This study is dedicated to my mother, Aracy Maia Guará, a strong woman, great human being who has dedicated her life to me and my brother.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am heartily thankful to all of those who have encouraged me in my journey towards the completion of this work. My special thanks to:

God, for all the blessings in my life, for giving me strength, for helping me learn all I have learned during these two years away from home.

My *family* for all the love and care, for encouraging me into this challenging experience of being away from home and from you, for all the phone calls, for the delicious meals when I go home to visit you, for helping me *whenever* I need you. You're always on my mind and heart and I love you.

My fiancé, *Kiko*, for all the love and care, for cooking for me when I was hungry, cleaning the house when I was studying, taking care of me when I have those *awful* headaches. I think that being a PGI student's boyfriend, fiancé or husband is one of the hardest task a man can face to accomplish and you have carried out such task beautifully. I would not have been able to carry on without you by my side. Ours is the greatest love of all.

My advisor, *Mailce*, for being this wonderfully demanding professor, researcher and advisor, for asking me such tough, intruguing questions, for being so attentive to details, for sharing so much knowledge, for seeing me at your place sometimes late at night because it was the only time *I* had available.. *Indeed*, you have helped me learn a lot.

My professors *Vládia Maria Cabral Borges* and *Manolisa Vasconsellos* from the Federal University of Ceará for believing in me and for all the e-mails of encouragement.

All my professors at the Federal Universiy of Santa Catarina for the sharing of knowledge, ideas and experiences.

Professor *LedaTomitch* for kindly opening the doors of your house and inviting us to wonderful parties. It has been so much fun. I even get more motivated to study the days after the dancing nights.

My special friends *Illona, Ana Karine, Júlia, Márcia and Alexandra* for your precious friendship, for all the e-mails, for cheering me up when I was down. God has spread us all over the world, two of us in Barcelona, one in Rio, one still in Fortaleza, one in Recife and one in Florianópolis. I miss you all, but deep inside I never feel so far away from you because you are always on my mind and heart. I will never forget our good *and* bad times together. I will never forget our adventurous trips to Noronha, Rio, Pipa, Jericoacoara and Canoa.

 All the teachers and students who participated in this study for your collaboration. I will never be able to thank you enough.

My friends, *Raquel and Marimar,* for caring and sharing, for being so sweet, for helping me so much. I'm so glad I've met you here in Floripa.

My friends, *Leonice and Armando*, for all your help.

Two brilliant researchers and great human beings, *Vilmar Ferreira de Souza* and *Pedro Praxedes Filho,* for giving me good pieces of advice and helping me in my journey throughout these two years.

All *my* friends at Instituto Brasil Estados Unidos- Ceará for teaching me so much.

ABSTRACT

**A MATTER OF STYLE: LOOKING AT L2 TEACHERS' TEACHING STYLES
FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LEARNING STYLES**

MARIA DA GLÓRIA GUARÁ TAVARES
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
2004

Supervising professor: Dr. Mailce Borges Mota Fortkamp

The present study aims at investigating L2 teachers' teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles to identify the learning styles which tend to be most favored by foreign language teachers, the relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles, students' attitudes towards discussing learning preferences in the classroom, and difficulties teachers face when trying to develop a balanced teaching style. The data for the present study were collected at the Extracurricular Language Courses offered by Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), from April, 16th to July 4th , 2002. Eight teachers of English as a foreign language – two at the beginning level, two of the pre-intermediate level, two of the intermediate level, and two of the high-intermediate level – were observed for the purpose of investigating their teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles. Out of the eight teachers, six were observed for three classes. The other two were observed for six classes, took part in an instructional program, and were required to accomplish two tasks. Task one consisted of trying to approach students' learning styles and task two consisted of trying to develop a balanced teaching style. For the data collection, seven instruments were used: (1) classroom observation, (2) audio recordings, (3) one instrument for assessing teaching styles, (4) one instrument for assessing learning styles, (5) one questionnaire for assessing students' attitudes, (6) a reflective session, and (7) a semi-guided interview with teachers. The framework for data analysis was the Myers and Briggs Learning Style Model (1987). Results indicate that (1) extraverts, feelers, perceivers and kinesthetic tend to be the learning styles most favored, (2) there seems to be a correlation between teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles, (3) students present a positive attitude towards teachers' attempts to discuss learning styles, and (4) teachers face two main difficulties when trying to develop a balanced

teaching style: lack of time for planning their classes and lack of knowledge of learning style theories.

Number of pages: 116
Number of words: 36.173

RESUMO

A MATTER OF STYLE: LOOKING AT L2 TEACHERS' TEACHING STYLES FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF LEARNING STYLES

MARIA DA GLÓRIA GUARÁ TAVARES

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
2004

Professora Orientadora: Dra. Mailce B. M. Fortkamp

O presente estudo tem por objetivo investigar estilos de ensino de professores de L2 sob a perspectiva de estilos de aprendizagem. O estudo foi motivado por quatro perguntas: (1) Quais estilos de aprendizagem tendem a ser mais favorecidos pelos estilos de ensino de professores de L2? (2) Existe relação entre os estilos de ensino dos professores de L2 e seus próprios estilos de aprendizagem? (3) Quais as reações dos alunos quanto a discutir sobre seus estilos de aprendizagem em sala de aula ? (4) Quais as dificuldades encontradas por professores de L2 ao tentarem desenvolver um estilo de ensino mais balanceado? A coleta de dados foi realizada nos cursos extracurriculares de idiomas da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, no período de 16 de abril a 1º de julho de 2002. Oito professores participaram desse estudo- dois dos cursos iniciantes, dois dos cursos pré-intermediário, dois dos cursos intermediários e dois dos cursos intermediários-avançados. Desses oito professores, seis foram observados por três aulas e dois foram observados por seis aulas, participaram de um programa de instrução sobre estilos de ensino e de aprendizagem e realizaram duas tarefas em suas salas de aula. A primeira tarefa consistiu em tentar abordar seus alunos sobre suas preferências de aprendizagem. A segunda tarefa consistiu em tentar desenvolver um estilo de ensino balanceado em uma de suas aulas. Sete instrumentos foram realizados para coleta de dados: (1) observação de sala de aula e gravação em áudio (2) anotações em diário (3) um instrumento para determinar estilos de aprendizagem, (4) um instrumento para determinar estilos de aprendizagem, (5) um questionário para verificar reações dos

alunos quanto a discutir sobre seus estilos de aprendizagem, (6) uma sessão reflexiva com os professores e (7) uma entrevista com os professores. Os resultados indicam que: (1) alunos extrovertidos, sentimentais, perceptivos e sinestésicos tendem a ser os mais favorecidos pelos estilos de ensino dos professores de L2, (2) existe uma relação entre os estilos de ensino e de aprendizagem dos professores de L2, (3) os alunos apresentam reações positivas ao discutir sobre seus estilos de aprendizagem em sala de aula e (4) os professores encontram duas dificuldades ao tentar desenvolver um estilo de ensino mais balanceado: escassez de tempo para planejar a aula e falta de familiaridade com as teorias de estilos ensino e aprendizagem.

Número de páginas:116

Número de palavras: 36. 173

Table of Contents

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Preliminaries

Second language acquisition research has gathered evidence to show that individual learners have distinctive approaches to learning an L2[1] (Ellis, 1989). Skehan (1998) distinguishes two perspectives towards individual differences in L2 learning: aptitude and style. Skehan explains that within the aptitude perspective fixedness is implied and some learners are labeled as gifted ones, while others are not so talented. On the other hand, Skehan believes the style perspective seems more attractive asserting that:

> A style perspective contains two differences which render it more attractive. First, it implies that there may be some degree of disposition, so that the style someone adopts may partly reflect personal preference rather than innate endowment. In such a case the fixedness associated with aptitude would not apply. Second, there is the possibility that with style, even though there may be a continuum of some sort with more or less of an attribute being possessed, all the advantages may not accrue to only one end of the continuum (Skehan 1998, p. 237).

The reasons argued by Skehan concerning more attraction toward the style perspective have enhanced my interest in learning styles. As an educator, I would not feel comfortable in labeling learners as fortunate or unfortunate ones. Thus, I feel more attracted by the perspective that not all advantages or attributes for L2 learning belong entirely to one style or another. In this sense, I tend to believe that most learners may have strengths and weaknesses as a result of their learning style.

One of the issues in which learning style research has concentrated on is learner-instruction matching (Ellis, 1994). This field of learning style research concerns the match or mismatch between teachers' instructional style and students' learning styles.

---

[1] In the present study, both foreign and second language will be referred to as L2. Whenever necessary, a distinction will be made as to whether the context is that of a foreign or second language.

Research on this issue has suggested that learners will differ in the type of instruction to which they best respond (Bialystok, 1985; Ellis, 1989). According to Dunn and Dunn (1993), the compatibility between the teacher's instructional style and the student's learning style is an important factor in the learning process. Similarly, Bialystok (1985) claims that a minimal congruity between the type of instruction and students' preferred learning strategies is necessary for successful L2 acquisition.

On the other hand, mismatches between the teachers' teaching styles and learners' learning styles may have a negative impact on learning (Felder and Henriques, 1995). In the same vein, Nelson (1995) claims that teachers and students come to classrooms with certain assumptions about how learning takes place. When these assumptions diverge, frustration is likely to take place on the part of both teachers and students.

In short, learner-instruction matching research is concerned with seeking the best type of instruction (Ellis, 1994). Within this perspective, the belief is that students learn best when they are in learning situations that match their learning style needs. Thus, it is likely that teachers who use instruction that is compatible to their students' learning styles may be able to reach a larger number of learners (Wintergest, DeCapua, Verna, 2003).

As an L2 teacher and researcher, I have been intrigued by the assumption that some learners may respond well to a certain instructional style, while other learners may not respond well due to mismatches between their learning styles and the teaching styles of their teachers. Therefore, in order to gain insights on L2 teachers' teaching styles from the perspective of learners' learning styles and on how teachers can better account for different learning styles, the present study aims at investigating teaching styles and learning styles in the L2 classroom.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

I believe L2 teachers aim at language learning for *all* students. Thus, it is the teacher's role to accommodate different learners in the classroom (Kinsella, 1994) since teachers are expected to meet a variety of students' needs and preferences. At the heart of learning style theory lies the assumption that teachers can maximize students' learning by incorporating learning tasks that meet their students' learning styles (Wintergerst, DeCapua and Verna, 2003). In order to meet students' learning styles, researchers suggest that teachers should aim at achieving a balanced teaching style (Oxford, 1993; Kinsella, 1994; Felder and Henriques, 1995). A balanced teaching style[2] is the one which accommodates, simultaneously or sequentially, different learning styles in the classroom (Oxford, 1993; Felder and Henriques, 1995).

In developing a balanced teaching style, the aim is that teachers should address students according to their learning styles, as well as challenge students to stretch their learning preferences. A balanced teaching style is achieved when teachers, at times, expose students to learning tasks that match their learning styles, and, at other times, expose students to approaches other than their preferred ones (Oxford, 1993; Felder and Henriques, 1995). As a consequence, learners will have opportunities to learn through their individual learning styles, as well as opportunities to stretch their learning preferences and become more flexible learners (Oxford, 1993; Kroonemberg, 1995).

In sum, there is agreement among researchers that by pursuing a balanced teaching style teachers may be better able to account for different learning styles in the classroom (Oxford, 1993; Felder and Henriques, 1995). However, being able to accommodate students' learning styles seems to be a complex task. First, teachers may have students with a variety of learning styles. Second, it is also difficult to assess students' learning styles because of the lack of reliable instruments to appreciate

---

[2] For the present study, a balanced teaching style means a teaching style that is aimed at addressing all learning styles on an equal basis (Felder and Henriques, 1995).

learning styles (Reid et.al., 1995; Ellis, 1989). Third, models of learning styles abound in the literature: Witkin (1962), Kolb (1976), Reid (1984), Myers and Briggs (1987), Oxford (1993), among others. Thus, it may be hard for teachers to choose one learning style model to work with in order to find out about their students' styles and somehow try to accommodate different styles in the classroom.

Teachers may be able to choose a model of learning style to investigate their students' preferences if they are familiarized with learning style theories. Nevertheless, from my experience as a teacher and researcher, I believe not many teachers are familiarized with such theories. In addition, teachers usually have busy schedules; thus, planning classes in order to address different learners may imply extra work and effort on the part of the teachers. This may not be feasible because of time constraints or even lack of support on the part of the schools.

In short, the general assumption in the present study is that adjusting instruction to match different learning styles may somehow have positive impacts on learning (Felder and Henriques, 1995). However, adjusting instruction to account for learning styles may be a complex task due to the problems and difficulties aforementioned. It is aiming at achieving a better understanding of the learning styles that tend to be most favored by L2 teachers' teaching styles, and of how L2 teachers can adjust their teaching styles to accommodate different learners' learning styles that I nestle this investigation.

1.3. Objectives and Research Questions

The general objective of the present study is to investigate teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles. In order to achieve this broader objective, the specific objectives of this study are:

i. to investigate the learning styles that tend to be most favored by L2 teachers' teaching styles;

ii. to investigate the relationship between L2 teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles;

iii. to investigate students' attitudes towards teachers' attempts to promote students' awareness of their learning styles;

iv. to investigate the difficulties L2 teachers face when trying to develop a balanced teaching style that addresses a variety of students' learning styles.

In pursuing these objectives, this investigation aims at answering the following research questions:

a) What learning styles tend to be most favored by L2 teachers' teaching styles?

b) Is there a relationship between L2 teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles?

c) What are students' attitudes towards discussing learning styles in the classroom?

d) What difficulties do L2 teachers face when trying to develop a balanced teaching style?

Answers to these questions may shed some light upon teaching and learning styles within the L2 classroom as well as raise teachers' and students' awareness of this variable.

1.4. Significance of the Study

The present study focuses on teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles. According to Sternberg and Grigorenko (1997), research on learning styles has been considered relevant for styles represent a bridge between cognition and personality. Actually, perspectives on learning styles often overlap between cognitive and personality factors. As Brown (1994) points out:

> "Styles, whether related to personality (eg. extroversion, self-steem, anxiety) or to cognition (e.g. left/right brain orientation, ambiguity tolerance, field-sensitivity) characterize the consistent and rather enduring traits, tendencies, or preferences that may differentiate you from another person." (p.192).

Following these lines, research on learning styles is relevant since it may somehow tackle both cognitive and emotional factors involved in L2 learning.

Although extensive research has been carried out on learning styles in the field of education (e.g. Dunn & Dunn, 1978; Dunn, Dunn & Price, 1979; Felder & Silverman, 1988, just to mention a few), not much has been done in L2 learning. In addition, most studies on learning styles within language learning have not been concerned with foreign language teaching, but with second language teaching contexts[3], involving matters such as culture learning styles (Shimahara, 1986), and limited English proficient students (Violand de Hainer, 1990). The present study aims at contributing to the research on learning styles in the context of foreign language teaching and learning since it focuses on the foreign language teachers' teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles.

In addition, the field of teaching and learning styles lacks empirical research in Brazil. The present study is, to the best of my knowledge, the first one in Brazil, to address teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles within the approach of

---

[3] Here a distinction between second and foreign language context is made. A second language context is the one in which the language under study is learned in the country where it is spoken as a first language, whereas a foreign language context is the one in which the language is learned in a country where it is not spoken as a first language (Brown, 1987).

reflective teaching. Thus, this investigation may contribute to this field of research in our country and shed some light on individual differences in the L2 teaching and learning Brazilian context.

1.5. Organization of the Thesis

So far, the statement of the problem, objectives, research questions and significance of the study have been briefly introduced. The remainder of the thesis is organized as follows:

In chapter 2, the relevant literature in the two main issues addressed in the present study, teaching styles and learning styles, is reviewed. In addition, theories of teacher development are reviewed since a reflective approach was pursued regarding teachers' participation in the study. In chapter 3, the method used in the present study is described. In chapter 4, the research questions are retaken, and the analysis and interpretation of the data pertaining to each of the questions are presented. In chapter 5, the findings of the present study are summarized, and the limitations of the study, pedagogical implications as well as suggestions for further research are included.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In this chapter, I aim at giving an overview of the literature related to the main topics of my thesis: learning styles and teaching styles. In addition, I present a brief overview of the theories of teacher development, for I pursued a reflective approach during the instructional program carried out with the volunteer teachers participating in this study. The chapter is divided into eight sections. Section 2.1 summarizes the most relevant learning style theories, and section 2.2 gives an overview of leaning style models. Section 2.3 describes the framework for the data analysis of my study: Jung's Theory of psychological Types and Myers and Briggs' elaboration of Jung's theory. Sections 2.4 and 2.5 give an overview of theoretical perspectives on teaching styles. Finally, section 2.6 gives a brief overview of the theories of teacher development.

2.1. Defining Learning Styles

According to Reid et.al (1995), the area of learning styles is both complex and fragmented mainly due to the fact that researchers have investigated various aspects of learning styles, and in so doing, researchers have labeled the learning style aspects investigated with a variety of terminologies. This variety of learning styles and terminologies often blur our understanding of this field of research.

I believe researchers have investigated various aspects of learning styles because they seem to have different perspectives towards this variable of L2 learning. Some researchers take a cognitive perspective and define learning styles as "preferred or habitual patterns of mental functioning and dealing with new information" (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990, p.311). Within the same perspective, Kinsella (1995, p. 171) defines

learning styles as " an individual's natural, habitual, and preferred ways of absorbing, processing, and retaining some information skills which persist regardless of teaching methods or content area." However, some other researchers emphasize both cognitive and affective aspects of learning styles. For example, Keefe (1979, p. 4) defines learning styles as "cognitive, affective, and physiological traits that are relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment." Scarcella (1990), in turn, suggests that learning styles are "cognitive and interactional patterns which affect the ways in which students perceive, remember and think" (p.114). The various perspectives researchers have on learning styles seem to be reflected in the ways they classify learning style models[4].

Several researchers (e.g. Reid et. al, 1995; Dunn and Dunn, 1993; Gregorc, 1979; Nunan, 2003) classify learning style models into cognitive, sensorial or personality ones. However, researchers do not seem to offer an explanation of how these models are grouped into such categories. For instance, Reid et al.(1995) and Nunan (2003) classify the Right-and Left–Hemiphere learners into a personality learning style model, and Reflective/impulsive learners into a cognitive learning style model. This classification seems fuzzy because right- and left- brain dominance relates to brain lateralization; it seems that it would fit better into the cognitive learning style category. In addition, there seems to be no evidence for such lateralization since many studies support a complementary specialization, involving both right- and left- hemispheres, rather than a lateralization perspective (Kaplan, Brownell, Jacobs and Gardner, 1990; Hough, 1990; among others).

On the other hand, the Reflective/Impulsive learning style model seems to refer mainly to personality traits, hence, it seems that it would fit better into the personality learning style category. It is likely that some researchers may categorize learning style

---

[4] Learning style models are frameworks in which learning styles are organized and described (Brown, 1987; Reid et. al, 1995).

models as cognitive, sensorial and personality models as a consequence of the different ways in which they approach learning styles, and for didactic reasons as well. Nevertheless, these categorizations may make the field of learning styles even more fragmented and blurry. Having presented the different ways in which researchers approach and classify learning styles, it seems reasonable now that I state my own perspective towards learning styles for the present study.

In trying to make sense of the various perspectives within the field, I have looked at learning styles through the scope of cognition. Since learning an L2 is a complex cognitive process (Mclaughlin, 1987), I believe learning style is essentially a cognitive construct. However, as Schumann (1994) has pointed out, there is a link between emotion and cognition since "cognition may be conceived as perception of the stimuli, the emotional appraisal of the stimuli, attention to the stimuli, representation of the stimuli in memory, and subsequent use of that information in behavior"(Schumann 1994, p. 231). In order to explain what structures in the brain allow affect to influence cognition, he explains that "in the temporal lobe there is a part of the limbic system called the amygdala, which assesses the emotional significance and motivational relevance of the stimuli; this appraisal then influences attention and memory" (Mishkin and Appenzeller, 1987, as cited in Schumann, 1995, p. 233). Thus, from a reductionist approach in which cognitive processes are seen as neural processes, Schumann (1994) has highlighted that:"(…) emotion and cognition are distinguishable but inseparable. Therefore, from a neural perspective, affect is an integral part of cognition." (p. 232).

Following this line of reasoning, I take the perspective that learning style is essentially a cognitive construct, which can be influenced by emotion. In addition to this, learning style seems to influence learners' behavior within the learning environment. For instance, field-dependence /independence is a cognitive construct which regards modes of perceiving: individuals may be more holistic or analytical in

their perception (Witkin, 1962). These modes of perceiving seem to drive learners' behavior. In this sense, field-dependent learners are described as more socialized, and cooperative, whereas field-independent learners are described as competitive, and self-confident (Skehan, 1998; Brown, 1987). Within the learning environment, learners' behavior seems to be more evident than the actual mental processes learners undergo, this being one reason why learning styles are usually described in terms of learners' personality characteristics.

Thus, in short, I take the perspective that learning style is essentially a cognitive construct which can be influenced by emotion and can drive learners' behavior. Consequently, for the present study, I adopt Keefe's definition: "learning styles are cognitive, affective, and physiological traits that are relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment…Learning style is a consistent way of functioning, that reflects underlying causes of behavior" (Keefe, 1979, p. 4).

This definition seems suitable for the present study since it encompasses both cognitive and emotional factors, and suggests that learning styles are manifested in terms of learners' behavior. In addition, the definition also includes the learning environment, which will somehow also be tackled in the present study once learning and teaching styles will be investigated within the L2 classroom environment.

The perspective I take towards learning styles also applies to the way learning styles are organized in models. As stated above, I believe learning style is mainly a cognitive variable which can be influenced by emotion and can be manifested in learners' behavior. In this sense, cognitive, affective, and personality factors seem to be intermingled within the concept of learning styles. Therefore, I shall not refer to learning style models as either personality, sensorial or cognitive ones. I will refer to them simply as learning style models, a theme to be treated in the following section.

2.2. Learning Style Models

The different styles in which people learn have been the focus of considerable study. As Brown (1987) points out:

> "If we were to try to enumerate all learning styles that educators and psychologists have identified, a long list would emerge. From early Ausebel (1968) and Hill (1972), to recent research by Reid (1995), Ehrman (1996) and Cohen (1998), dozens of learning styles have been identified"(p. 114).

The various learning styles which have been identified by researchers are usually organized in learning style models. As stated before, a model is a framework in which contrasting learning styles are organized and described (Brown, 1987; Reid et al., 1995). For example, Field–dependent /-independent learning styles, Ambiguity tolerant / intolerant learning styles, Right-/ left-brain learning styles, among others, are usually referred to as models of learning styles (Reid et al., 1995).

It seems reasonable to highlight that "learning styles exist on wide continuums, although they are often described as opposites" (Reid et. al, 1995, p. xiii). There is agreement among researchers that learners benefit from all styles of learning, they are not supposed to fit into one or another learning style exclusively (Dunn and Griggs, 1988; Felder and Henriques, 1995; Nunan, 2003). Therefore, learning styles indicate stronger tendencies within the learner rather than absolute styles of learning.

From all models of learning styles, the field-independent/dependent model is the one which has attracted most attention in second language acquisition research (Ellis, 1994). According to Witkin (1962), field-independence/dependence is related to modes of perceiving. Field-independent learners are more analytical in their perception; thus, they are more able to distinguish parts from a whole. They have "an ability to perceive a particular, relevant item or factor in a field of distracting items"(Brown, 1987, p. 114). Field –independent learners tend to benefit from learning situations which involve analysis and they tend to be more competitive and independent learners (Brown, 1987;

Skehan, 1998). Field –dependent learners, on the other hand, are more holistic in their perception, they are more able to perceive the overall organization of situations (Witkin, 1962). They tend to view parts of a problem or situation as a unified whole, and they seem to be more socialized, person-oriented and cooperative learners (Brown, 1987).

Another learning style model which is commonly addressed in the literature is the visual/auditory/kinesthetic/tactile model. This model concerns the sensory channels through which perception occurs. Educators often refer to these sensory channels as modalities, and "the sensory channels through which each individual best absorbs and retain information have become known as modality strengths" (Kinsella, 1995, p. 173).

Kinsella (1995) clarifies these learning styles. First, she remarks that visual and auditory learners seem to be described in oversimplified ways. The former being described as learners who best absorb and retain information through seeing, and the latter as learners who best absorb information through hearing. However, according to Kinsella (1995), visual learners may differ among themselves and so do auditory learners. Some visual learners may benefit mostly from reading, while others may benefit mainly from pictures, diagrams and charts. In the same vein, some auditory learners may favor mainly from listening to lectures or tapes while others may benefit mostly from discussions and group activities.

The second clarification is related to kinesthetic and tactile learners. According to Kinsella (1995), although these learners are usually referred to as being the same, they may differ in subtle aspects. Tactile learners favor mostly from hands- on activities such as writing, painting, and drawing, whereas kinesthetic learners benefit from complete involvement in a learning task such as visiting a museum or carrying out an interview.

As far as teaching is concerned, the claim is that language pedagogy should include visual as well as verbal presentation along with writing, reading, hands-on, and complete body involvement activities. Learners should not only experience approaches that match their learning styles, but also approaches other than their preferred ones (Oxford and Ehrman, 1993). Therefore, the best approach in terms of modality strengths is a multisensory approach (Kinsella, 1995). This pedagogical claim seems to be compatible with that of developing a balanced teaching style in order to accommodate different learners in the classroom (Felder and Henriques, 1995).

Having presented some of the learning style models available in the literature, I shall now present the model used for data analysis of the present study. In the next section, I present the Myers and Briggs Model (1987). Since this model is based on Jung's theory of psychological types (1974), the following section presents Jung's theory and the Myers and Briggs Model (1987).

2.3. Jung's' Theory of Psychological Types (1974) and The Myers and Briggs Model (1987)

It seems appropriate that I justify the use of the Myers and Briggs Model (1987) for data analysis in the present study. First, the Myers and Briggs is based on a traditional psychological theory extant for almost a hundred years, Jung's Theory of psychological types (1974). Second, the Myers and Briggs Model has originated one of the most widely used instruments to measure learning styles, the Myers and Briggs Type Indicator (1987), usually referred to as the MBTI (Sternberg and Grigorenko, 1997; Carrell and Monroe, 1995). The MBTI was originally created to measure psychological types in more general terms, such as to relate psychological types to professional preferences and abilities. Then, the MBTI was applied to education and learning in order to measure learning styles (Carrell and Monroe, 1995). Third, since the Myers and Briggs has originated a widely used instrument, the model has already

been operationalized in previous research (e.g. Moody, 1988; Jensen and DiTiberio, 1989; Oxford, 1993; Erhmann, 1994, among others). Having justified the choice of learning style model for the present study, it is now high time to start presenting the theory underlying the model, then, the model itself.

Psychological types are mental patterns of the way people perceive and make judgments (Jung, 1974). According to Jung, all conscious[5] mental activity can be classified in four mental processes: two perception processes – sensing and intuition – and two judgment processes – feeling and thinking. In this theory, whatever comes into consciousness, comes either through the senses or through intuition. As these perceptions continue in consciousness, they are analyzed and evaluated through the judgment processes, thinking and feeling (Lawrence, 1982).

According to Jung (1974), the four mental processes-sensing, intuition, thinking and feeling- are used by all human beings. However, these processes are not utilized equally well or in the same extents: each individual relies on certain mental processes more than on others. Consequently, some processes become predominant. Psychological types can be characterized according to the predominant mental processes.

In Jung's theory, psychological types are classified as sensing, intuitive, thinking and feeling. According to Jung (1974), sensing types easily memorize facts, details, and have accurate power of observation. Intuitive types tend to perceive what is symbolic and abstract and value complexity and possibilities. Thinking types pursue objectivity and logical analysis when making judgments. Finally, feeling types make judgments from a personal and subjective basis.

---

[5] The terms *conscious and consciousness* as present in Jung's theory mean awareness (Jung, 1974), and they seem to be used in a broader sense, not in the sense meant by Schmidt (1990), who defines *consciousness* in three differenet ways as : (1) awareness, (2) intention, and (3)knowledge.

Besides classifying psychological types as sensing, intuitive, thinking and feeling, Jung (1974) also classifies people as extraverts or introverts, according to their interest towards the world. Extraverts are those individuals that are motivated by the outer world of actions and objects. Introverts are those who are motivated by the inner world of ideas and reflections.

In Jung's theory, the mental processes are seen as polar opposites. In other words, the perception processes-sensing and intuition- are opposites. Likewise, the two judgement processes-thinking and feeling- are in opposition to each other. Therefore, polar opposite mental processes can not be focused on at the same time. For instance, at the moment an individual is focused on intuitions, he /she can not be simultaneously focused on sensation and vice-versa (Lawrence, 1982). In this sense, people may even shift from one mental process to another quite fast, but not focus on both at the same time. When a person relies on one mental process as a pattern of mental habit, this process prevails as the dominant process.

