...” Then I realized I shouldn’t have said it. I should’ve had them explore the image, then guess it was a pharmacy, then I’d make more questions. I just rushed.

**R: Why do you think you shouldn’t have done it that way?**

L: Because they could observe the image and pay more attention and be more engaged with the situation before listening to the conversation. They could’ve imagined by themselves the situation if they had observed the picture before I said anything. Right? I think it’d be more profitable.

**R: And it’d be also more student centered, right?**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**R: Instead of you telling them what it is, having them see that.**

L: Right!

**R: So again, was it to provide them with context, or not? When you said “Now, let’s talk about pharmacy...”**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah. That’s the idea.

**R: OK. Then, there’s this other thing... The manual suggests “Books open. Students cover the text, elicit the containers in the picture.” You didn’t do it.**

L: No, I didn’t.

**R: So there was a jar of multivitamins, a jar of lotion... You didn’t do it. Also, the books suggests “Ask students ‘what does the woman buy?’. Encourage students to guess.” You didn’t do that either. Can you tell me why?**

L: I remember I did it at the end, after we had listened to the conversation.

**R: Any thoughts on that?**

L: Not at all (laughs).

**R: Do you see any difference between having them look at the containers before and having them look at the containers after listening?**

L: Yes. Focus questions are always good for them to listen to specific information, not to try to understand everything, maybe they don’t have all the vocabulary to understand the conversation. And it’d be better for them to try to focus on specific information, before.

**R: Ok... So you’d have students have a look at the containers before, but this is not exactly a focus question, right?**

L: No?

**R: Because it’s not about the listening itself...**

L: It’s about the image?

**R: Yes. What I mean is: basically, there’s this idea of having students look at the image so as to understand the context and explore and be attuned to what they’re about to listen to. This is not the part in which you have them listen to specific questions, cause you were still preparing them to listen by using the picture.**

L: Uhum.

**R: I mean, for example, you could’ve had them recycle the vocabulary about containers they saw, you could’ve worked with vocabulary again, provide context, then help them focus on these specific containers (pointing to the picture in the listening) so as to help them listen.**

L: Alright.

**R: They’d see the containers, and they’d be like “Oh, they’re probably going to be mentioned in the listening”...**

L: Uhum, uhum...

**R: Right? For them to activate the vocabulary that would come.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok? I’m explaining this, because when you said “focus question”... I just want to make sure that you’re not confusing this with the focus questions you write on the board for students to focus on the listening. Cause these are not exactly questions (pointing to the manual’s suggestion to have students focus on the containers in the picture).**

L: Yeah, yeah. I don’t know the exact terms.

**R: No problem. I don’t wanna be invasive, I just wanna explain...**

L: No, no. It’s good to know. It makes a difference. Not only in relation to the terms, but how they work.

**R: I mean, it is related to contextualization, it is part of the pre listening, but it’s not the same as the focus questions like “Pay attention to what the woman buys. What does she buy?”. This is a focus question.**

L: Uhum.

**R: And these (pointing to the questions the manual presents so as to explore the images) are questions for them to focus on the image so as to have a context. They “work together”, but they’re not the same.**

L: Yes.

**R: Also, this suggestion “What does the woman buy? Encourage students to guess”. You didn’t do that. Can you tell me why?**

L: I think it was just rushed.

**R: Can you think of any advantages to encourage students to guess what she buys?**

L: Yeah. They’d connect the images, the names of the containers with the images they saw. Basically.

**R: Remember we talked about prediction?**

L: Yes.

**R: So it’d be this idea, right? It’d also help them activate the vocabulary, that specific vocabulary... Well, they knew she wouldn’t talk about painkillers, for example, or other types of medicine...**

L: Yeah...

**R: Also in the picture you have an old lady, so you have the information that it’s an old lady who’s probably buying multivitamins... Maybe she needs them for herself, or for someone in her family. So there’s this idea of having them see that it’s an old lady... Do you agree?**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: Ok... So, I also wanna know about this suggestion the book gives, which it presents it by saying it’s orional. The manual says “Students work in groups. Group A listens for the problems the woman has, and group B listens for what she buys.” Then they share information. Can you tell me why you did this?**

L: I think it’s be a different way for them to listen to the conversation, cause they always listen to it individually. I said “why not?”, maybe they could be split into two groups and not do the things individually, because a group would listen for specific information and within the group they could share that info, confirm if it’s correct or not. It’d already be a good kind of interaction between them, among themselves in the groups, then after they collect the information and share it within the group, they’d share between different groups. I think it was a very good idea for them do interact. So they could check information.

**R: Why do you think it’d be a good idea for them to check info?**

L: Because sometimes I feel that some people have difficulty with understanding some things, sometimes one person listens, they can listen to a specific word but they don’t understand how that word connects with the context, so having a group that is listening for the same information may help them connect words that sometimes they don’t listen correctly, they don’t understand the meaning or how it connects. So I think it is a good idea.

**R: Uhum. And by having the groups listening for different things... do you think this has any impacts on the listening activity itself? Not only in terms of interacting.**

L: I think it does, cause they may not pay attention to... they will have to pay attention to all the conversation to collect this specific information, but they’ll focus more on what words may give them the kind of information they want. So they’ll know how to filter information from a context. Right?

**R: Uhum...**

L: I think it’s good that they look for specific information.

**R: So you’re basically narrowing it down, right? One group is responsible for this, the other one for that... And also this idea you said, of having them share information between groups, since one group had listened to one thing and the other had listened to another, it’s nice cause you have an information gap. For example, some people that are listening for the woman’s problems may not understand what she buys. So this could foster a nice moment for interaction, which is one of the principles of CLT. You have an information gap, then they’d sit in pairs to exchange information that one group has and the other doesn’t...**

L: Yeah. This is something that I like. A lot. This kind of... to know when I can make them interact more, I think my classes are really focused on me. I have to think of ways I can make them interact more.

**R: And what do you think of this idea of using this “information gap moments” to have them interact?**

L: Genius. I should just do it more.

**R: Ok... Why?**

L: Ah... Then they'd have, not just the information gap, but they'd listen for... not only listen, but sometimes read a text, a piece of text, and collect different information and have this interaction. That kind of interaction gives purpose for the communication.

**R: Why do you think so? Can you relate it to real life...**

L: Yeah! We communicate because we need something, and we cannot have everything we need by ourselves... So we need to exchange things. Sometimes we give information, sometimes we receive information, sometimes we just complete things... Not just information, but anything. So why would someone just get information for themselves, by themselves, all the time? I know this is a very important principle. This is basic and I need just to make it happen. I need to make it happen.

**R: Nice. Cause in real life we have a lot of information gaps, right? For example, our interviews. You don't know what I'll ask you about. I don't know what you'll respond.**

L: Yeah! But we have an idea.

**R: Yes, we do.**

L: And that's the purpose. That we connect... in the same context, that we connect these kinds of information.

**R: And even when we just don't have any idea. When someone comes to us, we don't know anything about what the person is going to ask. You know?**

L: Yeah.

**R: So, this idea of "information gap", I really like that you used this part, and I wanted to explore it a little bit more with you. This idea of having this information gap and just having the groups "fill in each other's gaps" (laughs) when they speak, when they interact..**

L: (laughs) yeah.

**R: Which is similar to what we do in real life. Then I just to talk to you about... well, when you presented grammar. Do you remember what you did?**

L: No.

**R: After working with the conversation, you said "I'll show you some things about grammar, then we'll go back to the text."**

L: Uhum.

**R: Can you tell me how you connected grammar and the conversation? What was your intention to say what you said? Why did you tell them you'd later go back to the conversation?**

L: So they'd not forget about the text. They'd connect... That was the idea, it was very rudimentary (laughs). The idea was that, they didn't just go on as we have already discussed, I tend to just go for grammar and forget about the conversation. I wanted them to think "Ok, this is not the focus. We'll go back to the conversation, so maybe there's some connection."

