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

Paola Gabriella Biehl

**TRACING TEACHER DEVELOPMENT: a case study of a novice
English teacher.**

Florianópolis

2016

Esta Dissertação de Paola Gabriella Biehl, intitulada "TRACING TEACHER DEVELOPMENT: a case study of a novice English teacher", foi julgada adequada e aprovada em sua forma final, pelo Programa de Pós-Graduação em Inglês: Estudos Linguísticos e Literários, da Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, para fins de obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

Área de Concentração: Estudos Linguísticos e Literários

Dra. Anelise Reich Corseuil
Coordenadora da PPGI
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina

BANCA EXAMINADORA:

Dra. Adriana de Carvalho Kuerten Dellagnelo
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
Orientadora e Presidente

Dra. Raquel Carolina de Souza Ferraz D'Ely
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
Examinadora I

Dra. Gloria Gil
Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina
Examinadora II

Dr. Marcos Cesar Polifemi
Cultura Inglesa
Examinador III

Florianópolis, 07 de março de 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ABSTRACT

Tracing teacher development: a case study of a novice teacher
Paola Gabriella Biehl
Advisor: Adriana Kuerten Dellagnelo

In the field of English as a ForeignLanguage (EFL) teacher education, special attention must be given to novice teachers, (i.e. the ones working as a teacher for at most three years[Huberman,1993]), so that they can bridge the theory learned at preservice, courses, workshops or academia to the reality of their practice more comfortably and less lengthily. Following one on the main tenets of Vygotsky's (1987) Sociocultural theory (SCT), this study aimed to trace a novice teacher's developmental path, as she was mediated by a more experienced other (in this study, the researcher herself). The guiding question that permeated this study was to what extent the mediating sessions between teacher educator and novice teacher impacted the teacher. In order to answer this research question, the following specific questions were asked: i) How the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberated on the novice teacher's practice; ii) How the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberated on the novice teacher's discourse; and iii) if the novice teacher perceived herself differently, felt more confident about her teaching, and in what ways. Qualitative research methods were used to analyze data, which were collected through filmed class observation, filmed feedback sessions (called mediating sessions), and questionnaires. Analysis showed that the mediating sessions did impact the teacher,presenting evidence inboth teacher's discourse and practice, as well as in her self-analysis. These findings support the importance of a teacher educator's intentional and goal-oriented mediation for teachers, especially beginner teachers.
The results of this study, while confirming the imperative role of reflective teaching (Richards, 1995) and teacher reasoning (Johnson, 1999), corroborate Vygotsky's (1987) proposition concerning the twisting path of concept development (Smagorinsky, Cook & Johnson, 2003).

Key-words: Teacher education; concept development; mediation; reflective teaching; teacher reasoning.

Number of pages: 219
Number of words: 37.550

RESUMO

TRAÇANDO O DESENVOLVIMENTO DO PROFESSOR: um estudo de caso
de um professor iniciante
Paola Gabriella Biehl
Orientadora: Profa. Dra. Adriana Kuerten Dellagnelo

No campo de formação de professores de Inglês como Língua Estrangeira (EFL), uma atenção especial deve ser dada aos professores iniciantes, (ou seja, aqueles que trabalham como professor durante, no máximo, três anos [Huberman, 1993]), para que possam relacionar a teoria aprendida em treinamentos, cursos, *workshops* ou academicamente com a realidade da sua prática de forma mais confortável e menos longa. Seguindo um dos principais princípios da teoria sociocultural (SCT) de Vygotsky (1987), este estudo teve como objetivo traçar o caminho de desenvolvimento de uma professora iniciante, como ela foi mediada por um colega mais experiente (neste estudo, o próprio pesquisador). A questão norteadora que permeou este estudo foi até que ponto as sessões de mediação entre a formadora de professores e a professora iniciante impactaram na professora. A fim de responder a esta questão de pesquisa, foram feitas os seguintes questões específicas: i) Como as interações entre a formadora de professores e a professora iniciante reverberaram na prática da professora; ii) Como as interações entre a formadora de professores e professor principiante reverberaram no discurso da professora; e iii) se a professora iniciante percebeu-se de forma diferente, se sentiu-se mais confiante com seu ensino, e de que forma. Métodos qualitativos de pesquisa foram utilizados para analisar os dados, que foram coletados por meio de observação de aulas filmadas, sessões de *feedback* filmadas (chamadas de sessões de mediação), e questionários. A análise mostrou que as sessões de mediação realmente impactaram na professora, apresentando evidências tanto no discurso quanto na prática da professora, bem como na sua auto-análise. Estes resultados reiteram a importância da mediação intencional e com foco nos objetivos dos formadores de professores para o desenvolvimento dos professores, especialmente professores iniciantes. Os resultados deste estudo, confirmando o papel fundamental do ensino reflexivo (Richards, 1995) e do raciocínio do professor (Johnson, 1999), corroboram com a proposta de Vygotsky (1987) relativa à trajetória sinuosa (*twisting path*) de desenvolvimento do conceito (Smagorinsky, Cook & Johnson, 2003).
Palavras-chave: Formação de professores; desenvolvimento de conceito; mediação; cognição do professor.

Número de páginas: 219
Número de palavras: 37.055

TABLE OF CONTENTS

*Videos from classes and mediating sessions: Dropbox (upon request from paolabiehl@yahoo.com.br)

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Context of Investigation

A great number of studies on teaching refer to teachers' development as they evolve in their profession. In most cases, it takes some time until an EFL (English as a Foreign Language) novice teacher is able to comfortably manage classroom practices and to understand the effects of teaching decisions and choices on students' development (Huberman, l989, as cited in Waites, 1999). As Johnson (2009) asserts: "learning to teach is conceptualized as a long-term, complex, developmental process that is the result of participation in the social practices and contexts associated with learning and teaching". (p. 10).

From my experience as a teacher educator for over ten years, by the time novice teachers (a novice teacher in this study stands for one that has had experience with teaching for at most three years [Huberman, 1993]) finish their pre-service program, they usually have not had enough classroom practice that allows them to make informed decisions about teaching nor have they had the opportunity to make sense of the theory learned in their own classrooms, or of the theory that underlies the activities they carry out with their students as they follow a

book and its manual, for example. According to Zeichner and Liston (2013), "the process of learning to teach continues throughout a teacher's entire career, a recognition that no matter how good a teacher education program is, at best, it can only prepare teachers to begin teaching". (p. 6). Hence, without assistance, being from an academic coordinator, teacher educator, or another more experienced peer, bridging the theory to practice may become a difficult task.

Accordingly, one way of enabling a novice teacher to more confidently and adequately deal with teaching practices might be via *mediation,* which, according to Vygotsky´s Sociocultural Theory (SCT), is the process by which human beings are formed and develop. In this vein, the way to optimize the teacher's developmental process is by providing them with assistance from a more experienced peer, who may guide them into thinking about and questioning their own practice, as well as reflecting on the impact that procedures, decisions and techniques may have on students.

For the scope of this study, *mediation* refers to a process of engagement the novice teacher and teacher educator (the more experienced peer) undertake, with the goal of having the novice teacher verbalize the rationale under which they make pedagogic decisions, problematize and (re)think these decisions and practices. It is by means

of mediation that knowledge generated in the intermental sphere (when in interactions with others) turns into the intramental sphere (self-regulated) (Brooks, Swain, Lapkin & Knouzi, 2010), thus allowing the development of new concepts.

One aspect that may determine how much a teacher will or will not develop along this process is Vygotsky's notion of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), or the state of development they can achieve when mediated by an expert other (that otherwise would not be achieved on their own). Accordingly, this expert other has to be strategic enough to recognize the level of information that can (or not) be grasped and assimilated, for new information has to be anchored in previously assimilated one.

> Since a self-regulated individual is not the premise but the result of education (Kozulin 1995: 121), education does not wait for the learner to reach the appropriate developmental level for instruction to be effective, but promotes learner development through instruction. The most effective instruction is that which takes account of the learner's Zone of Proximal Development. (Lantolf, 2007, p. 44)

Another important aspect that may impact on the developmental process a teacher undertakes is engaging in a cognitive process of pedagogical reflection, defined by Richards (1995) as: " referring to an activity or process in which an experience is recalled, considered, and evaluated, usually in relation to a broader purpose" (Richards, 1995,

p.1). As Johnson and Dellagnelo (2015, p. 12) put it "teachers' sense making unfolds as teachers engage in reflection in and on the real-life activities of both teaching and the learning of teaching."

Within this reflection is *reasoning*, a term largely used by Johnson (1999), referring to the reflection teachers make upon their own practice, in order to perceive the implications of the decisions they make while teaching: "I see reasoning teaching as representing the cognitive activity that undergirds teachers' practices: the reasoning that determines the doing of teaching." (Johnson, 1999, p.1). *Reasoning*, thus, relates to *thinking* in a broader sense, encompassing not only the act of teaching but what surrounds this teaching, as well as teachers' backgrounds, values and beliefs, constituting what teachers understand teaching is. As Jonhson (1999) states:

> I believe teachers' reasoning is grounded in teachers' knowledge and beliefs; that is, what they know and believe about teachers and teaching, where their knowledge and beliefs come from, their particular views of students and learning, and how they make sense of their own teaching. I believe teachers' reasoning occurs in and is shaped by the places where those teachers work; making all of teaching local and dependent on particular circumstances in specific classrooms with particular students. (Jonhson, 1999, p. 2)

In this sense, teachers should engage in a reflective process in their practice, one which should be adapted to the specific conditions and environment surrounding them.

Having presented the main notions underlying this study, the next session will define its purpose.

1.2 Statement of the Purpose

Based on the discussion previously presented, the purpose of this study is to trace the developmental process that a novice teacher undergoes as she is mediated by a teacher educator, in this case, the researcher herself, who motivates her to reason upon her practice and reflecting upon what constitutes the teaching she does, providing her with individual and continuous assistance.

The context in which this study took place is a renowned private Language Institute (LI) that provides novice teachers with a pre-service program, aiming at instructing and qualifying teachers to apply its methodology.

This study can thus be seen as a follow-up to that program in that it proposes to bridge the theory learned at the pre-service setting and the participating teacher's practice, with an eye to the extent to which the researcher's interactions with the teacher (named *mediating sessions* in this research) impact on her teaching and reverberate on her practice, which can be best seen by analyzing the way this teacher verbalizes teaching decisions and assimilates the specific teaching concepts

provided by the LI. The teacher's perception as for her own

development and self- confidence is also of interest to this research.

1.3 Research Questions

Considering the aforementioned objectives, the main research question

for this study is:

To what extent do the mediating sessions between teacher

educator and novice teacher impact the novice teacher?

In order to answer this research question, the following specific

questions are asked:

1. How do the interactions between teacher

educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice

teacher's discourse?

2. How do the interactions between teacher

educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice

teacher's practice?

3. Does the novice teacher perceive herself

differently? Does she feel more confident about her

teaching? In what ways?

1.4 Significance of Research

By inviting the novice teacher to allow me to attend her lessons and to have mediating sessions with me after class so that we can address, debate and negotiate teaching practices and plans, it is expected that this teacher reflects upon her pedagogy as well as becomes more confident and comfortable about teaching and develops a more critical thinking about her practice.

To date, the literature in teacher education is large and comprehensive, offering insights in regards to a myriad of aspects, such as teachers' perceptions, concerns, expectations and beliefs, when in induction periods or on the course of their career (Ozturk, 2008; Michel, 2013; Berger, 2002; Barci, 2006), also on action research or teacher research (Borg, 2012; Fagan, 2015), with a focus on the teacher as conductor of their own research. Some studies (Anjos-Santos & Cristovão, 2015) analyze the impact of blogs in self-reflective process; others, the importance of communities of practice to improve teachers' cognition (Sarmento and Kirsch, 2015; Gimenez, Stein, and Canazart, 2015). Golombek (2011) conducted a research in which a novice teacher was mediated by a teacher educator, aiming at promoting expert thinking via the use of the integration of Dynamic Assessment (DA)—mediation that integrates learning and assessment—in dialogic video protocols (DVPs), investigating how a teacher educator can support the

development of a teacher-learner using DA procedures and how can DA support expert teacher thinking in a teacher-learner. The research was conducted with one teacher, whose first class session was attended and videotaped, and on the following day, teacher educator and teacher conducted a dialogic video protocol, which was also videotaped and transcribed and took approximately 90 minutes. In this study, both the teacher educator and the teacher had the opportunity to stop the video at any point that they considered relevant to discuss what was happening in the class and what they perceived. Results showed that "teacher performance alone does not provide a true sense of a teacher-learner's abilities and that using DA procedures in DVPs enables a teacher educator to be responsive to that teacher-learner's needs, thereby promoting internalization of key concepts." (Golombek, 2011, p 122).

However, few studies (Jonhson, 1999; Vásquez & Harvey, 2015), to the best of my knowledge, have focused on novice teachers' development, perceived and traced by a teacher educator, based on documentation (videotaping classes and feedback sessions), and assisted and mediated by a more experienced peer

Hopefully, the results achieved in this research will inform new empirical and theoretical studies on teacher education, more specifically on teacher cognition, novice teachers' reasoning and development, and

the impact of mediation provided by a more experience other in teachers' developmental processes.

1.5 Organization of the thesis

Besides the present chapter, which presents the context of investigation, its objectives and the significance of the study, this master thesis has four more chapters. Chapter 2 lays the theoretical background for this study: it presents Vygotsky's notions on mediation, ZPD, concept development and internalization, as well as ideas on teacher cognition, reflection, reasoning, sense of plausibility and apprenticeship of observation. Chapter 3 describes the method used to collect data for the present study, which includes the objectives, information about the setting where the data was collected (Language institute, classes, the participants), the instruments and procedures to collect the data, the key constructs the analysis is based on (the language institute guidelines for class planning), and the nature of the mediating sessions undertaken by the teacher educator and the novice teacher. Chapter 4 presents the analysis of the data obtained from the present study. Chapter 5 presents a summary of the main findings of the study, and also points out its limitations, as well its pedagogical implications and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

This study is based on the understanding that individuals build their subjectivity from the interpersonal relations established with others, and with the social, historical and cultural context they are inserted in. (Wertsch, 1985, p. 58) This subjectivity, or self-regulation, is constructed from a person's constant participation in culturally oriented practices, and by using tools and artifacts (specially language) in order to develop cognitively. (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 1)

Thus, human mental functioning is organized within a culturally established scenario, in which language plays a fundamental role, one which enables individuals to interact and function in the world. Language in Sociocultural Theory (SCT) is considered a mediational tool that serves communicative purposes, cognitive development, and meaning-making processes (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 5).

In the same vein, language also underlies the process of development of concepts, which appears to signal that if concepts are verbalized and thus open to discussion and mediation, they will be more easily and more accurately assimilated and internalized.

As this study is guided by SCT, this chapter addresses some of the relevant literature on the topic (drawing from Vygotsky's ideas), as well as on teacher cognition.

The SCT section will permeate the notions of mediation, internalization, concept development and zone of proximal development. Aligned with this perspective, we discuss the notions of reasoning teaching and sense of plausibility as we look at teacher cognition as a process deriving from teachers' participation in given sociocultural contexts, wherein mediation within their zone of proximal development ends up in internalization and concept development.

2.2 Sociocultural Theory

During his short but profitable career, Vygotsky elaborated what came to be recognized as the Sociocultural Theory, which is a *theory of mind* (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006). According to these authors, human beings have a mediated mind, rooted in and dependent on cultural and historical contexts, and formed according to the social interactions they engage in along their existence. In this sense, knowledge is socially mediated, and mediation is seen as a sociocultural construct that links the man to the world.

According to Lantolf and Thorne (2000, 2006), higher mental functions ("problem-solving, voluntary memory and attention, rational thought, planning, and meaning-making activity" – Lantolf & Thorne, 2000, p. 198) are socially constructed and mediated by auxiliary means, such as physical and psychological tools (for example: a glass is a physical tool that mediates the relation between man and what they drink, while language is a psychological tool used to mediate the relation between man and the world). These higher mental functions arise due to human participation in cultural activities, making use of cultural artifacts and concepts in an interdependent way.

Following, we will look more closely at the main tenets of the SCT (mediation, internalization, concept development and ZPD), connecting these concepts to the purposes of this study

2.2.1 Mediation

Mediation, according to Vygotsky, is the process of intervention undertaken by a tool (be it physical, like a hammer, or symbolic, like a shopping list) that intermediates our relation with the world. Oliveira (1993) refers to it as symbolic mediation (pp. 25-27), asserting that our relation with the world is a mediated one, involving a stimulus, a response, and a mediational tool that links both (the stimulus would be,

for example, the heat of a candle; the response, would be withdrawing

our hand; and the mediational tool can be direct- burning our hand, or

indirect- the memory of the burn).

Vygotsky refers to two kinds of mediational tools: physical

tools, or objects used to accomplish a task (like a shovel), and symbolic

tools, related to higher mental functions (like remembering). The author

states that

> the invention and use of signs as auxiliary means to solve a
> given psychological problem (to remember, compare
> something, report, choose, and so on) is analogous to the
> invention and use of tools in one psychological respect. The
> sign acts like an instrument of psychological activity in a
> manner analogous to the role of a tool in labor. (Vygotsky,
> 1980, p. 52)

Tools and signs are socially and culturally constructed and

defined. Lantolf and Thorne (2006) point out that, for Vygotsky, higher

mental functions are mediated by culturally constructed signs.

According to Vygotsky "human development is a product of a broader

system than just the system of a person's individual functions,

specifically, systems of social connections and relations, of collective

forms of behaviour and social cooperation" (Lantolf &Thorne, 2006,

p.59).