In order to counterbalance the dominant process, an auxiliary process is developed. According to Jung (1974), the auxiliary mental process is always distinct from the dominant one, but never opposite to it. For instance, thinking as a dominant process can have either intuition or sensing as an auxiliary process. However, it will never have feeling as an auxiliary process because feeling is the opposite mental process of thinking. By pairing dominant and auxiliary processes respectively, the following types are identified: sensing-feeler, sensing-thinker, intuitive-feeler, intuitive-thinker, thinker-sensing, thinker-intuitive, feeler-sensing, and feeler-intuitive. In addition to all this, people can be also extraverts or introverts.

Myers and Briggs (1987) interpreted Jung's theory and added one more dimension of psychological types: judging and perceiving. This dimension is related to the attitudes people take towards the world. When a judging process drives the attitude

taken, the person tends to benefit from having control over events and by having things organized. However, when a perceiving mental process prevails, the person benefits from accepting events the way they happen and adapting to the new circumstances of life.

By having a combination of the preferences: extraversion (E) /introversion (I), / Sensing (S)/ Intuition (N), Thinking (T)/ Feeling (F), Judging (J)/ Perceiving (P), sixteen different types of people can be identified. The description of these sixteen types is summarized by Lawrence (1982, p. 15) in Table 1:

Table 1. Lawrence's summary of the 16 types

Learner	Characteristics
ENTJ	Intuitive, innovative ORGANIZER; aggressive, analytic, systematic, more turned to new ideas and possibilities than to people's feelings.
ISFP	Observant, loyal HELPER; reflective, realistic, patient with details, gentle, enjoys the moment.
ESTJ	Fact-minded, practical ORGANIZER, aggressive, analytic, more interested in getting the job done than in people's feelings.
INFP	Imaginative, independent HELPER; reflective, loyal to ideals; more interested in possibilities than practicalities.
INTP	Inquisitive ANALIZER, reflective, independent; more interested in organizing ideas than in situations or people.
ESFJ	Practical HARMONIZER and worker with people; social, expressive, orderly, opinionated, realistic and well tuned to the here and now.
ISTP	Practical ANALYZER; values exactness; more interested in organizing data than situations or people; reflective, a cool and curious observer of life.
ENFJ	Imaginative HARMONIZER and worker with people; sociable, expressive, opinionated; curious about new ideas and possibilities.
ESTP	REALISTIC ADAPTER in the world of material things; tolerant, easygoing, oriented to practical, highly observant of details of things.
INFJ	People-oriented INNOVATOR of ideas; serious, quietly forceful and persevering; concerned with the common good.
ESFP	REALISTIC ADAPTER in human relationships; friendly and easy with people; highly observant of feelings and needs.
INTJ	Logical, critical, decisive INNOVATOR of ideas; serious, intent, highly independent, concerned with organization, determined and often stubborn.
ISTJ	Analytical MANAGER OF FACTS AND DETAILS; dependable, decisive; concerned with systems and organization.
ENFP	Warmly enthusiastic PLANNER OF CHANGE; imaginative, individualistic, pursues inspiration, seeks to understand and inspire others.
ISFJ	Sympathetic MANAGER OF FACTS AND DETAILS; dependable, systematic, stable and conservative.
ENTP	Inventive, analytical PLANNER OF CHANGE; enthusiastic and independent, pursues inspiration, seeks to understand and inspire others.

**Note. E = extrovert; I = introvert; N = intuitive; S = sensor; T = thinkers; F = feelers;
J = judgers; P = perceivers**

Lawrence (1982) interpreted Jung's theory and Myers and Briggs' new dimension, and related them to education and counseling by displaying typical characteristics of each type. Lawrence states that extraverts like action and variety, and they benefit from doing mental work by talking to people, whereas introverts like quiet and time to consider things and benefit from doing mental work before talking. Sensing types pay attention to details and facts. Intuitive types pay attention to meanings, facts and how they relate, thus, they benefit from possibilities and imagination. Thinking types like to decide things logically, value fair play, but do not need harmony. On the other hand, feeling types like to decide things from the perspective of personal feelings and human values. Finally, as far as judging and perceiving are concerned, perceivers benefit from flexibility, avoid fixed plans, and deal well with unplanned events. On the other hand, judgers benefit from having things planned beforehand and like to have fixed schedules.

Since the MBTI does not deal specifically with sensory preferences, these preferences were included in the data analysis of the present study by drawing on Kinsella (1995). I decided to include these sensory preferences for they all relate to the presentation of input, a relevant variable which has received attention in second language acquisition research (Krashen, 1982; VanPatten and Cadierno, 1993; Smith, 1993). After summarizing relevant theories of learning styles and presenting the frameworks for data analysis of the present research, I shall turn now to the theoretical perspectives on teaching styles.

2.4. Defining Teaching Styles

Although, Heinrich (1993), Kinsella (1994), and Felder and Henriques (1995) all have dealt with the match or mismatch between the teachers' teaching styles and students' learning styles, they have not provided a clear definition of teaching styles.

They usually refer to teaching styles as teachers' instructional styles. However, I assume this is not actually a definition once it does not say much about teaching styles, which is a relevant concept for the present study.

A definition of the term was provided by Smith (1997, p.4), who states that "teaching styles are those actions, interactions and communications that are associated with effective and / or positive outcomes." As stated in the introduction of the present study, two of my research questions deal with the learning styles that tend to be favored by teachers' teaching styles and with how teachers can develop a balanced teaching style in order to accommodate different learners in the classroom. In order to answer these questions, it is imperative that I consider teachers' actions in the classroom. In this sense, Smith's definition seems reasonable since it includes teachers' actions.

However, this definition seems vague regarding interactions and communications. What kind of interactions and communications is he referring to? Teacher-student interaction, student-student interaction, or both types of interaction? Teacher-student communication? Communication among students? Given the fuzziness of this definition, I found it was not suitable for the present study.

Another definition of teaching styles is given by Katz (1996). She defines teaching style as " the manner in which the teacher interprets his or her role within the context of the classroom, for the teacher occupies a pivotal role within the context of the classroom"(p.58). This definition seems suitable in the sense that teachers' actions in the classroom seem to be guided by teachers' interpretation of their own roles. However, for the present study, it seems more appropriate to focus on teachers' actions than on the ways teachers interpret their roles in the classroom. Therefore, this definition given by Katz (1996) does not seem suitable to be the one adopted in the present research.

Butler (1987) also defined teaching styles. According to her, teaching styles are defined as:

> "…a set of attitudes and actions that open a formal and informal world of learning to students. It is a subtle force that influences students access to learning and teaching by establishing the perimeters around acceptable learning procedures, processes and products. The powerful force of the teachers' attitudes towards students as well as instructional activities used by the teacher shape the learning teaching experience and require of the teacher and student certain mediation abilities and capacities" (Butler, 1987, p. 52).

Butler's definition encompasses teachers' actions, attitudes and instructional activities in the classroom, which are relevant factors in order to draw an overall picture of teachers' teaching styles. However, in this definition, I miss one element that I consider essential in determining teachers' teaching styles, the element of recurrence. I believe actions, attitudes and instructional activities can only characterize teachers' teaching styles if they are recurrent in teachers' practice. Even if one individual teacher could possibly have different actions, attitudes and instructional activities every single class, this constant change would, then, be recurrent and characterize this teacher's style.

As can be noted, the three definitions above mentioned seem to relate to the questions addressed in this investigation. However, none of them seem to pinpoint my target accurately. Hence, drawing on Smith (1997), Katz (1996) and Butler (1987), I attempt to provide my own definition of teaching style for the present study:

Teaching style is a recurrent set of teachers' actions, attitudes and instructional activities that may express the way teachers interpret their roles in the classroom and differentiate one teacher from another.

It seems reasonable to argue that actions, attitudes and instructional activities are distinct but closely linked. For instance, carrying out a game in the classroom is an action, the game itself is an instructional activity, and having a positive reaction to humor during a game is an attitude. Therefore, teachers' practice seems to intermingle

these three factors. Having presented teaching styles definitions and provided the one to be adopted in the current study, I turn now to studies on teaching styles.

2.5. Research on Teaching Styles

Research on teaching styles dates back to the 1890s and can be divided into three phases (Medley, 1972). In the first phase, students and researchers described teachers' behaviors in attempt to determine what qualities would make an effective teacher. In the second phase, rating scales were used to evaluate teachers' actions. Finally, in the third phase, teachers' behaviors were measured by instruments and correlated to student achievement (Medley, 1972).

According to Mawhinney (2002), a fourth phase seems to have emerged as a result of increasing interest in individual learning styles. In this phase, teaching style is paralleled with learning style. Several researchers (e.g. Butler, 1987; Felder and Silvermann, 1988; Dunn and Dunn, 1993) developed teaching style models which corresponded to learning style models, and described teaching styles according to the learning styles mostly addressed by teachers' practice. Studies on teaching styles will be the focus of the next section.

2.5.1. Empirical Studies on Teaching Styles

Ellis (1989) carried out an investigation which aimed to explore how learners' learning style varied, which learning style resulted in more effective learning, and the effects of instructional style on learners' learning outcome. The subjects were two adult learners of L2 German. The style of instruction was mainly form-focused, and the teaching was traditional and grammar-centered. Various instruments were used for data collection such as a questionnaire, a cognitive style test, a language aptitude test,

attendance, participation, word order acquisition, speech rate and proficiency tests. Results revealed that, one learner, Monique, approached L2 learning studially, that is, focusing on formal language learning and accuracy, whereas, Simon, the other learner, approached L2 learning both studially and experientially, by focusing on accuracy and on meaningful use of grammar respectively. In addition, results suggested that Moniques' choice of approach towards L2 learning may not have been the one she was used to. Since she was an experiential learner in nature, she may have adopted a studial orientation in order to adapt to the teacher's instructional style and meet the requirements of the course. However, Monique's learning diary provided evidence that such adaptation on her part seems to have been accompanied by stress and tension. Finally, results also indicated that learners achievement was related to what they had previously set out to learn, that is, Monique learned how to obtain high scores in grammar tests, whereas Simon learned how to perform well in grammar and in communicative tests.

Heinrich (1993) carried out a study concerning the match between students' learning styles and teachers' teaching styles. She investigated how this match influenced teacher-student interaction in L2 classes. The subjects were one teacher and two students of Portuguese as a foreign language. The Felder and Silvermann learning and teaching style models (1988) were used to find out learners' and teachers' styles. The teacher's style was deductive, one of the learner's style was deductive, and the other one was inductive. Four classes were audio- recorded and videotaped. The results showed that teacher-student interaction was directly influenced by the match between teachers' teaching styles and students' learning styles. Teacher-student interaction was increased when the teachers' teaching styles and the students' learning styles were alike.

Mawhinney (2001) carried out research on teaching styles and beliefs of secondary school teachers. The study aimed at investigating if the practices and beliefs of teachers could be changed by assessing their teaching styles and, then, allowing them to choose a teaching prescription which was based on the Dunn and Dunn Model of Learning Style (1993). First, the teaching styles of 160 teachers in five high schools were assessed using a revised version of the Teaching Style Inventory- TSI (1993), which is an instrument to assess teaching styles based on the Dunn and Dunn learning style model (1993). Next, teachers were allowed to choose a teaching prescription based on the learning styles described in the Dunn and Dunn learning style model (1993). After twelve weeks, the teachers were reassessed with the revised version of the TSI and no significant differences were revealed in teachers' practices. Results revealed that teachers' beliefs were more individualized than their actual practice. In addition to this, results indicated that the longer one teaches, the more traditional and less individualized his/her practices seem to be.

The studies reviewed above, although from different perspectives, all dealt with instruction and learning styles. As noted in chapter I, the present study focuses on teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles, being primarily concerned with investigating the learning styles that tend to be most addressed by L2 teachers, the relationship between teachers' teaching and their own learning styles, the students' attitudes towards teachers' attempts to raise learning style awareness and, finally, the ways teachers can accommodate different learners in the L2 classroom.

As stated before, I pursued a reflective approach during the instructional program carried out with the volunteer teachers participating in this study. Hence, the next section presents a brief overview of perspectives on teacher development.

2.6. Perspectives on Teacher Development

The field of L2 teaching has witnessed an increase of the research on teacher education (Freeman, 1989; Wallace, 1990; Richards and Nunan, 1996; Zeichner, 2001). Within the focus on teacher education, the elements of reflection and reflective teaching have been considered relevant to foster teacher development. Cruickshank and Applegate (1981) define reflection as "a practice that helps teachers understand what happened, why it happened and what else they could have done in order to achieve their goals" (p.153, as cited in Bartlett, 1990). In this respect, Schon (1983) remarks that reflection should not be seen as a mere pause to think about professional problems. Rather, professionals should see reflection "as part of ongoing practice as they interpret and respond to situations that are intermediate in order to achieve their aims"(p.36). I believe reflection is a tool that may raise teachers' awareness of their teaching practices as well as of the origins and beliefs underlying such practices.

According to Mok (1994), although there has been a variety of views and positions taken towards reflection, all of them seem to agree that reflective teaching must be a cyclical process and encompass both action and critical thinking. Richards, Platt and Platt (1992) define reflective teaching as "an approach to teaching and to teacher education which is based on the assumption that teachers can improve their understanding of teaching and the quality of their own teaching by reflecting critically on their teaching experiences" (p.312). Bartlett (1990) clarifies that becoming critical means going beyond the classroom and teaching techniques themselves in the attempt to locate teaching in a broader cultural and educational context.

According to Pinheiro (2000), a reflective teacher is the one who believes that effective teaching is not achieved by following prescriptions, but through systematic reflection. Almeida Filho (1999) remarks that the idea that teachers have to be reflective is prescriptive in its nature. However, he also believes this prescriptive nature

tends to be deemphasized because teachers are the ones who decide what to reflect on, and how to act.

I pursued a reflective approach with the two volunteer teachers participating in the present study. In this sense, no prescriptions were provided to the teachers, and I aimed at encouraging them to build upon the theories discussed, along with their own reflections and sharing of experiences in order to guide their actions.

2.7. Summary of the chapter

In this chapter, I have reviewed the main literature related to the two main topics of my thesis: learning and teaching styles. In addition, theories of teacher development have also been briefly presented in order to provide a better understanding of the approach adopted towards the teachers participating in this study. In the next chapter, I will describe the method used for data collection.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

In this chapter, I describe the method used to collect data for the present study. First, I describe the context in which the data were collected. Second, I describe the procedures for the collection of data. Finally, I describe the instruments used.

3.1. The Context

The data for the present study were collected at the extracurricular language courses offered by the Federal University of Santa Catarina (UFSC). The Extracurricular language courses were founded in the 1970s. They are located on the university campus and constitute a unit of foreign language teaching, assisting UFSC workers and students as well as members of the community in general. The languages taught are English, French, German, Spanish, and Italian. At the time of data collection, the extracurricular language courses had approximately 1200 English students and 41 English teachers. Most teachers at extracurricular courses are students of the Graduate Program in English. as well as undergraduate students of the Letras course at UFSC.

The extracurricular English course is composed of ten semesters of studies. Semesters 1 and 2 correspond to the beginning levels, semesters 3 and 4 correspond to the pre-intermediate levels, semesters 5 and 6 correspond to the intermediate levels, semesters 7 and 8 correspond to the high-intermediate level, and semesters 9 and 10 correspond to the advanced levels. The correspondence of the semesters in relation to the levels of proficiency is based on an in- house categorization.

The textbooks adopted in the English course are the New Interchange Series by Jack C. Richards, Susan Proctor and Jonathan Hull, published by Cambridge University

Press. New Interchange I is used in semesters 1 and 2, New Interchange II is used in semesters 3 and 4, and New Interchange III is used in semesters 5 and 6. For the advanced levels, the textbooks adopted are the Passages Series by Chuck Sand, published by Cambridge University Press. Passages I, is used in semesters 7 and 8; and Passages II in semesters 9 and 10.

The English classes are held twice a week and each class lasts ninety minutes. There are also classes held only on Fridays which last three hours and have a fifteen-minute break in between. The classrooms have audio and video equipment such as stereo CDs, videocassette recorders and DVDs.

3.1.2. The participants

Although the ideal procedure for providing an overall picture of foreign language teachers' teaching styles from a learning style perspective would be a longitudinal study with a large population, it was thought that - due to time constraints for data collection, analysis and the writing up of research – observing a group of eight teachers for a shorter period of time would also provide relevant data, assuming that these teachers would present differences among their teaching styles. Therefore, eight teachers of four different levels of proficiency – two teachers of the beginning level, two teachers of the intermediate level, two teachers at the high intermediate level, and two teachers at the advanced level- were observed. The teachers and the groups were selected throughout these levels so that I would have a general view of teachers' teaching styles in different levels.

The eight teachers were selected on a volunteer basis. First, I contacted four teachers who, also being involved with research on learning and teaching, promptly accepted to participate in the present study. Then, I sent e-mails to all teachers at the extracurricular English courses asking for volunteers. Two of them volunteered to be

my participants. The other two participants were chosen from the list of teachers at extracurricular English courses according to my availability and the time the classes were held. I contacted them by phone, and, then, set an appropriate time to meet with each one of them individually in order to explain the purposes of my observation. Finally, they accepted to participate in the present study, too.

The 8 teachers will be addressed as Colleen, Mary, Shellsea, Paula, Lea, Sylvia, Bill and Angela. All of them are students at UFSC. Mary, Paula and Bill are undergraduate students of the Letras course, and they have four to six years of English teaching experience. Angela, Colleen, Shellsea and Lea are students of the MA course in Applied Linguistics at UFSC, and they have 3 to 23 years of English teaching experience. Sylvia is currently a Ph.D. student of Applied Linguistics and has 11 years of English teaching experience.

Colleen and Mary were the teachers of the beginning level which corresponded to the second semester of English. Colleen's group had 16 students and Mary's group had 18. Shellsea and Paula were the teachers of the pre-intermediate level which corresponded to the fourth semester of English. Their groups had 16 and 21 students, respectively. Sylvia and Lea were the teachers of the high- intermediate level which corresponded to the sixth semester of English. Their groups had 22 and 15 students, respectively. Angela and Bill were the teachers of the advanced level which corresponded to the eighth semester of English and their groups had 8 and 17 students, respectively. Out of these eight teachers, two of them, Shellsea and Lea, were selected, on a volunteer basis as well, to participate in this study for a longer period of time. Having presented the context and participants of the present study, I will describe the procedures of data collection.

3.2. Procedures

The data for the present study consist of (1) transcripts of classroom observation, (2) transcripts of the instructional program sessions, (3) answers of the teaching and learning style instruments applied to the teachers, and (4) answers of the questionnaires applied to the students participating in this study. The data collection consisted of three different phases. The first phase was carried out with all the teachers. The remaining phases of data collection were carried out only with the two volunteer teachers, Shellsea and Lea, who participated in the present study for a longer period of time.

In the first phase, I carried out classroom observation with the teachers during three of their classes in order to identify their teaching styles and the learning styles they tended to favor the most. Upon coming to a class for the first time, I would introduce myself to the students and tell them I was interested in attending their classes for the purpose of observing their teachers as part of the study I was carrying out. Then, I would tell students that their teachers had allowed me to attend the classes. However, I also needed students' permission in order to attend classes at the extracurricular English courses. Once students agreed with the classroom observation, audio recording and note-taking, I would start the observation the following class.

First, classes were audio recorded and field notes were taken on a diary. Second, the teaching style instrument was applied to each one of the teachers in order to allow for the triangulation of data. Then, the learning style instrument was applied to the teachers in order to investigate whether there was a relationship between teachers' own teaching and learning styles. In order to counterbalance for practice effects, the first four teachers- Colleen, Mary, Shellsea, and Paula- were applied the learning style instrument first and, then, the teaching style instrument. With the four remaining teachers - Lea, Sylvia, Bill and Angela - the opposite procedure was carried out: the

teaching style instrument first, then, the learning style one. In addition, there was a period of at least two weeks between the application of the learning and teaching style instruments with each one of the teachers.

It is important to highlight that all the teachers had three classes observed, in this first phase, for the purpose of identifying their teaching styles. However, the analysis of data from classroom observation of the six teachers, Colleen, Mary, Paula, Sylvia, Bill, and Angela will not be included in the present study due to the limitation in the number of pages. Therefore, the analysis of these teachers' teaching styles will be based on their answers to the teaching style instruments. The analysis of the teaching styles of the two volunteer teachers who were investigated for a longer period, Shellsea and Lea, will in turn, be based on transcripts of classroom observation, answers on the teaching style instruments, and transcripts of the reflective session.

For the second phase of this investigation, Shellsea and Lea were observed for a longer period. I kept observing these two teachers for three more classes, for I aimed at having a better understanding of their teaching styles. Then, they took part in a 10 hour-instructional program which was divided into four meetings, three of three hours, and one of meeting of one hour. The general objective of the program was to expose teachers to theories of learning and teaching styles as well as theories of teacher development. Thus, teachers would be provided with opportunities to share their teaching experiences and to reflect on their own teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles.

The specific objective of the instructional program was to assign two tasks to the teachers. In task one, teachers were supposed to approach students' learning preferences in the classroom. In task two, teachers were supposed to try to develop a balanced teaching style in one of their classes. As stated before, in the present study, a balanced teaching style is the one that keeps a balance in instruction in order to

accommodate, simultaneously or sequentially, different learning styles in the classroom (Oxford, 1990; Felder and Henriques, 1995).

In the third phase of this investigation, I attended teachers' classes during the performance of tasks 1 and 2. Task 1 was assigned during the first meeting of the instructional program. Both teachers took around two weeks to plan and perform task 1. After task1 was carried out, I applied a questionnaire to the students in order to find out their attitudes towards teachers' attempts to approach their learning preferences.

Before carrying out task 2, teachers were supposed to apply the learning style instrument with their students. Due to time constraints, students did not answer the learning style instrument during class and were allowed to answer the instruments at home and bring them back the following class. For those who wanted so, a copy was sent by e-mail. In this case, the students would send their results to me by e-mail as well.

Since teachers did not have time to check the results of the learning style instruments of their students, I checked the results myself and reported the results to the teachers. After being informed about the different learning styles their students had, teachers started planning task 2. Again, both teachers took around two weeks to plan and perform the task. After task 2 was accomplished, teachers were interviewed about their difficulties and feelings during the planning and performance of such task. This interview took place in the last meeting of the instructional program. Having described the procedures of data collection, I will now report the content of the instructional program.

3.3. The Instructional Program

During the design of the instructional program, I carefully selected the materials and activities used in the instruction. While selecting, I had mainly three concerns on

my mind: the first one was related to the degree of objectivity I would need when presenting the texts, and carrying out activities, given the time constraint of the data collection; the second one was related to building rapport with the teachers during the sessions, in order to help them feel comfortable to express themselves and share ideas, experiences; and the third concern was related to arranging the dates for the teachers to carry out tasks 1 and 2 since they were busy teachers and were also carrying out their MA studies.

Bearing these concerns in mind, I carefully planned the time for each event of the instructional program. I tried to establish a balance between the presentation of academic texts, the sharing of activities, and the use of songs. I would always start by presenting songs so as to help teachers feel comfortable so that a trusting atmosphere would be likely to take place among us. In addition, I was always open to negotiate dates for the planning and performance of tasks 1 and 2, as well as to negotiate the time we would start and finish our instructional program meetings. The meetings usually took place from nine a.m. to noon in room 206 of the extracurricular courses. However, one of the teachers, Lea, asked if we could start the third meeting at half past eight once she had church activities scheduled that day. Still, another arrangement had to be made, due the commitments of the two teachers and the last meeting took place only after they had applied the final tests to their students. The instructional program content and schedule will be described next.

3.3.1. First Meeting: The Teacher & the Learner (16.05.2003, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00)

The first meeting of the instructional program consisted of three parts. Part I was focused on the teacher, part II was focused on the learner, and part III was focused on the assignment of task 1.

Part I was focused on the teacher and consisted of three phases. In the first phase, the focus was on the teacher as a person. As stated before, I pursued a reflective approach with these teachers. Thus, I assumed it would be abrupt to start talking to them about their teaching from the very first moment of the instructional program. Therefore, I chose to start by focusing on the teacher as a person. I started by presenting the song 'I am what I am' (Appendix B) on a transparency as a stimulus for teachers' thinking, discussion and sharing of ideas. After listening to the song, teachers were asked to choose a part of the song and make a comment about it.

In the second phase of part I, I started by carrying out the teacher's history drawing activity[6] (Appendix C) with the teachers. This activity consisted of having teachers tell their history as teachers through drawings. First, I presented my teacher history drawing to the teachers. Then, they were given fifteen to twenty minutes to think of their teaching experience and describe it through drawings on a transparency. Next, teachers would come to the overhead projector to share their histories and drawings. Finally, I moved to the third phase of part I in which the focus was on thinking about teaching.

In the third phase of part I, I presented the article "Conceptions of Teaching" by Richards and Freeman (1993). The presentation took place along with teachers' comments and discussions. Teachers were also given handouts of the article. My objective in presenting this article was to provide teachers with opportunities to share their views of teaching. After this presentation, I moved to the second part of the meeting, which focused on the learner.

Part II focused on the learner and consisted of two phases. Similarly to the first phase of part I in which I focused on the teacher as a person, in the first phase of part II, I focused on the learner as a person as well. I started by presenting the song 'What' s

---

[6] This activity was designed by Pinheiro (2000).

your sign?' (Appendix D) on a transparency. After listening to the song, I asked teachers how they thought the lyrics of the song could be related to language learners. Then, I moved to the second phase of part II.

In the second phase of part II, I presented an overview of learning style theories. I started with a brief presentation of some learning style models: The Dunn and Dunn Model (1989); The Brain Dominance Model (Herrmann, 1990); The Felder and Silvermann Model (1989). Next, I carried out a detailed presentation of the Myers and Briggs Model (1987) and The visual/auditory/kinesthetic Model by Kinsella (1995), which were the frameworks of the present study.

Finally, I presented the article "Teaching and Learning in the Second/Foreign Language Class" by Felder and Henriques (1995). This article emphasizes the idea of developing a balanced teaching style in order to address different learners, which was exactly what teachers were supposed to do in task 2. The objective of this whole phase was to expose teachers to theories of learning styles so as to prepare them to reflect on their teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles, and, at the same time, give them theoretical support to carry out tasks 1 and 2. All texts were presented on transparencies and handouts were also provided to the teachers. After this theoretical part, I moved to the last part of the first meeting, which focused on the assignment of task 1 to the teachers.

Task 1 consisted of having teachers approach their students' learning preferences for the purpose of investigating students' reaction towards this approach from the part of the teachers. First, teachers were supposed to read their handouts about learning styles at home. Then, they were supposed to plan a way to bring the issue of learning styles into their classes and talk to their students about it. Having described the content of the first meeting, I shall now turn to the report of the second meeting.

3. 3.2. Second Meeting: Teaching Styles (23.05.2003, from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00)

The second meeting of the instructional program consisted of four parts. Part I focused on teaching and teaching styles, part II focused on teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles, part III consisted of a reflective session, and part IV focused on the assignment of task 2.

I started part I by presenting the song *'Caminhos do Coração'* (Appendix E) on a transparency. Then, I asked teachers how they thought this song could relate to our lives in general, to our teaching, to our meetings during the instructional program, to teaching and learning. After the song activity, I presented definitions of teaching styles by Katz (1996), Smith (1997) and Butler (1987). Then, I presented the perspectives by Reid (1995), Almeida Filho (1999), and Zeichner (2001) concerning possible influences on teaching styles. During this presentation teachers discussed possible influences on their own teaching styles. Next, I moved to part II, in which the focus of discussion was discussing teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles.

I started part II by presenting, again, the two first songs of the instructional program: "I am what I am" (Appendix B) and "What's your sign?"(Appendix D) on transparencies as stimuli for thinking, discussion and sharing of ideas. The first song was related to praising who we are, being proud of who we are. The second song was related to the people around us and the differences among these people. After presenting the songs, I asked teachers to relate these two songs to the title of this part of the instructional program: Teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles.

Once the song activity was over, I presented two studies on teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles, one by Heinrich (1993) and the other one by Tavares (2002). The objective of the presentation was to help teachers become familiar with studies that were similar to the one I was carrying out with them. This understanding of teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles would possibly help them

accomplish task 2, in which teachers would have to try to develop a balanced teaching style in one of their classes. After finishing part II of the instructional program, I moved to part III which consisted of a reflective session[7] with the teachers.

In the reflective session, first, Teachers were given 20-25 minutes to write about their teaching practices: usual activities and attitudes, behavior, principles and anything else they could think of. Then, teachers shared what they wrote. Next, I presented my own views of their teaching styles from classroom observation and answers of the teaching style instrument. During my presentation, we discussed and compared my perspectives on their teaching styles with their own perspectives. When the reflective session was concluded, I assigned task 2 to the teachers.