**R: So you wanted them to keep in mind that there was a connection.**

L: Yeah. Probably, they would think about it, but the basic idea was that they didn't forget about the conversation.

**R: So, in our last session we talked about the fact that you did like... "So, this is the structure that we used in the conversation". Right?**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then we talked about this idea of separating things, and going straight to grammar. Do you think that what you did in this class was different was different from what you did previously?**

L: Not much.

**R: Why?**

L: Cause I just gave more importance to structure again. No big difference. Do you think there's a big difference, because I/

**R: Uh... Before I answer that, I just wanna ask you another question.**

L: Ok.

**R: Can you think of any ways you could've done it differently, so as to give less attention to the structure?**

L: Maybe if I... you mean, still going to the grammar focus, explaining, and then coming back?

**R: Yes. Cause you said "I'll show you some things about grammar, then we'd go back to the text."**

L: Yes, I divided those things.

**R: You divided.**

L: As if they were not connected.

**R: Yes, and we talked about it in our last interview, remember?**

L: Yeah.

**R: So, I wanna know if you can think of any ideas to connect those things, not separating them, like “This is the conversation and this is grammar”.**

L: Yeah... Maybe not presenting it that... Well, presenting it in relation to the conversation. Just saying “Oh, can you see that those structures are used in the conversation?”. Something like that. Maybe elaborate a little more on that.

**R: But then do you see you’d, again, go to the structure so as to go back to the conversation?**

L: Yes. It’s not the conversation that is the focus, again (sighs). Oh, I’m really bad at it.

**R: Nope. Stop saying that. So, can I show you the manual’s suggestion?**

L: Uhum.

**R: It says “Focus students’ attention on the conversation. Ask ‘how did Mrs. Web ask for things?’ Ask students to underline the examples ‘Could I have some aspirin?’ ‘May I have...’.” What is happening here?**

L: I’m focusing on the function.

**R: On the function.**

L: Not the structure.

**R: Starting from the conversation to go to/**

L: Within the context.

**R: Uhum.**

L: Not taking it out from the context, on the board, and then going back to the text.

**R: So they’d focus on function over form/**

L: Yeah.

**R: Which is one of the principles of the CLT/**

L: Yeah.

**R: Then they’d notice these things, the functions – when these things are used, then you could go to the grammar box.**

L: I tend to do this, but after.

**R: Uhum. I was going to ask you about that.**

L: I always do it after. I think it doesn’t matter. They’ll get the idea (laughs). But the order of things changes it completely.

**R: But do you see a difference between doing this way or the other way?**

L: Yeah. Absolutely.

**R: I have it written down “She did it, but in a different order.”**

L: Yeah (nervous laugh).

**R: Cause there’s this idea, when following CLT, that you present grammar to the attention of learners as part of communicative language practice.**

L: yes.

**R: So there’s the conversation, the communicative language practice, they’d identify the functions, they you’d draw students’ attention to grammar.**

L: Yeah.

**R: So you start form the context, from the conversation, then you’d draw their attention to grammar. You know?**

L: yeah.

**R: So there’s this idea of starting from context, from the conversation, then draw their attention...**

L: Uhum.

**R: So students start focusing on function. This idea.**

L: Yeah. So they understand what’s being said, before we move to how this thing is said.

**R: Uhum. Ok. Do you prefer doing it this way?**

L: Yeah! (effusively). Absolutely! This way we discussed?

**R: Yeah.**

L: Yeah!

**R: Ok. So, there's another thing that you did, and I wanna know why. So, after explaining grammar, you had students go back to the conversation and identify the modal verbs, and you said "I want you to tell me if those sentences are requests or suggestions". This is not in the manual. Why did you do it?**

L: Because then I wanted them to focus on the function. I did it the other way around (laughs)... It'd be more interesting if we could identify first the idea, the function, and then identify the modal verb, the structure itself. But that was the idea: to identify how those structures were used in the context... How the same modal verbs are used to make suggestions or requests.

**R: Uhum. I found it interesting, cause you didn't focus on function the way the manual suggests you to, but then you added this idea, to have them focus on the functions, to see if those expressions represented requests or suggestions.**

L: Uhum. Disorganized way of doing things (laughs).

**R: But, dear, it's good that you see these things. I know sometimes we think "Omg, what am I doing?", but it's good that you see some important things. This is very important. This is very good.**

L: Oh, thanks.

**R: Very good! Then you had students do another exercise, students had to circle the words, like students had to choose between "can/could", for example "Can/could I help you...". Again you asked them to identify whether the sentence was a request or a suggestion. Same reason?**

L: Uhum. Same reason. They had to understand what they were doing. It's easier to get the structure than to just blindly go... continue... just choosing correctly but not understanding.

**R: Then... last thing, you had them do a listening on page 82, and to introduce the listening you said "So, there are four people talking about...", then you said what the people were talking about (pointing to the activity), you set the scene and said...**

L: Yeah. Four people with four health problems.

**R: Yeah. You said "I want you to pay attention to what these problems are." Is it context? Are you contextualizing?**

L: Yes.

**R: What do you think that this is different from what you did in the activity that you started by saying "Now, let's talk about pharmacy."?**

L: Oh, yeah. Completely different.

**R: What's different?**

L: Because... "Pharmacy"... It's a very broad idea. I'm not saying that it's a place, I'm not setting a scene, I'm not saying there are people in the pharmacy. Maybe abstract, maybe... I don't know... There are many possibilities. It's not contextualization. It's just a word. But when I say there are four people talking about problems, we can imagine it, it's very simple, it doesn't need a lot of context, in my opinion (laughs).

**R: You even said "Let's see the situation, the context, why they have these problems." You even used the word. You wanted them to focus on it. Focus on the context.**

L: uhum.

**R: In part B, they had to listen again and pay attention to what the pharmacist suggests to each person. You added something else: you asked them to pay attention to what caused their problems. Why did you do that?**

L: I thought it was important not to ignore, the... The context (laughs). Because we talked about health problems, we talked about medicine, but we didn't talk about causes. If they can understand the problem the people had, they can understand the cause. They can imagine what happened. The situation, for example, sore feet. Does it come out of the blue? No. Something caused it.

**R: Like, "I went hiking and..."**

L: Yes. So then I can introduce vocabulary that can be related, so when they go to upper levels they understand what hiking is and what the consequences of hiking are.

**R: Ok. So do you have any questions for me?**

L: No.

**R: So we're done for today.**

L: Good.

Mediator-mediatee interaction 6

**R: So let's start our 6<sup>th</sup> interview! We're almost at the end. Yasss.**

L: I'm not happy, because I like it (laughs).

**R: I just wanted to thank you for being with me through this process.**

L: (laughs)

**R: So, the first question I have is... At the beginning of the class, you had this conversation here between a server and a customer. Do you remember how you started it?**

L: Yeah. I said "We talked about food a lot, but we didn't talk about how to order food."

**R: Uhum. Exactly. Then you said "Let's talk about it. We have a conversation between a customer and a server, I want you to pay attention to the situation." Then you showed them the picture and asked "what's happening here?". Students said it wasn't a restaurant.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then you said "in fact, it is. But it's a type of more informal restaurant, it's called 'diner'."**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then you explored the pictured, asking students what they saw in it, like the menu, the milkshake etc.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then you asked who the server was, who the customer was...**

L: Uhum.

**R: ... What the situation was. What they were going to talk about. Who was going to order.**

L: Uhum.

**R: And I wanna know why you did all these things in the beginning?**

L: Because I wanted them to try to guess what would come. I had already said we were going to talk about ordering food, and I wanted them to imagine these people, in this situation, ordering food. And I wanted them to imagine that one of these people was the customer and the other the server. So they could picture the conversation, not only listen to it.

**R: And why would you have them picture the conversation before listening to it?**

L: It was basically for them to have a meaning of the conversation. It'd be more meaningful if they could imagine the conversation, it'd be more... Also it'd be easier to kind of prepare for the vocabulary that could come. Also pay attention maybe to the way the customer would order the food.