Mediation can be either explicit or implicit, as far as the quality of the mediation is concerned. According to Wertsch (Daniels & Wertsch, 2007),

> Explicit mediation involves the intentional introduction of signs into an ongoing flow of activity. In this case, the signs tend to be designed and introduced by an external agent, such as a tutor, who can help reorganize the activity in some way. In contrast, implicit mediation typically involves signs in the form of natural language that have evolved in the service of communication, and are then harnessed in other forms of activity. (Daniels & Wertsch, 2007, p. 185)

As can be noticed, the author proposes that, in explicit mediation, there is the intentional and overt presentation of a tool (physical or symbolic), aiming at provoking another person and making them think and act accordingly. Implicit mediation, in turn, is unintentional, by chance, it is when the tool (i.e. language) is used and, unintentionally, this provokes an insight into another person; in this case, the external agent (mediator) does not have an intention to provide mediation over another person, but it is done anyway.

It looks, though, that Wertsch leaves a third kind of mediation behind, one that is rather common in educational contexts: that in which there is intentionality but not explicitness. In this later case, the mediator guides the "mediatee", who is then expected to make meanings by themselves.

As everything we do is socially and culturally mediated, one cannot deny that mediation plays an essential role in learning: it is by interacting with others that a person's subjectivity is formed, as member of a certain culture, situated in space and time. Wertsch (1985) states that "When encountering a new cultural tool, this means that the first stages of acquaintance typically involve social interaction and negotiation between experts and novices or among novices". (p. 187). The mediation provided by a more knowledgeable other (an expert) is an aid that may help an individual build their subjectivity, or self-regulation. It is through mediation that internalization of knowledge happens; in other words, it is through the process of mediation – be it object-regulated or other-regulated – that self-regulation emerges. According to Karpov and Haywood (1998),

> Vygotsky distinguished this duality: two types of mediation:meta-cognition, or self-regulation, and cognition, or mediation organized according to cultural concepts. Self-regulation is inwardly directed private or inner speech that is derived from social speech. The difference between social and self-regulatory speech resides in the nature of the interlocutors. In the former, interaction occurs between 'I'and 'You', while in the latter it takes place between 'I', who decides what to attend to and talk about, and 'Me' who interprets, critiques and evaluates 'I's' decisions (Vocate 1994: 12). We thus achieve self-regulation as a consequence of regulating others and of being ourselves regulated by others. (Lantolf, 2006, p. 39)

Mediation in this study is two-fold but intertwined: on one hand, language is used as mediational tool that externalizes the developmental process undertaken by the novice teacher along their path; on the other hand, the mediation provided by an expert other aims at provoking the awareness and development of the novice.

The concept of mediation is at the root of another important concept brought to light by Vygotsky: internalization, which will be discussed subsequently.

2.2.2 Internalization

Vygotsky proposed unifying the existent mind-body dualism there was in psychology and anthropology by juxtaposing both in the same process, which he called internalization (or *interiorization*) (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 151). He argued that "both the natural and the cultural lines of development (i.e. the internal and the external) were necessary for human thinking to emerge and develop" (Lantolf & Thorne, p. 153). This process involves the use of signs as mediational tools, "allowing external objective social activity to become idealized though the construction of personal relevant meaning, while mental activity (the ideal) becomes objectified through speech, and thus influences the material activity of the self and others." (Lantolf & Thorne, p. 154). By

this rationale, our mental world is constantly (re)organized when in interaction with others, and both internalization and externalization happen at the same time.

This development, or internalization, is a process that encompasses both social (external) and psychological (internal) spheres, meaning that psychological functions appears twice: first at an interpsychological plane (when one engages in interactions with others), second at an intrapsychological one (when one assimilates and makes sense of the knowledge generated in social exchanges).

Internalization involves three kinds of mediation: object-regulated, other-regulated and self-regulated mediation: object-regulated mediation is carried out as an object, like a teacher's manual, is interposed between teachers and their object of knowledge; other-regulated mediation happens when a more knowledgeable other interposes between men and their object of knowledge; and self-regulation (or subjectivity) is when an individual's internal plane is organized.

The path to internalization (from object to other and to self-regulation) is not static, direct or linear; rather, it follows a *twisting path* (Smagorinsky, Cook & Johnson, 2003), that develops over time and social participation of individuals within the activities related to their

object of knowledge. According to Vygotsky (1998), "the transformation of an interpersonal process into an intrapersonal one is the result of a long series of developmental events" (p. 75). The mechanism involved in internalization has an imitative nature, one which encompasses the goals and the means through which an activity is conducted, and as such is an "intentional, complex and potentially transformative process" (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p 176).

In this sense, internalization is not a transmission from the external to the internal plane; instead, it is a mentally developed process, of transforming knowledge generated from interactions with others (be it objects or individuals) into one's own, and also of externalizing this knowledge, in a "simultaneous growing in and growing out". (Zinchenko, 2003, p.15, as quoted by Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p 159). In this path, imitation plays a central role. Vygotsky stated that: "development made on collaboration and imitation is the source of all the specific human characteristics of consciousness that develop in the child" (Vygotsky 1987, p. 210)

In the present study the idea of internalization shall be perceived both in the way the novice teacher verbalizes their pedagogical choices and attitudes, as well as in the way this teacher externalizes the knowledge internalized through their practice.

Intertwined with the idea of internalization are Vygotsky's notions on how we develop concepts, which will be dealt with subsequently.

2.2.3 Concept Development

As previously mentioned, the way in which individuals internalize concepts, according to Vygotsky, is a dynamic, twisting process of consciousness. This means that the path to develop concepts is not even or linear, but rather winding as one can move back and forward in the process. Concept development, in his theory, happens in two ways: spontaneously (everyday), that is, empirically, situationally and practically (Swain & Kinnear, 2010), and thus in an intuitive manner, and scientifically (academic), abstractly, forming systematic relationships and definitions, and hence in a conscious form.

Spontaneous concepts come from an individual's participation in social and cultural activities, and as such

> They are empirically based and require lengthy periods of practical experience to develop. They are, however, at the heart of our lived experience as human beings and are, for the most part, more than adequate for carrying out our daily activities. (Lantolf, 2007, p. 39)

Spontaneous concepts are thus developed along individuals' experiences, and thus they often carry unsystematic, mistaken meanings.

These concepts are situated and do not usually apply to occasions divergent to the ones from which they originated.

On the other hand, scientific concepts are, although based on human experience, generalizations over a certain aspect, which are freed from physical constraints and can be understood at an intellectual level of abstraction, enabling individuals to apply them to situations divergent to the ones they originated from. They "represent the generalizations of the experience of humankind that is fixed in science, understood in the broadest sense of the term to include both natural and social science as well as the humanities" (Karpov, 2003, p. 66, as cited by Lantolf, 2007, p. 40). Scientific concepts evolve through instruction in a systematic manner, being applicable in diverse contexts.

According to Smagorisky, Cook and Johnson (2003) "while spontaneous concepts may be developed without formal instruction, scientific concepts require interplay with spontaneous concepts; hence the problematic nature of the theory/practice dichotomy" (p. 1). Therefore, concept development is rooted in social practice, requiring both spontaneous and scientific knowledge in order to be sound. Without Scientific concepts, knowledge is restricted and unsystematic; without spontaneous concepts, there's the risk of incurring in "empty verbalism" (Vygotsky ,1987, p. 170).

Bringing this notion to teacher education, one can say that it is along the practice that the scientific concepts learned by teachers in academia, or in teacher pre-service courses, are developed. [1]

There are two kinds of generalizations in the evolution of a concept, both being similar but failing to achieve their theoretical unity: "complexes, in which some members of the set may be unified with others but all are not unified according to the same principle; and pseudoconcepts, in which members of the set appear unified but include internal inconsistencies." (Smagorinsky, Cook & Johnson, 2003, p. 1).

Linking this to teacher education, the way in which teachers develop concepts may depend on the quality of knowledge generated academically and the way they resonate in the teacher's empirical knowledge, as well as how much sense they make of what they perceive. The constant development of concepts should follow a teacher along their career, as it is not a formula to be learned; instead it is a process of engagement in understanding.

---

[1] The notion of concept development brought to light by Vygotsky is similar to the concepts of beliefs discussed in the work of Dufva (2003), Barcelos (2000, 2001, 2004), Kramsch (2003), Watson-Gegeo (2004), Woods (2003), among others, in the sense that it refers to the way in which individuals see and perceive the world, built on one's experiences and the way in which one interprets and makes meaning of them, and thus are "social (but also individual), dynamic, context-based and paradoxal." (Barcelos, 2006, p.18, my translation), and also "experiential, mediated and not necessarily linked to action". (Barcelos, 2006, pp. 19-20, my translation)

One's awareness and understanding of concepts is also dependent on how much one is able to attain from what is being presented to them. This level of awareness is what Vygotsky called Zone of Proximal Development, the topic of the next subsection.

2.2.4 Zone of Proximal Development

Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) is defined by Vygotsky as "the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers" (Vygotsky, 1980, p.86). As an individual characteristic, it explains the different learning rhythms of each person in their process of apprenticeship.

Vygotsky (1980) points out that an individual possesses two levels of knowledge: the actual level of development he is - "the level of development of a child's mental functions that has been established as a result of certain already completed developmental cycles" (Vygotsky, 1980, p. 85) and the ZPD, the potential level they can attain when helped by others (an object or a person): "The zone of proximal development defines those functions that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation, functions that will mature tomorrow but are

currently in an embryonic state" (Vygotsky, 1980, p.86). The former

refers to the past, while the latter, to the future: "The actual

developmental level characterizes mental development retrospectively,

while the zone of proximal development characterizes mental

development prospectively" (Vygotsky, pp. 86, 87).

Important aspects about the ZPD are that it is transitional,

process-bound and revolutionary, that is, it is in constant reorganization,

therefore, the amount of mediation has to be adapted to the person's

dynamic ZPD.

In this study, it is essential that the teacher educator, mediating

between teacher and concepts, notice and assist the novice teacher's

ZPD, so as to both acknowledge the teacher's actual development level,

and enable them to reach the potential development level: "The potential

level of development is suggested by the kinds of assistance needed to

carry out the activity and the visible ability of the learner to utilize forms

of external assistance." (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007, p. 215). The teacher

educator's goal and challenge is, then, to recognize these boundaries.

According to Lantolf and Thorne, 2007, *graduation* and

contingency are essential aspects the more expert other should pursue:

> Assistance should be graduated— with no more help
> provided than is necessary because the assumption is that
> over-assistance decreases the student's ability to become fully

> self-regulated. At the same time, a minimum level of guidance must be given so that the novice can successfully carry out the action at hand. Related to this is that help should be contingent on actual need and similarly removed when the person demonstrates the capacity to function independently. Graduation and contingency are critical elements of developmental productive joint activity. This process is dialogic and entails continuous assessment of the learner's ZPD and subsequent tailoring of help to best facilitate developmental progression from other-regulation to self-regulation. (Lantolf and Thorne, 2007, p. 215)

Based on the aforementioned, it is essential the teacher educator know the novice teacher's capabilities, as well as their room for growth, so the former can adequately assist the latter in their journey of awareness and development. Awareness and cognition are other key constructs this study is based on, and they will be dealt with in the next section.

2.3. Teacher Cognition

Besides drawing from the sociocultural theory, teacher cognition is a pillar of teacher education and development. Teacher education nowadays encompasses an area that focuses on teachers as agents of change, what came to be known as Teacher Cognition. According to Richards (2009), teacher cognition comprehends the mental lives of teachers, how they develop, what they consist of, and the influence of teachers' beliefs, thoughts and thinking processes in shaping how they understand teaching and their classroom practices.

The path that leads teachers to reflect upon pedagogy may be both instructional and practical. By instructional I mean either academically, or having access to pedagogic texts, lectures, seminars and classes, which aim at presenting and discussing teaching issues and practices. By practical I mean either putting into practice what one reads, sees and listens in these instructional moments, and reflecting upon them, or seeing one's classes as moments to be reflected upon, and exerting this reflection.

The idea of a reflective teacher emerged in the mid 70's with the shift from a positivist view of teacher education to a congnitivist paradigm. The positivist paradigm emphasized patterns of "good teaching", with a transmission of the conceptualization of how to teach from teacher educators to teachers, where teachers were seen as empty vessels who are told how to best teach ; the cognitivist paradigm, in turn, emphasizes the way in which teachers teach, what they know, and how they make sense of that. (Johnson, 2009, pp. 9-10)

The construct of reflection is this study is in alignment with Dewey's concept "to reflect is to look back on what has been done to extract the meanings which are the capital stock for dealing with further experience" (Grant & Zeichner, 1984, p. 108). To critically reflect upon one's pedagogy "involves conscious recall and examination of the

experience as a basis for evaluation and decision-making and as a source for planning and action." (Richards, 1995, p. 59). Still according to Richards, it usually requires three stages: i) The event; ii) Recollection of the event; and iii) Review and response to the event. (Richards, 1995, p.60). It is in stage three that most of the critical reflection takes place, with the teacher thinking about and evaluating others' or their own practice. Although there are other important definitions and conceptualizations of reflection in the literature (Zeichner's, (1994) technical, practical and critical levels of reflection; Schön's (1983) reflection-on-action and reflection-in-action epistemology of practice, to name a few), I will use Richards construct for being more aligned with the methodological path of this study.

The importance of practice is widely recognized in teacher education literature. Some authors refer to Teaching Practice, others to Practicum (Richards, 1998; Johnson, 1999; Crookes, 2003; Borg, 2006; Farrell, 2008; Ochieng'Ong'ondo & Borg, 2011). One of the biggest contributions of teaching practice, especially for novice teachers, is to "provide teachers with opportunities to 'develop the pedagogical reasoning skills they need when they begin teaching' (Richards, 1998: 78, as cited by Ochieng'Ong'ondo & Borg, 2011, p. 510). This reflection, or pedagogic reasoning,

refers to the ability to think critically about the relationship between procedures and principles in teaching. It involves seeking to understand the reasons for instructional actions and comprises the decision-making and problem-solving skills that teachers call upon during both the preactive and interactive phases of teaching (Richards, 1998; Johnson, 1999; Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Youngs and Bird, 2010). (Ochieng'Ong'ondo & Borg, 2011, p. 510)

The dual awareness teachers should have when engaging in reasoning (pre and during classes) is also present in post class self-assessment. Conversely, teachers may have difficulty in putting all this into action, either due to lack of time, or of knowledge. Teachers usually depend on a third party to mediate this dialogic process.

Thus, another fundamental aspect on teacher education is the role of a teacher educator, mentor or instructor in teachers' developmental processes; these mediators take on various roles, like of assistance, guidance, reassurance, or pointing out aspects where there is room for growth. According to Bailey (2006)

The supervisor's role is to help novice language teachers make connections between the material in their training courses and the classroom contexts they face … the supervisor may need to guide them as they build bridges between the research and theories they have studied and the realities of the classroom teaching … so in addition to providing practical tips, supervisors' feedback can promote reflective practice and socialize novices into the professional discourse community. (Bailey, 2006, pp. 240–44)

Ideally, it is important that teacher educators balance between assertiveness and acceptance; this balance is what may grant an effective

guidance, as teachers may both benefit from the teacher educator's experience and knowledge, but at the same time have room to explain and sustain their pedagogic choices. During this process, it is of key importance that teachers be attentive to perceive difficulties, and open to operate changes in their practice.

Notably, one cannot take for granted that engaging in a reflective process, either with or without the mediation of another person, i.e. a teacher educator, will inevitably generate change. It is possible that teachers have entrenched beliefs, ideas, values, concepts and principles about how to teach that are rooted in their long experiences as learners, what Lortie (1975) defined as the "apprenticeship of observation". It generally encompasses one's memories as students, the way in which they should behave in this role, and their memories of teachers they have had in their lives, and how these former teachers behaved and taught (Johnson, 1999, p. 19).These beliefs may mold the prospective teacher when engaging in actual teaching to the point of perpetuating the ways in which they have been taught. Therefore, in order to attempt to generate change, it is important that these beliefs are brought to light and made explicit by means of verbalization, so they can be discussed and questioned. (Abrahão, 2002, p. 61)

At the core of the reflective attitude teachers should undertake lies the concept of reasoning teaching, the topic of the next subsection.

2.3.1 Reasoning Teaching

By engaging in a reflective process, teachers may observe, pinpoint and make changes in their practice, developing what Johnson (1999) calls *reasoning teaching*, that is, teachers need to use their cognitive process to perceive how they teach. Johnson (1999) defines it as:

> knowing what to do in any classroom depends on a wide range of considerations, and the ways in which teachers think about these considerations, or what I have come to call reasoning teaching, lie at the core of both learning to teach and understanding teaching.(Johnson, 1999, p. 1)

In this sense, teachers need to reflect upon their practice to make sense of their own teaching, aiming at maximizing their students' learning. As observed by Johnson (1999), this reasoning goes beyond teachers' awareness of what, for whom and where to teach, encompassing how and why to teach and what they think while teaching. These thoughts and knowledge are grounded in the perception of teaching each teacher has, originated from their roles as students, the model of teachers they´ve had, and social aspects of teaching, that is, the locus where teaching has taken/takes place and the interactions generated by this.

Robust reasoning, as coined by Johnson (1999), refers to the way teachers understand where their knowledge about teaching comes from, how and why teachers teach the way they do, and how they reshape their teaching over time:

> Robust reasoning emerges when teachers expand their understandings of themselves, their teaching, their students, and their classrooms and schools. It emerges when teachers engage in a continual process of "criss-crossing" their professional landscape, seeing and experiencing it from multiple perspectives, recognizing its inherent complexity, and considering the interconnectedness of its various components. Robust reasoning occurs when teachers are able to assemble and apply their knowledge of their professional landscape flexibly so that it can be used in different situations and for different purposes (see Spiro et al., 1987). (Johnson, 1999, p. 2)

Robust reasoning may be achieved by having teachers critically reflect on their teaching; however, as pointed out by Johnson (1999), this reflection is difficult to be accomplished by teachers on their own, due, for example, to the practical aspects of teaching and the daily routines teachers face in their job. To cope with this, Johnson suggests that they work collaboratively with peers, pointing out and sharing perceptions of teaching (p. 11). In this study the collaboration happens between the teacher educator and the novice teacher, fostering in the latter an opportunity to put forth robust reasoning.