In task 2, teachers were supposed to plan a class in which they would try to develop a balanced teaching style. They were supposed to choose one of the four dimensions of learning styles from the Myers and Briggs (1987) categorization: (1) Extroversion/Introversion, (2) Thinking/Feeling, (3) Sensing/Intuition, or (4) Judging/Perceiving. Next, they were supposed to plan a class in which the aim would be the balance between the two poles of the dimension chosen. Finally, they would teach the class planned.

Since the MBTI does not deal specifically with sensory preferences, these preferences were included in the data analysis of the present study by drawing on Kinsella (1994). Therefore, besides the dimensions of the Myers and Briggs, teachers could also accomplish task 2 by choosing the dimension of Visual/Auditory/ Kinesthetic/[8] by Kinsella (1995) and plan a class in order to keep a balance between these three poles.

---

[7] A session in which teachers meet to reflect on a certain matter (Yonemura, 1981 as cited in Telles, 1997). In the case of the present study, two teachers and the researcher met to reflect on teaching styles.
[8] The Model by Kinsella actually deals with visual, auditory, *tactile* and kinesthetic preferences. However, since the differences that may exist between kinesthetic and tactile are subtle, I joined both preferences under the kinesthetic terminology for the purpose of simplification.

As stated before, I decided to include these sensory preferences for they all relate to the presentation of input, a relevant variable which has received attention in second language acquisition research (Krashen, 1982; VanPatten and Cadierno, 1993; Smith, 1993). Having reported the second meeting, I shall now turn to the third meeting.

3.3.3. Third Meeting: Teacher Development (30.05.2003)

The third meeting consisted of one long part focused on teacher development and reflective teaching. First, I presented the song 'The circle of life' (Appendix F) and teachers were supposed to choose a segment of the song and make a comment about it. The objective of this song activity was to build rapport and lead teachers to the topics of reflection and reflective teaching. Second, I presented definitions of reflection by Cruickshank and Applegate (1981), Richards, Platt and Platt (1992); and definitions of reflective teaching by Mok (1994) and Pinheiro (2000). Finally, I presented the Reflective Cycle by Wallace (1991). Then, we discussed Wallace's reflective cycle and compared it with our reflective cycle during the instructional program. Having described the third meeting, I shall finally turn to the report of the fourth meeting of the instructional program.

3.3.4. Fourth Meeting: Teachers' Voices (July 1st, 2003)

During the last meeting teachers shared the experiences they had during the instructional program, what attitudes their students had during the teachers' performance of task 1, and the difficulties they faced while planning and performing task 2. This sharing happened through a semi-guided interview (Cook, 1982). Having described the content of the instructional program, I will now describe the instruments of data collection.

3.4. Instruments

In the present study, seven types of instruments were used: audio-recording, note-taking, 1 questionnaire for assessing students' attitudes towards discussing their learning preferences in class (Appendix G), 1 questionnaire for appreciating learning styles[9] (Appendixes H and I), 1 questionnaire for appreciating teaching styles (Appendix J), the reflective session of the instructional program for assessing teachers' perspectives on their teaching styles, and the semi-guided interview (Appendix K) in the last meeting of the instructional program for assessing teachers' difficulties on Task 2.

Audio-recording and note-taking were carried out from the first day of classroom observation of all teachers on. As I had previously told students that my main goal was to observe their teachers, they seemed comfortable with having my presence in the classroom. They seemed attentive to their teachers, and did not seem to pay attention to me for they did not look at me often or asked me anything during classes.

The questionnaire for assessing students' attitudes towards discussing learning preferences in class (Appendix G) consisted of four questions. Only Question 1 was open-ended, students were asked their opinion about the activity in which their teacher talks to them about their learning preferences. In question 2, students were asked if they had been approached, by former teachers, regarding learning styles. In question 3, students were asked if they considered relevant to be asked about their learning styles by their teachers. Finally, in Question 4, students were asked about their willingness to contribute to future teachers interested in finding out about their learning styles. For questions 2, 3, and 4, students had to answer 'yes' or 'no'.

---

[9] Two versions of the learning style instruments were designed. The one applied to the teachers was in English, and the one applied to the students was in Portuguese in order to avoid any language misunderstandings.

The search for instruments to appreciate learning and teaching styles was one of the hardest obstacles of this study. First, some of the most used instruments such as the MBTI (1987), and the Dunn and Dunn teaching and learning style instruments (1977) can not be used for free. The authors charge for use of the instruments and I could not afford to pay the fees. Second, some of the instruments which can be used for free upon authors' previous permission were designed specifically to the populations investigated by such authors. Hence, they would not be suitable for the present study.

In my search for an instrument, I contacted some authors by e-mail and two of them gave me permission to use their instruments. Joy Reid, from the University of Wyoming, gave me permission to use The Learning Style Survey (1995). However, she warned me that the Learning Style Survey would probably not be appropriate for my study once it was designed to the specific population she investigated (Reid, Personal Communication, 2003).

Likewise, Richard Felder, from the North Carolina University, also gave me permission to use the Felder and Silvermann questionnaire (1988). Nevertheless, he stated the model had been designed specifically to investigate teaching and learning styles in engineering education (Felder, personal communication, 2003). Consequently, the Felder and Silvermann Model would probably not be suitable for the present study, for it was specifically developed to deal with engineering classes.

Based on the problems and difficulties mentioned, I decided to design the teaching and learning style instruments of this investigation. According to Reid et al. al (1995), the MBTI is one of the most widely used instruments in research on learning styles because of its reliability and validity. Bearing this in mind, I decided to develop two instruments, one for appreciating learning and one for appreciating teaching styles, drawing upon the MBTI. Since the MBTI itself is not available, both instruments were

designed by drawing upon the Kiersey and Bates instrument (1986), which is one of the closest versions of the MBTI available (Reid et. al, 1995).

Similarly to the MBTI, the Kiersey and Bates instrument does not deal specifically with sensory learning preferences (visual, auditory, and kinesthetic). Since sensory preferences were included in the data analysis, they were also included in the instruments designed for this study by drawing upon Kinsella (1995). As previously stated, I decided to include these sensory preferences for they all relate to the presentation of input, a relevant variable which has received attention in second language acquisition research (Krashen, 1982; VanPatten and Cadierno,1993; Smith, 1993).

In brief, the instruments were developed mostly by adapting a version of the MBTI to a foreign language teaching context and, to a lower to extent, by including sensory learning preferences. After the instruments were developed, they were tested with nine students and seven teachers. Then, they were revised and applied to the participants of the present study.

Both instruments contained fifty multiple-choice questions divided in five sections. Four of these sections are related to the dimensions of the Kiersey and Bates[10] (1984), and one of these sections is related to visual, auditory and kinesthetic preferences Kinsella (1994). After all questions of the five sections were concluded, they were arranged so as to have each dimension assessed every five questions. In both learning and teaching style instruments, questions 1, 6, 11, 16, 21, 26, 31, 36, 41, and 46 are related to Extraversion/Introversion; questions 2, 7, 12, 17, 22, 27, 32, 37, 42, and 47 are related to Sensing/Intuition; questions 3, 8, 13, 18, 23, 28, 32, 38, 43, and 48 are related to Thinking/Feeling; questions 4, 9, 14, 19, 24, 29, 34, 39, 44, and 49 are related to Judging/Perceiving; and questions 5,10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, and 50 are

---

[10] The dimensions described in the Kiersey and Bates are the same as in the MBTI: Extroversion/Introversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, Judging/Perceiving.

related to Visual/Auditory/ Kinesthetic. For the purpose of avoiding biased answers, this arrangement of the questions was set in attempt to distract participants' attention concerning the sequence of the questions addressed to each one of the dimensions.

The reflective session, which was described in detail in the previous section of this chapter, was another instrument of data collection. In the reflective session, I had the chance to assess teachers' own descriptions of their teaching styles and compare these descriptions to the analysis of their class transcripts and their answers on the teaching style instrument.

The semi-guided interview during the last meeting of the instructional program was carried out for the purpose of assessing teachers' difficulties during the planning and performance phases of Task 2. The interview contained three questions; the first question was related to their feelings and opinions regarding the instructional program in general. The second question was related to their difficulties concerning the planning and performance phases of the tasks, and the third question was related to their general opinions about the ways I carried out classroom observation and the instructional program.

3.5. The Data Analysis

The data of the present study consisted of (1) the class transcripts of the two teachers selected to participate in the instructional program, (2) teachers' answers to the learning and teaching styles questionnaires, (3) students' answer to the questionnaire about attitudes towards learning styles, and (4) teachers' answers to a semi-guided interview. The analysis of the class transcripts consisted of searching for patterns of teachers' behavior in the classroom. The analysis of the questionnaires given to teachers – number 2 above – consisted of counting the answers relating to each one of the teaching and learning style dimensions. The questionnaires contained 50 questions

each, 10 questions per each dimension of teaching and learning styles (Introversion/Extroversion, Sensing/Intuition, Thinking/Feeling, Judging/Perceiving). The answers pertaining to each dimension were counted in order to establish the percentage of answers belonging to each pole of the dimension. Then, in order to verify whether there was a relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles, I compared teachers' answers on the teaching and learning style instruments. This analysis was carried out for all of the 8 teachers who contributed data for the present study.

In relation to the two teachers who took part in the instructional program, I carried out the same procedures described above for analyzing the teaching and learning style instruments. As already said, an analysis of their class transcripts was also carried out. In analyzing class transcripts, I searched for patterns of teachers' practice in order to draw a picture of their teaching styles. These two teachers' answers on the semi-guided interview were analyzed in order to find out their difficulties in carrying out one of the tasks proposed in the instructional program – trying a more balanced teaching style. Finally, students' answers to the questionnaire about attitudes towards learning styles were analyzed in order to determine their attitudes towards discussing learning styles in the classroom.

3.6. Key to Conventions on Transcription

The following transcription symbols, adapted from Van Lier (1988) and Johnson (1995), were used in the present study:

T: teacher

L1, L1, L3...: identified learner

L: unidentified learner

LL: several or all learners simultaneously

R: researcher

(( )): double parentheses indicate comments about the transcript, including non-verbal actions

XXX: inaudible

Italics: indicate emphasis

Ellipses: (...) indicate pauses

Brackets [ ]: indicate overlapped speech

Quotation Marks (""): indicate reading passage

3.7. Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter I have presented the method used to collect the data for the present study. In doing so, I described the context in which the study was carried out, the participants of the study, the procedures and the instruments for the collection of data. In the following chapter, I present the analysis of the data collected.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The objective of this chapter is to present and discuss the results of the analysis of the data in order to determine the learning styles mostly favored by teachers' teaching styles, the relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles, students' attitudes towards discussing their learning preferences, and teachers' difficulties when trying to develop a balanced teaching style.

The analysis consisted of (1) identifying, in class transcripts, teachers' patterns of actions, attitudes and instructional activities (i.e. teachers' teaching styles) in the classroom and determining which learning styles tend to be most addressed within such patterns, (2) determining whether there is a relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles through their answers to the teaching and learning style questionnaires, (3) determining students' attitudes towards discussing learning styles in the classroom through their answers to the questionnaire designed for that purpose, and (4) determining, through a semi-guided interview, what difficulties teachers face when trying to develop a balanced teaching style.[11]

4.1. Teachers' Teaching Styles

In this section, I will present and discuss the results related to teachers Colleen, Mary, Paula, Sylvia, Bill and Angela. First, I will determine their teaching style from their answers on the teaching style instruments. Second, I will compare their answers on the teaching and learning style instruments in order to investigate whether there is a

---

[11] The students' and teachers' speeches dealt with in this study are reproduced as they were actually produced.

relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles. Finally, teachers' results will be summarized and discussed. Results for teacher Colleen are displayed in Tables 2 and 3:

Table 2: Results for Teacher Colleen.

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Colleen's Answers to the Teaching Style Dimensions		Colleen's Answers to the Learning Style Dimensions	
Extraverts (E) & Introverts (I)	30% (E)	70% (I)	50% (E)	50% (I)
Feelers (F) & Thinkers (T)	30% (F)	70% (T)	10% (F)	90% (T)
Intuitive (I) & Sensing (S)	30% (I)	70% (S)	10%(I)	90% (S)
Perceivers (P) & Judgers (J)	60% (P)	40% (J)	20% (P)	80% (J)

Table 3: Results for Teacher Colleen.

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Colleen's Answers to the Teaching Style Dimensions			Colleen's Answers to the Learning Style Dimensions		
Auditory (A), Visual (V) & Kinesthetic (K)	10% (A)	10% (V)	80% (K)	20% (A)	30% (V)	50% (K)

As can be seen from Tables 2 and 3, results in indicate that Colleen tends to favor (1) introverts (70%) over extraverts (30%); (2) thinkers (70%) over feelers (30%); (3) sensing (70%) over intuitive (30%); (4) perceivers (60%) over judgers (40%); and (5) kinesthetic (80%) over auditory (10%) and visual (10%) learners. Therefore, introverts, thinkers, sensing, perceivers and kinesthetic seem to be the learning styles mostly favored by Colleen's teaching style.

As regards whether there is a relationship between Colleen' s own teaching and learning styles, based on her answers in the teaching style and learning style instruments, results indicate that: (1) Colleen seems to be a thinker (90%), and tends to favor mostly thinkers (70%); (2) she seems to be sensing (90%), and tends to address mainly sensing learners (70%); (3) she seems to be a kinesthetic learner (50%), and tends to favor mostly kinesthetic learners, (80%). Hence, there seems to be a correlation in 3 out of the 5 dimensions, which corresponds to 60% of the dimensions. These results

are in line with the literature on teaching and learning styles, which claims that teachers tend to teach in ways that match their own learning styles (Oxford, 1990; Kinsella, 1995). I shall now turn to Mary's results, which are displayed in Table 4and 5:

Table 4. Results for Teacher Mary.

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Mary's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions		Mary's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions	
Extraverts (E) & Introverts (I)	50% (E)	50% (I)	60% (E)	40% (I)
Feelers (F) & Thinkers (T)	90% (F)	10% (T)	60% (F)	40% (T)
Intuitive (I) & Sensing (S)	10% (I)	90% (S)	60%(I)	40% (S)
Perceivers (P) & Judgers (J)	80% (P)	20% (J)	80% (P)	20% (J)

Table 5. Results for Teacher Mary.

Teaching & Learning Style Dimensions	Mary's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions			Mary's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions		
Auditory (A), Visual (V) & Kinesthetic (K)	20% (A)	10% (V)	70% (K)	20% (A)	20% (V)	60%(K)

As shown above, Mary tends to keep a balance between extraverts and introverts. In addition, she tends to favor (1) feelers (90%) over thinkers (10%); (2) sensing (90%) over intuitive (10%); (3) perceivers (80%) over judgers (20%); and (4) kinesthetic (70%) over auditory (20%) and visual learners (10%). Thus, extraverts as well as introverts, feelers, sensing, perceivers and kinesthetic seem to be the learning styles mostly favored by Mary's teaching style.

As regards whether there is a relationship between her own teaching and learning styles, the results of the teaching and learning style instruments indicate that: (1) Mary seems to be a feeler (60%) and tends to address mostly feelers (90%); (2) she seems to be a perceiver (80%) and tends to address mainly perceivers (80%); (3) she seems to be a kinesthetic (60%) and tends to address mainly kinesthetic learners (70%). Thus, I may argue that there seems to be a correlation in 3 out of the 5 dimensions, which corresponds to (60%) of the dimensions. Again, the results seem to be in line with the

claim that teachers tend to teach through the ways they best learn (Oxford, 1990; Kinsella, 1995). I shall now focus on Paula's results, which are displayed in Table 6 and 7:

Table 6. Results for Teacher Paula

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Paula's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions		Paula's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions	
Extraverts (E) & Introverts (I)	80% (E)	20% (I)	100% (E)	0% (I)
Feelers (F) & Thinkers (T)	80% (F)	20% (T)	80% (F)	20% (T)
Intuitive (I) & Sensing (S)	80% (I)	20% (S)	80%(I)	20% (S)
Perceivers (P) & Judgers (J)	80% (P)	20% (J)	100% (P)	0% (J)

Table 7. Results for Teacher Paula

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Paula's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions			Paula's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions		
Auditory (A), Visual (V) & Kinesthetic (K)	10% (A)	30% (V)	60% (K)	20% (A)	30% (V)	50% (K)

As can be seen, Paula tends to favor mostly (1) extroverts (80%) over introverts (20%); (2) feelers (80%) over thinkers (20%); (3) perceivers (80%) over judgers (20%); and (4) kinesthetic (60%) over visual (30%) and auditory learners (10%). Therefore, extraverts, feelers, perceivers and kinesthetic tend to be the learning styles most favored by this teacher.

In relation to whether there is a relationship between her own teaching and learning styles, the results of the teaching and learning style instruments indicate that: (1) Paula seems to be an extrovert (100%) and tends to favor mostly extroverts (80%); (2) she seems to be a feeler (80%) and tends to favor mainly feelers (80%); (3) she seems to be an intuitive (80%) and tends to favor those who are intuitive (80%); (4) she seems to be a perceiver (100%) and tends to favor mainly perceivers (80%); and (5) she seems to be kinesthetic (50%) and tends to favor mostly kinesthetic learners (60%). Hence, there seems to be a correlation in 100% of the dimensions. Once more, results

corroborate the claim that teachers tend to favor their own learning styles (Oxford, 1990; Kinsella, 1995). I shall now report Sylvia's results, which are displayed in Tables 8 and 9:

Table 8. Results for Teacher Sylvia.

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Sylvia's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions		Sylvia's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions	
Extraverts (E) & Introverts (I)	60% (E)	40% (I)	60% (E)	40% (I)
Feelers (F) & Thinkers (T)	60% (F)	40% (T)	60% (F)	40% (T)
Intuitive (I) & Sensing (S)	70% (I)	30% (S)	80% (I)	20% (S)
Perceivers (P) & Judgers (J)	40% (P)	60% (J)	40% (P)	60% (J)

Table 9. Results for Teacher Sylvia.

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Sylvia's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions			Sylvia's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions		
Auditory (A), Visual (V) & Kinesthetic (K)	40% (A)	30% (V)	30% (K)	20% (A)	50% (V)	30% (K)

As shown in Tables 8 and 9, Sylvia tends to favor (1) extroverts (60%) over introverts (40%); (2) feelers (60%) over thinkers (40%); (3) intuitive (70%) over sensing learners (30%); (4) judgers (60%) over perceivers (40%); (5) auditory (40%) over visual (30%) and kinesthetic (30%). Thus, extroverts, feelers, intuitive, judgers and auditory tend to be the learning styles mostly favored by Sylvia's teaching style.

As regards whether there is a relationship between her own teaching and learning styles, the results of the teaching and learning style instruments indicate that: (1) Sylvia seems to be an extrovert (60%) and tends to favor mainly extroverts (60%); (2) she seems to be a feeler (60%) and tends to favor mostly feelers (60%); (3) she seems to be an intuitive (80%) and tends to favor mainly those who are intuitive (70%); (4) she seems to be a judger (60%) and tends to favor mainly judgers (60%). Therefore, there seems to be a correlation in four out of the five dimensions, which corresponds to (80%) of the dimensions. Once more, results seem to be in line with the literature on teaching

and learning styles which claims that teachers seem to favor their own learning styles (Oxford, 1990; Kinsella, 1995). I shall now turn to Bill's results, which are displayed in Tables 10 and 11:

Table 10. Results for Teacher Bill

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Bill's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions		Bill's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions	
Extraverts (E) & Introverts (I)	80% (E)	20% (I)	80% (E)	20% (I)
Feelers (F) & Thinkers (T)	90% (F)	10% (T)	20% (F)	80% (T)
Intuitive (I) & Sensing (S)	50% (I)	50% (S)	30% (I)	50% (S)
Perceivers (P) & Judgers (J)	30% (P)	70% (J)	50% (P)	70% (J)

Table 11. Results for Teacher Bill

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Bill's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions			Bill's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions		
Auditory (A), Visual (V) & Kinesthetic (K)	70% (A)	30% (V)	0% (K)	50% (A)	40% (V)	10% (K)

As can be seen on Table 10 and 11, Bill tends to keep a balance between intuitive (50%) and sensing (50%) learners. Moreover, he tends to favor mostly: (1) extroverts (80%) over introverts (20%); (2) feelers (90%) over thinkers (10%); (3) judgers (70%) over perceivers (30%); (4) auditory (70%) over visual (30%) and kinesthetic (0%). Thus, extraverts, feelers, judgers and auditory tend to be the learning styles most favored by this teacher.

Concerning whether there is a relationship between his own teaching and learning styles, results of the teaching and learning style instruments indicate that: (1) Bill seems to be an extrovert (80%) and tends to favor mostly extroverts (80%); (2) he seems to be an auditory (50%) and tends to favor mostly auditory learners (70%). Thus, there seems to be a relationship between his teaching and learning styles in two of the five dimensions, which corresponds to (40%) of the dimensions. In comparison with the previous four teachers, Bill seems to be the one who presents the lowest correlation between his own teaching and learning style, (40%). Thus, in (60%) of the dimensions,

there seems to be no similarity between the ways he best learns and the ways he teaches. Therefore, I may argue that Bill's results are not in line with the claim that teachers tend to teach through the ways they best learn (Oxford, 1990; Kinsella, 1995). Finally, I shall report Angela's results, which are displayed in Table 12 and 13:

Table 12. Results for Teacher Angela

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Angela's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions		Angela's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions	
Extraverts (E) & Introverts (I)	60% (E)	40% (I)	30% (E)	70% (I)
Feelers (F) & Thinkers (T)	20% (F)	80% (T)	10% (F)	90% (T)
Intuitive (I) & Sensing (S)	50% (I)	50% (S)	50% (I)	50% (S)
Perceivers (P) & Judgers (J)	60% (P)	40% (J)	70% (P)	30% (J)

Table 13. Results for Teacher Angela

Teaching and Learning Style Dimensions	Angela's Answers Related to the Teaching Style Dimensions			Angela's Answers Related to the Learning Style Dimensions		
Auditory (A), Visual (V) & Kinesthetic (K)	10% (A)	60% (V)	30% (K)	30% (A)	40% (V)	30% (K)

As can be seen on Table 12 and 13, Angela tends to keep a balance between intuitive (50%) and sensing (50%) learners. In addition, she tends to favor mostly (1) extraverts (60%) over introverts (40%); (2) thinkers (80%) overt feelers (20%); (3) perceivers (60%) over judgers (40%); and (4) visual (60%) over kinesthetic (30%) and auditory learners (10%). Therefore, extraverts, thinkers, perceivers and visual tend to be the learning styles most favored by this teacher.

Concerning whether there is a relationship between her own teaching and learning styles, results of the teaching and learning style instruments indicate that there seems to be a relationship between her teaching and learning styles in three out of the five dimensions, which corresponds to (60%) of the dimensions: (1) Angela seems to be a thinker (90%) and tends to address mainly thinkers (80%); (2) she seems to keep a balance between intuition (50%) and sensing (50%) as a learner and as a teacher; (3)

She seems to be a perceiver (70%) and tends to address mainly perceivers (60%); (4) she tends to be a visual and tends to address mainly those who are visual. Therefore, there seems to be a relationship between her teaching and learning styles in four out of the five dimensions, which corresponds to (80%) of the dimensions. Again, results seem to be in line with the claim that teachers tend to address their own learning styles (Oxford, 1990; Kinsella, 1995). The results of the analysis of which learning styles tend to be mostly favored by teachers' teaching styles are summarized in Table 14:

Table 14: Results of teachers' teaching styles according to learning styles mostly addressed.

Teachers	Learning styles mostly favored by teachers' teaching styles				
	I / E	T / F	I / S	P/J	A / V / K
Colleen	I	T	S	P	K
Mary	balanced	F	S	P	K
Paula	E	F	I	P	K
Sylvia	E	F	I	J	A
Bill	E	F	balanced	J	A
Angela	E	T	balanced	P	V
No. of teachers favoring each learning style	1 I; 4 E; 1 bal.	2 T; 4 F	2 I; 2 S; 2 bal.	2 J; 4 P	2 A; 1 V; 3 K

Note. I/E=Introverts/Extroverts; T/F=Thinkers/Feelers; I/S=Intuitive/Sensors; P/J=Perceivers/Judgers; A/V/K=Auditory/Visual/Kinesthetic; bal. = balanced

As can be seen in Table 14, all learning styles seem to be favored among these teachers' teaching styles. However, some learning styles tend to be more favored than others. By comparing the extents to which different learning styles seem to be addressed among these six teachers, the results above indicate that: (1) one teacher, (16,66%), tends to favor mostly introverts, one teacher, (16,66%), tends to keep a balance between introverts and extroverts, and four teachers, (66,66%), tend to favor mainly extraverts; (2) two teachers, (33,33%), tend to favor thinkers, and four teachers, (66,66%), tend to favor feelers; (3) two teachers, (33,33%), tend to favor intuitive learners, two teachers, (33,33%), keep a balance between intuitive and sensors, and two teachers, (33,33%),

tend to favor sensors; (4) four teachers, (66,66%), tend to favor mainly perceivers and two teachers, (33,33%), tend to favor judgers; and (5) two teachers, (33,33%), tend to favor mostly auditory, one teacher, (16,66%), tends to favor mainly visual, and three teachers, (50%), tend to favor mainly kinesthetic learners.

In conclusion, 66,66% of the teachers tend to favor extraverts over introverts; 66,66% of the teachers tend to favor feelers over thinkers; 66,66% of the teachers tend to favor perceivers over judgers; and 50% of the teachers tend to favor kinesthetic over auditory and visual. In addition, teachers seem to vary in their balance between favoring sensors and intuitive learners since 33,33% of the teachers favor sensors over intuitive, 33,33% favor intuitive over sensors, and 33,33% keep a balance between both learning styles. Therefore, it seems reasonable to argue that extraverts, feelers, perceivers and kinesthetic tend to be the learning styles mostly addressed among these six teachers. Moreover, there seems to be a balance in the extents sensor and intuitive learners are favored among these teachers.

The results of the analysis concerning the relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles are summarized in Table 15:

Table 15: Results of the relationship between teaching and learning styles.

Teachers	Dimensions in which there is a correlation between teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles						
	I/E	T/F	I/S	P/J	A/ V/ K	No. Corr. Dim.	% Corr. Dim.
Colleen	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	(03)	60%
Mary	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	(04)	80%
Paula	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	(05)	100%
Sylvia	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	(04)	80%
Bill	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	(02)	40%
Angela	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	(04)	80%

Dimensions of teaching and learning styles: I / E =introverts/ extroverts; F/T=feelers/ thinkers; I/S=sensing/intuition; P/J=perceivers/judgers; A/V/K=auditory/visual/kinesthetic

Results in Table 15 indicate that: (1) one teacher seems to present a correlation between teaching and learning styles in 40% of the dimensions; (2) one teacher seems to present a correlation between teaching and learning styles in 60% of the dimensions; (3) three teachers present this correlation in 80% of the dimensions, and (4) one teacher presents this correlation in 100% of the dimensions. In other words, five out of these six teachers seem to present a correlation between their own teaching and learning styles in 60% to 100% of the dimensions, and one teacher presents this correlation in 40% of the dimensions. Thus, I may argue that there seems to be a correlation between teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles. Having presented the results of these six teachers, I will focus on the results of the two teachers who were investigated for a longer period.

4.2. Teachers' Teaching Styles

In this section, I display teachers' patterns of actions, attitudes and instructional activities during classes so as to draw an overall picture of teachers' teaching styles and discuss which learning styles tend to be most favored within such patterns of teachers' procedures.

In analyzing Teacher Shellsea's and Teacher Lea's teaching styles, I listened to the class recordings and read class field notes several times searching for teachers' patterns of actions, attitudes and instructional activities. I was able to determine seven categories of patterns in teachers' procedures. The seven categories determined during these teachers' classes have been named building rapport, dealing with the speaking skill, teaching grammar, focusing on pronunciation, using the board, being attentive to students' difficulties, and carrying out pair and group work. It is important to highlight that these categories are not totally apart from one another for they may overlap. For instance, a teacher may work on building rapport at the moment she is dealing with the

speaking skill. Rather, these categories are attempts to concentrate on and scrutinize each one of the most evident patterns in teachers' practices. The sum of all these categories constitute teachers' recurrent set of actions, attitudes and instructional activities. In other words, all these categories together actually constitute teachers' teaching styles. Each one of these categories will be treated next.

4.2.1 Building rapport

Shellsea and Lea seem to be willing to help their students feel comfortable in class. Shellsea usually relies on informal interactions, gentleness and humor in order to build rapport, whereas Lea relies on informal interactions, enthusiasm and humor. Although they present similarities in their general approaches towards building this classroom atmosphere, some differences also arise.