**R: So, you said that you know you had already told them what they'd see...**

L: yeah, yeah.

**R: I wanna know why did you start to start it like this, by saying "So, we talked about food but we didn't talk about how to order it."**

L: To make a connection between these kind of separate ideas, cause we talked about food with no context. Then we could... I could introduce this kind of new content with the connection of food. Not only implicitly, but explicitly connecting.

**R: And when you say "no context" you're referring to the first conversation, right?**

L: Yeah. Because the first part of this unit is only food. Food and... sometimes this first conversation, people talk about restaurants, but the focus is not restaurants. It's "kinds of food" and "being hungry".

**R: Ok, and you think that's not context?**

L: Yes, it is.

**R: Cause you said before...**

L: Yeah.

**R: you said you talked about food but not...**

L: There's context but not specifically in the restaurant.

**R: Ok.**

L: That's what I meant.



**R: But this is context (pointing to the first conversation of the unit).**

L: Yes, this is context.

**R: Then, there's this manual's suggestion which is to cover the text and elicit ideas and vocabulary from the picture. You did that, you elicited ideas and vocabulary from the picture, but this is the first suggestion the manual gives.**

L: Uhum.

**R: And you started it differently.**

L: Uhum.

**R: why didn't you just showed them the picture, had them have a look at it and elicited what they saw in the picture?**

L: Because I thought it'd be more productive for them to connect these ideas. Kind of "oh, we know how to describe food. We know how to talk about kinds of food, kinds of restaurants. But we don't know exactly how to order food." So I wanted them to have this idea of connection... Like, I've just learned this new term... "smooth link"?

**R: Smooth link?**

L: Yeah (laughs). I think I tried to do that. I'm not sure if I succeeded. The ideas was to have a smooth link, so they could kind of have a thread between these two...

**R: Where did you learn this from? I've never heard of it.**

L: From a classmate of mine. She's taking a course on teaching.

**R: Ok, "smooth link" that's new to me. I'm asking you this because it's very similar to what you did in previous classes. For example, last week you said "We talked about medicine but we didn't talk about containers".**

L: Uhum. I always do that.

**R: Do you remember we discussed that in that context, that didn't work. Cause "container" was too broad.**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: This one was more...**

L: Specific.

**R: ok. Narrower. Ok. So I'm not saying this is wrong, ok? You could have this "smooth link"...**

L: Uhum.

**R: ... I just wanna pose one question. Do you think that this "so we talked about food but we didn't talk about how to order it. Let's talk about it." Is more centered on you or centered on your students?**

L: On me, I think.

**R: Why do you think so?**

L: Because I didn't make any connection with what they had talked about so far. Maybe I could've asked "How do you order food in a restaurant? How do you imagine yourself in a situation in which you had to order food in a restaurant?" Something like that.

**R: And do you think this would be more student centered?**

L: Yeah.

**R: Why?**

L: Because then I'd elicit from their experiences. I'd make them imagine themselves in that situation. Not just explicitly talk about it in a way that it's obvious.

**R: Well, again, I'm not saying that what you did was wrong, but I went back to some of our interviews and in one of them you said "I think my classes are too centered on me and I want them to be more centered on students".**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then I'd just like to know if you could think of any ideas that you could've started it, being more centered on them. Again, not that the way you did it is a problem, but what you suggested when I asked you... I really like it. Because you'd ask them, then they'd come with this idea of ordering the food, then you could explore the picture etc. I think it's a very nice idea so as to be student centered.**

L: Yeah.

**R: You wouldn't be giving them the topic, you'd be like...**

L: Proposing something.

**R:... getting them in the mood, proposing something. So they would interact with you, presenting ideas. So I really like it.**

L: Thank you.

**R: Another thing about this part, the manual suggests writing down this summary here (pointing to the conversation).**

L: uhum.

**R: Instead of that, you wrote down "Customer: 4 items; Server: 4 questions."**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then told them to pay attention to the 4 things the customer asks and the 4 questions the server makes.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Why did you do it this way?**

L: Cause when I read the manual's suggestions I thought it was too simple. I think it wouldn't be so helpful for them to really listen to what they were... to the conversation. So I think... Maybe I'd... This was too simple. Not just because it's easy, but I don't think it'd add anything. Then they'd just listen and check the item. How to pronounce these words. I just said "No, I'll skip it. I'll just try to get them to listen and maybe get the words". That's why I did it in groups, because maybe they couldn't do it individually.

**R: You mean... after that you had them get together in groups, right?**

L: Yeah. And the way I wrote on the board for them to pay attention to the 4 questions and 4 items... I think it'd be easier for them to understand the order if they... Because they're probably accustomed to the way... to the intonation of questions, right?

**R: Ok.**

L: So they'd identify by the number of questions and the intonation of the questions. So there'd be the questions, and then the other 4 would be the customer asking for food.

**R: And why didn't you just say "Oh, the customer is asking for food and the server is asking him some questions. What are these questions? What food does he ask for?". Why did you give them this information "there are 4 questions and 4 items"?**

L: Because it'd be easier for them to structure. They'd count and they'd know that between the questions there'd be an answer. Question, answer, question, answer. They could identify easily... not easily (laughs) ... They'd identify more directly. (laughs).

**R: ok. So basically if you had written down "the customer is asking for question and the server is asking for food. Pay attention."**

L: Uhum.

**R: They wouldn't know how many items the customer would ask for, right?**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah. It would be really difficult.

**R: Yes. It'd be really broad.**

L: Uhum.

**R: So you kind of kept this idea (pointing to the manual's suggestion). Cause the manual suggests this so as to give students orders "The customer order spicy fish/spicy chicken. Blue cheese/vinaigrette. Coffee/tea."**

L: Uhum.

**R: In this case, you'd be limiting, you'd be focusing their attention. And the way you did it you focused their attention in a different way.**

L: Uhum.

**R: You didn't just have them listen for the sake of listening.**

L: Yes. Just to identify the words.

**R: They had a focus.**

L: Uhum.

**R: They would listen for 4 types of food, 4 questions that the server asks.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Ok. Nice. I like that you keR this idea of “focus”. They had something to listen to. It wasn’t like “so, just listen to it”. You know what I mean?**

L: Yeah.

**R: I just wanna add something else. I like the way you did it, but I have to disagree with the reason why you didn’t do this.**

L: uhum.

**R: I just wanna know what you think about it. The manual suggests writing down the summary so students have a focus, to have something to listen to. The way the manual presents, students had to choose one oRion.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Maybe, they’d not know what spicy fish or spicy chicken is, blue cheese or vinaigrette, coffee and tea. Maybe, they’d not be able to listen to the words and understand them.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Like “tea” is our “chá”.**

L: Uhum.

**R: you know? So maybe, the book suggests it this way because they’d see how things are written...**

L: Uhum.

**R: This didn’t happen, but they could’ve listen to the passage and do not understand what the customer asks for.**

L: Yeah. Because they don’t know the word and maybe they don’t separate the words that come in the context.

**R: Yeah, they’d not be able to link the sound to the word itself. So maybe this is one of the reasons why the manual suggests it.**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**R: You keR the same idea of having students focused on something, but by following the manual’s suggestion you’d show them the specific foods the customer asks for. So they’d see how it’s spelled, how it sounds. You know?**

L: Uhum.

**R: Any comments?**

L: Well I just thought that they could understand these things because some items we had already talked about. Just because of that.

**R: Ok.**

L: But it was kind of a leap of faith (laughs).

**R: No but I think your explanation is valid. Yes. They saw that in the first part, right? They saw coffee, they saw...**

L: We talked about tea, which is not in the book, but we talked about it, not iced tea. We talked about chicken, spicy chicken, curry... Some other items.

**R: Nice. Ok. You’re the teacher.**

L: (laughs).