In sum, teachers engaging in robust reasoning need to

> (…) view themselves as life-long learners of teaching; who
> engage in sustained critical reflection and inquiry into their
> own knowledge and practices; who recognize that in
> teaching, it depends; and who can articulate what it depends
> on will develop complex, flexible, conceptual understandings
> of themselves, their students, their classrooms, and their
> schools, and will be able to use their knowledge in different
> ways, for different purposes, and in different instructional
> contexts, enabling them to provide truly effective teaching
> practices. (Johnson, 1999, p. 12)

Robust Reasoning "emerges within teachers themselves" (p.

10), that is, it is developed from inside out, their deep understanding of

how they view teaching, and how they perceive themselves in this

process. By constant reflection and (re)organization of their practice,

teachers engage in a self-dialogic movement, which is very much

connected to what Prabhu calls *Sense of Plausibility,* which will be dealt

with subsequently.

2.3.2 Sense of Plausibility

When Prabhu (1990) advocated no teaching method was better than the

other, he highlighted the importance of teachers' developing a *sense of*

plausibility, what the author defines as "the subjective understanding of

the teaching they do" (p. 172). This understanding, which is formed and

conceptualized along a teacher's journey of perception, calls upon one's

sense of pedagogic truth and cause-consequence instances during

observation or practice. Prabhu mentions that "Teachers need to operate with some personal conceptualization of how their teaching leads to desired learning- with a notion of causation that has a measure of credibility for them." (p. 172)

The way teachers develop this conceptualization may derive from their own experience as learners or teachers (even in a tutoring process, for example), as well as from their professional education, their exchanges with colleagues and their observation of teachers' and peers' practice. In these moments, the latent and developing teacher acquires a sense of what they feel works, is pleasant and is effective in the learning process or not. This sense is of a personal nature, so the experiences undertaken by one person do not translate into the same interpretations to another. Every journey is unique: "Different sources may influence different teachers to different extents, and what looks like the same experience or exposure may influence different teachers differently." (Prabhu, p.172)

This *pedagogic intuition*, as he calls it, is likely to provide ground for questioning, seeking solutions, perceiving necessity of change or adaptations in the teacher's own teaching, and may translate into teacher maturation and development, avoiding the overroutinisation of teaching practice: "It is when a teacher's sense of plausibility is

engaged in the teaching operation that the teacher can be said to be

involved, and the teaching not to be mechanical." (Prabhu, p.172). The

author also claims that by feeling engaged and content with the result of

putting effort in thinking about the teaching process, teachers may be

more motivated to continue applying this to their practice, forming a

positive vicious cycle:

> Further, when the sense of plausibility is engaged, the activity of teaching is productive: There is then a basis for the teacher to be satisfied or dissatisfied about the activity, and each instance of such satisfaction or dissatisfaction is itself a further influence on the sense of plausibility, confirming or disconfirming or revising it in some small measure, and generally contributing to its growth or change. (Prabhu, 1990, pp. 172,173)

Therefore, teachers develop a "sense of involvement" in this

process, which is bound by the perception of consequences originated

from it; besides, this involvement may translate into more engaged and

content learners, creating a positive aura in the classroom:

> I also think that the greater the teacher's involvement in teaching in this sense, the more likely it is that the sense of involvement will convey itself to learners, getting them involved as well and helping to create that elusive but highly regarded condition in the classroom: teacher-learner rapport. (Prabhu, 1990, p. 173)

The author highlights the importance of avoiding ossification,

even by teachers that have engaged in this process. The way to do this is

by being constantly seeking ways of applying the sense of plausibility:

"When a teacher's sense of plausibility is active and engaged in the teaching, it is necessarily open to change, however slowly or imperceptibly, in the process of the ongoing activity of teaching." (Prabhu, p. 174). Therefore, he points out that "it is important for a teacher's sense of plausibility to remain alive and therefore open to change – not frozen but fluid in some degree" (p. 174).

One of the ways in which teachers can achieve this ongoing process is by engaging in informed dialogue with themselves, that is, reflecting on their own practice, or in interactions with others, colleagues or teacher educators.

It is important to mention that, in this study, when we refer to sense of plausibility, we adapt Prabhu's original concept of having teachers resort to any method or approach to language teaching. As the research has been carried out in a specific language institute, the novice teacher engaged in this project was restricted by the boundaries of the methodology there adopted. What we thus mean by sense of plausibility is actually the way the novice teacher made sense of how she taught. .

2.4 Summary of the chapter

This section dealt with some of the literature related to the importance of Vygotsky's sociocultural theory (concept development, internalization,

ZPD and mediation), shedding light to teachers' developmental process as they engage in their day-to-day practice. Besides it was presented some theory about teacher cognition, more specifically reflective teaching, teacher reasoning and sense of plausability, as means through which the teacher develops an understanding of their practice.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the method used to collect data for the study and is divided into five sections: Section 3.2 describes the goal and nature of the study; 3.3 presents a description of the setting and participants; 3.4 demonstrates the data collection and analysis; and 3.5 displays the summary of the chapter.

3.2 The study

This study aims at tracing the developmental process of a novice teacher participating in an in-service program, as she is mediated by a more experienced other and thus provided with opportunities to develop reasoning thinking. The study consisted of observing and filming classes taught by the selected novice teacher, and having feedback sessions about the classes. The primary goal is to verify the extent to which the feedback sessions (called mediating sessions) between the teacher and the teacher educator reverberate on her teaching as well as on her discourse. Another objective that this research aims at regards the perception of the teacher in relation to her own development.

In order to cater for this, this case study will follow a qualitative paradigm, in which a microgenetic approach will be used to perceive change. A microgenetic study is a "very short longitudinal study" (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 52), characterized by the use of direct observation of change that occurs in a person as they learn and develop cognitively, taking into consideration one specific aspect within a specific time span, "making explicit the moment-to-moment revolutionary shifts that lead to development of independent mental functioning." (Johnson & Dellagnelo, 2013 p. 415). Thus, what was taken into account were the instances of perceived change along the mediational process the teacher went through; in this sense, the process of observation evolved as the development of the individual also evolved. Interpretative analysis of the data was used to verify the research questions.

3.3 Setting and participants

3.3.1 Setting: Language Institute, design of classes and guidelines for class observation

The Language Institute (LI) where the research was carried out adopts a communicative language teaching approach, and sees learning in

alignment with sociocultural theories. Besides, learning is considered a

process that involves an active participation of learners in fulfilling

tasks. The construct of tasks adopted by the LI (expressed in the

preservice material) follows Nunan's (1991) definition,

> a task is any activity or action which is carried out as the result of processing or understanding language (i.e., as a response). For example, drawing a map while listening to a tape, listening to an instruction and performing a command, may be referred to as tasks. (Nunan, 1991, p. 280).

The LI has a class plan model, called TAF (Task Analysis

Framework, see Appendix A), which should guide teachers when

preparing classes. Thus, the analysis of the classes and the feedbacks

given by the teacher educator on this study took into account the

guidelines provided by the school for class observation.

The TAF is based on the notions of Communicative Task by

Nunan (1989), who defines it as

> A piece of classroom work which involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is principally focused on meaning rather than form. The task should also have a sense of completeness, being able to stand alone as a communicative act in its own right. (Nunan,1989, p. 10)

Therefore, each activity (involving a different skill or different

goal) is considered a different task; thus, one single class may have more

than one task (usually from two to three); which implies that there may

be more than one TAF per class.

The TAF was also based on Nunan's definition of task

components, "the definition of a learning task requires the specification

of four components: the goal, the input (linguistic or otherwise), the

activities derived from this input, and finally the roles implied for

teacher and learners" (p. 47). Taking this definition as a model, the

components of the TAF are (Polifemi, 2009): goal of task, input data,

grouping, instructions, procedures, link to the next task and related

homework. When preparing classes, teachers should answer some

questions in order to reflect on the components of the TAF.

The foci of the questions are: 1.Goals: Teacher (T) should know

what students (Ss) should be able to do by the end of the task; and which

of the communicative competences (sociolinguistic, grammatical,

discourse or strategic) is/are the focus of the task (Canale & Swain,

1980). 2. Input Data: what kind of input data is available for Ss to

accomplish the task; besides the book, what sources of information can

be explored/ used. 3. Grouping: what setting will be used - individual,

open pair, pair work, small groups, open group, the rationale behind it,

and what kind of interaction this task will generate (T-Ss? Ss- Ss). 4.

Instructions: how T is going to tell Ss what they are expected to do (for

example, Ss will read, silently or aloud; T will explain the instructions).

5. Procedures: this component is divided into 3 phases: 5.1.*Preparation*, whose goal is to set the mood for the activity, contextualize, help build up Ss' confidence, make Ss perceive the goals of the task , make instructions less 'explained' and more 'practical, by conducting open pair (T- student (S) and/or S-S) modelling of the linguistic goal of the task. In this phase, T plays a more central role through more controlled activities like open pairs, choral repetition, T-Ss and Ss-Ss guided dialogues, etc., depending on the type of task and its goals. T should pay attention to how to incorporate information brought up by Ss into the lesson; 5.2. *Performing*, when Ss will work at their own pace and will try to accomplish the task in pairs, small groups, etc. T acts more like an observer and supervisor, trying to make sure everyone is actively involved in the activity, helping Ss who are stuck for ideas; not interfering. Special attention should be given to early finishers, so they will make the most of class time; so, T should be attentive and provide them with further practice; 5.3. *Accountability*, which helps foster in Ss a perception of the way they use the language. In this phase, the T checks learning results and helps Ss realize how much they learned through the activity. The sort of accountability will vary according to the goal of the task. Some typical accountability activities include: asking Ss

to report on their findings or on their conversations, comparing different

results, dramatizing short dialogues, asking Ss about the language they

used, asking students to tell how they got to their answers, etc. 6. Link to

the next task: How the task is linked smoothly into the next task, so as

not to break the flow of the class. 7. Related homework: the T should

explain the homework, the activities carried out in the classroom should

be linked to the homework assigned and the work done at home should

be brought up and incorporated into the classroom. (See Appendix A for

TAF model and the TAFs filled out by the novice teacher). Special

attention is given to *Procedures* in the TEP, therefore, in order to outline

the previous information, I present Figure 1:

Procedures	
Preparation	• Contextualize (set the mood); • Model (help build up Ss confidence, make instructions less explained and more practical, make Ss perceive task goal); • Incorporate information brought up by Ss.
Performing	• Ss carry out the task at their own pace; • Teacher's role is of an observer; • Pay attention to early finishers.
Accountability	• Help Ss perceive what they have learned; • Check learning results.

Figure 1: Summary of the objectives of the three phases of Procedures.

The LI offers a 60-hour pre-service course for teachers before

they engage in the actual teaching. In the pre-service course (called TEP

- Teacher Education Program), teachers are presented with the theory

and method underlining the classes to be taught, through workshops, where they are asked to reason upon the concepts adopted by the LI, via group work, pair work or individual work. Moreover, they get to know the pedagogical materials adopted and the way in which the LI deals with evaluation. In addition to this, teachers are asked to plan and present classes to their peers (micro-teaching) along the preservice, first focusing on one specific aspect (for example, oral skills, listening,…), and in the end of the TEP teachers are asked to prepare and present a whole lesson. In either case, they receive feedback both from their peers and academic coordinator.

The TEP had eighteen participants, amongst which one – to be introduced in the next section - was selected to participate. The study focused on one of the groups assigned to this teacher along her first semester in the LI. The classes observed were eight one-hour-twenty-minute classes, held twice a week. Students were required to take part in classes and do the homework. The classes follow a communicative approach to learning, so the emphasis was primarily on oral communication (speaking and listening). Grammar is taught inductively (with students reasoning upon and discovering the rules with the help of the teacher). The writing part was basically approached in homework, which students were supposed to do at home and hand in the workbook

(called Resource Book) to the teacher, so the homework was not corrected in class, the teacher corrected it at home and assigned a mark to each student. There is also the school website, with activities that were carried out both in class (in another room called Resource Center, which had five computers with access to the internet) and as homework. The group was consisted of six students, from 11 to 12 years old, who had studied English before, from 2 to 5 years.

3.3.2 Participants

The participants of this research are the novice teacher and the researcher, as teacher educator. Following there is a brief description of them.

3.3.2.1 Novice teacher

One novice teacher from the LI was selected as the case study for this research, based on the criteria of lack of experience in teaching and willingness to participate in the research. At the time of the study, Nicole was twenty-five years old, Brazilian. Having lived in the USA for five years and a half, she did middle school and high school there, finishing her high school education as an exchange student in France. In 2012, she was a volunteer English teacher in Nigeria, where she stayed

for three months. After returning to Brazil, she started teaching private English classes, without having had any pedagogical course or training, while she studied Dentistry. After two years studying to be a dentist and teaching English as a hobby and a way of making some money, Nicole realized that what she really wanted was to be an English teacher, and decided to quit Dentistry and start studying Letras. It was then that she decided to teach in a language school, and in the summer of 2015 she took the TEP, starting teaching there soon after that, as well as beginning taking Letras at UFSC, also in March 2015. Her level of English proficiency is mastery or proficient.

3.3.2.2 The teacher Educator

Paola has been working as an English teacher since 1989, both in language schools and regular schools, having taught children, teenagers and adults. Besides teaching, she was also a teacher educator for ten years, in two language schools, working in the LI as a teacher for over twenty five years, and as academic coordinator for ten years. At the time this study was conducted she was not working as an academic coordinator at the LI anymore, neither was she a teacher there.

Her job as a teacher educator consisted of attending teachers' classes, giving feedback, formulating and implementing pedagogical and

linguistic developmental plans for teachers, preparing and giving
pedagogical workshops, that is, assisting teachers in pedagogical matters
as a whole. She has a degree in Letras from UFRGS, a specialist degree
in teaching methodologies from UNINTER and is currently taking an
M.A. degree in linguistic studies at UFSC, focusing on teacher
education. She has taken part in more than thirty pedagogical workshops
and seminars, formulated and presented several workshops on teaching,
and has presented in four language seminars.

3.4 Data Collection

3.4.1 Procedures

In the course of four months, eight classes taught by the novice teacher
were attended and filmed, and feedback was given by the teacher
educator (the author of this research). The frequency of classes and
feedback sessions should have been twice a month, every fortnight.
Unfortunately, Nicole had to leave the school before the end of the
semester, so the research was abridged (the last two classes were
supposed to be in June, but one was in the end of May and the other in
the beginning of June. So, the classes attended were: two in March, two
in April, three in May and one in June of 2015).

Prior to the class, the teacher planned it based on the class plan model adopted by the language institute (TAF), and this class plan was handed in to the teacher educator before or after class attendance, in hand or by e-mail. The data for this research was collected by videotaping both the classes and the feedback sessions, which were subsequently analyzed by the researcher, and the parts of the classes and the feedback sessions that were relevant to the study were transcribed.

Nicole also answered one assessment questionnaire about her perception on where she stood as a teacher, three follow-up questionnaires about her perceptions on her development, and one overall questionnaire (assessment questionnaire was applied at the beginning of the research, the follow-up questionnaires were applied after months one, two, three and overall questionnaire after month four). See Appendix B for questionnaires.

3.4.2 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted before the actual research, in order to test the data collection tools and procedures. It consisted of filming one class taught by a pilot study teacher, subsequent feedback given by the teacher educator (also filmed), and the application of one assessment questionnaire intended to evaluate this teacher's perception of the pre-

service, his alleged strengths and weaknesses as a teacher, and how he intended to improve his weaknesses. The pilot-study teacher had had ten years' experience both as an English teacher and school coordinator in several language schools, but started to work in the LI in the same semester this study took place, so he was a new teacher to the methodology of the LI.

Unfortunately the teacher selected to the pilot study had to exit the study due to personal reasons, so there was only one class and one mediating session. From the pilot study experience, I could make modifications on the feedback session (the mediating session): instead of showing all the class to the teacher, I showed only the parts where there was something to be commented on (according to my perspective and the guidelines of the school); this modification was done due to time constraints, and this way, the mediating session became more dynamic and to-the-point. However, I acknowledge that due to this modification, there was a limitation concerning the novice teacher's eventual perceptions, anxieties and needs.

3.4.3 Mediating sessions

These sessions focused primarily on practical examples of this particular novice teacher, when she was invited to discuss teaching practices,

verbalize the rationales behind her attitudes and decision-making processes, as well as her feelings, perceptions and doubts. This way, we could open a discussion regarding her teaching practices. Apart from that, along the four months in which the sessions took place, the novice teacher was asked to give feedback on the perception of her own development, besides comparing the classes taught by her before and after the mediating sessions (in writing, by answering the questionnaires aforementioned).

The mediating sessions had two stages: pre and during sessions. In the pre-phase, I watched the classes taught and perceived what should be talked about, taking notes on the exact time each instance took place; I also filled in a Class Observation Form (COF) for each mediating session, focusing on the TAF guiding questions, as well as on eventual other pedagogical aspects that came about, and compared the classes taught to the TAFs Nicole had planned. (See COFs at Appendix C).

During the mediating sessions, I asked Nicole about her general impressions of the classes, and then I showed specific moments in the class, trying to elicit the rationales behind her attitudes, like what a given moment aimed at (in terms of the task components of the TAF), why she took a given attitude, what could be other ways of dealing with that specific aspect, what were the consequences of that attitude, etc.