Teacher Shellsea tries to help students feel comfortable by being close to them. Before classes start, she usually sits close to her students, carries out informal talk with them and clarifies any doubts they might have. She walks around the classroom and sits close to different students, sometimes touches their heads and smiles. Once most students seem to have arrived, she stands up and starts the classes. The following class transcript registers a moment when Shellsea sits between two students before the class actually starts:

Excerpt 1 (Class 2, 23.04.2003):

1. T: So, how are you today?
2. L1: Fine, teacher (…) tired too
3. T: Tired? Such a young guy? ((The teacher laughs))
4. L1: ((The student laughs)) Yeah (…) many tests
5. L2: Teacher eu posso falar I went home I was hurry up?
6. T: I was in a hurry when I went home

In carrying these interactions, Shellsea seems to be concerned with building an affective relationship with her students. Thus, she tries to interact about matters that are

not necessarily related to what is being taught. This warm and informal interaction before her classes actually start seems to be a pattern of Shellsea's for she has acted so in all classes observed.

Similarly, Lea also interacts with her students about matters other than the ones related to what is being taught. She socializes in the beginning of her classes, as noted in the following class extract:

Excerpt 2 (Class 1, 21.04.2003)

121. T: So, how was Easter? Did you eat lots of chocolate eggs?
122. L1: Yes, teacher
123: T: Are you happy, then?
124. L2: happy? Tired, teacher
125: T: Tired of eating chocolate?
126: LL: ((students laugh))
127: L2: No (…) I (…) traveled to my house to visit my family (…) by bus, teacher (...) I'm tired
128: T: Oh, I see
129: L3: And you teacher?
130: T: Me?
131: L3: A lot of eggs?
132: No, *one* egg (…) I mean, I gave myself one egg

As shown in the excerpt above, Lea tries to interact with her students about their holiday, however, she keeps this interaction open by addressing her questions to the whole group. She stands in the center of the classroom and carries out informal talks.

Within these informal interactions both teachers carry out, feeling types seem to be the ones most favored. According to Lawrence (1982), a desire for harmony, warmth and empathy are typical characteristics of a feeling preference. Shellsea seems to emphasize this preference to a greater extent, since she sits close to students, smiles and even touch them. Lea is friendly, though she does not get as close to students. Thus, teachers seem to favor feeling types by interacting friendly with students. However, they emphasize such preferences in different degrees.

Simultaneously, these informal interactions also seem to address extraversion and introversion preferences. According to Jung (1974), introverts pursue working alone or interacting with just a few people, whereas extraverts are sociable and favor from interacting with many people. Therefore, Shellsea tends to favor introverts since she keeps this interaction more personal by sitting between a couple of students, addressing them directly, and having a small group interaction. On the other hand, Lea tends to favor extraverts for she carries out these informal talks by addressing all students and having a whole class interaction.

In addition to this, gentleness and enthusiasm seem to be key elements when building rapport is at play. The former is a strong characteristic of Shellsea's in the attempt to keep a comfortable classroom atmosphere, and the latter is an evident feature in Lea's practice. Shellsea's gentleness can be seen by the way she reminds students of the rules in her classes. In the following classroom transcript, Shellsea is reminding students the rules about the use of the target language:

Excerpt 3 (Class 2, 23.04. 03)

181. T: L1, are you speaking Portuguese, my dear? Ladies, ladies, you have to try to motivate your friend to speak English, OK? Remember what we have talked about it? Portuguese is not a very good idea! Let's try to speak English as much as we can.

The following excerpt also shows Shellsea's gentleness as well as playfulness when reminding students of the writing tasks they are supposed to hand in:

Excerpt 4 (Class 4, 30.04.03)

388. T: I wonder why I haven't had many compositions to correct
389. L3: Teacher, can I hand in the compositions I did' t
304. T: Yes, my dear, *When?* ((The teacher is almost singing))
305. The compositions teacher (...) [can I give]
306. [Yes, dear, *when* do you intend to bring them?] ((the teacher laughs))
307. L3: Ahh (...) ((the student laughs))
308. T: It's important to do the compositions, class ((teacher speaks with the whole class)) You will not learn English only by coming to class. Let's set up new dates for all the late ones, OK? It's

OK to give it to me a bit late, but you have try to do it (...) It's very important for you (...) I'll give you more time.

This gentleness may, again, indicate that this teacher values harmony in her classes once she seems to be concerned with students' feelings. She seems to avoid any kind of embarrassment or criticism. In acting so, Shellsea also tends to favor feeling types for she expresses this capacity for empathy and warmth and this awareness towards people's feelings (Lawrence, 1982).

In the same vein of building rapport, Lea's enthusiasm during the management of classroom activities can be also noticed. Lea is very active and she is always speaking in an exclamatory tone of voice. Hence, such enthusiasm seems to be contagious and spread among her students. As can be noted in the following excerpt, Lea tries to make everybody sing while performing a song activity:

Excerpt 5 (Class 5, 12.05.2003)

189. T: Ok, now come on, everybody! ((The teacher speaks loud)) " I wanna know have you ever seen the rain? Coming down on a sunny day" ((the teacher sings very enthusiastically and her students sing along))

In the following class transcript, Lea brings a guitar to class and asks one of the students to play it:

Excerpt 6 (Class 5, 12.05.2003)

196. T: L4, come and play for us!

197: L4: No teacher

198. T: Come on! Do it! Come and play for us! ((The teacher speaks loud in a very enthusiastic way))

199. L4: I don't play the guitar

200. T: Yes, you told me that you do ((the student finally stands up and plays the guitar while the teacher and the other students sing the song))

201. T: All right! Let's go! Let's raise our hands! " Have you ever?"((The teacher seems to be very happy and tries to cheer everybody in this musical moment))

202. LL: "Have you ever seen the rain?" ((everybody waves hands, and sings very enthusiastically))

This idea of movement such as waving hands is also frequently shown in Lea's classes. She seems to have high energy most of the time. Thus, all this energy and

enthusiasm lead to a pleasant atmosphere once students themselves really seem to engage enthusiastically in most activities carried out. This preference for using songs in order to build rapport is mentioned by Lea during the reflective session:

Excerpt 7 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

T: Playing songs is also a good way of making this class atmosphere more natural. Music is everywhere. The moment they are singing, they just put their whole body and heart into it. Last class a student of mine came to me and said: 'Teacher, how wonderful it is to sing!'

As can be seen in excerpts 6,7 and 8, Lea seems to promote a comfortable atmosphere in her classes by acting very enthusiastically when managing activities. By acting so enthusiastically and trying to involve learners, she tends to favor mainly intuitive, feelers, extraverts, and kinesthetic learners (Jung, 1974; Lawrence, 1982; Kinsella, 1994).

According to Jung (1974), intuitive types are attracted to possibilities, and usually focus on the new, untried, and creative ways of doing things. Thus, such preferences seem to be in accordance with Lea's procedures since she tries to promote various ways to experience songs with students, not only by focusing on language aspects, but also by singing, raising hands, or even playing the guitar herself. Moreover, this energetic way of working with songs also brings empathy to Lea's classes. She sings loud, smiles, and claps her hands so as to promote enjoyment in class. Thus, feelers also tend to be addressed, for they are the ones who mostly favor from warmth and empathy (Lawrence, 1982).

Along with this warmth brought into her classes, Lea also seems to make students express themselves, be it as a whole group- by having them sing loud and raise hands- be it individually, by asking one of the students to play the guitar. In this sense, she tends to favor extraverts once these learners are more motivated towards the outer world. "Extraverts' interest turns mostly outward to the world of actions, people and things" (Lawrence, 1982, p. 2).

Simultaneously, besides the emphasis Lea places on intuition, feeling and extraversion, she also tends to favor kinesthetic learners. According to Kinsella (1994), these learners favor from actually doing things. In other words, kinesthetic learners favor from whole body involvement activities such as moving around the classroom, drawing, singing or touching things. Hence, Lea tends to favor kinesthetic learners once she seems to aim at having students involved through all their senses and emotions by singing, waving hands, or even playing the guitar.

Following the same lines, the element of humor is another aspect which definitely contributes to building classroom rapport. Humor is a salient pattern of Shellsea's practice. She is always coming up with funny situations, examples, gestures or jokes, which make students laugh. Some of the classroom excerpts previously displayed - Excerpts 1, line 4; Excerpt 4, lines 306,307; and some of the excerpts which will be displayed later on such as Excerpts 17, line 17; and 30, line 1 - illustrate moments of laughter in her classes.

It is important to highlight that most of the laughter is provoked by the teacher. The following excerpt registers a moment of humor. As the teacher explains the differences among the prepositions *in, on, at, around, out,* she quickly draws a map of Brazil and places the names of the prepositions *in*, *around*, and *out* all over her drawing in order to make the meaning of the prepositions clear to her students. After drawing her map she makes a funny comment about it:

Excerpt 8 (Class 4, 30.04.03)

14. T: Suppose this is Brazil (...) Oh, I'm Picasso's friend ((the teacher laughs and students laugh with her))

The following class transcript registers another moment of humor as one of the students tries to clarify the meaning of a word:

Excerpt 9 (Class 5, 12.05.03)
89. L4: Teacher, what's the meaning of forgot?

90. T: Oh, I forgot! ((teacher touches her own head as if she had really forgotten))

91. LL: ((Students laugh))

92. T: Did you understand?

93. L4: So so

94. T: Can anybody help?

95. L1: Oh, I forgot! ((student laughs)) I forgot my homework, my composition (...) I forgot the word forgot ((everybody laughs))

96. L4: Ok (...) I know (...) I forgot, too ((The student laughs as he seems to understand the word and realize the joke))

Although Shellsea does not refer to these instances of laughter as humor, she does admit to value them as a tool for creating a favorable learning atmosphere. This can be seen in the following reflective section transcript:

Excerpt 10 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

R: Even though you haven't mentioned humor through your notes, I have seen you making funny comments and gestures many times such as these moments right here ((I point out to the transparency and show Shellsea some of the classroom excerpts containing laughters she has provoked in her classes))

T: Oh, yeah, yeah I try to make students laugh, but when I think of humor I think of funny stories such as anecdotes, you know *piadas?* And I'm not very good at telling *piadas*, but I try to make my classes funny, relaxed, you know when I was learning English, I've told you, my experience was painful, I was always scared, so I try to make my students feel good, not scared, relaxed (...) when they laugh they feel comfortable in class

As stated above, these instances of humor are actually attempts to make students feel comfortable in class. In this sense, Shellsea seems to believe that an environment in which anxiety and inhibition are kept low is favorable to learning (Krashen, 1982). It seems that this belief may have been acquired from her experience as a language learner once she describes her own learning experience as a painful one and shows her concern for providing a comfortable learning atmosphere to her students. The fact that Shellsea's concern for helping students feel comfortable seems to be a result of her own learning experience is in line with the idea that teachers actually acquire strong features of teaching from their own experience as learners (Kennedy, 1990).

On the other hand, Lea values humor by reacting in a positive way when it emerges from the students. She does not seem to promote as many funny moments or

create funny situations herself frequently. When asked to talk about her teaching, as shown in the extract below, Lea mentions the value of humor in her classes:

Excerpt 11 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

T: I value humor, when students do it, when they make jokes, I like it. I really like it.

During a game in which students were supposed to complete sentences with their own ideas, as illustrated in the excerpt below, Lea reacts to humor in a positive way:

Excerpt 12 (Class 3, 30.04.2003)

T: When you become a parent
L: When you become a parent (...) When you become a parent (...) you know hell
T: All right! ((the teacher laughs))
LL: ((students laugh together))

This way, humor is present in both classes and it seems to bring friendliness to the learning environment. Thus, again, feeling types tend to be favored by these teachers and, again, Shellsea tends to emphasize feeling preferences to a greater extent. She is the one who promotes humor in her classes most of the times, whereas Lea welcomes it whenever it comes from her students.

At the same time, humor may also be related to creativity and imagination. Intuitive learners are the ones who benefit from such features. According to Lawrence (1982), intuitive types rely on inspiration and enjoy creativity. Hence, both teachers also tend to favor these learners when dealing with humor in the classroom.

In sum, when building rapport is at play, Shellsea tends to favor mostly introverts, feelers, and intuitive, whereas Lea tends to favor extraverts, feelers, although to a lower degree, as well as intuitive and kinesthetic learners.

4.2.2. Dealing with the speaking skill

As far as the speaking skill is concerned, Levelt (1989, p.1) sates that "speaking is one of man's most complex skill. It is a skill which is unique to our species." Nunan

(1991) and Ur (1996) claim, from a pedagogical perspective, that the speaking skill seems intuitively to be the most important one to most learners. Similarly, both teachers show awareness towards the complexity of the speaking skill, as stated in the following transcripts:

Excerpt 13 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

101. TS: Learning how to speak takes time and effort because cognitive and physical processes are involved.

Excerpt 14 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

82. TL: I know that, from the papers that I've read, academic readings, that most students have difficulties in speaking.

Although these teachers may be aware of the complexity or even difficulty of the speaking skill, they present different patterns of procedures as they deal with speaking. In both teachers' classes speaking is the vehicle of communication. In this sense, several opportunities for speaking are provided by these teachers: socializing, correcting exercises, making up dialogues, discussions and games. Thus, most of what is accomplished in the classroom happens through speaking.

However, teacher Shellsea seems to provide moments in which, besides being a vehicle or a means, speaking is also the goal. Whenever speaking seems to be her goal, she usually deals with it through Topic-based activities (Ur, 1996). According to the categorization by Ur (1996), these activities are based on topics and "simply ask students to talk about a subject and the discussion is clearly the main objective" (p. 122). Within the topics she brings to her classes, Shellsea emphasizes reflection. After conducting a fill in the blank activity about a song she brought to her students, she promotes a discussion on the messages laying within the metaphors of the lyrics:

Excerpt 15 (Class 3, 26.04.03)

1. T: All, right, class uh (...) Can you tell me some positive adjectives and adverbs of this song?
2. L1: [Wonderful]
3. L2:   [Magical]

4. LL: XXXX

5. L3: Happily, magical, [wonderful]

6. L2:   [Joyfully what means?]

7. T: Happily, with pleasure

8. L1: Playfully

9. T: Good, when are these words used? In the beginning or at the end?

10. L1: beginning, teacher

11. T: Does anything change? Does this person go anywhere?

12. L2: The end is more negative I think (...) responsible, practical, [cynical]

13. T: [Very good!]

14. L4: "They sent me away" (...) after this phrase the song is negative

15. T: Yes! "They sent me away to teach me how to be sensible, practical, intellectual, cynical..." ((Teacher sings parts of the song)) Where did this person go?

16. L5: I think he is old

17. T: Oh, so old people are never happy, only young ones? Poor me! ((teacher laughs))

18. LL: ((students laugh))

19. L1: Maybe he went to a place bad (...) bad place (...) a military school, teacher

20. T: Good, maybe

21. L5: I don't know if is young or old (...) the beginning is happy (...) the end no, teacher

22. T: Yes, you're right! I really believe this is a criticism to society, to the educational system

23. L: What means Clinical?

24. T: Clinical, here means very technical, like a machine, you know (...) no affection or feelings, do you understand?

In conducting this discussion, Shellsea tries to make students reflect on the topic. The discussion around the message of the song is subjective, thus, she allows for flexibility since there are no right or wrong answers. This way of dealing with speaking through open, flexible and subjective discussions can also be noticed in the following excerpt in which Shellsea is brainstorming ideas related to a forthcoming lesson:

Excerpt 16 (Class 1, 16.04.03)

338. OK. In pairs please, I'd like you to list at least five (...) jobs that you think are hot in Brazil. You know hot? Hot jobs!!   What, what is a (...) hot job? A hot job, a hot work? ((students get in pairs for about ten minutes, then the teachers opens the discussion to the whole group)) So, what do you consider a hot job? What do you think a hot job is?

339. L1: A cool job?

340. T: A cool job in what sense?

341. L1: cool, hot ((laughing))

342. T: What ?((laughing)) What do you have in mind when I say hot job?

343. L2: A nice job.

344. L3: A dangerous job?

345. T: A dangerous job?

346. L1: If you like

347. T: If you like, OK, so what is hot for you is strong emotions? Do you intend to work someday ((joking))

348. L3: What?

349. T: Do you intend to work someday in the future, maybe ((laughing))

350. LL: Yes. ((laughing))

351. T: Yes, Ok. And what kind of jobs are you going to look for? (...) some job that you like, something that you like (...) what else? You have to know ideas about the jobs. I know that you're too young (...) to think about this subject. Do (..) do you think of money?

352. LL: Yes !! ((laughing)) Oh!

353. T: Oh, yes! You have to confess !! ((laughing)) So you think of family, because maybe you will have a family of yourself to support.

354. L: Well, I think of a job, but I don't know if it is a hot or cold job.

355. T & LL: ((laughing))

356. L1: Very stressful job

357. L2: A fun job, teacher?

It is important to highlight that, in the textbook itself, hot jobs are defined as the ones which will be the most plentiful over the next several years. However, Shellsea does not focus the discussion on this definition. Again, she tries to value students' own ideas and background knowledge. She carefully takes into account all her students' contributions as not to discard any point of view or comment they might have on the topic. In order to consider all points of view, she emphasizes subjectivity by not asking for specific answers. Hence, Shellsea tends to address mainly introverts as well as extraverts, feelers, intuitive and perceivers (Jung, 1974; Lawrence, 1982).

As regards extraversion and introversion, Shellsea addresses her questions to the whole group in both discussions displayed above. When discussing the metaphors in the song, she does not allow time for thinking before answering. Therefore, extraverts who enjoy discussing ideas overtly and quickly without much time for thinking previously tend to be the ones favored (Lawrence, 1982). In the second discussion, she allows time for thinking by having students work in pairs. Then, she has them present their lists and

opinions about hot jobs. Hence, introverts are favored once they like time to think and consider things because they may not be quick to try something before understanding it first (Lawrence, 1982).

Concerning thinking and feeling, Shellsea tends to focus on subjective discussions. Students are free to come up with their own interpretation once the teacher tends to accept all answers from them. Consequently, feeling types seem to be the ones most addressed. According to Jung (1974), feeling types benefit from expressing themselves from a personal, subjective basis.

This subjectivity in dealing with discussions also implies openness to possibilities. Once there are no right or wrong answers, students can share and experience a variety of interpretations. They can rely on whatever inspires them within the metaphors to build their interpretation, as well as express their own understanding of hot jobs. These preferences for openness, possibilities and inspiration are typically related to intuitive learners (Jung, 1974; Lawrence, 1982). Thus, they also seem to be favored within the management of these speaking activities.

Regarding judging and perceiving preferences, topic-based activities are usually flexible; the main goal is the discussion itself. There is no emphasis on precise procedures since such activities do not require step-by-step instructions nor focus on specific outcomes. In this sense, perceivers tend to be mainly favored because they are the ones who most benefit from flexibility (Lawrence, 1982). This pattern in dealing with speaking is confirmed by the teacher in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 17 (Reflective Session, 30. 05. 2003)

T: Students need to be stimulated to reach to conclusions. I've always had this with me: reflect, reflect, reflect. I reflect a lot about things and I think that's why I make my students reflect. Reflect, reflect (…) the news, the movies we see, the songs we listen

The importance given to students' own ideas and background knowledge is also mentioned by Shellsea:

Excerpt 18 (Reflective Session, 30.05.03)

T: I believe students should think of their background knowledge and share it with the group. They should be stimulated to give personal contributions to the group.

As shown above, Shellsea seems to value students' contributions by dealing with speaking through subjective and flexible discussions in which reflection on the topics is motivated.

In contrast, Lea's approach to speaking is particularly different. Although she promotes many opportunities for speaking throughout her classes, she does not seem to dedicate any moments to focus specifically on the speaking skill. This pattern may be related to Lea's own perspective towards this skill, as stated below:

Excerpt 19 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

T: I consider speaking any kind of oral production. Sometimes when students write down an answer for a question and read it aloud, I consider it speaking, and uh, every oral production they have in classroom

In this perspective, Lea seems to promote a variety of activities which involve speaking. However, speaking is seen as a means of communication in the classroom, not as the main goal Lea has in mind at specific moments. Thus, speaking seems to be spread over all the activities she carries out for different purposes. The following passage registers a moment when Lea promotes speaking during a game performed for the purpose of consolidating the grammar of adverbial clauses of time, and the use of different subordinating conjunctions such as *when, by the time, once* and after.

Excerpt 20 (Class 3, 30.04.2003)

76. T: All right, let's play a Tic, Tac, Toe, class! Do you remember?
77. LL: [yes]
78. LL: [Tic, Tac, Toe?]

79. L2: jogo da velha, né?

84. T: [Yes]

81. LL: [Ahh]

82. T: Ok, I'll give you numbers and you go to your teams, right? People with the same number belong to the same team (…) So, I'll write the life events on the board, you choose one life event to make a sentence with it. You have to use the Past Perfect, Ok? For example, by the time I took my driver's license I had finished high school, OK? You may take a look at the sentences while I draw the frame of the Tic, Tac, Toe ((teacher draws a frame for the game while students take a look at the sentences in the textbook. The Tic, Tac, Toe frame she draws is depicted below))

Tic, Tac, Toe frame drawn by the teacher:

1. you get your driver's license	2. you become a parent	3. you get your first job
4. You have your first date	5. You graduate	6. You get married
7.You buy your first car	8. you get engaged	9. you start college

83.   T: All right, who starts? Who starts? No volunteers? Ok, Odd or even? Let's go! ((students had to stand up: one would choose a number and the other one would complete the sentence))

84.   L1: You become a parent (…) number 2

84.   T: Ok, now someone from the other team has to make a sentence

85.   L2: When you become a parent (…)when you become a parent (…) you know hell

86.   T: ((The teacher laughs))

87.   LL: ((The students laugh))

88.   T: Good! Next

89.   L3: Once you graduate

90.   L4: (…) You will (…) you have to look for a job

Similarly, in the following transcript, Lea promotes opportunities for speaking during a game performed for the purpose of practicing vocabulary related to life events such as Sweet 16, losing first tooth, graduating and getting engaged:

Excerpt 21 (Class 3, 30.04.2003)

34. T: All right! I'd like you to get in two teams: boys and girls. Come on! You over here and you over here. Let's go! I'd like you to write a list of life important events, OK? Remember from last class? Go ahead! ((students write the list))

35. T: Ok, now I want one member of each group here (...) Ok, you try to explain a life event to your team and they will try to guess what life event you are describing. If they get it right your team scores a point, Ok? Let's go! Do you understand? ((students were supposed to stand up and explain the words so that the other ones could guess the meaning))

36. LL: Yes

37. T: Go on

38. L1: This is something that happens in your mouth when you are six or seven years old (...) you don't like

39. LL: Losing first teeth!

40. T: Very good! You got it! First tooth!

In general, while Shellsea emphasizes reflection during discussions, Lea brings speaking into play by focusing on other goals in the classroom, and she emphasizes action during games. These games usually require quick answers; students have to be fast in order to score their points. Therefore, extraverts tend to be favored. These learners like action and are able to act quickly without much reflection (Lawrence, 1982).

As regards sensing and intuition, students seem to have a variety of possibilities in the first game since they can complete the sentences with whatever comes to their minds. Intuitive learners are addressed for they value possibilities above all else (Jung, 1974). In the second game, students are supposed to come up with the correct answer. They have to listen to the explanation and give objective answers. Thus, sensing types are addressed since they benefit from accuracy and common sense (Jung, 1974).

Concerning thinking and feeling, thinking types seem to be more addressed in both games. The second game is more objective than the first one; however, the first game does not really focus on subjectivity. It only allows for some subjectivity in the sense that it does not seek for a specific answer. Thinkers like to decide things logically (Lawrence, 1982), thus, they seem to be the ones most favored within the procedures of the games themselves.

Regarding judging and perceiving, both games have step-by-step instructions which are set in advance by the teacher. In game one, students have to stand up, then, one has to choose a number, and the other one has to complete the sentence. In game two, students have to get in teams of boys and girls, then, write a list. Finally, one has to stand up and explain a word. These games move towards closure and judgers tend to be

the ones most favored for they prefer having a settled system in place, they like to act in a planned and orderly way (Lawrence, 1982). In the first game, perceivers seem to be slightly addressed in the sense that there is flexibility towards the answers. However, the second game focuses on the judging preference since even the answers are very specific. Therefore, judgers seem to be the most favored learners after all.

Another feature present in the management of such games is the element of movement. Lea has students move in order to get in teams and stand up when it is their turn to play. Thus, kinesthetic learners are simultaneously addressed.

This tendency of using lots of games, which somehow involve speaking as a means of communication in the classroom, is also verbalized by Lea during the reflective session:

Excerpt 22 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

T: Well, I don't like long discussions, many opinions, reflections (...) I think they don't take us anywhere (...) there is no result (...) We discuss, reflect and so what?
R: And where do games take you?
T: There is a result: some win, others lose (...) games start and they have an end (...) and besides, students seem to be more involved because games make students really engage and use the language in a less formal classroom context

In short, whenever the focus is speaking, Shellsea deals with it mainly through discussions. When conducting a discussion, she tends to address mainly feelers, intuitive, and perceivers, as well as keep a balance between introverts and extraverts.

On the other hand, speaking does not seem to be focused individually in Lea's practice. Rather, the speaking skill is involved in most of the activities she carries out for a variety of purposes, be it consolidate grammar or review vocabulary. Within these games, she tends to favor mainly extraverts, and thinkers as well as keep as balance between sensing and intuition. She also seems to address judgers over perceivers, and these games also include movement which favors kinesthetic learners.

4.1.3. Teaching grammar

The way teachers Shellsea and Lea approach grammar seem to constitute another pattern of their practices for they carried out the same procedures during all classes observed. The textbooks used by these teachers present grammar through focus on forms (Ortega, 1997) in a section called 'Focus on Grammar'.

Although the textbook itself presents grammar through focus on forms, Shellsea seems to emphasize grammar rules the least possible. The following excerpt of field notes, taken during Shellsea's presentation of a grammar point, summarizes her procedures when teaching grammar:

Excerpt 23 (Class 4, 05.05.03)

Shellsea presents the grammar focus by following the same procedures of the other classes. She plays the CD and students listen to the sentences. Then, she reads the sentences herself and clarifies any doubts concerning meaning. She gives more examples, asks students questions as to contextualize the grammar being taught. Then, she gives instructions for the textbook written exercises related to the grammar topic. Next, she corrects the exercises and during the exercise correction she also contextualizes the grammar aspects by asking students many personal questions in attempt to make them use the grammar being taught in their answers. Finally, if students have any questions about grammar rules, she answers these questions and tries to provide more contextualized examples. In case they do not ask anything about rules, she goes on to the next class event.

As can be seen, Shellsea tends to focus on meaning over form as far as grammar is concerned since she does not to focus grammar usage, but on grammar use (Widdowson, 1991). After all examples and attempts of contextualization, rules are mentioned only when asked by the students. In this sense, she tends to emphasize inductive reasoning for she seems to teach grammar by moving from the specific examples which can be contextualized to the general laws or rules which govern the examples (Brown, 1987).

By focusing on meaning and emphasizing inductive reasoning, Shellsea tends to address mainly intuitive learners. According to Lawrence (1982), intuitive types are more speculative and "they like to learn new materials through intuitive grasps of

meanings and relationships" (p.7). Thus, they tend to be addressed by Shellsea once she tries to help students make sense of grammar in a more holistic way by contextualizing it, using it meaningfully.

In addition, when trying to contextualize the grammar aspects being dealt with, Shellsea asks students many questions. She starts by addressing the same questions one by one to different students and they all give their answers. As a result, they end up sharing their ideas as a whole group interaction. Given the fact that extraverts are the ones who prefer interacting and sharing ideas with many people (Lawrence, 1982), they tend to be favored as grammar contextualization takes place.

Simultaneously, by contextualizing and, thus, making the grammar topics more meaningful to students, Shellsea tends to favor feeling types for she values students' answers by giving them chances to contribute and build such contextualization. The following classroom transcript registers a moment of grammar contextualization, as Shellsea tries to make students use gerunds in their answers:

Excerpt 24 (Class 2, 23.04.2003)

45.T: Are you good at creating things or memorizing facts?
46. L1: [memorizing facts]
47. T: [I'm good at]   ((teacher tries to make the student says the complete sentence))
48. L1: Ok, I'm good at memorizing facts
49. T: Yeah, you will be a lawyer, soon, right? ((teacher laughs))
50. L1: Yes
51.   T: And you L2?
52.   L2: Me? Teacher (...) I have to be good at creating things (...) I study design
53.   T: All right! And you, L3?

As can be seen, Shellsea seems to encourage students to use the grammar on focus by relating it to their own perspectives and contexts. Thus, feelers seem to be the ones mostly favored, for they like to deal with topics in a personal, subjective basis (Lawrence, 1982).

Regarding judging and perceiving preferences, Shellsea tends to deal with grammar in a flexible way, problems are dealt with as they come up, she only emphasizes rules if students ask so. Hence, perceivers seem to be the ones most addressed since they benefit from flexibility and easily adjust to problems and situations as they flow (Lawrence, 1982).