**R: I mean, I like your explanation. It makes sense to me. Then, you said you had them discuss the things they had listen to. Why did you have them get together and do it?**

L: Cause when it’s a little more complicated for them to listen to different words that they may not be accustomed to, and make sense of it, I thought it’d be good for them to share this information, not only individually try to guess all the items, so they could have this shared perspective of the listening, complete information.

**R: You mean complete like... I didn’t understand something that you did, then we just talk.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Basically that idea of information gap that we discussed?**

L: YEAH! (effusively). I always forget the terms. Yeah. Information gap.

**R: Was that it?**

L: Yeah.

**R: Like I understood something, you understood something else, then if we share like... there’s this information gap, there’d be interaction between them since they’d be talking about the things**

they understood and didn't understand, they'd share, they'd interact. There'd be a gap for them to be interacting.

L: Yeah. Uhum.

**R: ok. Thanks. So, let's move to the other part. You said "I want you to have a look at the way he asks the questions to the customer and how the customer orders the food.", focusing on the conversation. Then you did something the manual doesn't suggest. You said "have a look at the conversation in your books and compare it to the other one I'll project". What was different about this other one? Can you tell me?**

L: Uh... Instead of using the modals, I only used the verb "want", in a very direct way so they could compare. And you know how it went... (laughs).

**R: Ok...**

L: I was really happy that they got it.

**R: Why were you really happy? (laughs)**

L: Because they got the difference in formality.

**R: How do you know? What tells you that? (laughs)**

L: Cause one of the guys, that one guy, he said "oh, it's very informal, right?"

**R: Uhum.**

L: In Portuguese, but...

**R: I really loved it when he said "essa aqui eles falam no boteco".**

L: YES, YES! (effusively).

**R: That was amazing.**

L: YES! That was amazing! (cheerfully)

**R: So then you had, when you projected it you asked "Do they have the same idea?" Then you had students discuss it in groups.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then the guy said about the "boteco" and we laughed a lot...**

L: YES! (laughs)

**R: So you had them talk about it a little bit, then you did a whole class check "What's the difference?" They responded "this way is more direct". And you asked "Do you think it's more polite or impolite?" "This one is more direct, the way the book presents it is more polite..." You had this talk with them.**

L: Uhum.

**R: I found it amazing. Very, very nice. I really like the way you did it.**

L: Oh, nice. Thanks.

**R: I asked you "How do you know that it worked?" because I wanted to see if you saw how engaged they were, and how they were really discussing that. They were paying attention to the function.**

L: Yeah, yes!

**R: Right?**

L: Yeah.

**R: It was very nice, I really liked it. And the manual suggests writing these sentences on the board "What kind of dressing do you want? Do you want anything to drink? I want a mixed green salad. I want a large iced tea." Ok?**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then the book suggests "explain that people don't usually say 'want' in formal situations'." You didn't do it this way.**

L: No.

**R: You substituted the modals in the conversation for "want" and you had them discuss what the differences were. What were you doing in this moment?**

L: I was making them the center of that part of the class.

**R: Yes, you were.**

L: (laughs)

**R: and were you focusing on form?**

L: No, function! (laughs – L and R give a high five). Finally!

**R: I really liked it. I found it very, very good. I found it very nice because you were able to use the manual's suggestion but you did it on your way, you know?**

L: Uhum.

**R: Can you tell me why you changed the conversation?**

L: Because they already knew the conversation, like, I showed them, they had it in their books, and why would I take parts of the conversation if I could have the whole thing and they could see how it changed? The interaction, how it sounded. So I used the conversation and the image, the same image, the same situation but using different terms.

**R: I really like it. So after that, you went back to the original conversation, showed them the differences from the one you changed and the original one, focusing on the function... "This is too direct..." etc... "Would" is more formal"... etc. Then you showed the grammar box and said "So, these are the examples in the conversation".**

L: Uhum.

**R: Right?**

L: Uhum.

**R: What did you do in this class that is different from the previous classes?**

L: I didn't use the grammar box as a separate thing, I went back to the conversation. It was the center of attention. I got the conversation to explain the grammar box.

**R: Are you happy about it?**

L: Yes (effusively). Really happy.

**R: Cause you said "I'm so happy. You know how it went."**

L: (laughs)

**R: It was very nice. Remember when we talked about the idea of presenting grammar to the attention of learners as part of the context of the communicative language practice?**

L: Uhum.

**R: That's what you did!**

L: Yeah, finally (almost whispering).

**R: You had them look at it, you had them notice things... Even though the manual suggests explaining that people don't usually say "want" in formal situations, you just skipped it and had students see that. Making it more student centered.**

L: Yes.

**R: I really like it. I think you should be very happy about it.**

L: I am really happy.

**R: Oh, there's just one more question in this part – you started to go through the grammar box but then you went back to the second part of the listening. What happened?**

L: I forgot that there was another part of the conversation.

**R: What caught my attention is that you first had students listen for the ideas presented, then you just stopped by each sentence so as to compare them to the ones in the first part of the conversation. Why?**

L: So they could already prepare themselves for the structures they'd see in the grammar focus.

**R: So same idea?**

L: Yes, same idea.

**R: So they'd see the same structures in a different situation, but in the same way. They'd have more examples.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Nice. Then you went through the grammar box and explained it, explaining "would" etc... Well, you're saying you're happy, and did you see that they... How do you think the students dealt with it? How do you think this was for them?**

L: I think they looked more engaged. They were really discussing everything about the conversation, they were not just trying to get answers. Normally, when I do these kinds of activities they're like "oh, it's this, and that, and this, and that" (mimicking students in a boring way). They interact and try to get

answers when they have an information gap, for example, but this time I think they really got interested in what they were doing. It was the basic difference I could see.

**R: I also saw that, but I wanted to ask you because you're the one who's with them every day, but from my point of view, they were more engaged than they usually are.**

L: Yes, absolutely.

**R: I really like it.**

L: Me too. I was "OMG, they're enjoying it", and they were doing something because they wanted to. It's very different.

**R: And it's very good to have this feedback from them, seeing they're engaged, seeing they're part of it, they're in the center, they're constructing the ideas with you.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Right? One of the principles of the CLT. One more.**

L: I'm finally getting the gist.

**R: Focusing on them.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Having them do things. Student centered.**

L: Yeah.

**R: So I have two more questions. You had them do the role play activity. I wanna know why you decided to do it.**

L: I wanted to see if they'd use the structures they had just seen. And how they'd choose from the examples they had. Because I presented "would like" and "I will have". I wanted to see how they'd get this idea.

**R: And there was also "want", right?**

L: Yeah. They could have used want. Yeah.

**R: Ok. And can you think of any other advantages of using role play in class?**

L: Yes, because they can imagine themselves in the same situation, not just "Oh, I'm listening to people that I don't even know, talking about something, in a place that I'm not even seeing..." So they could imagine themselves, maybe, in that situation. And it's a familiar situation, but in English. So they could imagine themselves in a familiar situation, but in English.

**R: You mean a familiar situation...**

L: Ordering food in a restaurant. Everyone does that. At least one.

**R: Nice. Cause one of the principles of using role plays in class is the idea that they have a real social context in which they can play different roles, but that are real. They have them in real life. Also, in this case, you have information gap.**

L: Yeah, because you don't know what to expect. Right? You have to act, right there, at the moment.

**R: Like one of them could've asked... snails...**

L: Yes, yes...

**R: I don't know. And another thing that you have in role plays is... well, you have a social context, real life, you have info gap, cause you're not sure about what the person is going to ask, and you can have feedback from your listener.**

L: Yes.

**R: And that's how we communicate in real life, right? Because if a students had said something like "Oh, I'd like some snails". One of them could've said "What? I don't get it." The person would have feedback, they'd talk to each other...**

L: yes.

**R: ... communication happens when you have this feedback... I get what you say, so I respond to you, if I don't understand I'm gonna ask you... And these are the things we have in real life, right?**

L: yeah.

**R: If you tell me something that I don't understand, I'll say "hey, what's that? Can you tell me what you mean?". So you have real social context, information gap, and feedback. In role plays.**

L: Yes.