3.5 Data analysis

The data analysis followed a qualitative paradigm, which "is the analysis by directly reflecting upon and trying to interpret data" (Allwright and Bailey,1991, p. 65), in which a microgenetic study was carried out with a teacher in a case study. For the analysis of the data, interpretative content analysis was used, by observing, thinking about, and reflecting upon the data at hand, focusing on the TAF components. After a first inspection, I realized that the amount of data was too vast for a master's thesis, therefore I focused on aspects that brought about more change:*Prepararion* (the first phase of *Procedures*) and *Links*.

In the interpretation I tried to find signs of reflective teaching (reasoning thinking and sense of plausibility), and the tenets present in the sociocultural theory (concept development, ZPD, internalization and mediation). As far as mediation is concerned, I analyzed its quality, considering three types, as discussed in section 2.1.1 of the Review of Literature: the two types mentioned by Wertsch, namely explicit mediation (intentional) and implicit mediation (unintentional), and what I will call intentional implicit mediation, when the expert other intentionally leads the other person (in this case, the novice teacher) to discover the answers by herself, giving clues so that she reflected and

reorganized the activity on her own, though guided by me, aiming at driving her to a certain reasoning.

To answer research questions 1 and 2, (1. "How do the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice teacher's discourse?", and 2. "How do the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice teacher's practice?"), I analyzed the classes and the mediating sessions, specifically focusing on changes that were possibly motivated by previous feedback during the sessions.

The analysis consisted of: first, I watched the classes and the mediating sessions, making a chart of the topics that emerged in the mediating sessions; second, I compared the topics among the mediating sessions, analyzing both the practice (what the teacher did) and the discourse (what she said), both in the classes and in the mediating sessions, regarding the aforementioned constructs (TAF model); third, I selected the TAF components that presented a higher rate of change during the study; fourth, I transcribed the excerpts of the mediating sessions in which these topics emerged and analyzed them, referring to the theoretical foundations of my study.   The codes adopted in the transcriptions are provided in Figure 2.

Transcription Conventions	
T	Teacher
TE	Teacher Educator
S	Student
Ss	Students
[ ]	Encloses non-verbal and/or paralinguistic information (e.g. [laugh]);
Aham	Expression used to show agreement
Hummm	Expression used showing hesitation /pause
(…)	Short hesitation/pause
(!)	Expression of counter-expectation (e.g. surprise, amazement, etc.);
Italics	text in English with a grammar mistake/ use of bad words/ in Portuguese/ showing emphasis.

Figure 2: transcription conventions used when transcribing the classes and interactions presented in this study.

To answer research question 3 ("How does the novice teacher perceive themselves differently? Do they feel more confident about their teaching? In what ways?"), I analyzed the responses given in the questionnaires Nicole answered.

3.6 Ethics Review Board

Since this is a research that involved human subjects, an approval from the Ethics Review Board (CEPSH-UFSC) was submitted and granted under number 953.102. See appendix D for consent forms.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Introduction

The data collected for this study, about 10 hours of classes and 12 hours of Mediating Sessions (MS) and five questionnaires, is too vast to be thoroughly analyzed in a master's thesis, due to its restriction in size and scope. Therefore, as previously mentioned, the analysis will consist of the most relevant features presented in accordance with the goal of this study, which is to trace how the novice teacher Nicole developed along the study, reminding that the research question guiding this study is "To what extent do the mediating sessions between teacher educator and novice teacher impact the teacher?, and the specific questions are (i) How do the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice teacher's discourse?; (ii) How do the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice teacher's practice? and (iii) Does the novice teacher perceive herself differently? Does she feel more confident about her teaching? In what ways?

To answer the two first specific questions, I analyzed the classes and mediating sessions. To answer the third question, I analyzed the questionnaires Nicole answered along the study.

From the constructs analyzed (the TAF components, which are: *Goal, Input, Setting, Procedures* (subdivided into *Preparation*, *Performing* and *Accountability*), *Link to the next task* and *Related Homework*, one caught my attention as the aspect Nicole had most difficulty with, and where there was the most relevant development: *Preparation*. Different aspects of preparation have been analyzed, which are: *Contextualization* and *Modeling*. Along with this, I have looked at another TAF component*: Links* to the next task, which, although another task component, is intertwined with *Preparation* and presented significant initial difficulty and eventual change.

Concept development is an issue that deserves attention in the present analysis. As discussed along the chapter that provides the theoretical rationale for this study, Vygotsky poses that knowledge presupposes thinking in concepts, which, in turn, presupposes the dialectical and conflicting movement between scientific concepts and everyday concepts. One type of knowledge without the other does not suffice to form a concept.

4.2 Analysis of classes and Mediating Sessions:

4.2.1 Preparation

According to the Teacher Education Program (TEP) in the institution where this work took place, and particularly to the preservice that is offered to teachers prior to start teaching at this LI, *Preparation* has to do with: contextualizing (setting the mood for the activity) and modelling (helping build up students' confidence, making students perceive the goals of the task, making instructions less 'explained' and more 'practical'). In the specific subsections that follow there will be more details about these two components.

4. 2. 1.1 Contextualization

Contextualization is related to *Preparation*, in *Procedures*, and has to do with creating a context that enables the emergence of the topic to be studied/ discussed, so as to lead students to get in the mood for what will be dealt with in a specific task. According to the TEP material, this is the moment when the teacher and students get involved in the task. Therefore, it is not enough to explain what to do in the task (instructions), there is the need to create an atmosphere by relating it to reality and providing a link among the various tasks.

It is expected that teachers contextualize every task; however, the way to do it varies not only according to the objectives of the task, but also to the teacher's personality, or, as Parsons and Shils (1951) argue, *need-dispositions*, defined as "individual tendencies to orient and act with respect to objects in certain manners and to expect certain consequences of these actions" (p. 14). In the preservice offered by the Language Institute (LI), teachers are presented with an array of ways of contextualizing tasks (theoretical concepts), as well as are provided with a chance to apply them in the microteachings.

It was both in the beginning of the class and in listening tasks (happening either at the beginning or in the middle of the class) that I have found the most significant instances of problems in contextualization. For that matter, I will call it *class contextualization* for the ones happening at the first task of the day*, and listening contextualization* for the ones related to listening exercises. This analysis follows a chronological order, so there are instances of both class and listening contextualization.

The extract that follows is from the first mediating session (MS1), in which aspects from the first class were discussed. This passage displays the teacher's lack of understanding as regards the concept of *Contextualization* and its misuse in the first class. In order to

make it easier for the reader, I repeat the codes adopted in the

transcriptions:

Transcription Conventions	
T	Teacher
TE	Teacher Educator
S	Student
Ss	Students
[ ]	Encloses non-verbal and/or paralinguistic information (e.g. [laugh]);
Aham	Expression used to show agreement
Hummm	Expression used showing hesitation /pause
(…)	Short hesitation/pause
(!)	Expression of counter-expectation (e.g. surprise, amazement, etc.);
Italics	text in English with a grammar mistake/ use of bad words/ in Portuguese/ showing emphasis.

Figure 2: transcription conventions used when transcribing the classes and interactions presented in this study.

Excerpt 1: (Mediating Session 1 (MS1) (time: 3:42- 10:28)- See Appendix A2.1 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
TE: [TE shows the part of the class in which the T starts the class by asking Ss if the remembered the video they saw last class, and although Ss said they did, she tries to show the video again, but there was a technical problem and she could not] Ok, …, what part of the class was this?
T: The opening?
TE: The opening yes, …, remember the three phases of an oral task, in the training, there were three phases, right, the Preparation, Performing and Accountability…
T: ok…
TE: Yes, remember that? So what part of the class is this?
T: … Preparation?
TE: The preparation, aham… do you remember what you should do before engaging in the activity itself?
T: … set the mood?
TE: Set the mood, exactly, or in other words, contextualizing.
T: Aham.

TE: Do you think that was done?

T: Actually, I thought I was setting the mood by the video, but I guess I wasn't… yeah, no.

TE: ok, why not? Why saying "let's watch the video" is not the contextualization?

T: because they had even already watched it, …

TE: When did they watch the video?

T: Last class.

TE: [Nods in agreement] So there were two days (in between classes), so maybe they remembered, maybe not… So how do you think you could have "warmed up" the class? Because it's the same as saying "let´s open the book", and you remember in the TEP, the Preservice, that teachers shouldn't just arrive in class and say "open the book", so you should have a contextualization before engaging in the activity, right?

T: could I just say… I couldn't do that, right? Humm, what I wanted to do was actually start asking "do you remember the video from last class", but then I was so afraid that they wouldn't remember, that I showed the video before, you know what I mean, the part I did after this was actually my first plan… and then I thought it's like you always… what is the contrary of overestimate…

TE: Underestimate

T: Underestimate your students, I feel like I do that, because they remembered everything, we didn't have time, the internet was not working, and still they remembered.

TE: Aham, they remembered. So, just by saying "do you remember the video we watched last class" and eliciting, as you did in the rest of the class, "what was it about?", which was the activity you did after the video, right, actually you didn't have to watch the video again, yeah, because they remembered.

T: Yeah, that was my idea, but I was afraid…

TE: No, yeah… I think you should go with your guts, so that would be contextualizing, yeah. Other ideas to contextualize would be to start talking (maybe) "hummm do you like films, do you watch films, what kind of films do you like?, do you like documentaries?"(because that was a kind of documentary), so if you're starting a class with a video, maybe that would be a good idea to start, just by raising their curiosity, making them think about what they're going to see, what they're going to do, etc. ok? And, what do you think is the importance of warming up? Because it's in the TAF for a reason… why do you think contextualizing is important?

T: well… to warm the brain up! [laughs], and not just throw information, it's so hard, you know…when you get the whole information and you break into pieces, I would do it for a listening activity, well, for everything.

TE: So, you think it's important, to warm up…

T: Yes, that was my goal

TE: That's ok… hummm (TE reads the TAF filled out by T) the objective for this task was …warm up, you said, "it's a link from last class's activity, we watched a video of a girl who had lost a lot of weight", so the objective was "to raise awareness of healthy eating habits and bullying. Also, for listening skills improvement". And then my comment on the TAF was "even being a link from last class, there's still the need to warm the class up… how could you have done that? And what's the importance of that?"

T: So you think that maybe not watching the video and just making them remember…

TE: Yes, I don't think you would need to watch it, because you couldn't and they remembered everything.

T: Yeah, I was so afraid, but they… because last class I had to switch classes with somebody else to watch it, I didn't have my tablet or anything, and I didn't get their feedback when they left, because we had to switch classes…

TE: Hummm, there was no accountability.

T: No, and I was… I didn't know if they got it, that's why I was so…

TE: But even so you assigned some questions, guiding questions, so… I think you said… [TE reads in TAF] "How are you going to set the mood for the task? We are going to watch the movie again. And before that", I put.

T: Yeah…but I wanted to watch the video after the questions, to see if they get it, like "ok, now let's see if you got it"

TE: Aham, because there was a lack of accountability last class… but actually with the questions they got everything, right?

In MS1, Nicole showed a lack of understanding of the concept

contextualization, in practice and discourse, which might indicate that

there was a need to put theory into practice and/or practice into theory.

The scientific concepts presented at the TEP had not yet conflated with

the spontaneous concepts needed to internalize this concept, even after

the microteaching phase of the TEP. This can be observed by the fact

that even having filled in the TAF Nicole did not remember the name of

the TAF component. She mistook *Contextualization* with *Opening* -

which is a session of the book. Nicole used her own terms to explain the

goal of contextualization (to "warm the brain up"), which might indicate

that the goal of the concept was clear, although she failed to perform it.

Her fear that students would not remember the video shown in the

previous class prevented her from following what she had planned,

which would then be a class contextualization (asking questions before

the video was shown again).

Nicole also displayed lack of knowledge of the term

Accountability, which is another component of the TAF, referring to it

as *feedback*. Yet, she realized this ´feedback´ was missing from her

previous class, which indicates she perceived the necessity of doing it in

the end of each task, that is, she engaged in pedagogical reasoning. This

appears to show that what she lacks is in fact the discourse (familiarity

with the nomenclature) of the LI's nomenclature, and according to

Vygotsky, naming (knowledge of words) is an invaluable technical aid

for thinking: "Real concepts are impossible without words, and thinking

in concepts does not exist beyond verbal thinking. That is why the

central moment in concept formation, and its generative cause, is a specific use of words as functional "tools." (Vygotsky,1962, p. 107)

As for the quality of mediation provided in this session, the mediation was both explicit (explaining, defining, teaching concepts) and intentional implicit (leading Nicole to come to the concepts herself).The explicit mediation was necessary for her to understand the nomenclature and purposes, but at the same time intentional implicit, when asking her to think about and provide answers before actually explaining them. This way, I was trying to act upon her zone of proximal development (ZPD), which was then confirmed with later classes, when the concept *Contextualization* became clearly internalized, both in Nicole's practice and discourse.

Expanding the TAF component *Preparation*, another aspect that presented initial challenge and eventual development was *Listening Contextualization,* which involves the preparation for listening tasks (which can be in the beginning of a class, demanding a class contextualization, or in the middle of the class, requiring a pre-listening contextualization).

One of the strategies that can be used to prepare students for a listening task is to explore the pictures (besides other pre-listening activities, like predicting and anticipating the topic, reading the options

of the listening task, clearing up unknown vocabulary, etc). In the

beginning of this study, Nicole's classes showed a lack of pre-listening

activities, what might indicate that either this was not emphasized in the

TEP or that it had not made sense to her during the training program. As

we can see in the following passage, Nicole went straight to the listening

without preparing students first.

Excerpt 2- MS 2 (5:00- 7:33) - See Appendix A2.6 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
[TE showing an Excerpt of class 2 on TV] T: Ok, are you ready to listen? First, listen, just listen, and think, ok?]
TE: So, what part of the class, or what part of the second task is this?
T: (…) I don't know!
TE: The preparation for the second task…
T: Ah ok… but actually, I didn't like what I did… I don't think they should be so… soltos… so free TE: *loose*
T: Yeah, loose for the first listening, I don't know…
TE: That's what I was going to comment…
T: really?
TE: Yeah, because the instructions were "listen and think"… so, think of what?
T: Yes!
TE: What do you think you should've done for the first listening?
T: I think I should've stuck to the book, the instructions, it says first they listen and just check the vocabulary, then listen one more time for this part, see if they get it right, and then listen to it one more time to get the second, I think. I realized it while they were listening, like what's the point.
TE: OK, that's good! Yeah, you realized it before I even said something, they always have to have a point in listening, in reading; so" listen and think" is not actually a point, think about what?, your life? , what you're going to do after here? [laughs]. So, "listen and think what they're talking about", "listen and see if what we talked about before they also mention", you could have, without following the book, but it should be more directed, a little more directed".

In the second class, Nicole did something that did not work out the way she wanted, and she realized it before MS 2, which showed that, although this was her first class after the first MS, she was engaging in a reflective process, even during the class, as she mentioned. She realized that and attributed this to her way of giving instructions, which was a pseudoconcept of contextualization, as it seemed that it was the same thing for her.

Nicole's availability and openness to change made it possible for me to comment on that contextualization aspect in MS 2, and despite the mediation being primarily explicit, it was also reassuring, in the sense that what Nicole thought was not adequate in her class met what I was going to comment on, although we had different ways of seeing the same thing: I thought she lacked contextualization and she thought she had problems with instructions; yet, we were already sharing a level of intersubjectivity. We can notice here Nicole's *sense of plausibility* into action, when she mentioned she "didn't like" what she had done in class. She realized the consequence of what she did (that students lacked purpose for listening, and were not prepared for it, and therefore might have had more difficulty in understanding the listening passage). This may show that Nicole developed *sense of causation* of the way she had conducted the instructions for the listening before MS 2 took place, even

not knowing how to name it (she mentioned the students were loose –

"soltos" –, showing that her discourse about listening preparation was

absent).

In class 4, Nicole already presented an instance of the concept

being formed, when she showed a significant development in class

contextualization, even just after 3 classes and MSs; this might be an

indication that this concept was within Nicole's ZPD.

Excerpt 3: MS 4 (15:58- 19:34) See Appendix A2.12 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
TE: What part of the class was it?
T: Contextualization
TE: Aham, and what did you do in order to contextualize, how was this process?
T: I linked it to last class, and then I wanted them to pick the word technology, so I could bring up this to today.
TE: Did they do that?
T: Yeah [laughs] they did (score), I knew they would bring it up, technology, because that's what they do, they don't know how to play, I even told my mom yesterday, I feel sorry for these kids…
TE: Aham, playing without computers, right? So you got… actually you were talking about pollution right? Then I thought, oh, ok, let's see how she handles that… and it was really well, I think it was really smooth…do you feel that?
T: Yeah!
TE: Do you feel the difference between what you used to do in the first class … and now?
T: Oh Yeah! The first class was horrible!
TE: No, it was not horrible, but do you feel the necessity of doing that or you're just doing because the method says you should?
T: [Pause] No, I think it's better.
TE: In what ways?
T: Hummm I think that it's because they don't feel like: "Ok, today we're going to talk about this", and then it's like "ok, let me get

prepared". They just go with the flow and it just flows. So, I think it's better, you got me!

As portrayed, in this class, Nicole elicited the previous topic and linked to the topic of the class, which were completely different (pollution and technology). However, she managed to draw a smooth link between the two topics and contextualize the class. In MS 4, Nicole used the name (contextualization), and when enquired could explain why she did it, and the advantages of doing it. We can notice this concept was becoming internalized both in her practice as well as in her discourse, and more importantly, was rooted in her beliefs of good practices. Her final remark, "you got me", hints at the idea that first she did not perceive or believe in the importance or the necessity of contextualizing the class, and that along the four classes and MSs she realized it.