In contrast, Lea tries to emphasize grammar rules as much as possible. She focuses on the rules, gives many examples, and places all the grammar explanation on the board. The following excerpt of field notes, taken during Lea's presentation of a grammar point, illustrates this pattern:

Excerpt 25 (Class 4, 05.05.03)

 Lea presents grammar by projecting a transparency on the board containing all the rules and examples. She uses different colors. The rules are usually all written in the same color and all the examples are in a different color She explains the rules and gives the examples. Students ask many questions. She tries to answer all the questions. Then, students are supposed to do the grammar exercises of the textbook.

The following classroom transcript registers a moment in which Lea presents grammar:

Excerpt 26 (Class 2, 23.04.03)

32.T: All right, what kinds of future do we have?

33. LL: XXXX

34. L1: Will and going to (…) verb to be and going to

35. T: Ok and what is the difference between these two kinds of future?

36. L1: Will is not sure (…) maybe and (…) going to (…) you are sure

37. T: Ok. Do you agree, class?

38. LL: XXX

39. T: Yeah, this is a very good review, very nice (…) when we use will we are talking about possible things but maybe they will not happen and this one to be going to ((teacher points to the transparency projected on the board)) is when we are sure, Ok? Now let's see what we have here ((teacher looks at the transparency)) Believe it or not we have more ways to talk about the future ((teacher tries to place the transparency in a good position so that students can read)) Ok, believe it or not we use present continuous to talk about future, Ok? Many times we refer to the Present Continuous to talk about things that are happening now: you are studying, I'm teaching, Ok? But here we use it to talk about future events. So, let's read the information I have here: Use Present Continuous to express future time when the sentence refers to a planned event. ((teachers reads what's written on the board)) For example, you have plans to go to the dentist tomorrow and I ask

you: When are you seeing the dentist? And you answer: I'm seeing the dentist tomorrow. This is Present Continuous but used with this future intention, Ok? (…) What are you doing after this class, L2?

40. L2: I'm cooking dinner

By explaining rules, and, then, contextualizing grammar, Lea emphasizes deductive reasoning which goes from the language rules to the examples inferred from these rules (Krashen, 1989). Normally, after all the board explanation and textbook exercise correction, Lea also plays games for the purpose of consolidating the grammar taught. This feature is shown in Excerpt 22 displayed above, and can also be seen in the following excerpt as she carries out a game to practice prepositions:

Excerpt 27 (Class 1, 16.04.2003)

8. T: Ok, class. I'd like each one of you to write a question about History in a piece of paper. It can be any question, but try to think of questions about events most people have heard about. The questions should be about the year, month or date something has happened. For example, When did Colombus discover America? Only one question, not more than that. And I want you to write down the answer on the same piece of paper, the question and the answer together. Ok, I'll give you one minute.

((students write down their questions))

9. T: Ok, when you finish it I want the questions and answers. I need the pieces of paper, Ok, class? (...) Have you finished? Ok, the thing is I'll give you colors, Ok? So, you have to memorize your colors, Ok? You're blue, you're green, you're blue, you're green ((The teacher goes on giving students their colors)) Ok, you're going to do the following (...) You can not talk with the members of your group, Ok? I want two lines here next to the board, all right? I'll ask you questions and I want you to write the answers on the board using the right prepositions, Ok? Use *in, for, since*, all right? Ok! First question: When did the Gulf war begin? ((teacher waits until the student writes the correct answer)) All right! In 1991, that's correct! One Point for the blue group! Next question: When did the dictatorship start in Brazil? ((This way, the teacher kept asking questions to each one of the teams: Blue and Green. Students got one point for the right answer and another one for the right preposition. Students laugh and seem to have a real good time during the game))

As can be seen, Lea approaches grammar by focusing on grammar usage (Widdowson, 1991). She presents grammar in a very analytical way by emphasizing rules and details. According to Jung (1974), sensing types benefit from facts and details. These types like to start by what is known and benefit from systematically relating new knowledge to previous one. These preferences seem to be in accordance to Lea's

grammar procedures concerning grammar. In Excerpt 37, line 32, she starts slowly by what students are expected to know *"What kinds of future do we have*?", then, in line 39, she goes on by adding new information *"Believe it or not we have more ways to talk about the future…Believe it or not we can use present continuous to talk about the future, Ok*?" Following this line of reasoning, as she moves from what is known to what is new, rules and details are emphasized, thus, favoring sensing learners.

By dealing with grammar in this analytical way, thinking preferences are also addressed. According to Jung (1974) typical characteristics of a thinking preference include applying logical analysis, and the ability to consider facts objectively. Yet, she seems to address judgers for she has procedures previously set and follows the rules and examples organized in transparencies beforehand. Judgers benefit from following procedures settled in advance (Lawrence, 1982).

Regarding sensorial learning styles, Lea has all grammar explanation in transparencies in different colors, and she also gives all answers to students' questions on the board. She also plays games and have students move. Hence, she seems to keep a balance between visual, auditory and kinesthetic learners since all grammar presentation happens orally along with board use and followed by games. According to Kinsella (1994), a balanced instruction concerning sensorial learning preferences should include visual, auditory as well as kinesthetic activities.

Although Lea has dealt with grammar by using transparencies and focusing on rules in all instances of grammar teaching, she does not seem to be self-assured about her approach to grammar, as stated in the following reflective session transcript:

Excerpt 28 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

((After having 15-20 minutes to write about her teaching beliefs, procedures, and preferences, and sharing it with the group, I noticed Lea had not mentioned anything about the way she teaches grammar, so, I questioned her about it))

31. R: Lea, how about the way you teach grammar?

32.TL: Hmmm (…) What?

33. R: Would you mind sharing how you usually teach grammar?

34. TL: Ok, so let's see (…) Oh, well, first of all I don't like teaching grammar, Ok? I don't feel like teaching grammar, so I have to push myself to do it and then (…) what I usually do is I use transparencies so that I can explain the rules to them and we can discuss it, so they ask me many questions and I try to clarify their doubts as much as I can (…) I (…) I show the examples in the transparencies, sometimes I ask them for more examples uh (…) then, they do the exercises in the book, I correct the exercises and try to help them when they don't understand (…) I like to make sure they understood what was taught, Ok? So, I ask questions, too and (…) I guess that's it. Oh, I also like to play games to practice the grammar so that they can engage in a less formal activity, you know? But, I don't know if this way of teaching grammar is effective, Ok? I don't feel like doing things this way, but I do it because maybe it will help them.

As stated above, it seems that Lea is still trying to find her path regarding grammar teaching. She seems to be in conflict with her own teaching style once she admits to feel uncomfortable with her own pattern. In addition, as Shellsea tries to interpret Lea's discomfort, she verbalizes changes in her own patterns from the beginning of her career up to the present. This suggests that although teachers seem to present stronger tendencies at a given time, they may be working on and adjusting their teaching styles throughout their teaching experiences.

4.2.3 Focusing on Pronunciation

As regards pronunciation, both teachers seem to be aware of students' problems and they usually provide feedback when students mispronounce words. Shellsea waits until students finish speaking in order to point out any pronunciation problem. Whenever it is a word mispronounced by many students, she points the problem to the whole group. However, if a specific student mispronounces a word, she invites this one student to repeat the word correctly. This pattern is described in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 29 (Class 4, 05.05.03)

T: Please, repeat: truck driver ((The teacher emphasizes the vowel sound of the word truck which had been mispronounced by many students))

    LL: Truck driver ((students repeat the word))

Excerpt 30 (Class 4, 05.05.03)

T: L1, be careful ' im<u>pa</u>tient', Ok? ((The teacher emphasizes the stressed syllable of the word impatient which had been mispronounced by a specific student))

   L1: Impatient ((The student repeats it after the teacher))

As can be seen, Shellsea seems to focus on pronunciation as problems come up and she deals with them by providing the correct pronunciation to the students. Perceivers, intuitive and auditory learners seem to be the ones most addressed within this approach (Jung, 1974; Lawrence, 1982; Kinsella 1994).

Shellsea focuses on the problems and simply provides the correct sounds so that students can repeat it correctly. She does not carry out any phonological analysis by emphasizing details or comparing sounds. Thus, intuitive learners tend to be favored over sensing ones who benefit from details and analysis (Jung, 1974). By approaching pronunciation only as problems arise, she also seems to address perceivers, for these learners benefit from adjusting to situations as they come up and do not like to follow a previous plan or organization (Lawrence, 1982).

Furthermore, she does not use the board or focus or any written phonetic symbols as to have students visualize the sounds. Pronunciation mistakes are treated by providing the correct sounds and having students repeat. She relies only on the auditory sensorial channel, thus, auditory learners are the ones mostly addressed (Kinsella, 1994).

On the other hand, Lea tries to provide feedback on students' pronunciation, to a much greater extent than Shellsea, by placing phonetic symbols on the board, comparing sounds, and raising awareness on stress, intonation, and minimal pairs. This emphasis on pronunciation is portrayed in the following excerpts:

Excerpt 31 (Class 3, 30.04.2003)

126. T: The stress in the word 'argue' is here, class ((Lea writes the word on the board and underlines the first syllable)). Also, the vowel sound in the word 'most' is this one, Ok? ((Teacher

writes the phonetic symbol on the board)) And the vowel sound in the second syllable of the word 'ambitious' is this one ((teacher writes the phonetic symbol on the board))

argue	most	ambitious
	/oʊ /	/ /

As shown above, Lea seems to deal with pronunciation in a more analytical way by dealing with phonetic symbols and trying to make students aware of details in pronunciation, stress and intonation. In addition to this, Lea also takes students to the lab, have them record and listen to their own speech in order to improve their pronunciation.

Sensing learners benefit from facts, details and systematic analysis (Lawrence, 1982). Therefore, Lea tends to address them by carrying out analysis, comparison, and by giving students opportunities to focus on details of their own pronunciation when they record their own speech. By dealing with pronunciation in this analytical way, she also tends to favor thinkers once these learners are objective and benefit from applying logical analysis (Jung, 1974).

At the same time, Lea seems to address judgers since she presents planned systematic procedures when dealing with pronunciation. She does not wait until students present problems; she always emphasizes pronunciation rules and takes them to the lab in order to record their voice no matter what problems or difficulties they may have. She has these procedures settled and organized beforehand. Thus, judgers tend to be most favored for the are the ones who need to have things managed according to a plan and benefit from a settled system in place (Lawrence, 1982).

Concerning sensorial learning styles, she does not rely only on the auditory sensorial channel but also on the visual one by presenting phonetic symbols and signaling stress and intonation on the board. Thus, by using both visual and auditory

aids, she tends to favor visual and auditory learners when dealing with pronunciation (Kinsella, 1994).

In conclusion, on the one hand, Shellsea deals with pronunciation as problems come up by presenting the correct sounds to students, thus, favoring mainly intuitive, perceivers and auditory. On the other hand, Lea presents a more analytical approach to pronunciation in which she tends to favor mainly sensing, thinkers and judgers, and she tends to keep a balance between visual and auditory learners.

4.2.4. Using the board

Another evident pattern in both teachers' classes is the way they use the board. Shellsea seems to limit her board use to clarify spelling, assign homework, and sometimes draw, as it is the case in Excerpt 9 previously displayed. The following excerpt describes one more instance of board use by Shellsea:

Excerpt 32 (Class 5, 12.05.03)

T: This is how we spell liar and meet, Ok class? Be careful 'meat' the food is different in writing from 'meet' as in meet people (…) Be careful! Don't eat people or meet meat ((laughing)) we meet people and eat meat, all right? And a lawyer is not always a liar ((teacher laughs and students laugh with her)) Take a look at the spelling of these words, please ((teacher has the words written on the board as depicted below))

```
Liar
Lawyer
We eat meat
We meet people
```

In contrast, Lea's constant use of the board really called my attention. She writes explanations, clarifies spelling, draws, writes students' questions and doubts, and gives written answers for all exercises. This constancy can be seen in the Excerpts 22 and 29 previously displayed. In addition, the following excerpt of field note seems to register this characteristic:

Excerpt 33 (Class 4, 05.05.03)

101. The teacher is always writing all over the board, erasing the board and writing all over it again. She writes, draws, uses phonetic symbols…She goes on and on…She uses different colors on the board: red, blue, and green.

As can be seen, as far as visual and auditory preferences are concerned, Shellsea tends to focus on visual ones to a low extent since her board use is limited to the aforementioned circumstances. Thus, she tends to favor mainly auditory learners. In contrast, Lea focuses on both visual and auditory since she writes on the board as she carries out most explanations. It is important to highlight that Shellsea and Lea do not make use of other visual aids such as pictures, cards, videos or diagrams on a regular basis. Hence, the board is the visual aid commonly used.

4.2.5. Being attentive to students' difficulties

Both teachers seem to be careful with students' difficulties and they value homework as an important tool for improving students' learning. Shellsea corrects workbook exercises in the classroom and it usually takes about forty minutes to finish correcting all of them. She asks if workbook exercises were too difficult, she cares about the way students felt by doing the exercises and she usually tries to raise students' awareness on how they have answered certain exercises, what paths they have followed in order to get the right answers or reach to their conclusions. The following excerpts illustrate this characteristic:

Excerpt 34 (Class 1, 16.04.03)

1. T: So, what did you think of these exercises? How do you feel about these exercises? (...) Happy? Depressed?

2. L1: Not very happy.

3.   T: Not very happy, not so excited about these exercises, but (...) I mean, were the exercises difficult? Were they simple, easy?

4. L2: Well (...) I think (...) they were a little that the (...) student's book

5. T: Student's book?

6. L2: So difficult (...) that the (...) student's book.

7. T: Oh, they were more difficult than the student's book.

8. L2: *A little* (...)

9. T: A little bit. Yes, of course you have to have some challenges ((teacher says it in a playful way, laughing))
((students laugh))

As shown above, Shellsea shows concern towards students' difficulties. Her interest goes beyond exercise correction itself and students are given voices regarding their views or even feelings about the complexity of the exercises. Feelers tend to be favored in these procedures for they benefit from working on this personal basis by presenting their own feelings and views (Lawrence, 1982).

As Shellsea goes on correcting the workbook exercises, she frequently questions students about how they have gotten to a certain answer. In the following excerpt, the teacher is trying to make students aware of what hints they have paid attention to in order to reach the right answers.

Excerpt 35 (class 1, 16.04.03)

9. T: So, what kind of things did you look at in order to complete with the verbs in the present, past or future? Was that intuitive? Or you tried to find out some hints, some clues? You know, think about it (...) try to reflect on your answers (...) try to remember what has helped you, just guesses or you looked for some hints?
10. L3: Yes, teacher (...) present and past
11. T: What do you mean?
12. L3: Today, in the past (...) nowadays (...) ago
13. T: Yes, you tried to find? You paid attention to time expressions! ((teacher seems to be very enthusiastic about it)) Good, you found hints in order to choose the correct answers, all right.

As can be seen, the teacher also works on raising students' awareness of what clues or strategies they have used. In this sense, Shellsea seems to aim at eliciting from students some processes they undergo when carrying out written exercises as to raise awareness on the steps students have followed. Thus, sensing learners seem to be favored within this elicitation for these learners present acute power of observation and have a preference for tying new facts to previous ones (Lawrence, 1982). In addition, Shellsea tends to focus on auditory learners for she carries out all workbook correction orally in class. Her board use is limited to spelling clarification at the moment of workbook correction.

In contrast, Lea takes all workbooks home in order to correct them one by one. She writes notes and comments on students' performance and problems. This feature is also verbalized by Lea during the reflective session, as can be seen in the following excerpt:

Excerpt 36 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

T: I think homework is important (…) I ask them to do the workbook exercises. I like to correct them myself, mainly those ones with open answers or with possible different answers. Being attentive to details is important. So, I correct the exercises, then, I can have a glance at what they are 'kind of learning' and the problems they are facing. I write notes about their mistakes (…) I write notes so that they can see and understand their mistakes, you know? Be aware of it and then I can help them in some way, think about something to do in order to help them overcome their difficulties.

By taking workbooks home and writing individual notes, Lea seems to present a more objective approach towards homework correction. She aims at checking students' answers and providing the appropriate feedback towards their mistakes. She focuses on the outcome, not eliciting any feelings or processes learners undergo. Hence, thinking types seem to be addressed concerning their objectiveness and impartiality (Jung, 1974). Yet, she tends to address visual learners as well, for she carries out written correction on students' own workbooks and also writes notes about their performance.

In short, Shellsea tends to favor feelers, sensing and auditory learners when dealing with homework correction, whereas Lea tends to favor mainly thinkers and visual learners.

4.2.6. Carrying out pair and group work

As regards pair and group work, both teachers use these sorts of activities very frequently in their classes. Shellsea always moves around the classroom during pair work. She usually provides any help they need while carrying out activities. She conducts pair work and/or group work every class and students are the ones who decide who they are going to work with. Most of the times they simply carry out pair and group work with the ones sitting by them. This feature can also be seen in the following field notes taken when teacher Shellsea is giving instructions for pair work:

Excerpt 37 (Class 2, 23.04.03)

Teacher Shellsea has students work in pairs a few times in different moments of the classroom. Whenever there is an odd number of students she simply says that one of the groups should have three members. Students simply work with the classmates sitting by them. Shellsea is always walking around the students when they are working in pairs or groups. She stops by each pair, listens to the students, they sometimes ask for vocabulary help.

By allowing students to choose who they are going to work with during pair and group work, Shellsea tends to favor introverts who benefit from working alone or in pairs and prefer interacting with a few classmates, usually the ones they know better (Lawrence, 1982).

On the other hand, Lea is always making students move during pair and group work, they have to stand up or walk around the classroom, change sits. She is always making students work with different people, in different teams, pairs or groups. She is the one who decides the pairs, teams and groups in her classes. She does so by giving them numbers, colors, fruits, or by grouping them in boys and girls. This pattern can be verified in some of the excerpts displayed above such as in Excerpt 22, line 82: *I'll give you numbers,* also in Excerpt 23, line 34: *I'd like you to get in two teams: boys and girls,* and in Excerpt 26, line 9: *I'll give you colors*. Even when the games do not involve teams she has students move around the classroom.

As shown in the following excerpt, Lea plays a vocabulary game by giving words to some of the students and word definitions to some other students. Then, students are supposed to find their partners in order to match the word and its definition:

Excerpt 38 (Class 3, 30.04.03)

211. T: Ok, to some of you I gave the words naive, ambitious, selfish, argumentative…and to some of you I'll give the definitions for these words. You have to find your partner (…) I mean the word and the definition are supposed to be a pair, Ok? ((in order to find their partners, students have to move around, talk to one another, check their words and definitions)).

Yet another type of movement in her classes happens by having students pass objects to one another in a semicircle. The following excerpt illustrates this characteristic:

Excerpt 39 (Class 5, 12.05.2003)

27: T: I'm going to pass Kiwi around and play the CD. When I stop the music, the person who is holding Kiwi is the one who will answer my question ((Kiwi is the name of the teacher's little teddy bear))

As can be seen from the examples above, Lea uses various games in her classes and they are carried out along with the action of having students move. Within these procedures, the teacher makes students work in different pairs, groups or teams. Therefore, Lea tends to favor mainly extravert learners. Extraverts are motivated towards their outer world, they usually talk a lot in class and benefit from interacting with many classmates, even the ones they do not know well (Lawrence, 1982). Moreover, kinesthetic learners also tend to be favored since they benefit from moving around the classroom, manipulating objects, and touching things (Kinsella, 1994).

These different approaches towards pair and group work were also verbalized by the teachers during the reflective session as teachers shared their preferences regarding pair and group work:

Excerpt 40 (Reflective Session, 30.05.2003)

TS: Well, I think it depends on the group, I think sometimes I have students move. One day I was teaching some old ladies and I had them sit on the floor and they liked, but the next day, they told me they were aching, it was kind of funny, you know? ((Shellsea laughs)) So, I think it depends on the group we have, some like to move, others don't, so I respect them
R: All right, suppose you have a group that does not mind moving during pair work, do you usually make them move?
TS: No (…) I don't have students move often, yeah that' true (…) Ok ((It seems that Shellsea actually realizes her preference for caring out pair work without movement))
R: What about you, Lea?
TL: I simply don't respect them ((she laughs)) I have them move all the time and I think it's no problem (…) in the beginning they may not like it but they *always, always* get used to it.

This transcript suggests that, although Shellsea's own style may be prevalent, she seems to be aware of students' preferences concerning pair work and somehow tries to respect their styles. On the other hand, Lea believes that students will sooner or later will become comfortable to her approach towards pair and group work. Thus, she

carries out the pair work procedures she considers the most appropriate ones herself for students will, in turn, get used to it. Lea's belief is in line with the idea that students may stretch their learning preferences through practice and become more flexible learners (Oxford, 1993).

So far, I have dealt with some recurrent traits in both Shellsea' and Lea's classroom behavior, which, as a matter of organization, have been categorized and analyzed in order to build an overall picture of their teaching styles from the perspective of learners' learning styles. This analysis is summarized in Table 10:

Table 16: Summary of categories, teachers' patterns and learning styles most favored

Categories	Shellsea's Patterns	Learning Styles most favored	Lea's Patterns	Learning Styles most favored
1. Building rapport	Personal informal interaction	feelers, introverts	Whole group informal interaction	feelers, extraverts
	Gentleness	Feelers	High enthusiasm	feelers, extraverts, kinesthetic
	Humor	feelers, intuitive	Humor	feelers, intuitive
2. Dealing with the speaking skill	Topic-based activities (Subjective reflection during discussions)	feelers, introverts, extraverts, intuitive, perceivers	Speaking as a means of achieving other goals (action during games, step-by-step procedures)	thinkers, extraverts, intuitive, sensing, judgers and kinesthetic
3.Teaching grammar	Holistic approach (focus on meaning)	feelers, extraverts, intuitive and perceivers	Analytical Approach (focus on forms)	thinkers, sensing, judgers, auditory, visual and kinesthetic
4.Focusing on pronunciation	Deals with it as problems arise by providing the correct pronunciation of mispronounced words	intuitive, perceivers and auditory	Deals with it through procedures organized beforehand	judgers
			Analysis and comparison among sounds (phonetic symbols on the board)	thinkers, sensing and visual
			Has students record their own speech	auditory
5. Using the board	Limited use (spelling and meaning clarification)	visual (to a low extent) along with auditory	Constant use (spelling, games, written answers to all exercises)	visual (to a great extent) along with auditory
6. Being attentive to students' difficulties	Workbook correction in the classroom (focus on the process: students' feelings, difficulties and strategies)	feelers, sensing and auditory	Corrects workbooks herself one by one, and writes notes on students' performance (focus on the outcomes)	thinkers, visual
7. Carrying out pair and group work	Has students work in pair and groups every class and lets them choose who they are going to work with	introverts	Has students work in pairs and groups every class and makes them work with different people	Extraverts and kinesthetic

From this analysis, first, it seems reasonable to argue that teachers tend to favor some learning styles over others. Shellsea tends to favor mainly feelers, intuitive, perceivers, and auditory as well as keeps a balance between extraverts and introverts, whereas Lea tends to favor extroverts, thinkers, auditory and judgers, and keeps a balance between sensing and intuitive learners as well as between visual and kinesthetic learners.

Second, if a comparative analysis within the styles most addressed by each one of the teachers throughout the categories is considered, it seems that they tend to favor certain learning styles to different extents. Bearing in mind that the categorization is a matter of organization and categories may overlap with one another, it is assumed that these categories can not be totally measured by numbers. However, the learning styles have also been ranked for these categories as a matter of organization, in order to make it easier to visualize stronger tendencies within teachers' patterns of actions. The rank of learning styles most favored throughout the categories is summarized in Tables 17:

Table 17: Shellsea's rank of learning styles most favored throughout the categories

Learning styles	Rank of the most favored learning styles throughout the categories
Feelers	6
Intuitive	4
Auditory	3
Introverts	3
Perceivers	3
Extraverts	2
Visual	1
Sensing	1

As can be seen, in Shellsea's practice, feeling learners seem to be favored 6 times throughout the 7 categories analyzed; intuitive learners are favored 4 times; auditory, introverts and perceivers are favored 3 times; extroverts are favored twice; visual and sensing are favored in only once. This way, feeling learners tend to be the ones favored to the greatest extent within the styles most addressed by Shellsea, followed by intuitive

and auditory, introverts, extraverts and perceivers, whereas visual and sensing types tend to be favored to the lowest extents being present in only one moment throughout the categories analyzed.

Following the same line of reasoning, Lea's rank of learning styles for categories is displayed in Table 18:

Table 18: Lea's rank of learning styles most favored throughout the 7 categories

Learning styles	Rank of the most favored learning styles throughout the categories
Extraverts	4
Thinkers	4
Visual	4
Kinesthetic	4
Sensing	3
Auditory	3
Judgers	3
Feelers	3
Intuitive	2

As displayed above, Lea's patterns indicate that extraverts, thinkers, visual and kinesthetic are favored 4 times throughout the 7 categories; feelers, sensing, auditory and judgers are favored 3 times; and intuitive learners are favored twice throughout the categories. This way, extraverts, thinkers, visual and kinesthetic learners seem to be the styles favored the most within the ones commonly addressed by Lea, followed by feelers, sensing, auditory and judgers, whereas intuitive learners seem to be addressed to the smallest extent throughout the categories analyzed.

In brief, harmony and empathy tend to be the driving forces in Shellsea's teaching style since these are typical characteristics of a feeling preference, which seems to be the one most addressed within Shelsea's teaching style. On the other hand, Lea's driving forces seem to be shared among kinesthetic, extraversion, thinking, and visual preferences. First, movement and whole body involvement, which are the typical traits of a kinesthetic preference (Kinsella, 1994), tend to be strong in Lea's teaching style. Second, along with this feature of movement, Lea has students work in different teams,

groups and pairs, which are typical traits of a preference for extraversion (Lawrence, 1982). Third, her objectiveness and emphasis on logical analysis are typical traits of a thinking preference (Lawrence, 1982). Finally, her constant board use characterizes a tendency towards a visual preference.

In this section, I have analyzed Teachers' patterns of actions, attitudes and instructional activities in the classroom in order to determine their teaching style from the perspective of learning styles.

Next, I turn to the analysis of the teachers' answers to the teaching style instrument and how they reveal tendencies in teachers' practice.

4.3. The Results of theTeaching Style Intruments

In this section, I present the results obtained for the teaching style instruments applied to the teachers followed by a discussion comparing teachers' patterns in classroom transcripts to their answers to the questionnaire assessing their teaching style. Shellsea's answers are displayed in Tables 19 and 20:

Table 19: Teaching Style Questionnaire Results for Teacher Shellsea

Teaching Style Dimensions	Shellsea's Answers to the	Dimensions
Extraverts (E) & Introverts (I)	50 % (E)	50% (I)
Feelers (F) & Thinkers (T)	100% (F)	0% (T)
Intuitive (I) & Sensing (S)	90% (I)	10% (S)
Perceivers (P) & Judgers (J)	60% (P)	40% (J)

Table 20: Teaching Style Questionnaire Results for Teacher Shellsea

Teaching Style Dimensions	Shellsea's Answers to the Dimensions		
Auditory (A),Visual (V) Kinesthetic (K)	50% (A)	0% (V)	50% (K)

The teaching style questionnaire contained 50 questions, 10 questions assessing each dimension, 10 for extraversion/introversion, 10 for feeling/thinking, 10 for sensing/intuition 10 for perceiving/judging, and 10 for auditory/visual/kinesthetic preferences.   Indeed, the analysis of the results obtained in the teaching style

questionnaire corroborates most of the results revealed through the analysis of the classroom transcripts.

Shellseas' answers concerning extraversion (E) and introversion (I) presented a tendency towards balance between these two dimensions, 50% (I) and 50% (E). Similarly, both introverts and extraverts have arisen from the analysis of the categories, the former being present 3 times, and the former 2, throughout the 7 categories previously analyzed. As regards feeling (F) and thinking (T), the teacher presented a tendency towards feeling, up to the highest extent, 100% (F) and 0% (T). Likewise, feeling was the dimension most addressed throughout the 7 categories, being present 6 times.

In relation to intuition (I) and sensing (S), Shellsea reported a stronger preference for intuition, 90% (I) and 10% (S). A preference for intuition was also shown through the analysis of the categories, in which intuition was present 4 times, and sensing only 1. Regarding judging (J) and perceiving (P), the teacher reported a preference for perceiving, 60% (P) and 40% (J). In this case, a preference for perceiving over judging was also shown since perceiving has emerged 3 times throughout the categories, whereas judging does not seem to have emerged within the categories.

Finally, as far as sensorial preferences are concerned, Shellsea presented a tendency towards balance between auditory (A) and kinesthetic (K), 50% (A) and 50% (K), and none of her answers reported a preference towards visual, (V) 0%. In this case, the tendency towards auditory over visual corroborates the results obtained through the categories, in which auditory was present 4 times in the categories and visual only 1. The tendency towards kinesthetic learners was unexpected if compared to the analysis of classroom transcripts, for no instances of such preference seem to have been addressed throughout the categories. However, instances of a kinesthetic tendency could

be noticed when Shellsea performed both of the tasks[12] assigned in the present study. It seems that although patterns that would indicate a tendency towards favoring kinesthetic learners may not have emerged during the six classes observed, this tendency was shown during the performance of the tasks.