**R: I thought it'd be nice to talk to you about that because I know some people don't like role plays.**

L: I avoid them, I usually avoid them, but I think it's really important. Now I get the idea.

**R: When I had to use role plays in class... I didn't like them at the beginning. But when I studied about them I was like "oh, it makes sense". So I thought it'd be nice to talk about it.**

L: Yes. And it's stupid for me to avoid role plays, because I play role play games. So I know the benefits. Why would I avoid them?

**R: nice. So... last thing. At the end you said "Oh guys, maybe next class we can bring real food and do this role play again with real food." Why would you do that?**

L: Then it'd be more real. We could have even... more of a "feedback"... get the pun of "feeding"?

**R: (laughs)**

L: (laughs)

**R: I didn't see that coming!**

L: We could ask for food and actually have food. And the idea was that they'd bring whatever food they could and we would have a menu with the real food we got in class. So we'd have a menu, pretending we were at a restaurant and have the conversation.

**R: I really want it to happen, but when I'm in class. (laughs)**

L: (laughs)

**R: Ok. So, very nice. As you said, you're happy, so am I. Would you like to comment on anything?**

L: No, no. Just that it's very good to be part of something, not just do something, because I usually just do things that I think are right. I don't think of all the structure. But now I think I'm getting the hang of it. It's really good. Thank YOU! Thank you for pointing it out!

**R: No, no. You've been seeing things. I've just been helping you.**

#### Mediator-mediatee interaction 7

**R: Let's start! There was a moment in class when you were going to start working with a video about a game show... Then you said "Do you want to play a game before the video?"**

L: Uhum.

**R: Why did you do that?**

L: Because they were really down. I think they wouldn't pay attention to the video.

**R: And why did you decide to play the Arcade?**

L: Because every time we do that, they get happy.

**R: Ok...**

L: They start competing, and they love competitions. That was the idea.

**R: To get them back in track.**

L: Yeah. Change the pace.

**R: Uhum. Thanks. Then you moved to the video. You said "Ok, now I can show you the video. It's about geography...", which was the topic of the unit. Is this video in the Interchange DVD?**

L: I don't know if it's in the DVD, but it's in the website.

**R: Did somebody tell you about it?**

L: I saw it on the website.

**R: Ok. Then you said "It's about a game show. Do you know what a game show is? Can you give me examples?", and students said "Show do Milhão" and other examples. Then you said "So, there's a host, asking questions to three people..." etc. Why did you do this first part?**

L: Potentialize before they... they'd obviously see the video, but I wanted them to think of, maybe, the vocabulary they (the people in the video) could use, because the guy would present himself, not present himself, but the narrator would present the host. I wanted to kind of have the setting already for them to prepare themselves for the video. Also because as we were talking, before the video, about game shows, I wanted to introduce this vocabulary.

**R: Do you think there'd be any difference if you had just played the video? Like, if you had just told them "So, we're going to watch a video" and just played it.**

L: Yeah. I think they wouldn't be so engaged in watching it. And they would also, probably, not understand. The narrator would say "Oh, this is your host...". I think they would probably get lost in this part. And I think if you get lost, maybe you get yourself worked up, and you don't understand the whole context. So I thought it'd be nicer to get this out of the way.

**R: Ok. By giving context?**

L: Yeah. Giving context, eliciting vocabulary.

**R: Did you organize how you were going to work with the activity or you saw it somewhere else?**

L: No, I organized it.

**R: Then you split students into three groups.**

L: Uhum.

**R: “Categories”, group A, “Questions”, group B, and “ORions and answers”, group C. Each group had to pay attention to something difference. Why did you do it this way?**

L: First of all, I think the three groups were not a very good idea. As you could see, they complained that the group that had to pay attention to the categories was an easy task.

**R: Why do you think so?**

L: Because in every beginning of question the guy showed “This is in the category... ‘river’.” It was too easy. I think.

**R: It was written there.**

L: It was written, there was the image, right? So, it was too easy. While the other groups had to pay attention to longer sentences, and see a lot of other things. It was more verbal, not visual. So it was more complicated.

**R: If you could go back, would you do it differently?**

L: Yeah. I’d slip them into two groups.

**R: Two groups.**

L: Just two groups.

**R: One for the questions, and the other one for the oRions and answers?**

L: Yeah.

**R: And what was your main goal with this activity?**

L: It was for them to see the vocabulary we had already seen in the previous class.

**R: Like a review?**

L: To review vocabulary, see it in context... See the structures that we are studying, the comparative and superlative, and also see how geography can be a little interesting, because they were really bored. I asked them in the first class if they liked geography, and they all said they hated it. So I was like “oh, how can I make this interesting?”

**R: Then you thought that the video would be a nice way, like, to get them engaged?**

L: Yeah. I think they liked it.

**R: Me too.**

L: Yeah? They were engaged.

**R: So, you said you wanted them to review vocabulary, see the structure, and see it in a context. What do you mean by “see it in a context”?**

L: People talking about the theme we were talking about. The first activity we did was from the Snapshot, in which they had to put the letters that correspond to the names of the places...

**R: Like “volcano, beach...” etc.**

L: Yeah. So they liked it, but it was not very... how can I say? Hmmm... they weren’t very motivated with that.

**R: Ok.**

L: Maybe if they got a real life situation, a kind of a real life situation where someone could use this vocabulary...

**R: Like on a game show?**

L: A game show...

**R: Which is something real...**

L: ... I thought it’d be more interesting for them to see... sometimes you have to use those terms, right?

**R: Can I also say that you also aimed at working with students’ listening skill?**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah. Absolutely.

**R: You thought about that?**

L: Yes.



**R: So when you split them into the different categories, do you think they'd be practicing listening by focusing on the categories?**

L: No.

**R: Why?**

L: Cause they already had the image... and the written word. That's the biggest problem.

**R: Did you figure that out at the time or you thought about that before?**

L: I figured it at the time.

**R: I just wanted to know if you intended to do a listening activity when splitting them into these different groups... Then I thought "but the categories are written on the video"...**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok? It's interesting that they complained. They were like "Oh, it's there..."**

L: Uhum.

**R: But it's nice that you see that.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Oh... I asked you before... How you could do it differently, then you said you could've split them into two groups, right? Like: questions/oRions and answers. I thought about another possibility, and I wanna know what you think about it. If you had split them into questions, oRions, and answers. What do you think about it?**

L: Yeah. Way better. Way better (effusively).

**R: Why do you think it's way better?**

L: Because then they'd have a more or less equal amount of work. They'd have more specific information to get from the video. And they'd separate, especially if you have two groups... one listens to the oRions, and the other listens to the correct answer, then it'd be more profitable. They could differentiate, in the same group, what is an oRion and what is the correct answer. More specific, right?

**R: Ok. Thanks. Did you feel that the activity worked? How did you feel about it?**

L: The way it was?

**R: Yes. This part of listening. Like, when you were correcting, asking them for the answers... How did you feel about it?**

L: I feel that they got most of the things, especially the group that worked with the questions. They were really good, I think they got all the questions. But the group that had the oRions and answers they had difficulty with the names of the places, because most places were not very famous, so they didn't know how to write or... how to... hmm... they didn't know the correct name, they got just the sound of some names, so maybe it was a little confusing for them.

**R: I saw that too. That some of them were a little confused. Can you think of any ways that you could've helped them listen for those things, for the names of the places?**

L: If I gave them a list beforehand, with many names, and between those... the correct ones.

**R: Like, you'd give them a list with names of volcanoes, rivers etc...**

L: Yeah. Among the things that were talked about.

**R: Can you think of how you'd do that? I mean, you'd just give them the list...**

L: no. I'd need to think about it. Maybe if I presented another activity before. For example, I could've done something similar to what I did in that activity in which students had the numbers of the places that we saw in the questions, in the previous class, so maybe if I did this kind of activity, with this list of places...

**R: Like... names of rivers and how long they are...**

L: Yes. I could've done that.