The interaction that Nicole and I engaged in also evolved from a more explicit to a more implicit kind – although intentional one, trying to make the teacher aware of what she was doing, eliciting answers from her, and reassuring her decisions and practice.

The class contextualization dealt with before has to do with the teacher's effort to start the class with a warm-up that engages students into the topic of the class. However, the material also provides input for

contextualization, which is the introductory session of the unit. In this

session, there are usually textual aids (vocabulary) and visual aids

(pictures, charts, graphs, etc), both playing a significant role. The

following passage, also from Class 4, shows that Nicole neglected this

nonlinguistic information from the book.

Excerpt 4: Class 4 (12:42- 15:04) See Appendix A2.12 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
T: Let's see other kinds of crazes, from the 90's (…) everybody, turn to page 25 (T looks at TAF) Ready? Everybody, take a look here, it says "crazes of the 90's", take a look at them and see what you know…
Ss: *Power Rangers! Pokemon*! (Ss say other inaudible words, reacting to what's portrayed on the book)
T: [Shush] But you can read quietly… why are you so excited? quiet, just read [Shush]… why is that so funny? [Ss keep giggling and talking] Did you read them all?
S1: *Poly*!
T: Do you like *Poly*? I had one, I had *Poly*. Good, everybody, did you take a good look at them? Gabriel, please, read the first one, crazes of the 90's, movies. Everybody, listen!
S2: Crazes of the 90's: *Titanic, Jurassic Park, Home Alone, Men in Black*.
T: Do you know these movies? *Jurassic Park*, do you know that?
Ss: Yeah/ no.

In MS 4, I tried to lead Nicole to perceive the importance and

purpose of pictures on the material, as it follows in Excerpt 5.

Excerpt 5: MS4 (27:20- 34:23)
TE: Ok, then you told them to open the books [TE shows the class Excerpt described above]. So, you asked them to open the book on… after you've established what crazes meant, you asked them to open their books [TE gets the Student's book and opens on the pages of the class]. The first thing you see when you open the book is what?, when you open the book, imagine you're a student…
T: I think I see that [pointing at pictures].

TE: So, you see pictures, right? You don't see words…

T: Oh! OK! Sorry!

TE: No, no sorry…ok

T: Maybe… that's what they see… oh, I think I should've asked them… about the pictures.

TE: What do you think?

T: Yeah… I should [looking at book].

TE: Why would you do that? Why would you ask them about the pictures first, before they read?

T: Humm [pause] I think I would do that to, like, explore more "crazes"… but I don't know if this is so important since we had such a long preparation… maybe this could be a preparation if I had done…

TE: OK, it could be…

T: Because, see, we talked about… [looking at book], no, ok, never mind..

TE: The first thing he said… [TE shows S saying "Power Rangers" in the video] was *Power Ranger*… so, there's a picture of *Power Rangers* here, so the first thing they noticed was the picture… the first thing you notice when you open these pages are the pictures, right? (T: ok). Why do you think the pictures are important? Because they're here for a reason…

T: To… to visualize, to visual aid the whole unit… the whole, I mean, goal, that is crazes.

TE: You mean the topic?

T: Aham… you know, I didn't even notice the pictures…

TE: Aham, let's see if the teacher's book says something…

T: I'm sure it does…I really do.

TE: [TE opens the teacher's book file on the screen and reads from it] "Before Ss are in the activity make sure they understand the meaning of crazes", which you did, "you may give some examples or use the pictures on the page", so one thing would be to use the pictures on the page, the pictures are mentioned, they have a purpose, otherwise it would be just black and white, which is cheaper… besides, they have the words here… "Home alone", for example [TE shows the picture of the film *Home Alone* on the page], and the picture is there… so the pictures are here for a reason…

T: Yeah, especially because one of them said he didn't know what *Home Alone* was… I could've just shown the picture…I didn't realize it was there…

TE: Yeah, sometimes we're so worried about what the words say, and we forget that we have all this [showing the pages] to support us, to help

us.. like the *Pokémon's* here, so cute… so, you asked them to open the books and read silently… how could you have explored the pictures? Thinking now… ok, I have pictures… what do you think you could have done?

T: I could've asked them, like "what do you see, what catches your attention, about the pictures…"

TE: Aham, and do you think this would be better, more positive? In what way would this help?

T: Hummm [pause] I think they had already gotten the point, but it could be an extra help, actually, if I hadn't done the whole preparation…

TE: About the word "Crazes", yeah… and if you hadn't brought the realia…

T: Yeah, but I could still use that… as a plus…because actually the words are written there, and they could match, actually to understand words that they don't know… I think they knew everything, but… not *Home Alone*, for example.

TE: Which is an old movie, right?

T: Yeah… the word *pagers*… ah there isn't…

TE: Yeah, you drew the word pagers… your explanations are really good. So, whenever you have an opening, or a listening, or a reading, and there are pictures, always remember they are there for a reason, ok, it would be much cheaper to do a black and white book…

T: Yeah… I didn't even notice the pictures…

TE: I see, I understand, no problem… just…they are there, right?

T: Yeah.

As shown, the teacher didn't even notice there were pictures on the pages she was working with, which might indicate that class preparation focused primarily on what was written on the book, not on the visual aids. Maybe this aspect had not been emphasized in the TEP, or maybe T did not consider them important, after all it was not in her conceptual framework of contextualization.

Yet, as seen in the sentences highlighted in bold, at my prompt of what one sees in the book as they open it, she immediately realized

that she had lacked using the pictures to contextualize the topic, which,

again, appears to signal that this issue was already in Nicole's ZPD.

However, still in class 4, there is another example of lack of

listening contextualization. Nicole took the activity of exploring the

pictures as contextualization. As we can see in the following passage,

Nicole went straight to the listening without preparing students first.

Excerpt 6- Class 4 (42:00- 43:40) See Appendix A2.14 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
T: [T and Ss were talking about the crazes of the 90's, giving examples of games their parents played and the games they play now] Now, if we go to page 26, let's see what other kids have to say about the crazes of their time. Sounds good? [Ss open their books on the page and T puts the CD in the CD player]. Please, read the instructions [T holds her book so that Ss can see the page she's on, pointing at the instructions]. Ricardo, please, read the instructions, right here, on Task 1[Ss sing, talk] Are you? Guys! Please, instructions right here… tell me if you don't understand. [Ss read silently] Do you understand what you're supposed to do? What are you supposed to do, S1? [S1 says something, inaudible] She? No!
S2: You know, like number 1, I like to watch *power* movies, *daí*…
T: Aham
S2: Then you put number one…
T: okay. [T explains task to Ss who was were? out of class] you know what you're supposed to do? You number the conversations. [T plays the CD]

The page the listening exercise was on displayed a lot of

pictures, which were very important to understand the listening, as

students had to understand the pictures so they could match them with

what they listened. However, Nicole did not explore this in her class, as

portrayed above. In MS 7, this was discussed:

Excerpt 7: MS 4b (15:00- 17:45) See Appendix A2.12 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.

TE: Ok, then you're going to start the exercise. Between the instructions and the CD, there's something missing…

T: Humm…

TE: Humm… it has to do with something we talked before [T is silent]. Take a look at the page… [T looks at the book pages dealt with in class].

T: Humm… they should talk about the pictures before?

TE: What do you think? Why do you think it would be interesting to do that?

T: To contextualize, and to *kinda* know what they're looking for… does it say that in the Teacher's book?

TE: Let's see… [TE shows the Teacher's book file on screen]… "before playing the CD, make sure Ss understand the illustrations.

T: Humm, ok… yes, I'll do that!

TE: Because the illustrations were really tricky… and you did something, I think, because you thought it was tricky…

T: What did I do?

TE: Sorry, just my assumption, well, so in what way would it help, to work with the illustrations?

T: Oh, I know what I did, I asked them to get into pairs to…

TE: Aham, afterwards…

T: Yeah, I could've asked them "what do you think this person is talking about", you know…

TE: And why do you think this would help?

T: It would help so they would know what they're trying to get from the… audio

TE: Aham, you see… so again, there are illustrations for a reason. So, whenever you open a book "oh, they're here, why", so go to the Teacher's book, see what they say, or not, sometimes the teacher's book doesn't say anything, but it's your judgement, right? If you think it's important, if you listen to something and it's tricky.

T: That would be good, especially because these ones are…

TE: Yeah, not so easy, right.

T: Yeah.

Still in class 4, Nicole made use of the strategy talked about

previously (listening with a purpose), but forgot to explore the pictures

on the page, which were crucial to the understanding of the exercise.

This forgetfulness is not meaningless; on the contrary, it illustrates that the role of visual aids to the contextualization of the activity is not yet appropriated and internalized by Nicole. It was only during the MS, after having gone through another conversation regarding the importance of this kind of contextualization that she reflected and understood the reason to make use of the resources provided by the material (visual aspects of the material).

The strategy I used, as I know Nicole will be on her own after this study, was to refer her to the teacher's book, because that is the mediating artifact that will always be available to her, and consulting it when preparing classes is a potentially powerful resource. By doing this, I wanted her to start seeing the teacher's manual as an expert other, which she could always resort to, in this path to self-regulation (from other to object to self-regulation).

Thus, the mediation offered here was more explicit, as she was not getting to the point by herself. Therefore, one can say that this aspect, although in her ZPD, needed more maturation to be internalized. In her following class, Nicole explored the pictures, but still not in an optimum way, as shown in the class contextualization of class 5, transcribed in Excerpt 8:

Excerpt 8: Class 5 (00:45- 6:53) See Appendix A2.16 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.

T: Guys, what were we talking about in the last unit? [silence] You don't remember, we were talking about something called crazes.

Ss: Ahhh

T: What were the crazes a long time ago?

S1: *Star Wars*

T: *Star Wars*

[Ss start talking about things in Portuguese]

T: Ok, what do you think, what kind of transportation you think, was a kind of craze when they discovered Brazil?

S2: *teletransportador*

S1: *Navio*

T:Ohh, what is *navio*? Ships!

S2: *Era caravela…*

T: Sailing ships

S3: Potato chips

T: What else? Did they have cars?

S3: *Não, era carruagem*.

T: Ahh, they had carriages, it's called carriage… with what kind of animals?

S4: Horses!

T: Horses!… and what kind of transportation you think are one of the crazes now? Everybody has one.

Ss: Car

T: Cars! Do you have a car? No? (teacher talks about an anecdote about a flat tire she had) Ok, so yesterday I took the bus.

S2: You take the bus? You take a car? You take a carriage?

T: You know, I took a carriage in New York once.

S2: Me too

T: Did you? (Ss talk- inaudible).Ok, So you think one of the crazes now is cars. Everybody takes cars. Why do people take cars?

S2: Because you take a horse in the mountain.

T: Ok, do you think it's good if I take a horse in the city?

Ss: No/ Yes

T: In a big city, like Floripa?

S1: Because a horse is no good on *pontes*

T: How do you say *pontes* in English? Bridge! Ok, so in a big city, I don't think it's good if we have a horse, I think we take a car because it's… faster.

S2: And you control the car, the horse is problem.

T: Yeah, but you control *the* horse.
S2: but you *lost* the control.
T: You can lose control. Ok. Also, what happens with the bus? [T points at her watch]
S4: Sometimes you *lose* the bus.
T: Hummm, sometimes you miss the bus.
S1: Teacher, *have* horses in the street.
T: But many horses?
S1: in the car *have* a horse
T: Oh my God! Guys, if we open our books on page 35, what do you see here? Pay attention to the picture. What kind of place is this? [Ss get their books and open on page 35] What kind of transportation do you see in the pictures?

In Class 5, Nicole managed to explore some of the visual aids on the page. Yet, although she was clear in her questions and had the students' participate and understand the vocabulary related to transportation, her behavior is more a display of the development of a pseudoconcept than of a concept properly said. This is because, as will be clear in Excerpt 9, despite the fact that she explored the pictures presented in the book and that these pictures displayed means of transportation, the objective of the lesson was to talk about city life, not about means of transportation properly said.

Excerpt 9: MS 5 (10: 38- 15:31)
TE:[after showing the previous Excerpt of class 5] So, what part of the class was this?
T: It waaaas contextualization… a long one!
TE: [laughs] Yeah, no but it's ok, it has always been… what is the topic of the last unit?
T: Crazes ?
TE: Crazes [nodding], so you started talking about this topic, yeah, and then you linked to the topic of this unit.

T: Aham.

TE: What is the topic of this unit?

T: You know what, I forgot!

TE: By watching, what do you think it is?

T: It was transportation, right?

TE: I thought it would be, but it's City Life.

T: Okay.

TE: Ok… so from watching the beginning, we assume that the topic of the whole unit is transportation… but it's a little bit "bigger" than that…

T: Okay…and then I didn't talk about the differences between the two cities in the picture, did I?

TE: Aham, no… So, you focused on transportation because that was your link. But what did you forget to do?

T: I forgot to talk about the picture, I think…the differences, not only transportation… but hummm, (why did I do that) I think I did that because of the… the listening…

TE: ok, but the listening is about places…

T: Yeah…I don't know…

TE: But you linked, it was a great link, very smooth… do you feel that?

T: No, I feel that.

TE: That the links are really smooth? It's going naturally. But then, you got to the page and… maybe because there are so many interruptions, that maybe, I don't know what happened, sometimes you can lose concentration, whatever.

T: Yeah, I think this class, specifically, I was not concentrated at all.

TE: Oh, why was that?

T: because of my car, and my exams, and… I made an experience and prepared this class… I prepared this class last Friday

TE: Oh, my, so there was almost a week before class.

T: Aham, and then I didn't have time to read…

TE: Aham, to go over it.

T: So, I think I'm not gonna do that anymore.

TE: Aham, good, so this is experience, right. Once I had to do this and it was terrible, because all your line of thought is lost.

T: That's what I thought yesterday, I kept looking at the TAF…

TE: But you didn't remember why you wrote that on the TAF anymore, right?

T: Yeah, specially the "me either, me neither" part… it was right there on my face and I didn't do it…

TE: But it's really good that now you are realizing things before our session… before you didn't have a clue about it.

T: Yeah!

TE: Now you're like "Oh, I should've done that….". This is the process the teacher engages when using this… reasoning, to, to reflect upon their classes, to think about what could have happened if I had done differently…that's really good… and you are engaging by yourself, I'm just here helping you, but you engaged in this before I told you so…

T: Yeah! Well, during class, I was like "S…", this is not good.

TE: So, there are so many elements here that you could've explored, yeah [TE shows the pages of the book], that have to do with the topic, city life, and not only with transportation, which is one of them.

T: Yeah… I didn't talk about… I remember, I thought about it at the time, that this side was the suburbs, and this side was a big city, but I didn't say… I think I was expecting them to say anything, but they didn't, and I forgot.

TE: Exactly… this is the suburbs and this is like, downtown [showing the pages on the book]. In our last meeting, we talked about exploring the pictures, you did it…kind of [laughs]. But it's a process, too, right. So, maybe try to explore more, extract things and have them talk about the picture itself, because there are a lot of things… Language Institute gives you 2 pages of pictures for you to do that, ok?

T: Aham.

TE: But it's so nice that you realized that…

What we see in this excerpt is that, at this point, Nicole even understands that it is important to explore pictures for the flow of the lesson and its contextualization, but she does not yet realize that this discussion has to be related to the objective of the lesson. In other words, it is not yet clear for her that the use of pictures and any kind of contextualization after all is goal-oriented, intentional, thus necessarily having to address the objective of the lesson (as previously mentioned, it was City Life, so the pages of the book showed a city, its suburban area

and its downtown, with buildings, houses, streets, people, and also means of transportation).

Therefore, this class depicted that exploring visual aids was taken into account, but the concept was still in process of formation, as she could have explored more, leading to the topic of the class. My initial assumption, that this concept was in her ZPD, was then corroborated, as she attempts to apply it in her practice in the following class, showing that what had been previously discussed resonated to her.

In MS 5, Nicole used the word *contextualization* to define the part of the class, which shows that she was using the concept in discourse. However, by failing to explore all the graphic elements of the page so as to pave the way into the topic of the lesson, she demonstrated that the concept was still only at the level of discourse and not yet at the level of performance. This is expected, at first these concepts are just names a person gives to certain strategies without owing it. It is just in the situated activity, and with the help of a more expert other that they start building bridges that allow them to connect the scientific concepts (the definitions) to the spontaneous concepts (the practice). .

Additionally, Nicole brought up her uneasiness of not remembering what she had prepared/written on the TAFs, because she had prepared them a week before, which shows that she was, at this

point, other-regulated by the TAF mainly. She could not self-regulate

yet. But the mention that she started to take in flight decisions in class

and that she was rethinking actions during class and realizing things

before the MSs may signal that she is engaging in a reflective process

that little by little is making her able to reason her teaching.

Nevertheless, confirming the twisting path to concept formation

(Smagorinsky, Cook, and Johnson, 2003), in the subsequent MS, Nicole

misuses the name *contextualization* for *link.*

**Excerpt 10: MS 6 (22:45- 23:00)- See Appendix A2.19 for TAF filled
out by teacher of this task.**
TE: [TE had showed the contextualization of class 6 on the TV to T].
And what part of the class was this?
T: I was still linking [laughs]
TE: Yes [laughs]… it's *contextualization*, yeah, you were
contextualizing…
T: Yeah, linking to the last unit and contextualizing…

In this MS, Nicole's mix-up might be explained by the way she

conducted the contextualizations: first she always elicited or reminded

students about the previous class topic, and then she linked it to the new

topic. So, these two concepts, although different, may seem intertwined

by the teacher, and therefore interchangeable. I corrected her saying it

was contextualization, which she agreed by saying she was linking to

the last unit and contextualizing.