Thus, in general terms, it can be argued that most of the results obtained through the answers to the teaching style questionnaire were revealed to be in accordance with the analysis of the categorization of Shellsea's patterns. Now, I turn to Lea's answers to the teaching style questionnaire, which are displayed in Tables 21 and 22:

Table 21: Teaching Style Questionnaire Results for Teacher Lea

Teaching Style Dimensions	Lea's Answers to the Related Dimensions	
Extraverts (E) & Introverts (I)	80% (E)	20% (I)
Feelers (F) & Thinkers (T)	80% (F)	20% (T)
Intuitive (I) & Sensing (S)	90% (I)	10% (S)
Perceivers (P) & Judgers (J)	60% (J)	40% (P)

Table 22: Teaching Style Questionnaire Results for Teacher Lea

Teaching Style Dimensions	Lea's Answers to the Related Dimensions		
Auditory (A), Visual (V) & Kinesthetic (K)	10% (A)	20% (V)	70% (K)

The analysis of the results obtained in Lea's answers to the teaching style questionnaire corroborates some of the results revealed through the analysis of the classroom transcripts. Lea's answers concerning extraversion (E) and introversion (I) presented a strong tendency towards extraversion, 20% (I) and 80% (E). Similarly, this tendency towards extraversion was shown in the analysis of the categories in which extraverts were addressed 4 times. Introverts do not seem to have been favored throughout the categories analyzed.

Concerning feeling and thinking, Lea's results on the teaching style questionnaire presented a strong tendency towards favoring feeling (80%) over thinking (20%).

---

[12] Tasks 1 and 2, assigned in the present study, will be analyzed in the next section of this chapter.

Conversely, the analysis of the categories presented a tendency towards favoring thinking learners, which were present 4 times in the categories, whereas feelers were present 3 times.

This may be explained, partially, by the fact that one of the moments in which a tendency towards favoring thinkers has emerged was within the third category that is related to grammar teaching. Lea has verbalized her discomfort concerning her own approach to grammar during the reflective session, in Excerpt 30 previously displayed above. Being the fact that she may still be trying to find her path regarding grammar teaching, this may have affected her results concerning thinking preferences in the teaching style questionnaire.

According to Jung (1974), people develop mental processes by using them to achieve something they consider important and, at a given time, the dominant process may not be differentiated enough to integrate personality. Lea seems to be trying to achieve effectiveness regarding grammar teaching, thus, she may not be aware of the mental processes she is using in order to achieve such effectiveness.

Another remark that may help explain her results discrepancy concerning thinking/feeling has to do with the fact that thinking preferences have also emerged in the category related to the teaching of speaking. Bearing in mind that Lea also deals with speaking as a means of consolidating grammar as noted in Excerpt 22 displayed above, this suggests that speaking itself is sometimes related to grammar within Lea's patterns. Since she seems to be still working on her own style concerning grammar, this may also explain the difference between the analysis of her classroom transcripts and her answers to the questionnaire.

Yet another possible explanation may be that Lea's friendliness and empathy, promoted mainly by her enthusiasm when she claps hands, sings loud, and speaks in an exclamatory tone of voice, may be much more appealing than her objectiveness within

her teaching procedures themselves. Hence, she may be more aware of these appealing features that are typical traits of a feeling preference, which, in turn, have appeared to a higher extent in her questionnaire answers.

Concerning intuition and sensing, results obtained in the teaching style questionnaire were also different from the ones analyzed within the categories. The questionnaire presented a strong preference towards intuition (90%) over sensing (10%), whereas the analysis of the categories presented a moderate tendency towards sensing, present 3 times of the categories, over intuition, present twice throughout the categories. It is important to remark that sensing preferences have also emerged in the teaching grammar and dealing with speaking categories. Therefore, again, these differences in results may be also related to her own uncertainty towards her grammar approach.

Moreover, a tendency towards sensing learners has also emerged within the way she focuses on pronunciation. According to Lawrence (1982), people may answer personality instruments with different foci. They may sometimes focus on "their 'job self', at a given time, on their 'home self' at a different time, and results may differ" (p.19). Since the questionnaire itself does not contain any question which contemplates pronunciation specifically, Lea could not focus on the mental processes she tends to favor when dealing with pronunciation. This may also explain why a tendency towards sensing has emerged more often in the analysis of classroom transcripts than in the answers to the questionnaire.

As regards judging and perceiving, the results obtained in the answers to the questionnaire corroborate the results of the categories analyzed. Her answers reported a tendency towards judgers (60%) over perceivers (40%). The analysis of the categories has also reported this tendency since judgers were present 3 times throughout the 7 categories, whereas perceivers do not seem to have emerged in any of them.

Finally, Lea seems to present a balance between the preferences for kinesthetic and visual learners since both were favored 4 times throughout the 7 categories. This balance seems to represent a tendency of these two preferences over the auditory one, which was favored 3 times throughout the 7 categories. The answers to the questionnaire corroborated a tendency towards favoring kinesthetic (70%), followed by visual learners (30%), over auditory ones (20%).

However, the balance between visual and kinesthetic learning styles, both of them favored 4 times throughout the 7 categories, was not revealed in the answers to the questionnaire in which a tendency towards kinesthetic learners was stronger than towards visual ones. It is important to remark that the visual aid most commonly present in Lea's practice is the board use, which is indeed related to the way Lea teaches grammar and pronunciation. Therefore, this difference in results may, again, be due to her uncertainty regarding grammar as well as to the fact that the teaching style instrument did not encompass any aspects of pronunciation teaching.

In sum, Shellsea's results of the questionnaires indeed corroborated the results of the analysis of the categories. By the same token, from the analysis of Lea's answers, it can be argued that the results of the teaching style questionnaire regarding extraversion/introversion and judging /perceiving style seem to be in accordance with the analysis of the categories. The tendency in favoring kinesthetic and visual over auditory was shown in the analysis of the categories as well as in the questionnaire answers.

Nevertheless, Lea's results of the questionnaire concerning thinking/feeling, sensing/intuition and the stronger preference towards kinesthetic over visual were different to the results obtained from the analysis of classroom transcripts. It is believed that at given times, "you might still be discovering your preferences, and trying them on for size"(Lawrence, 1982, p.10). From the analysis of the categories, Lea seems to deal

with grammar mainly by favoring learners who pursue thinking and sensing mental processes. In this sense, she might still be trying to find her own preferences in order to achieve effectiveness. This suggests that teachers' patterns of actions will not always imply certainty regarding such patterns. This may be, thus, one of the reasons why differences have emerged between Lea's patterns and her answers to the teaching style questionnaire.

In addition, it seems reasonable to argue that teachers tend to favor some learning styles over others in different moments of their teaching practices. Shellsea seems to address feelers, extraverts as well as introverts, intuitive and auditory most of the time during her classes; however, she addresses sensing learners when dealing with workbook correction.

In the same vein, Lea addresses mainly thinkers, extraverts, sensing, judgers, visual, and kinesthetic. However, feelers and intuitive are addressed when she works on building rapport. This suggests that teaching style instruments should deal with general as well as with specific aspects of language teaching such as affection, grammar, speaking, pronunciation and so on, in order to grasp features of teaching styles more accurately. By having teaching style instruments containing general and specific features of teaching, teachers would be allowed to focus on different aspects of their practices.

In this section, I have presented the results of the teaching style questionnaires and discussed them in comparison with the results from the analysis of the categories. Next, I turn to the discussion of the learning style questionnaires applied to the teachers for the purpose of identifying any relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles.

4.4. The Results of the Learning Style Instruments

In this section, I present the results obtained for the learning style questionnaires applied to Shellsea and Lea. In order to verify whether there is a correlation between teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles, I discuss and compare the results obtained in the learning style instrument, teaching style instrument, and the results obtained in the analysis of classroom transcripts. As already discussed, there seems to be a tendency to believe that teachers will teach how they best learn. They tend to select teaching procedures that may meet their own styles of learning (Kinsella, 1994).

Shellsea's results to the teaching and learning style questionnaires, and her rank of learning styles favored per category of classroom transcripts are put together on Table 23, 24 and 25 so that they can be discussed. Since Shellsea's results on the teaching style questionnaire indeed corroborated most of the analysis of her classroom transcripts, this relationship between her own learning and teaching styles will be discussed as follows by comparing her answers to the teaching and learning style questionnaire.

Table 23: Rank of Learning Styles favored throughout the categories

Analysis of Shellsea's Class transcripts	
Learning styles favored	Rank for the categories
Feelers	6
Intuitive	4
Auditory	3
Introverts	3
Perceivers	3
Extraverts	2
Visual	1
Sensing	1

No. of categories:7

Table 24: Teaching and Learning Style Questionnaire Results for Teacher Shellsea

Shellsea's answers to the questionnaires			
Shellsea's Answers to the Teaching Style Questionnaire		Shellsea's Answers to the Learning Style Questionnaire	
50 % (E)	50% (I)	40% (E)	60% (I)
100% (F)	0% (T)	60% (F)	40% (T)
90% (I)	10% (S)	60% (I)	40% (S)
60% (P)	40% (J)	60% (P)	40% (J)

Table 25: Teaching and Learning Style Questionnaire Results for Teacher Shellsea

Shellsea's Answers to the Teaching Style Questionnaire			Shellsea's Answers to the Learning Style Questionnaire		
50% (A)	0% (V)	50% (K)	40% (A)	40% (V)	20% (K)

As displayed in Tables 23, 24, and 25, as a learner, Shellsea presents a preference towards introversion over extraversion, feeling over thinking, and perceiving over judging. By comparing such results with the results regarding her teaching style, in general terms, these learning preferences seem to correspond to her teaching preferences, although to different degrees.

As regards extraversion and introversion, Shellsea tends to keep a balance between these two preferences as a teacher, E (50%) and I (50%). As a learner, she tends to present a preference towards introversion, E (40%) and I (60%), which does not represent exactly a balance, but indicates that she benefits from both preferences. Thus, it can be assumed that she benefits from both extraversion and introversion as a learner as well as tends to benefit both types of learners as a teacher, even if the degrees to which she approaches such preferences in her teaching and learning may not be precisely the same.

The preference for feeling over thinking also seems to present different degrees between her teaching and learning style results. Bearing in mind, feeling seems to be the preference addressed to the highest extent within Shellsea's teaching style, F (100%) and T (0%), such strong tendency was not emphasized as much in her answers to the learning style questionnaire, F (60%) and T (40%). In this sense, she does not seem to use teaching procedures that favor learners who pursue thinking mental processes as a teacher. However she benefits from thinking mental processes as a learner.

Similarly, the strong tendency towards intuition (90%) over sensing (10%) obtained in her teaching style results was not as strong in her learning style results, I

(60%) over S (40%). Again, Shellsea tends to favor certain learners over others to a greater extent than she benefits from both learning preferences herself.

As regards judging and perceiving, results were the same for Shellsea's teaching and learning styles, P (60%) and J (40%), which makes it possible to assume that she has a tendency to approach such preferences as a learner and as a teacher to about the same extents. Therefore, she seems to present a balance between these dimensions.

Concerning sensorial learning styles, she presents a tendency towards visual (40%) and auditory (40%) over kinesthetic (20%), whereas within her teaching style, she tends to favor mostly auditory (50%) and kinesthetic (50%) over visual (0%). This suggests, again, that Shellsea tends to approach a greater variety of styles as a learner than as a teacher.

Now, I turn to the discussion of the relationship between Lea's own teaching and learning styles. Since Lea's answers to the teaching style questionnaire did not corroborate some of the results obtained from the analysis of her class transcripts, the discussion of this relationship will be carried out by considering her rank of learning styles most favored throughout the 7 categories of class transcripts and her answers to the teaching and learning style questionnaires. These results are displayed as follows in Tables 26, 27, 28:

Table 26: Results of the Analysis of Lea's Class transcripts, and her answers on the Teaching and Learning Style questionnaires

Analysis of Lea's Class transcripts	
Learning styles favored	Rank for the categories
Extraverts	4
Thinkers	4
Visual	4
Kinesthetic	4
Sensing	3
Auditory	3
Judgers	3
Feelers	3
Intuitive	2

No. of categories:7

Table 27: Teaching and Learning Style Questionnaire Results for Lea

Lea's answers to the questionnaires			
The Teaching Style Questionnaire		The Learning Style Questionnaire	
80% (E)	20% (I)	60% (E)	40% (I)
80% (F)	20% (T)	30% (F)	70% (T)
90% (I)	10% (S)	30% (I)	70% (S)
60% (J)	40% (P)	50% (J)	50% (P)

Table 28: Teaching and Learning Style Questionnaire Results for Lea

The Teaching Style Questionnaire			The Learning Style Questionnaire		
10% (A)	20% (V)	70 % (K)	10% (A)	10% (V)	80% (K)

As displayed above, as a learner, Lea tends to present a preference towards extraversion over introversion, thinking over feeling, sensing over intuition, and keeps a balance between judging and perceiving mental processes.

As regards extraversion and introversion, extroverts seem to be highly favored over introverts by Lea's teaching style, E (80%) and I (20%). She also seems to benefit mainly from extraversion as a learner, E (60%), I (40%). She tends to have a more balanced approach as a learner than as a teacher concerning these two mental processes for the difference between introversion and extraversion results is smaller in the answers to the learning style questionnaire.

The preference for thinking over feeling in Lea's answers to the learning style questionnaire, T (70%) and F (30%), is different from the answers she presents in her teaching style questionnaire, F (80%) and T (20%). However, the rank of learning styles per category analyzed in classroom transcripts shows a tendency towards thinking (4) over feeling (3), as in the learning style questionnaire. If the possible reasons[13], which I have previously raised to explain the different results obtained in the analysis of Lea's

---

[13] I have raised these possible reasons in section 4.2 of the present chapter as an attempt to explain Lea's results on the teaching style questionnaire.

transcripts and her answers to the teaching style questionnaire are taken into account, I may assume there is a correlation between Lea's own teaching and learning styles by comparing the similar results from the analysis of classroom transcripts and learning style questionnaire since both presented a tendency towards thinking.

Following the same line of reasoning, there seems to be a correlation between Lea's own teaching and learning styles concerning sensing and intuition. A tendency towards intuition (90%) over sensing (10%) was present in the teaching style questionnaire. However, by comparing the results of the learning style questionnaire- S (70%), I (30%) - to the rank of learning styles per categories- S (3), I (2)- a tendency towards sensing over intuition is present in both instances.

Regarding judging and perceiving, the teaching style questionnaire reported a preference towards judging over perceiving by presenting J (60%) and P (40%). Likewise, judgers are addressed 3 times and perceivers have not been addressed throughout the 7 categories. The learning style questionnaire reported a tendency towards balance between these two preferences, J (50%) and P (50%). Thus, her learning style seems to be more balanced than her teaching style concerning judging and perceiving.

As far as sensorial learning styles are concerned, both the analysis of classroom transcripts and teaching style questionnaire revealed a preference towards kinesthetic and visual over auditory by reporting K (4), V (4), A (3) and K (70%), V (20%), A (10%) respectively. The learning style questionnaire reported a preference towards kinesthetic (80%), and a balance between visual (10%) and auditory (10%). From these results, it can be argue that Lea approaches kinesthetic preferences in higher extents as a learner does and as a teacher.

In this section, I have analyzed the relationship between teachers' teaching and learning styles. In short, there seems to be relationship between these teachers' teaching

styles and their own learning styles. However, they seem to present a more balanced approach as learners than they do as teachers. Next, I turn to the analysis of students' attitudes towards discussing learning styles in the classroom.

4.5. Students' Attitudes on Task 1

The first task assigned to the teachers during the instructional program of the present study required teachers to plan an informal way to approach their students concerning their learning preferences. After the task was performed I applied a questionnaire to the students in order to find out their attitudes regarding task 1.

Shellsea prepared a speaking task (Appendix M) in which students would have to interview one another in order to find out if they would fit the requirements of a company that was selecting new employees. The interview was divided in three parts. In the first, students had to fill up the form with their personal information. In the second part, students had to ask and answer questions about their learning preferences. The third part consisted of a psychological test.

In the second part, Shellsea prepared multiple choice questions based on Jung's psychological types (1974), which had been presented to her in transparencies and hand- outs during the instructional program. This way, Shellsea approached her students concerning learning styles in a more implicit way, as part of a larger task. Students took around 30 minutes to complete the interview, then, Shellsea presented the answers for the psychological test. Finally, Shellsea raised awareness about the second part of the task by stating that the answers students had presented were actually related to their learning styles. After the task was completed and all answers presented, I applied a questionnaire to the students for the purpose of checking their general attitudes towards the task. Table 29 summarizes students' answers to the questionnaire:

Table 29:   Shellsea's Students' answers to the questionnaire regarding their attitudes about task 1

Questions	Students' answers		
1. What's your general opinion of the task?	Favorable 90,9..%	Unfavorable 0%	Neutral 9,09..%
2. Have you been approached about your learning styles before?	Yes 0%	No 100%	
3. Do you consider important being asked about your learning styles?	Yes 100%	No 0%	
4. Are you willing to contribute to future teachers regarding learning styles?	Yes 100%	No 0%	

Total of students who answered the questionnaire: 11

From the results displayed above, students seem to present a positive attitude towards discussing learning styles in the classroom. Only one of the students stated that it made no difference for her to do it or not in the classroom. However, she also stated that it can be very important for the teachers. Two of the students who were favorable, stated that the task was important, but very difficult to choose between one answer and the other. This seems understandable since they have never been approached about their learning preferences before and probably have never been in touch with such theories. Now, I turn to Lea's task and her students' attitudes.

Lea approached her students in a more explicit way. She prepared a set of four questions (Appendix M) about students' preferences concerning the procedures she carries out in her classes and asked students to answers and discuss the questions in pairs. Students took about 20 minutes to answer and discuss the questions in pairs. Then, I applied the questionnaire to the students in order to find out their attitudes about the task they had just performed. Students' answers to the questionnaire are summarized in Table 30:

Table 30: Lea's Students' answers to the questionnaire regarding their attitude about task 1

Questions	Students' answers	
1. What's your general opinion of the task?	Favorable	Unfavorable
	100%	0%
2. Have you ever been approached about your learning style before?	Yes	No
	30%	70%
3. Do you consider important being asked about your learning style?	Yes	No
	100%	0%
4. Are you willing to contribute to future teachers regarding learning styles?	Yes	No
	100%	0%

Number of students who answered the questionnaire: 10

As noted in Table 28, Lea's students also seem to present a positive attitude towards discussing their learning preferences in the classroom. They simply carried out the discussion in pairs as they do with all other classroom tasks assigned. One of the students answered question 1 by saying: *"Acho fundamental este tipo de atividade sobre como preferimos aprender, pois assim, o aluno é colocado no núcleo da questão."* Thus, students seem to have considered relevant to talk about their learning preferences.

It is important to remark that Shellsea decided to prepare her task from a theoretical framework, whereas Lea's task was class-oriented, based on her own procedures in the classroom. This freedom teachers had in planning and performing their own tasks reinforce the idea that, although I had clear objectives in mind during the instructional program-assignment of Tasks 1 and 2- teachers were free to take their own decisions, thus, showing that the instructional program actually pursued a reflective approach (Wallace, 1991; Richards and Lockhart, 1994). In this section, I have analyzed students' attitudes regarding teachers' task 1. Next, I turn to the analysis of teachers' difficulties during the planning and performance phases of task 2.

4.6. Teachers' Difficulties on Task 2

As stated before, the second task assigned to the teachers during the instructional program required them to plan a class, or even only a class activity in which they would try to develop a balanced teaching style regarding any of the dimensions of Jung's theory–extraversion/introversion, feeling/thinking, sensing/intuition, and judging and perceiving– or regarding Kinseki's sensorial learning styles-auditory, visual and kinesthetic.

Shells decided to plan an oral task in which she would keep a balance between introversion and extraversion. Students were supposed to present solutions for dilemmas. Shells brought a kind of toy which looked and felt like 'cold jelly' to the classroom and students had to keep the toy in their hands until they had performed their part of the task. The task was divided in two parts. In the first part, she would present a dilemma and students were given time to come up with ideas to solve the given dilemma. The task was individual; each student would have to think about different solutions for the situation. Then, they would hold the toy and present their ideas to the whole group. Indeed, this first part of the task favored introverts who benefit from thinking before acting and working alone as well as extraverts who like to share ideas with many people (Lawrence, 1982).

In the second part of the task, Shellsea presented other dilemmas, and students would have to come up with a solution for the situation. No time for thinking was allowed, whoever had ideas would ask to hold the toy and present them to the group. The activity favored extraverts who like to act fast without much reflection, and introverts were also addressed since they would not have to hold the toy and share ideas until they felt ready to do so, thus, being allowed to think before acting (Lawrence, 1982).

As regards Shellsea's difficulties on the planning and performance of Task 2, she stated, in the following interview excerpt, that:

Excerpt 41 (July, 1st 2003)

> TS: Uh (...) I planned an activity for extroverted and introverted and uh (...) as Lea's said, I have never planned my lessons according to learning styles, oh they are going to learn better if I (...) I focus on learning styles, but I had this unconsciously (...) because I (...) I (...) try to privilege sometimes people who are very active and quiet people in the classroom
> R: So, [intuitively]
> TS: [Yeah, yeah], intuitively I privileged them, so that's why I chose introverted and extroverted, so I to try to do it more consciously and the only problem I had was that I had some goals for the course because of the strike I had to finish the book in one or two classes and (...) then, I had this extra activity of preparing the task and (...) as I don't like to have extra activities just as extra activities or just to please the researcher ((Shellsea laughs)), I wanted my class to be all connected, so I tried to have things go smoothly so that they could not perceive that it was actually an extra activity only to find out about extraverted and introverted, so it was just like a part of my classes. The activity was the same I was going to do with them, I just focused the procedures on extroverted and introverted and I think they really liked, they worked a lot. I asked them to evaluate the activity at the end, and they really enjoyed. It was difficult because I did not have much time, but the procedures themselves were not difficult at all. I even connected what I did with theories of speaking, you know, when students are allowed time for thinking they are more fluent.

As stated above, the difficulties Shells faced when trying to plan an activity in which extroverts and introverts would be favored was related to lack of time. She had no difficulties with the procedures themselves. Surprisingly, she was even able to make connections between theories of learning styles and studies on second language speech production related to the idea that allowing time for planning before carrying out a task reduces the amount of on-line planning during the task performance, thus, enhancing fluency (Menhert, 1997).

In addition, Shellsea stated that she used to address introverts and extraverts unconsciously and by accomplishing such task she could do it more consciously. This suggests that theories may help teachers make more informed decisions in their classes. Again, the nature of the instructional program has shown to be a reflective one since Shells was able to build upon the theories and sharing of experiences. According to Wallace (1991), if received knowledge is related to teachers' own reflection and practice, teachers are allowed to evaluate this knowledge and may even incorporate it to their practices. In this sense, Shellsea was able to connect the received knowledge

during the instructional program to her previous experiential knowledge in order to plan and perform task 2 successfully.

Finally, she was even able to evaluate the effectiveness of her task by stating that "*I think they really liked and they really worked. I asked them to evaluate the activity at the end and they really enjoyed it*". This indicates that Shellsea went through a reflective process during the accomplishment of Task 2. Having reported Shellsea's difficulties in task 2, I turn to the discussion of Lea's difficulties on Task 2.

Lea also decided to focus on extraversion and introversion, and she also decided not to favor kinesthetic as much as she usually does. However, she did not actually develop a specific language task in order to do so. Rather, she focused on the way she carries out pair and group work in order to keep a balance between extraverts and introverts as well as in order to avoid addressing kinesthetic learners all the time. Thus, she planned her class in a way so as to allow students to work individually, in pairs, and with different people around the classroom. In some moments, she allowed students to work with the person next to them or work individually. In some other moments, she made them move and work with different classmates. Therefore, she favored introverts who like to work alone or in small groups, and extraverts who like to interact with many people (Lawrence, 1982). She did favor kinesthetic learners by asking students to move around the classroom, but not as often as she usually did in her classes. As regards Lea's difficulties concerning Task 2, she stated that:

Excerpt 42 (July 1st, 2003)

TL: Well, when you told me that I had to plan a class from the perspective of favoring learning styles, I had to choose one dimension (...), I said to me Oh, my goodness, how am I going to do that? I was so worried and I could not picture that, right? I have never planned my classes thinking about learning styles before (...) But that happened because I didn't have it really clear what an introvert or extravert was, maybe auditory and kinesthetic sounded clearer to me. So, I read those tables that you gave us ((teacher is referring to the texts and had-outs received during the instructional program)) and (...) and as I read I had the ideas, I didn't even read the others (...) I read extraverts and introverts (...) and kinesthetic and it was like a five-minute look and I already had the idea of what to do. So, it was not difficult or painful, it was just extra thinking that I had to do but once I read the theory it was easier. Did I feel bad, did I feel irritated because I had to do that? In the beginning, yes, but later on I read about it and it was ok, no bad feelings, no anxiety at all. The problem was also because I was so behind schedule that I had to teach extra classes in

order to finish the course before the strike. But it took me like ten minutes to think about the activities, then I wrote things down and I was done. Well, I think my students noticed (...) I mean they did not notice I was trying to favor introverts and extraverts, but I think they (...) maybe they noticed I was different ((Lea laughs)). I mean, maybe they were feeling different because they were working alone, I didn't' ask them to work in pairs all the time (...) so, that was funny.

As stated above, Lea also had problems related to lack of time for planning Task 2 because she was behind schedule, the university was about to go on a strike, and she had to finish the course before it. Although she did not verbalize any pain or more serious difficulties, it seems that she was not very comfortable in trying to favor introverts and extraverts for she stated '*Well, I think my students noticed ...maybe they noticed I was different'*.

Lea also verbalized difficulties concerning lack of knowledge of the theories of learning styles when she faced the planning phase of the task. However, it seems like she was able to overcome such differences quickly after reading the theory since she stated that "*It was like a five-minute look and I already had the idea of what to do"*. In this sense, Lea may not have been as reflective as Shellsea during the performance of Task 2. However, since she chose to address the dimensions of extraversion/introversion and tried not to address kinesthetic learners all the time, this indicates that she may have somehow reflected on the results of the analysis of her teaching style. The results of the analysis of her teaching style indicated that she tends to favor extraverts and kinesthetic to a high extent and these were the dimensions she decided to focus when trying to achieve balance during Task 2.

By discussing the data analyzed in this section, I shall answer the research questions addressed in the present study:

1. What learning styles tend to be most favored by L2 teachers' teaching styles?

In relation to the previous six teachers, results indicate that extraverts, feelers, perceivers and kinesthetic tend to be the learning styles mostly favored by these teachers. In addition, results indicate that there seems to be a balance in the extent to which sensor and intuitive learners are favored among these six teachers.

In relation to Shellsea and Lea, results indicate that Shellsea tends to favor mainly feelers, intuitive, perceivers, and auditory as well as keeps a balance between extraverts and introverts. In order to determine the learning styles mostly favored by Lea, I shall assume that the reasons raised to explain the differences between Lea's classroom transcripts and her answers on the teaching style instrument may be correct, and take the results of Lea's classroom transcripts as the parameter for her teaching style. In this case, I may argue that she tends to favor extraverts, thinkers, sensors, and judgers; and she seems to keep a balance between visual and kinesthetic learners.

Therefore, the results obtained in the analysis of the eight teachers' teaching styles suggest that extraverts, feelers, perceivers and kinesthetic tend to be the learning styles mostly favored among these teachers. In addition, it is important to remark that the results of the six previous teachers suggest a balance between the extent to which sensors and intuitive learners are favored among these teachers[14]: two teachers favor mostly intuitive, two favor mostly sensors, and two present a balance between both learning styles. The results of the two remaining teachers seem to confirm this balance since Shellsea tends to favor intuitive and Lea, in turn, tends to favor sensors.

Now, I will focus on the second research question.

2. Is there a relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles?

In relation to the previous six teachers investigated, results indicate that five out of the six teachers seem to present a correlation between their teaching and learning styles in 60% to 100% of the dimensions, and one teacher seems to present this correlation in 40% of the dimensions of teaching and learning styles. Thus, it seems reasonable to argue that there seems to be a correlation between teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles, with teachers tending to address their own learning styles.

---

[14] This balance towards sensing and intuition is displayed in Table 14 of this chapter.

In relation to the two remaining teachers, results indicate that there seems to be a correlation between Shellsea's teaching and learning styles in four out of the five dimensions of teaching and learning styles (extroversion/introversion, feeling/thinking, sensing/intuition, judging/perceiving), which corresponds to 80% of the dimensions. Thus, I may argue that there seems to be a correlation between Shellsea's teaching and learning styles, with Shellsea tending to favor her own learning styles.