**R: Nice. I think you could've done that. You could've asked "Have you ever heard of these places? Do you know where they are located?"**

L: Uhum.

**R: Then you could've explored the list and then go to the video. I think it'd be very nice.**

L: And I thought about preparing a slide presentation with images because I didn't show any images so far, so I think they need to get the idea of these adjectives. But I need to do that.

**R: But I really liked the way you did it. Like, splitting them into groups for listening to specific things... I think it was a very nice way to do it. Then, when they finished listening to the video, you**

**had them get together, the whole class, and write down the categories, the questions, the oRions, and the answers. A whole class activity. Why did you do that?**

L: Because the information gap would be... filled?

**R: (laughs)**

L: (laughs) And I thought they wouldn't share a lot between themselves, because one person had to write and at least one person from each group had to contribute, right? But they actually got involved. With the exceRion of maybe two people, everyone was contributing. I thought it was nice. So that was the idea to fill the info gap they had, and work together. I think it's very interesting that they work together towards a common role.

**R: Can you tell me what the information gap would be in this case?**

L: They probably didn't pay attention to a lot of information, because those two groups, the question group and the oRions and answers group, they had a lot to do, so they probably didn't pay attention to everything that was going on. So that was the information gap.

**R: Ok.**

L: I don't think they got everything that was happening.

**R: Ok. So they were split into different groups to listen for different things.**

L: To listen for different things.

**R: Right. Nice. I really like it, but I have to make some comments.**

L: Uhum.

**R: One comment. I have a different impression than yours in relation to the last part. The one in which they got together as a big group. I think... My opinion, ok? I wanna know what you think about it.**

L: Uhum.

**R: I really liked the way you structured everything, I think it was a very good idea. But at the end... Hmm... I would've had one student from each group get together.**

L: Oh, yeah (effusively).

**R: Like one that listened for the categories, one that listened for the questions, and one that listened for oRions and answers.**

L: Then they'd get in three new groups to probably do the same activity or...

**R: yes. What do you think the biggest difference would be?**

L: Everybody would have to work.

**R: yes.**

L: Yeah! Perfect! I hadn't thought about that.

**R: Cause I saw that some of them, for example... this very shy guy who's always in the corner of the classroom... he was just looking at everyone, and there's the blond girl... she was writing down, that other talkative guy participating, as usual... But I think that there were more than two people only looking at the others work.**

L: Yeah.

**R: You know?**

L: Uhum.

**R: I like the fact that you had them get together, there's this idea of filling the gap and interacting, having this interaction moment among students, not depending on you, you were just watching them.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Very nice. But I thought that it could be more profitable to have them in trios...**

L: It's better. You can say that. (laughs)

**R: ... as you said, everyone would have to work.**

L: Yes! (effusively) Yes! Absolutely!

**R: But I really liked the way you did it. I'd just change this part.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Do you agree with me?**

L: Yeah. Completely.

**R: Well, that's it for today.**

L: I didn't think you'd have so many comments, because I didn't follow the book.

**R: Yep, but we also have comments when we don't follow the book (laughs). And I just wanna praise you, it was very nice. I really like the way you did it.**

L: Thank you.

**R: And, again, I don't want you to feel I'm here just pointing to you what you should've done...**

L: No... Not at all. Because I'd never think about that. And it's like (snapping her fingers) so obvious! But at the same time, it's not.

**R: But I want you to see that you did a great job. I really like the way you did it.**

L: Thank you.

**R: Like, you had them listen for specific things, you had them interact etc... Very very good!**

#### Mediator-mediatee interaction 8

**R: So... This is our 8<sup>th</sup> week together!**

L: yes!

**R: Just to start, I wanna talk about the conversation. Do you remember how you worked with it?**

L: yeah, kind of. I introduced this kind of a new theme by saying that, sometimes, when we make invitations we get messages, right? We send messages. We give information, right? So, that's what I said to introduce it.

**R: so you did that to introduce this new conversation. Can I say that you also tried to link it with what they saw last class?**

L: Yeah.

**R: ok. And... in the first conversation they talk about "making plans".**

L: Yeah.

**R: There's the girl inviting her coworker to do some things. Then you said "Oh, let's continue talking about invitations..." is that it?**

L: Not invitations... If I said that I didn't mean to.

**R: You did (laughs).**

L: Oh yeah. I didn't mean to (laughs).

**R: What do you mean?**

L: Because this is not an invitation (pointing to the conversation). There's nothing about invitations here.

**R: Uhum.**

L: (laughs)

**R: Cause you said "sometimes we send messages to invite people..."**

L: uhum.

**R: But then... the conversation itself... it's nothing to do with that.**

L: No, no. It's not about invitations, so... Maybe it was a slip of the tongue, maybe I meant that sometimes when we want to invite someone we send messages. We give information about the invitation itself. So, yes, it was a mistake.

**R: Not a mistake, it's just that it was not very well connected to the topic of the present conversation.**

L: No, no.

**R: You see that, right? I just wanted to know if you could see that now.**

L: Yeah, yeah. I realized many things at the time of the class. You're probably gonna comment on them. (laughs)

**R: Let me see. (laughs) Ok, nice. So... then you started working with the listening itself, right? Then, one thing that the manual suggests is "have students describe the picture".**

L: Yeah.

**R: That's the only thing suggested in the manual. You did something different. You started asking them questions. Why did you decide to do that?**

L: Because as you could see, they were really quiet. I don't think they'd engage by themselves, so I just asked questions. Also to make them realize details about the image. I don't know if they'd just engage, and really explore the image.

**R: When you say “details” what do you mean?**

L: Hm... I mean... the notebook, the woman sitting on the chair, probably the link between these two people.

**R: Cause you asked “Where are they? What’s the situation like?”, then one of them said “It’s workplace”, and you asked “what type of workplace?”. Cause it’s an office. Then “What’s he doing? Why do you think he’s writing?” Cause students saw that the man was writing something down. “Why do you think he’s writing? He’s probably taking notes. What do you think his job is?”**

L: Uhum.

**R: You wanted them to say “secretary”.**

L: yep.

**R: Right? They didn’t say it. You had to say “I think he’s a secretary. What do you think?” Why do you think this happened?**

L: Maybe because he’s a man.

**R: Yes. That’s what I thought!**

L: They thought he was a banker, and this makes no sense. Yeah... I kind of understand, but if it were a woman, they would’ve said “secretary”.

**R: I’m 100% sure. That’s what I was going to say. I don’t know how you felt, but I really like the way you did it. Even though you didn’t get the outcome you were hoping for, you know?**

L: uhum.

**R: From my point of view, this is not on you. The way you explored the picture was very good. I think it was this social issue going on...**

L: Oh, yeah.

**R: When I saw it I was like...**

L: He’s not a banker... (laughs)

**R: It’s because it’s a man. If it were a woman they would’ve said “secretary”.**

L: yeah.

**R: Well... You told me before that you wanted them to pay attention to the details. Why?**

L: Because I wanted them to imagine the situation. Especially because of the woman. Her image is very contrasting from what we’d expect from this kind of situation... Workplace. She’s really relaxed, and the guy’s taking notes. So I wanted them to see the contrast between these two people, so they’d kind of imagine, when they listened to the conversation, why she was like that. That was the idea.

**R: This idea of the guy being the secretary and the woman being the boss.**

L: Yeah. And why would someone take notes... Then they’d kind of guess who Mrs. Graham is.

**R: uhum. Ok... Nice. Then you had students listen for the two messages.**

L: Ok.

**R: As the book suggests. Then you had them get together in groups. Then you said “I want group one to talk about the first message and the other one to talk about the second message.” Why did you do it this way?**

L: Uh... It was something from the moment, I didn’t think about it before class. I thought about doing the good old information gap, but more individually. They wouldn’t need to have the info gap between two different groups. They’d have the information gap among themselves. I divided into two groups, and one group had to listen to one message, and the other to another message. They didn’t have to get together. I don’t know. I thought about it in the moment, that It’d be nice to have uh... how can I say? Interaction?