In Class 7, Nicole's practice was in alignment with what had

been discussed with TE, and she showed understanding of the concept

of contextualization with the focus on visual aids, this time as a

Listening Preparation, both in practice and discourse.

Excerpt 11: Class 7 (6:00- 10:05)- See Appendix A2.21 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.

T: Ok, now let's go back to the previous class… what did we talk about? Remember we talked about internet. What did we talk about?

S1: Things that we should do and don't should do (SIC).

T: Yeah, they're internet safety tips, what's tips?

S2: D*icas*.

T: And then you did the homework, you checked each other's profile…what happened when you checked? Did you? Tell me the truth… ah you weren't here … so tell me one tip that you remember.

S1: Don't check in places.

T: Don't check in! Ok, one more.

S3: Don't take pictures of others.

T: Cool, ok… don´t post that you're traveling, remember?

S1: Don't accept strange people.

T: Don't add strangers on your *facebook*…humm we´re going to listen to a conversation, what do you think it's about?

S2: Internet

T: Yes.. internet…

S2: Tips

T: Tips? Safety tips… you agree? Does anybody have any other idea?

S1: Plans?

T: Maybe plans and safety tips… any ideas, Daniel, you're always… no? So we're going to listen and I want you to check if these two girls are correct… try to see what it's about, ok?... ok?

Ss: Okay!

In the MS, the improvement Nicole showed in preparing

students for a listening task was brought up for discussion, as shown in

Excerpt 12.

Excerpt 12: MS 7 (9:10- 10:00)
TE: So, here, you were talking about something, you were contextualizing, and then you linked to the listening, yeah. And this is something that you did that you didn't do before, do you realize that?
T: Yeah…
TE: Before you said, "ok, let's listen"
T: Ah, ok!
TE: Now you said "what do you think is gonna happen, maybe this", and then you elicited form them, and then they listened with a goal, yeah, this is something that was different. This is pre-listening, one pre-listening activity that is predicting, ok, the name of this is predicting.
T: Aham, ok…. But still it's not too short?
TE: No…we'll continue talking about this.
[TE shows the continuation of the class on screen]

By pointing out what Nicole did in this class, that was different from what she had been doing, I aimed at showing to the teacher her improvement, in terms of providing goals for listening activities and predicting the topic of the listening passage. By showing in her practice what was discussed in previous MSs theoretically, I tried to bridge the scientific concepts previously provided explicitly to the spontaneous concepts gathered from Nicole's practice. The fact that she had doubts about its efficacy (by saying "it's not too short?") is maybe an indication of what Wertsch (1998, p. 132) calls performance preceding competence. This concept, though already present in her practice, cannot yet be seen as a tool for thinking.

Nicole was able to apply the concept of contextualization in different contexts, either in listening activities, or in book activities,

which showed even more that the concept of contextualization was

strong enough to allow for generalization. A sign of the acquisition of a

scientific concept is the fact that one can generalize it and then apply it

in any context, not being limited by only one context, which is usually

the case of those who have everyday concepts.

We can notice Nicole's development in listening

contextualization in Excerpt 13, which pictures her in Class 7.

Excerpt 13: Class 7 (12:58- 18:18)- See Appendix A2.21for TA F filled out by teacher of this task.
T: Ok, what was the audio about?
S1: Internet safety tips.
T: How many people are there?
Ss: Two
T: Two?
S1: Yes, I think.
T: What´s it about?
S2: *Orkut, facebook, msn.*
T: No *facebook*, *orkut*, ok, social network.
S4: *Social flying beds*.
T: Social networks. Ok, is it… what is it saying? Anybody?
S4: She is talking to *he don't put the information on internet* .
T: Yeah, for example, *one* information .
S4: Cell phone.
S5: Don´t put your last name.
T: Don´t put your last name… so we´re going to listen to it again, but I want you to open your book to page 46 and let's see something here. What do you see here on page 46? [T talks about breaking a tooth the previous class, then returns to topic]. OK, what do you see there, in the pictures?
Ss: A conversation, a mood button, orcullt (S reads from page), *não existe botão de mood*…
T: Exactly, where do you see this in your life? Maybe they had that before? No? ok, S3, please read task 1, what are the instructions? [S4 reads the instructions, T asks Ss to read options of exercises] So we're

going to listen to it again, everybody, shush, in your best behavior [T plays the CD)

I went on commenting on the development Nicole portrayed in

this class regarding pre-listening activities.

Excerpt 14: MS 7 (12:49- 13:15)
TE: So, you see you had almost two minutes just talking before opening the book, so you re-explored their first impression of the listening, and then you opened the book…and this didn't happen before, you just went straight to the book and…
T: And what's nice about it was that I didn't have my TAF with me, that's why in the end I felt good about this class, because some things came, like, more naturally, I didn't have to "ok, what am I gonna do"…
TE: Aham, you didn't resort to…" oh I don't have my paper", so you followed your instinct,[2] followed everything we have been talking about…
T: Yeah, it was nice.

What was most interesting about this interaction was Nicole's

verbalization that she "felt good" because she knew what to do even not

having the TAF with her, that it became more natural. This clearly

shows that the concept of pre-listening contextualization and preparation

finally resonated to Nicole and that she was doing it automatically, not

being other-regulated by the TAFs, but self-regulated, which might

indicate that the scientific concept approached in preservice and

reaffirmed in the MSs met the spontaneous concepts T practiced in 6

classes, becoming internalized in Nicole's practice. The fact that Nicole

---

[2] By instinct I meant that she acted according to a concept that was already internalized, she did not have to think about the concept to apply in her practice, which might indicate Nicole is thinking in concepts.

thought about this issue, even before MS 7, may also hint at a sign of

reasoning, as she thought about the class, how her teaching had evolved,

how good she was feeling after that class, even before the MS occurred.

Nicole showed a sign of pedagogical maturation and development,

having engaged in a self-analysis process during and after classes, even

before TE brought this up for discussion. Summing up, it was a moment

of self-regulation that made her experience what we could call a

conceptual pedagogy.

In this same mediation session, there was one more interaction

about the topic listening contextualization.

Excerpt 15: MS 7 (16:53- 22:59)- See Appendix A2.21 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
TE: So, this is something that you didn't use to do either, yeah, when you had a listening. You asked them to open the books … [TE gets student's book and opens on the corresponding page]
T: and explore yeah
TE: The…[TE shows the book page to the camera and to T]
T: Aham.
TE: Picture. Yeah, as you said there was one little picture, but it was related to the topic, right. But at least you did that. Why did you do that?
T: I don't know, actually, it wasn't planned…
TE: OH, really?
T: NO, when I saw it I was like "Oh, ok, gonna work with that", but I hadn't planned to do that because… I wanted them actually to just explore the questions, because I really felt like this [pointing at picture] was so small, and that's why I decided to, to make them guess what the listening was about, but then I just did it! [laughs]
TE: Aham, and do you think it worked? Do you think it served the purpose of… of… trying to anticipate, and trying to make it easier for them to understand?
T: Yeah, yeah.

[TE continued showing class 7, when she asked Ss to read the options of the questions to be answered before playing the CD] So, what did you do in this class that you didn't do in the previous listenings (from the classes that I attended)?

T: I… explored the… questions.

TE: Aham, and why did you decide to do that? Read the options, yeah…

T: Hummm, so they know what they are listening for? I just think Im having too much teacher-student talking time…maybe they could've done that by themselves…not alone, in groups maybe… I don't know…

TE: Which part? Reading?

T: Yeah, I don't know i fell like it's always me the center…

TE: Hummm, it depends on the task, and the goal of the task. In this, if you remember the TEP, in the preparation the teacher plays a more central role, because it's when the teacher is supposed to say what students should do, and how they should do, right… and then in the *Sharing*, the *Performing, it's their turn to do the work.*

T: okay, yeah, so it was ok.

TE: Okay? Yeah, they read…maybe if you had read all the questions, maybe…

T: Ah, ok, that would be bad.

TE: No, not bad, but…

T: No, I talk so much!

TE: It would be more teacher centered… I don't think it's… I don't think that's an issue, Teaching Talking Time (TTT), because you're always motivating them to give their opinion, okay, and if you talk about a teacher that really has a high TTT, the teacher does all the talking all the time…

T; Ok, like a lecture

TE: Aham, and doesn't give opportunities for Ss to talk, yeah. So when you are doing the accountability, you always ask them to give more examples of their lives, for example, yeah. I don't think you should be worried about that.

T; Aham, ok.

TE: It's just that I realized in this class that you did things in the listening that you didn't do before.

T: Yeah! Ok, because the only meeting (that's why they are so important) I went to at LI was about the pre-listening… and then we got together in groups and planned the pre-listenings together, and… I had these ideas… with a partner… cause she's been teaching there for ten years, then I realized "Oh, I need to change this". So…

TE: Aham… we have been talking about this! A lot of times

T: [laughing] Yeah, but you know when you need something that just
makes you… [T snaps her fingers]
TE: Click
T: And then… yeah, that's why.
TE; Aham, yeah, nothing like hands-on…
T: Yeah.
T: Okay.

In this part of the MS, when acknowledged and inquired about
having been able to contextualize the task, Nicole states that the
completion of the concept of contextualization was due to a meeting and
workshop she had had with other fellow teachers, whose focus was on
preparing pre-listening tasks. This appears to indicate that, although we
had spent nearly three months talking about this issue, the point in time
of the whole experience when she acknowledged the comprehension of
the idea behind contextualization was after engaging in a more practical
learning moment, hinting at the need and the importance of hands-on
meetings.

On the other hand, it is my interpretation that the study we
engaged in was what pushed Nicole to understand and be able to make
use of the concept in a proper way when planning a class with a
colleague. As an essentially theoretical and practical study that focused
on her practice and on the (re)introduction of the concepts that were at
play in her here and now lessons, it was punctual, systematic and
contingent enough to push her development by building declarative

knowledge regarding teaching in the practical activity of teaching .

However, the moment when Nicole could apply the knowledge acquired

to a directed practical task and share the "responsibility" of preparing a

class with a fellow teacher was the moment in which she indeed

generalized the concept applying it within and to a context that was

apart from the guided study she was engaged in with me. Maybe what

happened at that moment was that it was an opportunity for her to play

her agency and intentionality (Cerutti-Rizzatti & Dellagnelo,

forthcoming), when there was already a great level of intersubjectivity

between her and me, as an expert other, generated by all those

exchanges we had had during the MSs.

This moment in which she acknowledged the meeting and not

the MSs, although disappointing for me, made me perceive that maybe

practice on preparing her following classes with me was also needed and

could be beneficial. Yet, sitting with a peer as opposed to sitting with the

teacher educator may have played an important role from an emotional

perspective. It is likely that she was more at ease with her peer than with

me, which may have resulted in more comfort to think of her own. And

this thought – not guided or directly influenced by the teacher educator –

led her to produce a pre-listening moment that was very much on the

basis of contextualizing students for the listening and making them have a goal while they listen.

The following class, Nicole again put in practice what we had talked about in the MSs, which leaves me with the data so far presented to come to an interpretation. So summing up, it looks that Nicole developed a lot in relation to contextualizing, moving from lack of discourse and practice, to acknowledgment in discourse, but not practice, to eventual use in discourse and practice.

I hope that she has evolved in that sense, but I am aware that the twisting path of concept development may make her give steps back again. Hopefully, however, she now has the resources to engage in reflective teaching herself and continue her path in her development as a serious and committed professional.

Nicole's development has not been limited to the concept of contextualization. As previous stated, there are other aspects that caught my attention in relation to her progress as a teacher. Modeling is the next concept that emerged in the data and that deserves observance and discussion.

4.2.1.2 Modeling

Another important step in the *Preparation* phase is *Modeling,* which refers to showing students *how* to perform a task, thus different from instructions, which is *what* to do. According to the TEP material, it helps make the instructions less "explained" and more "practical". In oral tasks, it is usually conducted through open pair dialogues (controlled dialogues conducted by the teacher), so that the whole class can listen to the pair who is practicing. It involves T-Ss and Ss-Ss type of interaction and it helps build up confidence by: i) providing students with vocabulary, intonation, pronunciation, and grammar needed for the task; ii) letting students know what is expected from them – both in relation to the language to be used and the degree of complexity in which they have to approach the task. The teacher's role during open-pair practice is that of a conductor, which involves managing the open pair dialogues, by asking students, whenever necessary, to repeat sentences, chunks, phrases or words, by making sure pronunciation and intonation pose no problem for a pair work practice, and by instigating them to use a variety of items in their conversations, in a way that students know what they have to practice and do it effectively. Modeling can also be written, either on the board or on posters, cards or slips, if the task requires

students to write, for example. Whichever way, what matters is that

students be aware of how to perform the task at hand.

In the first MS, modeling was approached twice, in a moment

when Nicole was talking about her general impression of the class, as

shown in Excerpt 16.

Excerpt 16: MS 1 (0:31-3:00)
TE: How did you feel yesterday?
T: Hummm about my… lesson?
TE: Yeah, in general.
T: I was happy actually with my… class. I think everything I wanted to
do… they gave me… I could see that they got what I meant. But I think
I wasn't so good with instructions…
TE: Why do you think so?
T: Because… I don't know, because I feel that since they know so much
already, I don't need to do so much modeling, but then I just go and give
the information… I … think…I mean I know I do some… for example,
they had to do a menu, I gave them a little weird menu before… I know
I did that part… I just think that I throw the activity to them…
TE: Aham… do you know the difference between instructions and
modeling?
T: … Yes… from the… training I think that modeling is for example,
you get two students, or one, and you do a modeling in front of the class.
But I just think that with them since they know it, it's kinda weird… I
feel like they would feel…
TE: Oh, I see…
T: With other classes I do, but with them… I feel like I say and they get
it. But the activity… there was one time that S1, he was supposed to be
the principal, and then he went like "Ok, I don't really get what I'm
supposed to do, and I had to explain to him…
TE: So… we're going to talk about this, about instructions and
modeling, but actually, the instructions were clear, but when it got to the
point when they had to perform, maybe it was not so clear because they
didn't know exactly how to do it… they knew what to do, right, because
you told them what to do, but they didn't know exactly – sometimes –
how to do it, and then what I could see is that sometimes you have a

goal, in your TAF, and that goal was not contemplated… but we're going one by one.
T: Okay.

Right in the beginning of the MS, it was clear that Nicole's

belief that students in an intermediate level do not need modeling to

perform tasks prevented her from promoting this step in the preparation

phase. Along the same MS, this topic was commented again.

Excerpt 17: MS 1 (26:57- 34:28)- See Appendix A2.2 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
TE: About instructions… you said [TE reads from TAF] "I'll explain the instructions because these kids understand everything"
T: Yes… (inaudible)
TE: So, what do you usually do with kids… [TE talks about ways of giving instructions so as to avoid mess in the class]
T: And I forgot to tell them that they could use other verbs, yes, to help, I had in mind to do that, but I forgot…
TE; You thought but you didn't verbalize… [laughs]
T: And they asked me "Oh, do I need to use it", yeah, it wasn't clear…
TE: So, what's advisable is to explain all the activity before, yes, it can be very clear "I'm going to throw some verbs, you can get as many as you want, but you have to use these verbs, and you're going to write a story about it". But the objective of the second task was, [TE reads from T's TAF] "to raise awareness about bullying, also to practice third person singular"
T: Aham… can it be both?
TE: Sure, no problem. So, the story should contemplate third person singular, but they used the past, they used other things, yeah.
T: I think one of them did it, I think S1, and… yeah, what should I have done?
TE: [laughs] That was my question! So, in the *Preparation* you have: the warm-up; when you are between tasks, the *link* is the warm-up; so the warm-up is in the first task of the day, yeah, you warm up not to say "Let's take a look at the book", then you have the task, then you have the accountability, then you link, from the accountability… [TE talks about accountability] So, the link would be, because the second task would be this writing activity, so the link would be, the accountability

moment of the bullying to the writing […] And then, you're going to explain all the activity before, yeah? OK, you want them to use third person singular, then you model, yeah… so you have: link, or warm-up, the first step, then modeling.

T: Could I have modelled that on the board?

TE: Of course!

T: I don't know why I thought that it wasn't good…

TE: No, you could… or you could've made a poster, to save time…yeah, you could've put a picture, a bigger picture and written something, and then you would call attention, "See, guys, Joãozinho *goes* to school everyday but his friends hate him… he *doesn't* like his friends. So, I'm using here goes, doesn't like…" Then your goal would be fulfilled, because your goal was to develop, to practice third person singular… but if you don't model that, they will do whatever they want in their writing, yeah… do you see the importance?

T: Yeah!

TE: So, the modeling is this, is the second moment, yeah, first link, then modeling

T: Actually I had no modeling for this, yes?

TE: No, you didn't…

T: Horrible!

TE: No, it was not horrible!

T: Because I didn't achieve my goal…

TE: Yeah… your linguistic goal… because, of course, there are educational goals, when you talk about kids, yeah, learning to respect each other, talking about bullying is an educational goal, there's awareness raising goal, but there is the linguistic goal, after all, it's a language school, right? So, the objective is to develop language, right? So, the linguistic goal was not fulfilled because… maybe it was, but maybe not… because it was not clear what they should do…

T: Yeah, it was not for S1… when he asked how to write "once upon a time" I went like "C…, he's gonna do it in the past!", because that's the only thing he knows so far, of course it's more comfortable, and I didn't do modeling, so…

TE: So, you see the importance of modeling?

T: Aham!