It seems more complex to determine whether there is a relationship between Lea's teaching and learning styles because there are two parameters for her teaching style: one based on the analysis of her classroom transcripts, and one based on her answers on the teaching style instrument. However, I shall assume, again, that the reasons raised to explain the differences between Lea's classroom transcripts and her answers on the teaching style instrument may be correct, and take the results of Lea's class transcripts as the parameter for her teaching style. In this case, I may argue that there seems to be a correlation between Lea's teaching style and her learning style in four out of the five dimensions of teaching and learning styles (extraversion/introversion, thinking/feeling, sensing/intuition, and visual/auditory/kinesthetic), which corresponds to 80% of the dimensions. Thus, I may also argue that there seems to be a relationship between Lea's own teaching and learning styles, which means that she tends to address her own learning styles. Therefore, in general, results suggest that there seems to be a correlation between teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles. In other words, teachers seem to teach in the ways they best learn.

Research questions 3 and 4 only apply to Shellsea and Lea since they were the ones who took part in the instructional program of the present study.

3. What are students' attitudes towards discussing learning preferences in the classroom?

Results indicate that students of both teachers seem to have a positive attitude towards discussing their learning styles in the classroom, and they seem to be willing to cooperate with future teachers who may have an interest in finding out about students' learning styles.

Finally, I will focus on the fourth research question.

4. What are teachers' difficulties when trying to develop a balanced teaching styles?

Shellsea reported difficulties concerning lack of time to plan the second task[15] I proposed during the instructional program. However, she seems to have gone through a reflective process, being able to make connections between her experiential and received knowledge as well as connect learning style theories to theories of second language speech production. Thus, I may argue that she has accomplished the second task proposed during the instructional program successfully.

As regards Lea's difficulties on the second task proposed during the instructional program, she reported difficulties regarding lack of time for planning the task and lack of knowledge of the learning style theories. Although she did not seem as reflective as Shellsea during the accomplishment of this task, some reflection may have taken place since she chose to work on her strongest tendencies for the purpose of achieving a balance during the accomplishment of Task 2.

I find it interesting to remark that the ways in which both teachers have approached the tasks seem to be related to their own learning styles. Shellsea seems to be an introvert and a feeler. Introverts tend to be more motivated towards their inner world of ideas and reflections, and feelers tend to be more subjective (Lawrence, 1982). This may explain why she may have been more reflective than Lea during the accomplishment of tasks.

---

[15] As stated previously, in the second task, teachers were supposed to develop a balanced teaching style in one of their classes.

Lea seems to be an extravert and a sensor. Extraverts are more motivated towards the outer world of things and actions, and sensors tend to be objective (Lawrence, 1982). This may suggest why she may not have been as reflective as Shellsea when planning and performing task 2. She seems to have gone straight to the point regarding what she was supposed to do "*as I read I had the ideas, I didn't even read the others (...) I read extraverts and introverts (...) and kinesthetic and it was like a five-minute look and I already had the idea of what to do*".

In sum, it seems reasonable to argue that both teachers have been able to build upon the theories and the sharing of experiences in order to accomplish the tasks. Moreover, I may argue that they seem to have relied on their own learning preferences during the accomplishments of the tasks.

4.7   Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, I have dealt with the analysis of the data collected for this study, illustrating it with field-notes, classroom transcripts, reflective session transcripts, extracts from the interview with the two volunteer teachers investigated for a longer period, teachers' answers on the teaching and learning style instruments, and students' answers on the questionnaire applied to the groups of the two volunteer teachers.

In the next chapter, I will summarize the main findings of this study, present some pedagogical implications of the study, point out its limitations and offer suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER V

FINAL REMARKS

In this chapter, I will summarize the main findings of this study, present some of its pedagogical implications, point out its limitations and offer suggestions for further research.

5.1. Summary

The present study aimed at investigating the learning styles that tend to be most favored by L2 teachers; the relationship between L2 teachers' teaching styles and their learning styles; students attitudes towards discussing learning preferences; and the difficulties faced by teachers when trying to develop a balanced teaching style.

My participants were eight English teachers of Extracurricular English courses offered by UFSC, two at the beginning level, two teachers of the intermediate level, two teachers at the high intermediate level, and two teachers at the advanced level. These teachers have been addressed as Colleen, Mary, Paula, Sylvia, Bill, Angela, Shellsea and Lea.

The first six teachers, Colleen, Mary, Paula, Sylvia, Bill, Angela were observed for three classes. Then, teaching style and learning style intruments were applied in order to determine their teaching styles and the relationship bet their teaching and learning styles. Due to the limitation in the number of pages the analysis of classroom data pertaining to these six teachers was not include in the present study. Hence, the analysis of their teaching styles was based on the answers of the teaching style instruments.

The two remaining teachers, Shellsea and Lea, were investigated for a longer period. They had six classes observed and took part in a 10-hour instructional program. The objectives of the instructional program were to present theories of teaching and learning styles, engage teachers in a reflective session, and assign two tasks to the teachers. In task 1 teachers were supposed to approach their students' learning styles. Then, I applied a questionnaire to each one of the students in order to find out their attitudes towards task 1.

In task 2, teachers were supposed to plan and perform a class in which they would try to develop a balanced teaching style. Finally, I carried out a semi-guided interview with the teachers for the purpose of identifying the difficulties they faced during the planning and performance of task 2. Having provided an overview of the steps taken to collect data for the present study, I now turn to the conclusions drawn from my data analysis.

5.2. Findings

The analysis of the results have revealed that, in terms of the learning styles most favored, all learning styles seem to be favored among these teachers, however, not to the same extent. Some learning styles tend to be more favored than others. In this sense, extraverts, feelers, perceivers and kinesthetic learners tend to be the learning styles most favored among these teachers. Moreover, there seems to be a balance in the extent to which sensor and intuitive learners are favored among these eight teachers.

In relation to the relationship between teachers' teaching styles and their own learning styles, only one teacher, Bill, presented a correlation in 40% of the dimensions, in other words, in less than 50% of the dimensions. The other seven teachers presented a correlation ranging between 60-100% of the dimensions of teaching and learning styles. Thus, I may argue that there seems to be a correlation between teachers'

teaching styles and their learning styles. In other words, teachers' teaching styles tend to suit their own learning styles.

As regards learners' attitudes towards discussing learning styles in the classroom, in both teachers' groups, students presented a positive attitude towards teachers' attempts to raise awareness of learning styles in the classroom. Learners seem to be favorable to contribute to future teachers who may have an interest to bring the issue of learning styles to the classroom.

In respect to teachers' difficulties when trying to develop a balanced teaching style, lack of time for planning the classes and lack of knowledge of learning style theories were reported by teachers. In addition to this, I may argue that both teachers seem to have been able to benefit from their experience in the instructional program in order to accomplish task 2, and they seem to have accomplished this task by relying on their own learning preferences.

5.3. Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Research

The main limitation of the present study was related to time constraint. Being the fact that an MA study must be concluded in two years, the data collection took place in a limited period of time, from April 16th to July 1st, 2003. This time constraint prevented me from investigating a larger population of teachers for a longer period of time. As a result of time constraints, the present study is limited in respect to the number of teachers observed — eight teachers – and the number of classes observed – three for the six previous teachers, and six for the two remaining ones who were investigated for a longer period. Future studies on teaching and learning styles should investigate a larger population for a longer period of time.

Another limitation concerns the instruments used for appreciating learning and teaching styles. Although these instruments were tested with nine students and seven

teachers and revised, they were not statistically tested concerning validity and reliability. In this respect, studies could be conducted in order to validate instruments to appreciate learning styles. Working with a larger number of participants for a longer period of time and using validated instruments would certainly bring more enlightening results to the purposes of the study of teaching and learning styles.

Since learning style is a complex, multifaceted variable of L2 learning, much can be done in the area in order to help educators broaden up their views on the value of learning styles within the process of teaching/learning an L2. Other ideas deriving from the one developed in the current research could be: (1) the conduction of a study to investigate testing from the perspective of learning styles, identifying what learning styles tend to be most favored by the types of tests L2 teachers apply; (2) the conduction of a study to investigate how learners can stretch their learning preferences in order to adapt to teachers' teaching styles, and identifying what difficulties learners face when trying to adapt; (3) the conduction of a study to investigate the effects of the match / mismatch between learning and teaching styles on students' motivation; (4) the conduction of a study to investigate the effects of the match / mismatch between learning and teaching styles on students' achievement.

5.4. Pedagogical implications

Taking into account the results obtained, it can be argued that extraverts, feelers, perceivers and kinesthetic tend to be the learning styles mostly favored among the teachers investigated. Consequently, introverts, thinkers, judgers, visual, and auditory tend to be favored in lower extents in these teachers' classes.

However, in order to account for all learning styles in a more balanced way, teachers do not need to make drastic changes in their teaching styles (Felder and Henriques, 1995). After all, without effort, teachers already tend to favor some learning

styles. In fact, the results of the analysis of the eight teachers' teaching styles indicate that teachers already frequently favor at least four learning styles- extraverts, feelers, perceivers and kinesthetic. Therefore, what they need to do in order to achieve a balanced teaching style is to incorporate more learning tasks which will match the learning styles less frequently favored- introverts, thinkers, visual and auditory.

One key point in trying to account for learning styles in a more balanced way, is to raise teachers' awareness of their own teaching and learning styles. Kinsella (1995) remarks that without fundamental awareness of their own preferences, it is likely that teachers will believe that the most efficient way to teach is the one which addresses their own learning styles. In the present study, results seem to be in line with the idea that teachers seem to teach in the ways they best learn. After raising awareness of their own learning and teaching preferences, teachers should, then, turn to learners' preferences so as to account for different learning styles in the classroom. In this sense, teachers seem to have open doors. Considering the results obtained, students have a positive attitude towards talking about their learning preferences, and they seem to consider relevant to be asked about their preferences. Thus, students may be willing to contribute to teachers who aim at finding out about their learning styles.

In the pathway to develop a balanced teaching style, teachers may have difficulties such as lack of time for planning classes from the perspective of learning styles, and lack of knowledge of learning style theories. These difficulties seem to be related to two relevant issues of L2 teaching. First, the issue of planning and, second, the issue of teacher education.

In relation to planning, it should no longer be ignored that planning is a teacher's task. It is a hard task which requires time and effort. Thus, teachers should be provided the time for planning their classes and they should be paid for it, as well. This issue is, actually, part of a broader context. Brazilian L2 teachers earn low salaries and often

have to cope with busy schedules in order to compensate their low income. Consequently, time for planning classes is scarce and often not supported by the schools.

Given the Brazilian context, the second issue, teacher education, is also a problematic one. Since teachers have busy schedules and low income, it is unlikely that they will be able to engage in teacher education programs frequently. Therefore, among more urgent social problems and needs, learning about theories seems to be frequently away from educational priorities. However, I believe theories do help teachers make more informed decisions about teaching. According to Claxton and Murrel (1987), learning about learning is an empowering experience for both teachers and learners. These researchers claim that information about learning styles may lead to educational improvement if teachers and students are willing to learn about "how the learner learns, how the teacher teaches and how each can adapt to the other in the service of more effective teaching" (Claxton and Murrel, 1987, p.54).

As wisely pointed out by Stebbins (1995), " Knowledge of learning styles is not a panacea for all educational problems, but only one avenue, albeit a multifaceted one, for understanding the learning process"(p. 116). I believe awareness may be the most precious advantage that information about learning and teaching styles may bring to us. Kinsella (1995) claims that if learners are led to develop awareness of their own learning preferences, strengths and weaknesses, and if teachers are engaged in fostering a classroom environment that accounts for individual differences, empowerment will be likely to take place since the responsibility for learning will be shared between teachers and learners.

I agree with Eliason's (1995) position when she states that the most important contribution that information of learning styles may bring to us should not be the one of labeling students or teachers as either visual, kinesthetic, extravert or intuitive types.

Rather the most relevant contribution should be the one of helping us become able to "acknowledge and celebrate the various types and processes we and our students bring to the classroom, while continuing to both accommodate *and* diverge" (Eliason, 1995, p. 33). In this respect, I hope the present study is a seed in the attempt to raise awareness that we teach an L2, but, first of all, we teach people, and people are different. Thus, as educators, it is our task to reflect and search for ways in which such differences can somehow accommodate and diverge effectively in our classrooms.

REFERENCES

Bartlett, L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In: J. Richards and D. Nunan (Eds.) *Second Language teacher Education*. Cambridge: CUP.

Bialystok, E. (1985). The compatibility of teaching and learning strategies. *Applied Linguistic*s 6, 255-262.

Bluter, K. (1987). *Learning and teaching style: In theory and practice*. Columbia, CT: the Learners' Dimension.

Brown, H. D. (1987). *Teaching by principles: a interactive approach to language   pedagogy*. New Jersey:Prentice Hall Regents.

Brown H. D. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*, New Jersey, Prentice Hall Regents.

Carrel, P. L. & Monroe, L. B. (1993). Learning style and composition. *Modern Language Journal*, 77(2), 148-162.

Claxton, C. & Murrel, P. (1987*)*. Learning styles: implication for improving the educational process (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education report No. 4) Washington, DC: Association for the study of Higher Education.

Cook, V. J. (1982). What's your learning theory? *Modern Englsih Teacher*, 10/1, 40-43.

Dunn, K. and Dunn, R. (1977). *Administrators' guide to new programs for faculty management & evaluation*. New York, NY: Parker Publishing Co.

Dunn, R. & Dunn, K. (1978). *Teaching stydents through their individual learning styles: A practical Approach*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pprentice Hall.

Dunn, R., Dunn, K. & Price, G.E. (1979). Identifying individual learning styles. In J. Keefe (ed.) *Students Learning Styles: Diagnosing and prescribing programs*. (pp. 39-54). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Dunn, R. & and Dunn, K. (1993). *Teaching secondary students through their individual learning styles: Practical Approaches for grades 7-12*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Dunn, R. and Griggs, S. A. (1988). *Learning styles: A quiet revolution in American secondary schools*. Reston, VA.: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Ehrman, M. E. (1994). The type differentiation indicator and adult foreign language   learning success. *Journal of Psychological Type*, 30, 10-29 .

Ehrman, M. E. & Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal*, 74(3), 311-327.

Eliason, P.A. (1995). Difficulties with cross-cultural learning styles assesssment. In J. reid (Ed.) *Learning styles in the ESL/EFl* classroom, pp. 19-33. Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Ellis, R. (1989). Classroom learning styles and their effect on second language acquisition: a study of two learners. *System* 17, 249-262.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Felder R. M. and Henriques E. R. (1995) "Learning and Teaching Styles in Foreign and Second Language Education, *Foreign Language Annals*, 28 (1), 21-31 Application of the F-S style model to language education.

Felder, R. M. and Silvermann, L. K (1988)."Learning Styles and Teaching Styles". *Engineering Education,* April, 1988, 674-681.

Filho, Almeida J. C. P. (1999). Análise de abordagem como procedimento fundador de auto-conhecimento e mudança para o professor de língua estrangeira. In: Almeida Filho, José Carlos Paes de. (Org.). *O Professor de Língua Estrangeira em Formação*. Campinas, SP: Pontes (11-27)

Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development and decision making: a model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *Tesol Quarterly* 23 (1), 27-45.

Gregorc, A. F. (1979). Learning/teaching styles: Potent forces behind them. *Educational Leadership*, 36, 234-236.

Heinrich, S. H.(1993). O papel dos estilos de ensino e aprendizagem na interação professor-aluno. *Dissertação de mestrado não publicada*. Campinas. Unicamp.

Herrmann, N. (1990). *The Creative Brain.* Lake Lure, NC, Brain Books.

Hough, M. (1990). Narrative comprehension in adults with right and left hemispheres brain-damage: Theme organization. *Brain and Language*, 38, 253-277.

J. Reid (personal Communication, March 26th, 2002).

Jensen, G. H. & DiTiberio, J. K. (1989). *Personality and the teaching of composition.* Norwood, N.J: Ablex.

Johnson, K. (1995). *Understanding communication in second language classrooms*. Cambridge. Cambridge 212. University Press.

Jung ,C.G. *Tipos Psicológicos*. Trad. Álvaro Cabral. Rio de Janeiro: Jahar Editores,1974.

Kaplan, J. A., Brownel, H. H., Jacobs, J. R. & Gardner, H. (1990). The effects of the right hemisphere damage on the pragmatic interpretation of conversational remarks. *Brain and Language*, 38, 315-333.

Katz, A. (1996). Teaching Style: a way to understand instruction in language classroom. In

Bailey, K. & D. Nunan (Eds). Voices from the language classroom, pp.57-87. Cambridge: CUP.

Keefe, J. W. (1979). Learning style: An overview. In Keefe (ed.) *Students Learning Styles: Diagnosing and prescribing programs*. (pp. 39-54). Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Kennedy, M. (1990). *Policy issues in teacher education*. East Lansing MI: Michigan State university, College of Education, National Center for Research on teacher education.

Kiersey, D. & Bates, M. (1984) Please undestand me: Character and Temperament Types. Del Mar, California: Prometheus Nemsis Book Company.

Kinsella, K. (1994). Perceptual Learning Preferences Survey.

Kinsella, K. (1995). Understanding and empowereng diverse learners in the ESL. In: J. Reid (Ed.). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL Classroom,* p.170-193. Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Kolb, D. A. (1976). The Learning Style Inventory: self-scoring test and interpretation. Boston: McBer and Company.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in second language acquisition*. London: Pergamon.

Kroonemberg, N. (1995) Meeting language learners' sensory-learning-style preferences. In: J. Reid (Ed.). *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom,* p.170-193. Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Lawrence,G. (1982*). People Types and Tiger Stripes: a practical guide to learning styles.* Gainesville, Florida: Center of Application for Psychological Types.

Levelt, W. J. M. (1989). *Speaking: from intention to articulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Mawhinney, T. (2002). Effects of Teaching Prescriptions on the Self-Assesssed Teaching Styles and Beliefs of Secondary School Teachers. St. John's University. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation.

Mclaughlin, B. (1987). Theories of second-language learning. London: Edward Arnold.

Medley, D. (1972). Early history of research on teacher behavior. *International Review of Education,*18, 403-438.

Menhert, U. (1997). The Effects of Different lengths of time for planning on second language performance. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20, 83-108.
Moody, R. (1988). Personality preferences and foreign language learning. *Modern Language Journal*, 72, 389-401.

Mok, W. E. (1994). Reflecting on reflections: a case study of experienced and inexperienced ESL teachers. *System*, 22, 93-111.

Myers, I. B. & Briggs, P.B. (1987). *The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Nelson, G. L. (1995). Cultural differences in learning styles In: J. Reid (Ed.). *Learning styles in the ESLl/EFL classroom,* p.3-18. Massachusetts: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Nunan, D.(1991). *Language teaching methodology: a textbook for teachers.* Englewod Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall International.

Nunan, D. (2003). *Practical English language teaching*. New York: NY: McGraw Hill.

Ortega, L. (1997). Planning and Focus on Form in L2 oral Performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 21, 109-148.

Oxford, R. (1993). Evidence and instructional implications of gender differences in second/foreign language learning styles and strategies. Applied Language Learning 4(1-2), 65-94.

Oxford, R. L. (1990).Language learning strategies and beyhond: A look at strategies in the context of styles. In S. S. Magnan (Ed.), Shifting the instructional focus to the learner (pp. 35-55). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of foreign Languages.

Oxford, R. L. & Ehrman, M. (1993). Second language research on individual differences. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 13, 188-205.

Pinheiro, J.D. (2000) Auto-observação: uma abordagem de desenvolvimento do professor de LE. Fortaleza: UECE. *Dissertação de mestrado não publicada.*

R. Felder (personal Communication, April 16th, 2002).

Reid, J. (1984). Perceptual learning styles learning preference Questionaire.

Reid, J. (1995). *Learning Styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heninle Publishers.

Richards, J. C. and Freeman, D. (1993). Conceptions of teaching and the education of second language teachers. Tseol Quarterly, 7(2), 193-216.

Richards, J. C. and Lockhart, C.(1994). Reflective teaching in second language classrooms. Cambridge: CUP.

Richards, J. C. , Hull, J., & Proctor, S. (1998). New Interchange: English for international communication. Cambridge: CUP.

Richards, J. C., Platt, J. and Platt, H. (1992).*Dictionary of language teaching and Applied Linguistics*. England: Longman.

Scarcella , R. (1990).*Teaching language minority students in the multicultural classroom.* Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Pretice Hall Regents.

Schdmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Lingustics*, 11, 129-158.

Schon, D. A. (1983). The Reflective practiioner. How professionals think in action. Basic books.

Schumann, J. H.(1994). Where is cognition? Emotion and cognition in second languagfe acquisition, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 16, 231-242.

Sharewood Smith, M. (1993). Input enhancement in instructed SLA: Theoretical bases. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 165-179.

Shimahara, N. K. (1986). The cultural basis of students' acheivement in Japan. *Compaprative Education*, 22, 10-26.

Skehan, P., (1998). *A cognitive Approach to Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, W. C. Jr. (1997). A review of the research into teaching styles/behaviors' impact on students' cognitive outcome and Bloom's taxonomy. (Eric Document Reproduction Service ED 408 310)

Stebbins, C. (1995). Culture-specific perceptual-learning-style preferences of postsecondary students of English as a second language. In: J. Reid (Ed.) *Learning styles in the ESL/EFL classroom*, pp. 108-117. Boston, Massachusetts: Heinle & Heninle Publishers.

Sternberg, R. & Grigorenko, E. (1997). Are cognitive styles still in style? *American Psychologist* 52, 700-712.

Tavares, M. G. G. (2002). Learning Styles most addressed by L2 teachers within the management of speaking activities. *Unpublished research paper.* Florianópolis. UFSC.

Telles, J. A. (1997). Metaphors as coalescences of teachers' beliefs of language, their students and language teaching. *Revista do Instituo de Letras*, Vol. 16, pp. 86-115. Campinas: Puccamp.

Ur, P. (1996). *A course in language teaching: practice and theory.* Cambridge: CUP.

Van Lier, L. (1988). *The classroom and the language learner: Ethnography and second language classroom research*. London: Longman.

VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Explicit instruction and input processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 225-243.

Violand de Hainer, E. (1990). *Integrating learning styles and skills in the ESL classroom: An approach to lesson planning*. Washington, D C: National Clearninghouse for Bilingual Education.

Wallace, M. (1991). Training foreign language teachers: a reflective approach. Cambridge: CUP

Widdowson, H. G. *O ensino de línguas para a comunicação*. Trad. José Carlos P. de Almeida Filho. Campinas, SP: Pontes, 1991.

Wintergest, A. C., DeCapua, A. & Verna, M. A. (2003). Conceptualizing learning style modalities for ELS/EFL students. *System* 31, 85-106.

Witkin, H. (1962). *Psychological differentiation*. New york: Wiley.

Zeichner, K. M. (in press). Educating reflective teachers for learner-centered education: possibilities and contraditions. *Paper presented at the Sixteenth Encontro Nacional de Professores Universitários de Língua Inglesa.* University of Londrina, Brazil (September, 2001).

APPENDIX A

March 1st, 2003

Dear Coordinator,

Under the supervision of Professor Dr. Mailce Borges Mota Fortkamp, I am conducting an M. A. Study that will investigate L2 teachers' teaching styles from the perspective of learning styles. With your persmission, I would like to observe 8 teachers. I would like to observe six teachers' during three of their classes, and two teachers during six of their classes. Naturally, participation is voluntary and no teacher or student will be identified. All the findings will be reported in summary form and will be available upon request.

Sincerely,

Maria da Glória Guará Tavares.

APPENDIX B

Song

Gloria Gaynor

I Am What I Am
(Jerry Herman)

I am what I am
I am His own special devotion,
So go take a look,
give me the hook, or the ovation
It's my world that I want to have a little pride in
My world, and it's not a place I have to hide in
Life's not worth a damn, 'til you need to say "I am what I am".

I am what I am
I don't want praise, I don't want pitty
I bang my own drums
Some think it's noise, I think it's pretty.
And so what if I love
each bauble and each bangle,
Why not try to see life from a different angle?
Your world is a sham, 'til you can shout out, "I am what I am"!

I am what I am
And what I am needs no excuses
I deal my own deck, sometimes the ace, sometimes the deuces
It's one life, and there's one return and no deposit,
One life so make sure you light what's in your closet,
Life's not worth a damn 'til you can shout out "I am what I am"!
"I am what I am"! (16x)

I am what I am
And what I am needs no excuses
I deal my own deck, sometimes the ace, sometimes the deuces
It's my life that I want to have a little pride in
My life, and it's not a place I have to hide in
Life's not worth a damn, til you can shout out: "I am what I am".

I am I am I am useful/helpful
I am I am I am true
I am I am anybody/somebody
I am as good as you/she
I am… what I am

APPENDIX C

Teachers' History Drawing Activity

APPENDIX D

Song

What's your sign?
Des'ree

What's your sign? Do you know?
Let me guess? You're scorpio?
What's yur rising? Where's your moon?
Scorpios are pretty cool. See, I'm a Sag.
So they say. I'm a butterfly, I like to play
I'm always aiming into the sky
I point my arrows extremely high

'Cos everyone has a sign
Whether supernatural or divine
Believe it or not, if you're so inclined
'Cos in this great big universe
We're the stars on earth

See the man over there, he's a Leo
Check his smile. Virgo eyes. Aries smile
I like the Leo, check his style
When the night is good and clear
I hear a whisper in my ear
If you follow the Northern star
You will always know just where you are

'Cos everyone has a sign
Whether supernatural or divine
Believe it or not, if you're so inclined
'Cos in this great big universe
We're the stars on earth

We are the stars
'Cos in this great big universe we're the stars on earth
We are the stars doo, doot, doot, doo
'Cos in this great big universe we're the satrs on earth

'Cos everyone has a sign
Whether supernatural or divine
Believe it or not, if you're so inclined
'Cos in this great big universe
We're the stars on earth

APPENDIX E

Song

Caminhos do Coração
(pessoa = pessoas)
Gonzaguinha

Há muito tempo que eu saí de casa
Há muito tempo que eu caí na estrada
Há muito tempo que eu estou na vida
Foi assim que eu quis e assim eu sou feliz

Principalmente por poder voltar a todos os lugares onde já cheguei
Pois lá deixei um prato de comida, um abraço amigo
Um canto para dormir e sonhar

E aprendi que se depende sempre de tanta muita diferente gente
Toda pessoa sempre é as marcas das lições diárias de outras tantas pessoas
E é tão bonito quando a gente entende que a gente é tanta gente onde quer que a gente vá
E é tão bonito quando a gente sente que nunca está sozinho por mais que pense estar
È tão bonito quanto a gente pisa firme nessas linhas que estão nas palmas de nossas mãos
È tão bonito quando a gente vai à vida nos caminhos onde bate bem mais forte o coração

É tão bonito quanto a gente pisa firme nessas linhas que estão nas palmas de nossas mãos
È tão bonito quando a gente vai à vida nos caminhos onde bate bem mais forte o coração

E aprendi que se depende sempre de tanta muita diferente gente
Toda pessoa sempre é as marcas das lições diárias de outras tantas pessoas
E é tão bonito quando a gente entende que a gente é tanta gente onde quer que a gente vá
E é tão bonito quando a gente sente que nunca está sozinho por mais que pense estar
È tão bonito quanto a gente pisa firme nessas linhas que estão nas palmas de nossas mãos
È tão bonito quando a gente vai à vida nos caminhos onde bate bem mais forte o coração

APPENDIX F

Song

Circle of life

Elton John

From the day we arrive on the planet
And blinking, step into the sun
There's more to see that can never be seen
More to do than can ever be done
There's far too much to take in here
More to find than ever be found
But the sun rolling high
Through the sapphire sky
Keeps great and small on the endeless round

It's the circle of life
And it moves us all
Through despair and hope
Through faith and love
Till we find our place
On the path unwinding
In the circle
The circle of life

It's the circle of life
And it moves us all
Through despair and hope
Through faith and love
Till we find our place
On the path unwinding
In the circle
The circle of life

APPENDIX G

Questionnaire for assessing students' attidues towards discussing learning styles in the classroom

---

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

Pós-graduação em Inglês e Literatura Correspondente

Este questionário é parte da pesquisa de mestrado que estou conduzindo com a orientação da Professora Dra. Mailce B. Mota. Agradeço a sua colaboração. Sua participação é extremamente importante para a realização desta pesquisa.

---

1. Qual sua opinião sobre a atividade que acabou de fazer sobre estilos de aprendizagem?

   _____

   _____

2. Você já havia sido abordado sobre seu estilo de aprendizagem por algum professor de Inglês?

   (   ) Sim   (   ) Não

3. Você considera importante que professores abordem questões sobre preferências de aprendizagem com seus alunos?

   (   ) Sim   (   ) Não

4. Você estaria disposto a contribuir com futuros professores que desejassem abordá-lo a respeito de seu estilo de aprender?