**R: Ok.**

L: Among themselves.

**R: Can I say that the main idea was to have them interact?**

L: Yes. Not the main idea. I wanted them to listen to the messages individually and maybe complete the messages. Within the group. If necessary.

**R: Ok. Nice. Well, you mentioned the information gap.**

L: yes.

**R: When do you think this information gap happens?**

L: Maybe, individually, if they didn't listen to all of the message or they didn't understand in which part of the conversation the message was contained, maybe they could share within the group.

**R: Ok, nice. I think it's a good way for them to interact and to complete each other's ideas, what I don't get is why one group talked about message one and the other talked about message two. Why didn't you have both of the groups talk about both messages?**

L: Because I didn't think they would do that. They were really bored (laughs). Maybe I should have done that. Maybe they'd like it more. A little challenge. Maybe I underestimated them.

**R: I thought about this idea of info gap, then I thought you were like... hmm... One thing that you could've done, was to tell them "One group should pay attention to the first message and the other to the second". Then have them exchange information, then there would be...**

L: This gap.

**R: You know? Between one and the other. But I get your idea. It also works. Like, even though they listen for the same thing they don't understand the same thing.**

L: uhum.

**R: got it. Then, you told them "I want you to identify the messages", then you pointed to the conversation and asked "Can you see a difference between them?"**

L: uhum.

**R: And students were like... dead.**

L: (laughs)

**R: "It's about function. The first is about doing something and the second is about getting something."**

L: uhum.

**R: Then you had them discuss the difference functions of those sentences. This is not in the manual, can you tell me why you decided to do so?**

L: Because before going to the grammar box, I wanted them to understand the difference between a request and a statement. So I wouldn't need to explain all these conceRrs.

**R: So your focus was on the function?**

L: On the function.

**R: The ideas.**

L: yeah.

**R: The manual suggests "Focus students' attention on the statements in the grammar focus box." It asked you to open the grammar focus and go through it. Why didn't you do it this way?**

L: I think we've had enough conversations about this (laughs). I wouldn't continue doing the same thing, like... Just pointing to the grammar box and explaining those things while students could just see them in the conversation, in the context, understand the function of these things, instead of me pointing them out.

**R: I really like that. The manual, in fact, is not being communicative here. (laughs)**

L: Not consistent.

**R: It's suggesting you to show students the grammar focus box, out of the blue, and start exploring it.**

L: uhum.

**R: And I really like the fact that you went back to the conversation, you asked students to focus on the messages, on the functions of the messages, to talk to their classmates so as to see what these different functions were... I found it very nice. I wanted to praise you for that.**

L: Thank you.

**R: It was really, really nice. I mean... you have this manual, which was written by experts, you know? But in this case, it's not very communicative.**

L: I thought it was really not consistent with what they normally say. The instructions are normally in the same way, right? Like, they don't direct you straight to the grammar box.

**R: I've realized that this happens sometimes with this book, and when I saw it I was very curious. I was like "What is she going to do?" I found it very nice the way you did it.**

L: Thank you.

**R: I really liked that you had them discuss the different functions, then one of the students said “ah, nessa ele tá pedindo pra fazer algo”.**

L: Finally (laughs).

**R: And I noticed that it was very difficult for them to understand, and I just wanna tell you that, as an outsider, this is not on you. They were almost sleeping in class. I think they were very tired, and this is normal. It happens sometimes. The way you did it was very nice. You focused on function, you asked them very good questions focusing on the different ideas between messages, then you had them talk in groups about the messages so as to share information, to unveil the different ideas of the messages... Then you gave two other examples I really liked. You wrote on the board “Our class starts at 8:10” And “send me your homework”. And you compared how the first sentence is just giving information while the second is asking them to do something. Then you connected these two sentences to the conversation, and after that you went back to the idea of “ask” and “tell”. You drew their attention to the verbs, asking them if they knew the difference between them, explaining when they’re used and what they’re used for. You showed them in the conversation, and only after that you went through the grammar box. I found it very nice.**

L: I’m getting there (laughs).

**R: How do you feel about it?**

L: It’s becoming more natural for me. I get the steps that I need to take beforehand. I don’t need to plan a lot, to write my class plan every time. I’m getting it. It’s becoming more natural.

**R: Do you feel that this makes your job easier?**

L: A lot (laughs).

**R: nice.**

L: I can even improvise more. I feel more confident.

**R: That’s very nice! I’m very happy!**

L: Thanks to you!

**R: Thanks to us! (laughs). Well, let me see, then you explained the grammar box, going back to the conversation, making links between these parts. After that, you had students do exercise below the grammar box, and after you corrected you asked them to classify the sentences into “requests” and “statements”. Why?**

L: So they could go back to the idea, because they were really confused. I wanted them to get the idea that, most times, when you use “tell” it’s something, and when you use “ask” it’s something different. Then next class it’s going to be a little more complex, but I wanted them to get the idea. They could relate these verbs to the functions.

**R: Nice. I really like it. Again, it’s not in the manual, but it’s very nice that you drew their attention to functional aspects. Do you have any other comments?**

L: No.

**R: I’m glad to know that you feel more confident.**

L: I didn’t imagine this class was good.

**R: What do you mean?**

L: I had no idea it was a good class.

**R: Really?**

L: Yeah, because they were so bored. I thought “Oh my God. What do I do now?”

**R: You thought you had done something wrong?**

L: Not something wrong, but they were... I don’t know. I have very low self-esteem, so sometimes even though I see that I did not do something wrong, I keep thinking “maybe I said something wrong, maybe I’m making silly faces...” I don’t know. I always try to point something wrong in me.

**R: I think you have to stop doing that.**

L: Yeah, I do.

**R: It was very nice. As an outsider, I found it a very nice class, very well structured, you taught it in a very communicative way. I really think that... I’ve been in class with you for three months and I’ve never seen the students like that. I think it wasn’t your fault. There’s this “end of semester vibe”, they may have many tests, they looked tired...**

L: yeah.

**R: I just wanted to make it very clear to you. I think you did a very good job and it was not your fault that they were bored and sleepy. It doesn't depend only on you.**

L: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. I want to motivate them more, I don't know what to do that's why I always bring cake.

**R: Food always motivates people.**

L: yeah. I'm thinking about getting something cheap and sugary to wake them up... I don't know... Popsicles...

**R: Caramel candies!**

L: YEAH! Good one!

#### Mediator-mediatee interaction 9

**R: So this is our last interview.**

L: Yes.

**R: So just to start, I wanna go straight to the part of the class in which you introduced the new unit. Unit 16 "A Change for the Better".**

L: Uhum.

**R: After finishing an activity you had started in the previous class, you told them "Let's change subjects". Then you showed them a picture of a caterpillar turning into a butterfly. And you asked them "What do you see here?"**

L: Uhum.

**R: A student answered "Transformation, change". And you asked "What comes to your mind when you think of transformation?". Then they said "habits", "age", "appearance"... Then you told them that there are changes for the worse and for the better. After that, you presented some slides – I loved them...**

L: (laughs)

**R: With your opinion about politics and other stuff. Then you talked about one thing that has changed in your life.**

L: Uhum.

**R: After that you had students right down changes they had for the better in their lives. Why did you do all of this? This is not in the manual's suggestions. The manual suggests "Write the unit title on the board and elicit or explain the meaning of 'a change for the better and also a change for the worse. Explain that the unit is about important changes in our lives'. You did something very different.**

L: Uhum.

**R: Can you tell me why?**

L: Yeah! I wanted them to engage. I did not want to explain this. They'd see if I showed them images. It was more of a conceR thing. I wanted to show the images and then they'd understand what it means to have a change for the better and for the worse. Also they'd give their own examples. I got inspired by this, of course...

**R: The Snapshot?**

L: Yeah. They'd have to answer what kind of changes they had in their lives... And I was like "yeah, maybe I can make them do that, instead of just showing things." Then I showed again some of these same aspects.