TE: It doesn't have to be… because if you talk about modeling when you talk about oral tasks, of course, you get one pair "Ok, so we're going to ask each other what we did on the weekend. What is the question, remember? What did you do on the weekend?" OK, write on the board, etc. Then you ask: "João, can you ask Maria?" Then "What

did you do on the weekend?" Open Pair. Then: "I went to …" or "I go to …", then you correct. The modeling is the chance for the teacher to see if what was taught before is ok, if not, that's the moment of correction, because when they go to *Performance*, when they are doing pair work or group work you shouldn't interrupt, right? You should let them perform the activity. So, the modeling is very, very important, I would say the *Preparation* is the most important part of the class, because if the preparation is not done well, then the rest is bad, the performing is gonna be cracked and the accountability's gonna be bad, right? So, the modeling is this… as the modeling here is for written exercise… you should have written! I think writing on the board a story, it would be too long, but if you write sentences "This girl eats a lot of junk food (…), maybe underline, so "Guys, you should follow this, remember, talking about another person right?". So it would be clear.
T: [Nodding in agreement] Okay.

In the beginning of the first MS, Nicole had verbalized that she understood what modeling was, and she had even given examples, but she believed that for these students it was not necessary "as they knew so much". This moment of the MS proved her wrong: she could realize that, although they know a lot, if not well explained and modeled, they will not perform according to the linguistic goals of the task. The mediation provided by me was, thus, very explicit, as it was in the first MS, and as I saw that Nicole had some beliefs that had to be confronted; however, I did not tell her that her assumptions about it were mistaken (that intermediate students do not need modeling).

Despite all that long explicit mediation about modeling, Nicole kept displaying lack of it in her following classes. In MS 2, the same conversation we had on the first MS basically took place again.

Excerpt 18: MS 2 (31:41- 34:19)- See Appendix A2.7 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.

TE: So, what kind of task was this? [T is silent] In the preservice you had 4 kinds of tasks: Listening, Writing, Reading and Oral skills.

T: Oral skills?

TE: Oral skills, yeah it's a moment they'll interact by talking to each other… so you have to contextualize, yeah, you did, by linking you contextualized, but between the contextualization and the doing you need to do something for oral tasks…

T: Modeling?

TE: Modeling, yes!

T: I know…

TE: How do you think you could've modeled, because you went from instructions do the doing, the performing.

T; Yeah, I think at the time I thought "Oh, my God, if I model this again, they're gonna kill me, because I kept asking them questions the whole class…and because in the last unit we've seen things with usually, sometimes, never… so I just let them do it.

TE: Ah, ok. So, maybe recalling "Do you remember how to ask questions?" Ah, "You go …" " No, remember that before 'you' you have to use something", yeah, just to make sure that they won't have problems in the performing… I know this is very easy for this level, but even so…

T: Yeah, I should do it.

TE: And I think S1 had a problem, he asked "You…" [TE shows a part in the class when student asked "You go to school by bus] He asked "You", "You get up… go to school by bus", he asked "you", instead of saying "Do you"…

T: Ahhhh, ok!

TE: In communication, no problem, but the goal of the task is to ask "Do you", right? So, he asked "you", because again, remember we talked about last class (MS), they knew *what* to do, but they didn't know… they didn't know they had to pay attention to "Do you", because it wasn't asked.

T: Can I model that on the board?

TE: Sure! No problem!

Nicole's belief about the non-necessity of doing modeling with

intermediate students once again prevented her from having it, thus

causing problems in students' performance. Only when I showed her that S1 had made a mistake did she realize that, which might show that she tended to overestimate students.

Nevertheless, in MS 2 she came up with the name (modeling) right after I inquired her about what was missing, showing that the concept was there in her discourse and in her ZPD, although not in her practice. Once again she asked if she could write the model on the board, an issue that had been discussed in the previous MS, pointing to the need for a longer period of maturation for Nicole to start applying this concept in her practice. One could expect that after realizing that students had experienced difficulty again, and thus having her belief that modeling is not necessary for students with a certain level of linguistic proficiency confronted with the new theoretical concept, she would be able to indeed understand the concept.

Yet, the following class showed lack of modeling again, signaling that the concept was still too abstract for her. In Class 3, there was no modeling, and this time Nicole said she was aware of it, as the following Excerpt shows.

Excerpt 19: MS 3b (18:00- 20:43)- See Appendix A2.8 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
TE: [TE was talking about instructions and grouping] And also, you didn't model this, I know it's easy, but you should have modeled, right, you should, you could've gotten a card and done yourself one, so they

would see the example, you know? Of how to do it… one thing is giving instructions, what to do, another thing is modeling… and instruction itself is not enough sometimes… I know that they are really good students, and sometimes you overestimate them, yeah, but maybe…

T: No, you know, I actually think of this, you know, I could do this, I could do that, it's just that it's … it's really time consuming, sometimes I think about it, because I have University, and when I *go* to prepare… it doesn't, I know it's not so good, but it actually takes me time [laughs]

TE: I know, I know that, I know you make a lot of effort, and I appreciate that!

T: No, but it's not only for this class, you know, for all of them…

TE: And do you make the TAFs for all the classes?

T: Yeah.

TE: The TAFs, like this [showing the TAFs Nicole had made] or…

T: Oh, no! But I think through all, all my classes… I thought of it, but then I thought "Oh, no, I don't have time, I'm just gonna model on the board.

TE: Okay! That was going to be my next comment, in the last meeting we talked about the need of using visual aids, and I saw that you're really evolving in that, you are writing things on the board, words, instructions, so the ones (students) that rely on visual can be contemplated.

T: Aham… so this, this was not enough, right, for modeling, like that's not model at all?

TE: That's not modeling, you just gave instructions…maybe getting a bigger picture and explaining what to do…

T: I feel the need of an e-board… in this other school that I teach I have a digital board, and that's perfect, because I do the modeling, but I don't have to print in paper, I just put it and they get it, it's not so time-consuming…

TE: Ah, ok, so you can show a big picture… yes… do you see the difference between instructions and modeling?

T: Yes, yes, I do, actually.

TE: So the modeling would be you getting a picture and saying exactly what you expect them to say.

T: Like an example?

TE: Yeah, like giving an example.

It seemed like we were going round in circles, I kept saying the

same things to Nicole, and she again appeared to know what modeling

was about, at least in theory. And the excuse she used not to model this time was time. She said it was too "time-consuming", that class preparation takes a lot of time, and thus she is taking for granted that students will know how to do the task. Therefore, she blames on technology, in the sense that this would make it easier for her to model, she would not have to make posters at home, or cards, or slips of paper. The fact that she thought about it, though, looked like an indication that the process was on the way, but then she showed some misunderstanding of the concept again, as she took instruction and modeling as equals, which in fact showed a twisting path in the development of the concept. Hopefully with our final comment that modeling was like an example, this concept would become clearer and start being part of her routine.

So it was: Class 5 showed improvement in modeling. This time Nicole attempted to model, but there was a problem during performance: as it was written on the book "Find someone who **goes** to school…", one student asked " Do you goes to school…". This happened because Nicole did not do the modeling using open pair examples, as the TEP and I had suggested, and the consequence was that students did not know they were supposed to change the verb when asking. See the excerpt of class 5:

Excerpt 20: Class 5 (49:15- 50:30)- See Appendix A2.18 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.

T: If we turn to the next page we can find more things about… each other. You know this? What is "find someone who"? Guys, remember "find someone who"? "You're gonna go around the class and do what? [Ss are silent] Do you… do you… How do you think is the first one, S1? The first question, Do you take… [the school receptionist opens the door to call a student out, T and Ss say goodbye to this S] How do you think we do the first question? To a friend

S2: Do you take a bus to school?

S3: Who takes a bus everyday?"

T: No, not like that, no! You should ask to each person! Get up, get up, get up and go around!

Once again, this topic emerged in the MS:

Excerpt 21: MS 5 (13:55- 18:02)

TE: Okay, then they went to the… oral production, the speaking part, the oral production… and what was missing? [TE shows a picture of the book page on her cell phone]. They had to interview and find someone who, right?

T: Aham [T gets Cell phone and analyses the picture] "Do you blab la bla" … Hummm… Do you think what I did was not so good?

TE: It was good, but something was missing… you modeled the question…

T: Yes… the link?

TE: No, the link was good…

T: I don't know what I did wrong…I did the modeling…

TE: Yeah… let me show you something… I hope we can listen… see if you can listen [TE shows a part of the class when S1 asked "Do you *walks* to school?"] "Do you *walks* to school?"

T: Oh, I didn't hear that! Ohhh, ok!

TE: So, you said how to do the sentence… however, they had written "Find someone who… walks to school"

T: Yes, that's why I asked them to ask a question with "do you", and that I think S2 said it right…

TE: And then you took for granted that all of them did… because S2 is great!

T: Yes… who said "Do you walks to school?"

TE: I think S4 said… because they are just reading, they put "Do you" and they're reading.

T: Ok, I should've said "You know, bla,bla, bla…"

TE: "So, guys, walks is because I'm talking about she walks… but it's "Do you walk".

T: Especially because this is what they saw in the last unit.

TE: Ok, so this is modeling, the modeling is not just saying ok, "ask this", but paying attention to how you're going to do…and also the answer.

T: And S3 said "Who here walks to school?"

TE: Aham, who walks to school, it's perfect! Correct! [laughs] But it was not the objective of the… but grammatically it would be perfect. So, here, it's very important that they know what to do from the beginning, so you wouldn't interrupt them… in the TAF, when you prepared the class, you put "I will interrupt them if I see problems in their performance". But to avoid these problems in their performance, the preparation should be really good…

T: And I didn't hear… If I was going to check I should've paid more attention, I guess…

TE: Yes, maybe… or… because when you model you get two people… and you ask them to role play, you know, open pairs, so, "S4, can you ask S3 if he takes the bus"… "Do you *take* the bus?", then you could have realized if there is a problem, ok?

T: Yeah.

TE: Because *you* said, you said how to say (ask), they didn't… when you model you ask for 2 volunteers to perform as the real thing, just to see if they are doing correctly, you know?

T: Okay!

TE: It's a little different, because you know what you're saying, you will say correctly, you know?

T: Yeah… I keep having problems with modeling, it's horrible… I should… I don't know…

TE: Yes… it's the one thing, I think… to… to work on.

As previously discussed, Nicole's assumption that these students were "too good" for modeling again originated a linguistic problem in class, and by showing that on the video she might have realized that it was necessary to model, and to "spend" time on modeling. This insight might have made her rethink her attitude towards

modeling for this group, as she verbalized to "keep having problems

with modeling". Her next comment "I should… I don't know" hints at a

moment of reasoning, *sense of plausibility* taking place, when she must

have thought about how to sort out this "problem"; however, she did not

verbalize it at the moment. In her subsequent class, Nicole also had a

modeling that was not very effective. Again she did not have two

volunteers perform the dialogue nor did she write an example on the

board. Once more, it was commented on the MS.

Excerpt 22: MS 7 (56:32- 59:47)- See Appendix A2.22 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
TE: Okay, what was that, that just happened?
T: I don't really remember if I managed to put things on the board or not, for this one, 'cause we didn't watch it right now… did I do the modeling?
TE: You wrote *Do's and Don't's* [pointing at TV screen]
T: But I didn't write the… sentences, I didn't do… an example, right?
TE: No…
T: I remember doing an example but it was for something else… it was for this one [pointing at book].
TE: But you didn't write on the board…
T: … No, I think I did… I put *Do's and Dont's* and then for this one, I put examples of… for Do's and Dont's on the board…
TE: We're going to see… maybe…
T: And then I asked them "When do we use hummm *Dont's*…
TE: Ah, ok, ok, you wrote.
T: Okay… yeah, this one [looking at TV screen, referring to the class Excerpt just seen] there wasn't really modeling, I think… I think I should've done one of them with them…
TE: Yeah… it was an oral modeling, but it was a modeling… in the past you'd just say, in the beginning you'd just say "Ok, let's take a look at the chart on the next page and let's try to do…
T: Okay.
TE: OK, you wouldn't explain so well.

T: But, still, I wasn't happy…

TE: Really? What do you think you should've done?

T: I think I should've… I don't think I got an example…

TE: She said [pointing to S4 on the TV screen] "you shouldn't do something"

T: Oh, she did?

TE: Aham, S4 said "You shouldn't post your… photographs", let's imagine this… and then you asked, "was it should… was it *Do's or Dont's*?"

T: But was it only her that answered?

TE: Yeah…

T: That's why I asked them "Do you know what you're doing?

TE: Aham… but I guess it was clear, because they started doing…

T: Yeah!

TE: That's the thing with this group yeah? They start doing…

T: But for this one [pointing at task on the book] S1 did, and he did it wrong… he said "finished" and I took a look at it and said "No, you didn't", because he just put items (inaudible). I don't know what he did, but he didn't put complete…

TE: Ah, like don't "Don't add strangers…"

T: Yeah… so I told him "That's why you finished early, because you didn't do it right"… but ok… the others did it right.

TE: Okay… it was a modeling… yeah, maybe you could have written on the board, yeah, then you should've emphasized that you should put "Don't" in the *Dont's*…because he put *Dont's*: add strange people, and it should be *Dont's*: don't add strange people… yeah, in this sense you didn't model.

T: Yeah, I did the modeling for this one [pointing at previous task]

TE: You did the… the…the idea modeling, like, "if you say shouldn't, it's *a Dont's,* that's what you did.

T: Yeah [nodding in agreement]

TE: So, it was a semi-modeling [laughs]

T: Almost there! [laughs]

TE: Almost there! [laughs]

As the excerpt above shows, what we had been discussing in the

previous MSs resonated to Nicole, inasmuch as she started paying

attention to modeling, and being critical about it (the fact that she was

not happy about the modeling that she did). Her previous justification,

lack of time and students' level of English, this time was not mentioned.

This may indicate that, although she devoted a lot of effort and time

preparing classes, now she considered worth it. Despite my comments

that there was modeling, she still saw room for improvement, as she

herself realized that S1 had made mistakes in performance, due to the

lack of a clearer modeling. Her final comment, "almost there", hints at

the will she had in pursuing an ideal modeling, and what happened in

the other class was, then, the product of this reasoning.

Excerpt 23: Class 8 (09:35- 11:35)- See Appendix A2.24 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
T: Guys, we're going to play a game!
S1: Again?
T: No, it's different…I'm going to give you cards, ok? [showing colored cards] and some of them start with "If you bla bla bla", and then you make up sentences, let me show you one example:[T draws two big squares on the board] you're gonna have different cards, ok? For example one of them is going to say [T writes inside one square] "If you don't like chocolate", and then for example, there's gonna be another card written [T writes inside the other square] "Don't eat it". Could you match this [pointing at both squares] or, look at this one [T draws another square and written inside it] "Eat it all the time". Which one would you prefer?
S2: The… [pointing at the square at the bottom]
T: The bottom? Yeah! So, you put this beside "Don't eat it.". But, let me tell you something, sometimes, to make up a sentence, you're gonna need 3, maybe more cards, not only 2. Okay?
S1: Okay

In the last mediating session, the topic modeling was again

discussed, this time showing improvement.

Excerpt 24: MS 8 (12:30- 13:57)
TE: [after showing the above passage to T] Now, let's talk about modeling… was there modeling here?
T: I hope so! [laughs]
TE: [laughs] I´m just asking this question because of the [pointing at the camera]
T: Okay! I hope that was a modeling!
TE: Okay! Do you think the modeling was effective?
T: Yes! Yes!
TE: How did you feel it was effective? How did you perceive that?
T: Hummm because I basically drew the cards on the board, and I made them choose, like "Eat it all the time" or " Don't eat it", and then… they saw how they should put the cards side by side…
TE: So, it was very visual.
T: Aham. Yeap, that was fine.
TE: Aham. Did you use an example that was in the cards?
T: No.
TE: Why not?
T: Because you told me [laughs]
TE: [laughs] what is the reason I told you?
T: Okay, because you'd kill… no, I know, you'd kill one of the… activity.
TE: Yeah.. so you couldn't use it… actually the terms are " you would kill the information gap"
T: Yeah!
TE: Information gap is what you need in order to… have a reason to do something, ok? If I ask you, "Nicole, what's your name", why would I ask that? Yeah… so, if you had put an example that they had, why would they do that sentence? Excellent.

Finally, in the last attended class, Nicole did a modeling that was meaningful and effective. The mediation we engaged in, from very explicit, even repetitive, at last made sense to her, and the consequence was that she performed modeling effortlessly and naturally. The concept was, then, developed both in her discourse and in her practice (in

discourse prior to practice). The reasoning she engaged in during the classes and mediating sessions finally paid off, and the result was very good, showing that this concept, filled with pre-conceptions (that intermediate students do not need modeling, that it is time-consuming) entered her ZPD and was later internalized, or at least in the process of internalization, as, due to the twisting path of concept, we would need more consistent successful examples in order to say that the concept has indeed been internalized.

As for the fact that she developed the concept in discourse before she did it in practice, this resonates in the SCT literature as it is argued that the learning of a word may precede awareness of its concept, illustrating the "empty verbalism" that Vygotsky (2007 [1978]) mentions when discussing the "mindless learning of words" (Vygotsky, 2007 [1978]). According to him: "... the child learns not the concept but the word, and this word is taken over by the child through memory rather than thought. Such knowledge turns out to be inadequate in any meaningful application". (Vygotsky, 2007 [1978], p. 170)

This whole discussion of the development of modeling in Nicole appears to illustrate Vygotsky's (2007[1978]) notion of concept development in the understanding that theoretical concepts alone do not suffice. They need to be confronted to everyday knowledge so that

everyday concepts are formed and then the concept itself can be consolidated; it is only then that sign forms move into sign meanings (Johnson & Dellagnelo, 2013). In this sense, what happened to Nicole was that she learned the theoretical concept of modeling along the TEP, but this was still too abstract and general for her, and as such not amenable to application in context. She needed concrete and practical circumstances, which she gained as she went to the classroom in the shoes of a teacher.