   (   ) Sim   (   ) Não

APPENDIX H

Students' answers on the questionnaire for assesing their attitudes towards discussing learning styles

(The first question only)

1. Qual a sua opinião sobre a atividade que acabou de fazer sobre estilos de aprendizagem?

S1: É importante sermos abordados sobre nossas formas de aprendizagem para atender ás diferenças de cada um.
S2: É importante para que o professor verifique as preferências dos alunos e possa direcionar suas atividades.
S3: Interessante. Ajuda tanto ao aluno como ao professor ter um melhor conhecimento de como melhor aprendemos.
S4: Boa, pois ajuda o professor a conhecer melhor as preferências de seus alunos e tornar seu ensino mais personalizado.
S5: É importante que o professor saiba mais sobre cada um de seus alunos para tentar tornar a aula mais agradável, o aluno aprende mais e o professor sai satisfeito com os resultados dos alunos.
S6: É relevante levantar questões, acho importante essas atividades sobre como aprendemos, pois o aluno é colocado no núcleo da questão.
S7: Interessante, já que cada aluno tem uma maneira particular de ver a aula e como elas são dadas.
S8: Importante para melhorar a relação professor-aluno e para que as atividades sejam apropriadas.
S9: Para mim não faz muita diferenças estas atividades, mas para o professor deve ser muito importante.
S10: È muito interessante para que eu possa descobrir como eu mesmo aprendo, nunca pensei muito nisso.
S11: Interessante, acho que nós ganhamos se o professor se preocupa em saber como melhor aprendemos.
S12: Interessante, mas achei difícil responder algumas questões da tarefa, não sei muito dizer como eu mesmo aprendo.
S13: Acho super bacana responder sobre minhas formas de aprender, acredito que pode ajudar ao professor a dar melhores aulas e me ajudar a me conhecer.
S14: Achei a atividade legal, bom saber que o professor pensa em como cada um de nós aprende, mas achei difícil pensar sobre mim. Acho que estudo muita gramática e pouco sobre mim mesma.
S15: Bem legal. Gostaria de observar agora como aprendo nas aulas da faculdade.
S16: Interessante. É bom saber como eu e meus colegas somos parecidos e ao mesmo tempo diferentes, eles adoram jogar e eu prefiro ler.
S17: Gostei de falar sobre minhas formas de aprender com meus amigos, mas achei difícil responder sobre mim mesmo, fiquei surpresa.
S18: Acho que mais professores deveriam se preocupar em como aprendemos, especialmente os da minha faculdade.
S19: Acho fundamental que o professor tente conhecer a gente melhor.
S20: Legal, uma professora aqui do Extra já tinha feito algo parecido com a gente.
S21: Acho que é muito importante o professor fazer este tipo de atividade, mas às vezes, não sei bem como eu aprendo melhor.

APPENDIX I

Learning Style Instrument

(version in English)

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

Pós-graduação em Inglês e Literatura Correspondente

Este questionário é parte do estudo de mestrado que estou conduzindo sob a supervisão da professora Dra. Mailce Borges Mota. Sua colaboração é extremamente importante para este estudo. Desde já agradeço sua participação.
Glória Tavares

Instructions:
1. You have 30 minutes to answer the questions. Do not stop or reflect for too long.
2. You have to choose only one answer
3. Don't worry. There are no right or wrong answers
4. Answer the questions based on what you think tends to be true about yourself.
5. You may feel there is more than one answer that tends to be true about yourself. That is possible. Try to choose the one that is more frequent and / or evident about you.
6. By choosing one answer, it does not mean that you are totally excluding the others or that the others are completely untrue. Answers just indicate stronger tendencies about you.

1. During classes, I usually ante as aulas, eu geralmente
    (a) Interact with many even the ones I do not know so well
    (b) Interact with few that I know well

2. I am more
    (a) realistic
    (b) imaginative

3. I am more motivated by
    (a) being appreciated by others
    (b) my achievement itself

4. I learn better if classes are
    (a) formal
    (b) playful

5. I learn something better if I
    (a) discuss it with my classmates
    (b) read about it
    (c) play a game about it

6. During classes, I usually
    (a) Speak a lot
    (b) Don't speak very much or prefer to be quiet

7. I am more attracted to
    (a) sensate people

(b) creative people

8. I prefer discussions that involve
    (a) Logical thinking
    (b) Values and principles

9. I prefer to
    (a) finish one project before starting another
    (b) start many projects, but I may have problems to finish them

10. I really enjoy activities that deal with
    (a) songs, audiotapes
    (b) pictures, videotapes
    (c) moving around, touching things

11. I'm more motivated
    (a) From the Beginning to middle of the class
    (b) From the Middle to the end of the class

12. I prefer
    (a) to have the teacher explain words and grammar rules to me
    (b) to have the teacher encourage me discover words and grammar rules by myself

13. It is very important to me that the teacher is
    (a) friendly
    (b) objective

14. I learn better if classes have
    (a) precise procedures, fixed schedules and routines
    (b) flexible plans, tentative schedules and surprises

15. I learn better if I
    (a) I listen to it many times
    (b) I write things down
    (c) I have to prepare a presentation about it

16. When I have a problem I usually
    (a) look for others to talk about it and ask for help
    (b) need to be alone to think about it

17. I usually prefer
    (a) classes that follow a clear, systematic plan
    (b) classes that do not necessarily follow a clear, systematic plan

18. I usually approach situations in
    (a) a rational way
    (b) an emotional way

19. I usually decide things
    (a) fast
    (b) slowly

20. I really like it when the teacher
    (a) explanis things orally
    (b) explains things on the board
    (c) explain things by using objects, making us move

21. I usually know
    (a) most classmates' names
    (b) few classmates' names

22. I learn better when
    (a) activities are presented in a step-by-step way

(b) actvities are presented in a flexible way

23. I usually decide things based on
    (a) my head
    (b) my heart

24. I prefer
    (a) planned events and expected happenings
    (b) unplanned events and unexpected happenings

25. I prefer when the teacher
    (a) gives oral instructions
    (b) writes down instructions
    (c) gives a model or example of what I have to do

26. I are usually

    (a)   interested to know something about your classmates' life
    (b) not interested about getting to know anything about your classmates' life

27. I usually think
    (a)   think of many different ways of doing an activity
    (b)   think of one or two ways of doing activities

28. I am more
    (a) firm
    (b) gentle

29. I usually
    (a) Have no problems to change schedules and plans
    (b) Don't like to change schedules and plans

30. I usually
    (a) listen to music when I study
    (b) underline or highlight the important parts of texts that I read
    (c) need some breaks when I study

31. I prefer to
    (a) Work alone or in pairs
    (b) Work in groups
32. I pay attention to
    (a) facts and details
    (b) possibilities and ideas

33. I think the greater error is to be
    (a) too objective
    (b) too passionate

34. I like to solve problems based on
    (a)   my past experiences
    (b) new ideas and information

35. I usually
    (a) listen to music when I study
    (b) underline or highlight the important parts of texts that I read
    (c) need some breaks when I study

36. I develop ideas mostly by
    (a) Discussing
    (b) Thinking quietly

37. I am more inclined to be
    (a) practical

(b) original

38. I hope I always have
   (a) Clarity of reason towards situations
   (b) strong compassion towards the others

39. It is more important to me
   (a) To be right
   (b) To have lots of experiences

40. I really
   (a) Like to listen to background instrumental music when I study
   (b) Like to learn in a room that has lots of posters and pictures
   (a) Get impatient when I sit for too long during my studies

41. I usually

   (a) Try do lots of things at once
   (b) Try do one thing at a time

42. I prefer to write about
   (a) things that are more abstract and figurative
   (b) things that are more concrete and literal

43. I think it is
   (a) Very important to have a friendly atmosphere in my classes
   (b) Very important to have an objective atmosphere in my classes
44. When I have to study, I usually
   (a) list what I have to do and plan the time to do it
   (b) start without listing what to do or planning the time to do it

45. The type of activity I like the most
   (a) Listen to the sounds and voices of parts of a movie and try to describe the situation (without seeing the images)
   (b) See parts of a movie, without listening to the sounds, and try to imagine what they are talking about
   (c) Watch the beginning of a movie (sounds and images) and write an
      end to the movies in groups

46. I am more inclined to be
   (a) open
   (b) reserved

47. I my classes I prefer activities that involve
   (a) understanding the present reality
   (b) imagining future possibilities

48. I think the best compliment to me would be
   (a) "He/She is a very logical person".
   (b) "He/She is a very sentimental person."

49. I prefer when the teacher
   (a) gives me very detailed instructions and set time for carrying out activities
   (b) gives me brief instructions and gives me freedom to use time for carrying out activities

50. I would prefer to learn about someone's life by
   (a) Listening to this person lecture about his /her life in an auditorium
   (b) Reading the book that this person wrote about his/her life
   (c)Interviewing this person

APPENDIX J

Learning Style Instrument and students' answers

(version in Portuguese)

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

Pós-graduação em Inglês e Literatura Correspondente

Este questionário é parte do estudo de mestrado que estou conduzindo sob a supervisão da professora Dra. Mailce Borges Mota. Sua colaboração é extremamente importante para este estudo. Desde já agradeço sua participação.

Glória Tavares.

Instructions:
7. You have 30 minutes to answer the questions. Do not stop or reflect for too long.
8. You have to choose only one answer
9. Don't worry. There are no right or wrong answers
10. Answer the questions based on what you think tends to be true about yourself.
11. You may feel there is more than one answer that tends to be true about yourself. That is possible. Try to choose the one that is more frequent and / or evident about you.
12. By choosing one answer, it does not mean that you are totally excluding the others or that the others are completely untrue. Answers just indicate stronger tendencies about you.

1. Durante as aulas, eu geralmente
    (a) Interajo com muitos, até com as pessoas que não conheço tão bem (10students)
    (b) Interajo com poucos, só com as pessoas que conheço bem (8 students)

2. Eu sou mais
    a. realista (2 students)
    b. imaginativo (16 students)

3. Eu me sinto mais motivado por
    a. Ser admirado pelos outros (7 students)
    b. Meu próprio desempenho (11 students)

4. Eu aprendo mais se as aulas são
    a. formais
    b. descontraídas (18 students)

5. Eu aprendo algo melhor se
    a. Discuto o assunto com meus colegas (7 students)
    b. Leio sobre o assunto (3 students)
    c. Participo de um jogo sobre o assunto (8 students)

6. Durante as aulas, eu geralmente
    a. Falo muito (8 students)
    b. Falo pouco ou prefiro ficar calado (10 students)

7. Eu admiro mais as
    a. Pessoas sensatas (8 students)
    b. Pessoas criativas (10 students)

8. Eu prefiro discussões que envolvam
   a. Raciocínio lógico (10 students)
   b. Valores e princípios (8 students)

9. Eu prefiro
   a. Terminar um projeto antes de começar outro (12 students)
   b. Começar muitos projetos, mas tenho dificuldades em terminá-los (6 students)

10. Eu prefiro atividades que envolvam
    a. Músicas , audiotapes (10 students)
    b. figuras, videotapes (2 students)
    c. movimento (6 students)

11. Eu sou mais motivado
    a. Do início ao meio das aulas (13 students)
    b. Do meio ao final das aulas (5 students)

12. Eu prefiro
    a. Ter um professor que explique palavras e regras gramaticais para mim (14 students)
    b. Ter um professor que me estimule a descobrir significados de palavras e regras gramaticais (4 students)

13. É muito importante para mim que o professor seja
    a. Amigo, simpático (18 students)
    b. objetivo

14. Eu aprendo melhor se as aulas apresentam
    a. Procedimentos precisos, calendários e rotinas fixas (3 students)
    b. Procedimentos flexíveis, calendários ajustáveis e surpresas (15 students)

15. Eu aprendo melhor se
    a. Escuto a informação muitas vezes (8 students)
    b. Faço anotações (5 students)
    c. Tenho que preparar uma apresentação sobre um assunto (5 students)

16. When I have a problem I usually
    a. Procuro amigos para conversar e pedir ajuda (10 students)
    b. Preciso ficar sozinho para pensar sobre o problema (8 students)

17. Eu geralmente prefiro
    a. Aulas que sigam um plano prático e sistemático (7 students)
    b. Aulas que não sigam necessariamente um plano claro e sistemático (11 students)

18. Eu geralmente encaro situações de forma
    a. Racional (6 students)
    b. emocional (12 students)

19. Eu geralmente tomo decisões
    a. rapidamente (7 students)
    b. vagarosamente (11 students)

20. Eu gosto bastante quando o professor
    a. Dá explicações orais (6 students)
    b. Dá explicações usando o quadro (10 students)
    c. Dá explicações usando objetos e fazendo a gente se movimentar (2 students)

21. Eu geralmente sei
    a. Os nomes da maioria dos meus colegas de classe (8 students)
    b. Os nomes de poucos colegas de classe (10 students)

22. Eu aprendo melhor se as atividades são apresentadas
    a. passo a passo (9 students)

     b.   de forma bem flexível (9 students)

23. Eu geralmente tomo decisões seguindo
    a. Minha cabeça (5 students)
    b. Meu coração (13 students)

24. Eu prefiro
    a. Eventos planejados e esperados (8 students)
    b. Eventos surpresas, acontecimentos inesperados (10 students)

25. Eu prefiro quando o professor
    a. Dá instruções oralmente (5 students)
    b. Escreve instruções no quadro (10 students)
    c. Fornece um modelo ou exemplo do que eu tenho que fazer (3 students)

26. Eu geralmente

    a. Tenho interesse em saber sobre a vida de meus colegas (4 students)
    b. Não tenho interesse em saber sobre a vida de meus colegas (14 students)

27. Eu geralmente penso
    a. Em várias maneiras de fazer uma atividade (6 students)
    b. Penso em uma ou duas maneiras de fazer uma coisa (12 students)
28. Eu sou mais
    a. Firme (8 students)
    b. Gentil (10 students)

29. Eu geralmente
    a. Não tenho problema em mudar calendários e planos (9 students)
    b. Não gosto de mudar calendários e planos (9 students)

30. Eu geralmente
    a. Escuto música quando estudo (5 students)
    b. Sublinho ou marco as partes importantes de um texto quando leio (10 students)
    (c) Preciso de intervalos quando estudo (3 students)

31. Eu prefiro
    a. Fazer atividades de classe sozinho ou aos pares (14 students)
    b. Fazer atividades em grupos (4 students)
32. Eu presto mais atenção a
    a. fatos e detalhes (6 students)
    b. possibilidades e idéias (12 students)

33. Para mim o maior erro é ser
    a. Objetivo demais (11 students)
    b. Emotivo demais (7 students)

34. Eu gosto de resolver problemas com base em
    a. minhas experiências passadas (12 students)
    b. novas idéias e informações (6 students)
35. Eu gosto bastante de atividades
    a. de música (12 students)
    b. de leitura (3 students)
    (c) que envolvam movimento (3 students)

36. Eu tenho idéias principalmente se
    a. Discuto sobre um assunto (14 students)
    b. Penso sobre um assunto (4 students)

37. Eu sou mais inclinado a ser
    a. Práctico (12 students)
    b. Original (6 students)

38. Eu desejo sempre ter
    a. Clareza e lógica perante situações (7 students)
    b. Forte senso de compaixão com os outros (11 students)

39. È mais importante para mim
    a. Estar certo (12 students)
    b. Ter várias experiências (6 students)

40. Eu
    a. gosto de ouvir um fundo musical quando estudo (7 students)
    b. gosto de estudar em uma classe com muitas fotografias e pôsteres (1 student)
    c. Fico impaciente se sento durante muito tempo enquanto estudo (10 students)

41. Eu geralmente
    a. Tento fazer muitas coisas de uma só vez (9 students)
    b. Tento fazer uma coisa de cada vez (9 students)

42. Eu prefiro escrever sobre
    a. Coisas mais abstratas e figurativas (5 students)
    b. Coisas mais concretas e literais (13 students)

43. Eu acho muito importante
    a. Ter uma atmosfera amigável e descontraída em minhas aulas (16 students)
    b. Ter uma atmosfera objetiva e profissional em minhas aulas (2 students)

44. Quando tenho que estudar, eu geralmente
    a. Listo as coisas que tenho que estudar e planejo o tempo para estudar estas coisas (5 students)
    b. Simplesmente começo a estudar sem listar ou planejar nada (13 students)

45. O tipo de atividade que eu mais gosto
    a. Ouvir as partes de um filme sem as imagens e tentar descrever a situação (7 students)
    b. Assistir a partes de um filme sem os sons e tentar imaginar o que eles estão falando (9 students)
    c. Assistir o começo de um filme e tentar escrever o final (2 students)

46. Eu tendo a ser
    a. Aberto (6 students)
    b. reservado (12 students)

47. Eu prefiro atividades de classe que envolvem
    a. Compreensão da realidade presente (7 students)
    b. Imaginação de possibilidades futuras (11 students)

48. O melhor elogio para mim seria
    a. Ele/ela é uma pessoa muito lógica. (4 students)
    b. Ele/ela é uma pessoa muito sentimental (14 students)

49. Eu prefiro quando o professor
    a. Fornece instruções detalhadas e determina o tempo que tenho para realizar uma atividade (10 students)
    b. Fornece instruções breves e liberdade de tempo para eu realizar uma atividade98 students)

50. Eu prefiro aprender sobre a biografia de alguém
    (a) Assistindo a uma palestra sobre a vida desta pessoa (7 students)
    (b) Lendo um livro sobre a vida desta pessoa (5 students)
    (c) Realizando uma entrevista com esta pessoa (6 students)

APPENDIX K

Teaching Style Instrument

Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
Pós-graduação em Inglês e Literatura Correspondente

This questionnaire is part of the MA study that I have been carrying out under the supervision of Professor Dr. Mailce Borges Mota. I really appreciate your collaboration. Your participation is extremely important for this investigation. Thank you very much for answering the following questions.
Sincerely,
Glória Tavares.

Instructions:
1. You have 30 minutes to answer the questions. Do not stop or reflect for too long.
2. You have to choose only one answer.
3. Don't worry. There are no right or wrong answers.
4. Answer the questions based on what you think tends to be true about yourself.
5. You may feel there is more than one that tends to be true about yourself. That is possible. Try to choose the one that is more frequent and / or evident about you.
By choosing one answer, it does not mean that you are totally excluding the others or that the others are completely untrue. Answers just indicate stronger tendencies about you.

1. In my classes, I usually
   (a) let the students free to work with the same people, in the same groups, if this seems to be what they want
   (b) try to make students work with different people, in different groups

2. I really admire
   (a) students who are very objective
   (b) students who are very creative

3. The comments I make about my students' achievement tend to be
   (a) Affective, showing that I appreciate their accomplishments
   (b) Objective, showing that I am aware of their accomplishments

4. My classes tend to be
   (a) formal
   (b) playful

5. Most of the time, I ask students to
   a. Discuss something with their classmates
   b. read about something
   c. play a game about something

6. Most of my questions are
   a. addressed to the whole group
   b. addressed to specific students

7. I usually prefer
   a. to explain words and grammar rules to my students
   b. to encourage my students discover words and grammar rules by themselves

8. When choosing oral tasks, I prefer the ones which involve
   a. values, principles and imagination (ie. giving opinions, creating stories based on pictures)
   b. logical thinking and observation (ie. Unfolding a mystery; finding differences between two pictures)

9. I usually have
   a. few ideas at a time and I easily implement them with my students
   b. many ideas at a time and I have difficulty in implementing them with my students

10. The type of activities I use the most involve
    a. songs, audiotapes
    b. pictures, videotapes
    c. moving around, touching things

11. I get more energized
    a. from the beginning to the middle of my classes
    b. from the middle to the end of my classes

12. I usually
    a. follow my class plans in a very systematic way
    b. follow my class plans in a very flexible way

13. In my opinion, the worst criticism about myself would be
    a. "The teacher is too strict with the students."
    b. "The teacher is too flexible with the students."

14. My classes tend to have
    a. precise procedures, fixed schedules and routines
    b. flexible procedures, tentative schedules and changes

15. I think students learn better if they
    a. listen to something many times
    b. write things down
    c. have to prepare a presentation about it

16. In class, my students and I
    a. usually talk about our lives (weekends, work, study, family…)
    b. almost never talk about our lives, I try to keep conversation around very impersonal and general topics

17. I tend to
    a. have my classes very organized, well structured and my procedures usually follow a planned sequence
    b. accept some messiness and flexibility in my classes, and sometimes I change my mind about procedures during class

18. I usually think of my teaching
    a. emotionally
    b. rationally

19. I usually carry out activities which involve
    a. quick answers and outcomes
    b. time for thinking before answering

20. I really like to explain things
    a. orally
    b. on the board
    c. by using objects, making students move

21. I usually have my students
    a. work alone or in pairs

b. work in groups

22 . Most of the tasks I carry out tend to
a. emphasize facts and details
b. emphasize possibilities and ideas

23. I believe that teaching requires
a. sense and objectiveness
b. sensibility and subjectiveness

24 . I think my students usually
 (a) can predict my procedures in class
 (b) have surprises towards my procedures in class

25. I usually
(a) give instructions orally
(b) write instructions on the board
(c) give a model or an example of what students are supposed to do

26. I try to promote opportunities for individual work
a. very often
b. not very often

27. In class, I believe
a. I'd better be practical
b. I'd better be original

28. In my classes I really tend to be
a. firm
b. gentle

29. As a teacher, I usually
(a) Have no problems to change schedules and plans
(b) Don't like to change schedules and plans

30.   I think it is very important to
a. use music in class in many ways and opportunities
b.underline or highlight the important points of my class on the board
c.make students move around and play games using language

31   I believe the best ways to help my students develop ideas are
a. through discussions in pairs or groups
b. through reading or thinking

32. I tend to lead my students to talk or write about
a. things that are more abstract and figurative
b. things that are more literal and concrete

33. As a teacher, I think the greater error is to be
a. too affective
b. too technical

34. As a teacher, I usually act based on
a. my past experience
b. new ideas and information

35. Most of the activities I really like involve
a.   listening and discussing
b.   reading and writing
c.   projects (making presentations, interviewing someone)

36.   I tend to be
a. very open with my students

b. reserved with my students

37.   When choosing a topic for discussion, I would prefer a topic which emphasizes
        a. understanding of present reality
        b. imagination of future possibilities

38. I hope I always have
        a. clarity of reason towards situations in my class
        b. strong sensibility towards students in my class

39.   I tend to value
        a.   Gettig the right answer from students
        b.   Getting a good try from students

40. I usually
        a.   play some background instrumental music in class (while students prepare a task,
              work in pairs, or read somehting)
        b.   place posters, pictures, and other visual aids on the wall
        c.   carry out activities in which students have to stand up, walk around

41.   Most of the activities I carry out
        c.   require quick answers
        d.   allow time for thinking and planning before answering

42.   When choosing a topic for discussion, I would prefer a topic which involves
        e.   facts and details
        f.   possibilities and ideas

43. I think it is
        (a) Very important to have a friendly atmosphere in my classes
        (b) Very important to have an objective atmosphere in my classes

44.   In planning classes, I usually
        a. List all I have to do and set the time it will probably take for me to do it
        g.   Have an idea of all I have to do without listing or setting time to do it

45.   The type of activity I like the most is
        a.   having students listen to the sounds and voices of parts of a   movie and trying to

             describe the situation (without seeing the images)

        b.   Seeing parts of a movie, without listening to the sounds, and trying to imagine what they are

             talking about

        c.   Having students watch the beginning of a movie (sounds and images) and writing an
             end to the movie in groups

46.   I think it is
        a. Very important to do some reading and writing activities in class
        b. Not very important to do writing and reading activities in class

47.   In class, I usually
        a. do things in a particular way that I think is the best
        b. try a variety of ways to do things

48. As a teacher, the best compliment to me would be
        a."The teacher makes things so clear to understand."
        b."The teacher makes us feel so comfortable."

49. When I assign a class activity, I usually
    a. give very detailed instructions, including the time students have to do it
    h.   give brief instructions and do not emphasize the time students have to do it

50. I would really encourage students to learn about a profession by
    a. listening to professionals lecture about it
    b. reading a book written by professionals
    c. talking to professionals

APPENDIX L

Semi-guided Interview and Teachers' Answers

1. What's your general opinion of the instructional program? How did you feel?

2. What did you think of the two tasks you had to carry on? What difficulties did
    you face when planning and performing task 2?

3. What's your general opinion about the way I carried out the instructional
    program meetings?

1. Lea: Well, I really liked it, really. Many times I felt nervous, I was afraid I was
    not going to help you with my answers, when you observed my classes, I was
    always worried (…) I used to think, oh my God, what am I supposed to do? But
    when we talked and you said "just be yourself and you will help me" (…) Then,
    I think I started to relax. I liked the music, the songs you used (…) I think you
    were wise in the times Shellsea was having difficulties to speak, participate, you
    helped her feel comfortable (…) Everything was fine, I hope (…) I wish I had
    more time, you know? I could read more (…) maybe I could have helped you
    more.
1. Shellsea: I must confess it was really painful to me to have you in my classroom,
    so difficult. I started thinking about the teachers who were my participants in my
    study, maybe they felt scared, too and (…) I never thought they would be just
    because I was friendly, helpful (…) My God, it is so difficult to be observed (…)
    when you first talked to me I thought: I must help Glória. I needed participants,
    too. But I was always worried when you were there. The instructional program
    was also painful to me (…) I mean, the way you conducted was just so good, so
    nice, all the songs, the way you respected me and waited for me (…) even
    though, it is so hard to think, reflect about my classes, about myself (…). It was
    very painful (…) However, I admit that it made me feel good about myself, too
    because I realized how important it is to think about me, my work (…) I usually
    think a lot, but alone (…) doing this with you two was difficult, but at the same
    time, made me feel good about myself and my teaching because I was able to go
    ahead and overcome (…) not overcome but feel better, improve. If I had to do it
    again (…) maybe it would not be that hard anymore and I learned a lot , I read
    (…) planning and doing the activities with the students was very good, I liked it,
    I had to think a lot, reflect and (…) I learned.
2. Lea: Well, when you told me that I had to plan a class from the perspective of
    favoring learning styles, I had to choose one dimension (...), I said to me Oh, my
    goodness, how am I going to do that? I was so worried and I could not picture
    that, right? I have never planned my classes thinking about learning styles before
    (...) But that happened because I didn't have it really clear what an introvert or
    extravert was, maybe auditory and kinesthetic sounded clearer to me. So, I read
    those tables that you gave us ((teacher is referring to the texts and had-outs
    received during the instructional program)) and (...) and as I read I had the ideas, I

didn't even read the others (...) I read extraverts and introverts (...) and kinesthetic and it was like a five-minute look and I already had the idea of what to do. So, it was not difficult or painful, it was just extra thinking that I had to do but once I read the theory it was easier. Did I feel bad, did I feel irritated because I had to do that? In the beginning, yes, but later on I read about it and it was ok, no bad feelings, no anxiety at all. The problem was also because I was so behind schedule that I had to teach extra classes in order to finish the course before the strike. But it took me like ten minutes to think about the activities, then I wrote things down and I was done. Well, I think my students noticed (...) I mean they did not notice I was trying to favor introverts and extraverts, but I think they (...) maybe they noticed I was different ((Lea laughs)). I mean, maybe they were feeling different because they were working alone, I didn't' ask them to work in pairs all the time (...) so, that was funny.

Shellsea: Uh (...) I planned an activity for extroverted and introverted and uh (...) as Lea's said, I have never planned my lessons according to learning styles, oh they are going to learn better if I (...) I focus on learning styles, but I had this unconsciously (...) because I (...) I (...) try to privilege sometimes people who are very active and quiet people in the classroom (…) [Yeah, yeah], intuitively I privileged them, so that's why I chose introverted and extroverted, so I to try to do it more consciously and the only problem I had was that I had some goals for the course because of the strike I had to finish the book in one or two classes and (...) then, I had this extra activity of preparing the task and (...) as I don't like to have extra activities just as extra activities or just to please the researcher ((Shellsea laughs)), I wanted my class to be all connected, so I tried to have things go smoothly so that they could not perceive that it was actually an extra activity only to find out about extraverted and introverted, so it was just like a part of my classes. The activity was the same I was going to do with them, I just focused the procedures on extroverted and introverted and I think they really liked, they worked a lot. I asked them to evaluate the activity at the end, and they really enjoyed. It was difficult because I did not have much time, but the procedures themselves were not difficult at all. I even connected what I did with theories of speaking, you know, when students are allowed time for thinking they are more fluent.

3. Lea: As I said before, I really liked, I think you were wise (…) you helped us when we did not know what to do (…) it was pleasant to sing, think (…) I just wish I had more time to do things (..) I really liked, sometimes I don't like to talk about myself, but, actually, I learned to talk about myself when I started learning English (..) in the English classes (…) I think you prepared something very nice for us.

3. Shellsea: Indeed, the way you conducted was very nice (…) *as músicas foram lindas* (…) the activities were nice (…) as you said, I was shy but I was able to speak a lot, as you would say, I was able to *share* a lot of things. I suffered but not because of you, because of myself (…) but the way you conducted the whole process helped me participate more and feel better about myself.

APPENDIX M

Lea's taks 1

APPENDIX N

Shellsea's task 1