**R: Oh, yes. Then you presented some slides with pictures that represented some of the ideas in the Snapshot.**

L: Yes.

**R: So you worked with this idea of the Snapshot, but in a different way. Again, to engage them?**

L: To engage them and also to elicit before just giving them some answers. I wanted to know what kind of things they could think of.

**R: Ok. Then you had them say some changes people go through. You skipped this discussion here in the snapshot. Can you tell me why?**

L: I don't even remember what kind of discussion there is.

**R: “Which of these events are the most important changes? Have any of these things ever happened to you? What other things bring about change in your lives?”**

L: I didn’t want to waste time. And I didn’t know how important this would be.

**R: ok.**

L: Just... Straightforward. I don’t know if this is a good thing, but I didn’t want to waste time.

**R: Can you think of any differences between doing this and what you did?**

L: It’d be more straightforward.

**R: What?**

L: To have this kind of discussion and elicit things from them would be more straightforward.

**R: What you did?**

L: Yeah. I think. They’d think more quickly, so they... I don’t know if this would be very productive.

**R: Do you think they’d participate?**

L: They’re not accustomed to having this kind of very open discussions.

**R: You mean in groups? Like...**

L: I mean “open” in a sense of... This doesn’t require any kind of specific answer. So it’s a very broad... “Which of these events are the most important changes?” This is a very open question. And I don’t know where this would lead them.

**R: Ok. Cause the manual suggested discussing the questions in pairs.**

L: Uhum.

**R: And you did something similar to... “What other things bring about change in our lives?”. You just asked them to think of changes people normally go through. But instead of having them discuss it in groups, you just had them...**

L: Everybody.

**R: Yeah. Everybody together. Can you think anything that you would be, kind of “neglecting” by doing this?**

L: Interaction among themselves.

**R: Ok. Between peers. Ok. You were aware of that...**

L: Yes.

**R: You just decided to do something different.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok. Then you went to the conversation. You said “Now let’s listen to some people talk about changes. What do you see here?” Students said “married”, “boyfriend”. You pointed to the woman’s ring and students said “married”, “boyfriend”, “engaged”, and you said “Yeah, she’s probably engaged. Look at her hand” etc. Which is also different from the book. The manual suggests setting the scene “Two old friends run into each other and catch up on changes in their lives.” Instead of doing this, you asked them these questions. Why?**

L: First of all, I wouldn’t use these words, because...

**R: Which words? “Catch up”...**

L: “Catch up”, “run into each other”... These are terms that they’d not recognize, I think. I think... I don’t know... Maybe I didn’t know how to phrase that in a different way that they could understand. So I just skipped it.

**R: No problem. But what was your intention when you asked them these questions? Instead of doing that.**

L: To have them imagine the situation, but maybe without all the context. Like “to catch up with someone”. I just didn’t focus on this idea of “catching up” after some time. Just the changes.

**R: You thought it wouldn’t be necessary?**

L: Yeah. Maybe it was a mistake, I don’t know.

**R: I really liked the way you did it. If you had followed the manual’s suggestions “Two old friends run into each other and catch up on changes in their lives”, you didn’t do it. After that, the manual suggests “ask students ‘has Carrie’s life changed for the better or for the worse?’.” Then you had them listen for that.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Then you did the “true of false”, which is in the manual. Then... you played part B.**



L: Oh yeah.

**R: So, you did this first part in which you asked them some questions about the picture, so they'd imagine the situation. Oh... One question: do you think they'd picture the situation in the same way if you had said "Two old friends run into each other and catch up on changes in their lives", if compared to the way you did it?**

L: It would be different because then they'd think more about the change. It'd be more linked to what we were talking about. Of course, here, the way I did it... I think they noticed the women were talking about things that have changed, but with this contextualization of two friends that have not seen each other for some time, maybe it'd be even more obvious how this was related to time.

**R: Ok.**

L: It's not like you haven't seen someone for two days and things have completely changed. It'd be different.

**R: Ok. But I liked the way you did it. You asked them more questions, with more details. I think they had a very good idea of what was happening.**

L: Probably, yeah.

**R: Cause you asked them many questions, you showed them the ring, ok? Well... After that you went to part B. Before playing it, you wrote on the board... Well, this part asked students about how the women's lives have changed. Then you wrote on the board "job", "living". So there was a change in relation to her job and to the place she was living. This is not in the manual. Why did you do that?**

L: Because I wanted to guide them, maybe they wouldn't get the separate ideas. These are the central ideas of how her life has changed. Just to help them, to guide them.

**R: Ok. So you think it'd better for them to understand?**

L: Yeah. Just the central conceRs, then they could get the whole array of differences in relation to these central ideas. Her job was the central idea, for example. Then she talks about how she was a nurse, she was still a nurse but had quit her job in the hospital and was working in a private clinic.

**R: uhum.**

L: So there was a lot of information, but it was all related to her job. And the other conceR of "living". Any things, but all of them related to this conceR.

**R: So they'd probably focus on those two conceRs, on that context...**

L: Yeah.

**R: ... those two ideas.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Ok. Nice. After that you opened the conversation and said "So, there are different manners to talk about changes. Then you showed students their answers for that first activity. Was it intentional? I mean, to make this connection?"**

L: Yeah.

**R: Why did you decide to do that?**

L: Because they'd see that, sometimes, you naturally use different kinds of structures to talk about the same thing, the same theme... That was "changes". I wanted it not to sound formulaic. That was the idea. It sounded natural that they'd produce something, it makes sense that they'd use that or other kinds of structures.

**R: Nice. I remember someone said something in the present, then most of them used the present perfect.**

L: Yeah.

**R: Nice. Then you went through their answers so as to show we can talk about changes in different ways, and had them underline the changes in the conversation, classifying them between present and past. The manual suggests writing four categories on the board: present tense; past tense; present perfect; and comparative. Focus students' attention on the conversation and ask them to find examples of each category. And you didn't do this. Why?**

L: I think it'd be too focused on these tenses. I wanted them to perceive, more naturally, let's say, that there are differences, but not to classify those differences. I didn't even ask them to classify them in detail.

**R: Yes.**

L: Right? I wanted them to talk about past and present. And that's it. And If they could get that there was a comparative in the present tense... yeah, nice.

**R: Ok. You made it more like... Focused on the function rather than on the form.**

L: Yeah, yeah.

**R: I know we've talked about it before, but can you tell me why you decided to do it this way? Like, do you think it's better for them or...**

L: Yeah. I think it's better for them that they perceive that things are different, but they're all connected. They're not parts of a machine that you can just combine or you try to make this... This kind of...

**R: Form? System.**

L: Yeah, form. Very rigid system of rules, right? I didn't wanted them to think of this as four different ways, but different manners you can do that, the same thing, but not to classify. Right? I think if I did that, if I classified in four different manners, they'd think those are the only manners they can do that. Those are the main ones, but this is not the idea.

**R: Uhum.**

L: So I wanted them to focus on the different manners that changes are described, and it flows, it flows.

**R: So you're focusing on function.**

L: Yes.

**R: Nice. And, again, I want to congratulate you because it's something very nice. The book focuses on grammar, asking you to write those four categories on the board, and you had them underline the changes, the way people talk about changes first so they could focus on the changes. You had them to that, to focus on the changes. The manual doesn't suggest that. So it was something very nice. You worked on the changes, then you went through past and present, then you went through the grammar box, showing the ideas and going back to the conversation. Very nice. I really like it.**

L: I'm getting good at it.

**R: I think so too! Let me see if I have something else. Oh, I also liked that you compared the ideas in the book to their examples, the ones they gave you in the other activities.**

L: It was according to the plan! FINALLY! (effusively) Not finally like "oh, it's the first time", but it's going smoothly and I really like it.

**R: Do you think it's becoming more natural to you?**

L: Definitely. I don't even need to think a lot before class, I just "Uh... there's a better way to do that. I can organize this in a different way."

**R: Nice. Very nice!**