Yet, she could not work out this movement from the abstract to the concrete by herself, as the concept was possibly not in her ZPD or yet was still very immature; she needed mediation from an expert that would guide her into thinking in concepts. It was a long and twisting path, but in the end of the study Nicole understood the concept of modeling, and applied in her discourse first, and in her practice in her later classes. Yet, more attendance would be needed to affirm that this concept was internalized by Nicole.

Another aspect that was focus of attention during the mediating sessions between Nicole and I, and that she also showed a twisting path for development was *links.* And it is to this feature that the next session is dedicated.

4.2.2 Links

The concept of *link* has to do with class flow and sequencing, as a common thread between the previous topic and the new one, which intertwines the class, so that it flows as a whole. In the TEP material, it is pointed out that: "a lesson reflects the concept of structuring when the teacher's intentions are clear and instructional activities are sequenced according to a logic and structure that students can perceive" (Richards & Nunan, 1990, p. 11). It is also emphasized that "Transitions actually link ideas and tasks together so that students can see the whole picture" (Polifemi, 2006, p. 35).

As aforementioned, similarly to what happened to Nicole as she paved the way for developing the concepts of *contextualization* and *modeling*, the concept of *links* also presented a twisting path. Following, I will display the chronological excerpts of examples where this concept emerged, both in classes and mediating sessions, and then I will trace Nicole's path to understand it.

Excerpt 25 shows the part of the first class that I analyzed.

Excerpt 25: Class 1 (08:58- 22:59)- See Appendix A2.1 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
 (in class, T and Ss were talking about instances of bullying)
T: Does that happen in your school?
Ss: No/ sometimes
T: Sometimes? Do you know a story?
S1: No.

T: No? In your class (pointing at everyone), nobody?
S2: Na minha escola tem…
T: Oh, tell me!
S2: In my class *has* a girl that *she's* overweight
T: She's overweight? Does she suffer… bullying?
S1: No? Nobody?
S3: Ahh.. in my class… in third grade… ahhh… a boy was…
T: bullied
S3: No,… *obeso*…
T: overweight
S3: Overweight… and… ahhh… he suffered bullying.
T: He suffered bullying? What did people say?
S3: *Bolota*, *bolota*!
T: ball, ok… that's not good, right?
S3: No.
T: OK, guys [T picks up papers and hands them in to Ss]. Don't show!
Ok, here's what we´ll do. Can I? [T gets papers and throws them in the
air] Go! [Ss collect papers from the floor]. Now… ah, you took
everything. [T says to one S][T hands in another set of papers for Ss].
Good. What we're going to do is… [T explains next task].

In the MS that followed this class, the TAF component *links*

was discussed.

**Excerpt 26: MS1 (24:12- 26:50)- See Appendices A2.1-A2.2 for
TAFs filled out by teacher of this part of the class**
TE: Here you changed tasks, yeah, you went from one task, they were
reporting about bullying in their school, and then they're going to
another task. (that of picking papers from the floor) What's missing
here? [T is in silence]. When you change from one task to another?
T: I didn't think there was something missing, because the next task was
about bullying. But then I felt that maybe I should've told them the
instructions before I gave them the papers…
TE: Exactly… so you see, this is called *link*. The importance of links is
not to have *chunks* in the class, so they feel it's a flow, a movement, a
thread that links all the activities together. So just… how could… how
do you think you could have done the link? Because the way… do you
see now? Do you *wanna* see it again?
T: No, I see…
TE: You were talking about bullying, and the guy was called *bolota*,

bolota and.. [TE makes gestures as if picking up something from the table]. "Don't show!", ok so this is "oh ok, what's going on?" Ss might feel like this: "what's going on?" "Have we finished?"

T: Ahh, ok!

TE: So, how do you think you could have linked? The other activity was about bullying too, yeah, but what is the common thread that linked one to the other?

T: The funny part was that I thought this was the link, all this.

TE: I know, it's here [showing the TAF].

T: I don't know, maybe… I should have introduced it… ah "how"…

TE: They were talking about bullying at school, examples…

T: Aham, and then they had to make a…

TE: They were going to show a picture of people who might have (suffered) bullying

T: Story about… aham. Maybe I should have… humm, but I didn't want them to see… maybe I should have given them the pictures and said "oh guys, so think of what might be going on with these people I'm *gonna* give you, don't show each other"

TE: Aham, so, while giving or even before giving, right? You could even say "Oh, we're talking about bullying in our schools, and we're talking about bullying in my life, in your life, and so on, but let's think about bullying with other people, what other people might feel", and then you go on and explain the task, ok?

T: [Nods in agreement].

(28: 54) TE: So, in the preparation you have: the warm-up; when you are between tasks, the *link* is the warm-up, so the warm-up is in the first task of the day, ok, you warm up not to go… not to say "let's take a look at the book"; then you have the task, then you have the *accountability*, then you link from the *accountability* …the story about bullying in their schools was the accountability of the first task, it was not the link, ok? Because checking what they understand is not accountability, it's just checking what they understand… the *accountability* is how you relate this to your life, and you did it perfectly, you asked about situations of bullying in their school…

T: That was the *accountability*? I didn't know that!

TE: Aham… so the *link* would be…the second task would be this writing activity, so the *link* would be: the *accountability* moment of the bullying, to the writing… and then you can say "as we're talking about examples of bullying in our school, let's see other examples of bullying, but you will create"… something like that…

T: Humm, ok.

In the first attended class, Nicole conducted her class in separate tasks (or learning chunks), which, although having elements in common (the topic), were not connected to each other as a natural sequence. The teacher did not apply the concept of *links* in her class, as Excerpt 25 shows. Subsequently, in the first MS, showed in Excerpt 26, it was clear that this concept was not formed in Nicole's conceptual framework, she thought that link was another task that was related to the topic of the previous one. The mediation provided by me intended to make her aware of this concept, thus, it was very explicit.

She did not apply this concept maybe because she did not know what it was, despite the fact that she had been introduced to it during the TEP. This signals that the formal introduction to the scientific concept during the TEP was too abstract for Nicole, and she was not able to generalize it and then activate and apply that knowledge in the here and now of her teaching practice. It was easier, though, when I, during the mediating session, brought the concept to the classroom moment, thus confronting the theory to Nicole's pedagogical practice.

Already in the following class (Class 2), Nicole put in practice what we had talked about in the previous MS, what was commented in the MS.

Excerpt 27: MS 2 (29:27- 30:45)- See Appendices A2.6-2.7 for TAFs filled out by teacher of this task.
TE: [Showing the Excerpt of the class to T] They (Ss) were talking about things they were supposed to write, in the previous part they were supposed to write about how… what things to do to help the environment, yeah. So, they were reporting and discussing about that. [TE and T continue watching the Excerpt] And then you asked them hummm "Do you do these things?" And do you think he does that"? "Do you think I do that?" [T nods in agreement] And what… what was this?
T: The link?
TE: Yes! [laughs] and it was really good! Because you linked from what they were talking about to the topic of the next task, yeah.
T: Aham.

In the second MS, showed in Excerpt 27, the comment I made

about Nicole's link was in a way positivistic, in the sense that I, in a

way, *told* her that what she had done was "correct". My intention,

though, was to reassure that her practice, just after one meeting with me,

met what we had talked about in the previous session. The mediation

was intentionally reassuring, trying to motivate her to continue doing it.

Nevertheless, as expected from a developmental process, this

understanding was yet incomplete and twisting, and some of her links

presented an order that hindered a smooth flow, as portrayed in class 2,

in Excerpt 28.

Excerpt 28: Class 2 (26:57-27:13)- See Appendix A2.6 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
T: [T and Ss were checking the results of the first task, talking about what they can do to help the environment. Ss were sitting together, solving a quiz on environmental issues] When you get water and oil, they don't mix, so even if you have a lot of oil, it doesn't mix with

water, because it has less weight than water. Do you understand? Good? Everybody go back to your seats now [Ss go back to their seats]. Now, I'd like you to turn the page, because there's a conversation on the book, a listening activity, that's actually about… the environment… and pollution. [T gives instructions for the next task]

In MS 2 there was a problem with the camera, so the first part was lost. In the following excerpt there is a recollection of what TE and T talked about, which I considered very important to show the sequence Nicole was using in her links.

Excerpt 29: MS 2 (2:30-3:31)
TE: [TE showed the excerpt of class 2 above] So, what part of the class was this?
T: It was the… wait! It was the link?
TE: Aham
T: But I did it backwards! I got it!
TE: Yes, so, as we talked, you made the link, but instead of saying "There are other people who also talk about the environment, let's see, go to the next page", you said "Let's go to the next page because…". It's not a problem, but the flow is a little interrupted, you see?
T: Yes, yes, yes, I told you it's because I forgot to do it, and then I remembered…
TE: I hope it was not because I was there!
T: No, it's actually, it was actually the second time I was trying to really do the link!
TE: You got it! Of course, there is some room for improvement, but we had only one MS!

In Excerpt 29, still about class 2, we talked about the way to conduct a link; the goal of the link, as the name says, is to connect one idea to another, so, in a class, it is to connect what the teacher and the students were talking about to what would come in the sequence.

Leading students to naturally turn the page, without having breaks or chunks in the lesson, is the ideal idea of a link. If students are told why they are moving from one task to the other before they actually do it, it becomes more natural, purposeful and smoother. The fact that Nicole had realized that before I told her showed that she was in the path of forming this concept.

In Class 4, the teacher showed sign of improvement on this aspect.

Excerpt 30: Class 4 (12:30- 13:35)- See Appendix A2.12 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
T: [T was showing objects- realia- from the 90's, opening a discussion with Ss about them, if they knew them. T plays a song in her cell phone, asking if Ss knew it.] Do you know this song? I love Pearl Jam… Let's see other kinds of crazes of the 90's. [picks up book and opens it]
S1: teacher, it's grunge
T: No, that's not grunge music, grunge music they have long hair, and they go like that [T bangs her head].
S2: *Kiss*!
T: *Kiss* is from the 70's…everybody turn to page… page 25 [Ss get their books] Ready? Everybody, take a look here, it says "crazes of the 90's" [T holds her book turned to Ss, pointing at pictures]. Take a look here and see what you know.

In MS 4, this aspect was brought to discussion.

Excerpt 31: MS 4 (25:04- 27:20)
TE: So what part of the class was… or what was the sequence… what was that, that you just did?
T: Humm. Ok, all that was the preparation for the… task…
TE: Aham, before that was the preparation.
T: Aham and I think I tried to link… I don't know if I did…
TE: Aham, how do you feel… why you didn't think you linked?
T: Oh, because I didn't think I emphasized it, I said, "oh, let's see other

kinds of crazes", but I don't think they even paid attention to that…
TE: Oh ok… do you see the difference of this link to the ones you were doing before? (it was a link)
T: It was a link?... ok. Hummm…
TE: Do you see what you did differently this time? From the ones you did before?
T: [Pause] Yes! First I said "let's see other kinds of crazes" and then I said, "let's go to page…"
TE: Exactly! There was something in the middle, but it would have been… yes, so "let's see what other people have to say about it, let's open the book", instead of the opposite. What do you… why did you do this this time?
T: Because you told me [laughs]… because… no, I get it, it's like, they don't even know why they're opening their books, so it's better if I tell them, although I think I should have "oh, let's see other kinds of crazes"
TE: Again.., because you were talking about music in the middle…
T: Aham…
TE: Do you think that's positive, or it's just something you're doing because you have to?
T: No, I get the point, I get it.
TE: Aham, what is the point?
T: To me the point is that, it's like meaningless, yeah, "open your book", then I tell them what they're supposed to do, and then it's not smooth, like they're more interested in opening their books if I tell them why they're doing it… that's why!

In Excerpt 31, depicting MS 4, Nicole can be said as being at an intermediate stage in the development of this concept, i.e. she has so far developed a pseudoconcept, she managed to do a *link* as we had been talking about, but was unsure about having done it properly. It is as if she were just imitating, which, in sociocultural theory, is seen as a step into self-regulation. Vygotsky stated that: "development made on collaboration and imitation is the source of all the specific human characteristics of consciousness that develop in the child" (Vygotsky

1987,p. 210). Again, this might be an indication of the twisting path in

the formation of concepts, as they can be formed and restructured along

the way to internalization.

Nicole's uncertainty concerning this topic was evident in Class

6, when she performed a good link.

Excerpt 32: Class 6 (42:45-44:06)- See Appendix A2.20 for TAF filled out by teacher of this task.
[T and Ss were talking about tips on internet safety, what you should and shouldn't do on social networks)
T: Ok, guys, you know LI's website? We have a … profile to fill. Yeah! Asking things like: what kind of music you listen to, what are your hobbies, write about yourself… I want you guys to… we're going there (the computer center of the school), I want you to make a nice profile, ok, and tonight, when you go home, you can put a picture of yourself…
S2: Eu já fiz isso.
T; But you don't have your profile filled [talking to S2] No, I saw yours.
S2: Really?
S1: Eu já fiz (inaudible)
T: No, it's not there. Really? On mine, it didn't show.
S2: Ano passado pediram pra mim...
T: Really? I think it's ... vanished. But try to see if you follow the tips [T points at board]: If it's private, what kinds of things you write, if you have your parents' names, or if your full name's there… ok? Can we go?
[Ss and T go to the computer center and do the task there]

As portrayed in Class 6, Nicole managed to perform a good link

from one task to the other. However, in the MS about it, something

unexpected happened.

Excerpt 33: MS 6 (1:00:17-1:00:58)
TE: So, what… what happened here?
T: It was *instructions*.

TE: Aham, between one task and the other, now you went to the second task, okay, so this was the *link*, yeah, do you think the link was smooth?
T: No.
TE: No??
T:No… I just… "Guys, guys, you know we have the…" I don't know…
TE: They were talking about Facebook, saying…
T: Yeah! Ok, it was. I just didn't like the end, I didn't like the task.
TE: Yeah? Why not?
T: Because it went against everything we had just talked about… so…
TE: Did you see (the LI social network) before? Did you fill in your profile there?
(The video was cut off, and the rest of this conversation was lost)

In Excerpts 32 and 33, showing class 6 and the subsequent MS, the flow from one task to the other was smooth; however, Nicole was not convinced of that, due to the fact that she did not like the result of the following task, she thought it was meaningless (In class, students had been talking about internet safety, what they should and shouldn't do on social networks, and when they filled out their profile pages on the LI's social network, they did not apply those rules). So, this time, despite applying the concept link in practice, Nicole at first did not see it as having done one, focusing on the task that followed it. With my comment, and the recollection of what she had done, she managed to realize that the link was smooth.

Along the MSs, my mediation would focus on the concept *links* again and again, confronting the scientific and the everyday counterparts, as shown in excerpts 34 and 35.

Excerpt 34: Class 7 (5:55- 6:40)- See Appendix A2.21 TAF filled out by teacher of this task.

T: [T and Ss were talking about future plans, using going to, and one S made a mistake, using will, so T explains the grammar deductively]. Oh, this weekend there's *pizza party*, so I'm going to *pizza party*. Did you understand? It's a future plan. Ok, now let's go back.

S1: *Back to the Future!*

T: No, not back to the future, back to the past… back to the class that I was here [T had not taught the previous class to Ss, she was substituted by another T]. What were we talking about that day?

S2: I don't know!

T: Ah?

S2: Plans!

T: No, we talked about something remember, we did on House of English (the internet site of the franchise). What did we talk about that day? Ah? … we talked about internet and… [T reminds Ss ofthe previous class).

Excerpt 35: MS 7 (32:14- 33:12)

TE: So, what was missing from…

T: A link!

TE: A link [laughs]. Ok, go ahead.

T: I couldn't… I didn't think of one at the time…

TE: OK, but when you were teaching, you thought, or not?

T: When?

TE: When he finished talking about "going to"… did you think "oh, now I have to link or "now I have to talk about the class"

T: Yeah, no, I felt like I needed one, but I'm like *crap*, I can't think of one…

TE: it's like blank, blank, blank and then you decided…

T: Yeah, I think I even stopped for a moment and I was like "Ahh, ok"

TE: Aham, you did it!

T: And then I was like "Oh, no, there's not *gonna* be one here, sorry Paola"

TE: OK, sorry study! [laughs], no link… but you thought about it…

T: Yeah!

TE: Ah, that's interesting, because in the beginning you didn't even consider, right? Now you're like "I have to do a link" hummm, fail, but I thought about it.

T: No, I did, I did.

Excerpt 35, MS 7, shows the concept *link* was established in Nicole's conceptual framework, internalized in her discourse, but sometimes she did not perform it, it was not established in her practice. This might be indicative that the use on the noun was a social use, not a thinking act, a scientific concept that did not descend to achieving spontaneous knowledge, thus an empty word, a noun not internalized, perhaps a pseudoconcept.

In the subsequent and last attended class, Nicole planned and executed links; sometimes, they were smooth, but sometimes there were interruptions between the link and the following task, so the flow was lost, as in this example in Excerpt 36.

Excerpt 36: Class 8 (21:10-24:50)- See Appendices A2.23-A2.24 for TAFs filled out by teacher of this class.
T: [Ss were playing a game about conditional sentences, Ss were reading sentences they had made using conditionals]Okay, one more point…so who's the winner? [winning Ss raise their hands, and one S from the losing team raises his hands]What???
S1: Because the square is not, not closed..eu quero dizer que todo o quadro é ponto nosso, porque os pontos do quadrados deles estão fechados, e os nossos estão abertos, então a gente pegou todos os pontos [T and Ss laugh]
T: Okay, we have another game now, so…
S2: Posso falar a piada agora?
T: Yeah, one second [T says to S2]. We have a game now, so maybe you guys win. How about we don't switch the teams, we stay in the same team, so ..
S1: Switch?
S3: Switch [gestures of mixing things]

T: So, guys, okay? So, we don't switch, so maybe you guys win. [Ss start talking in Portuguese] Yeah, guys, but I promised Daniel he would be able to tell a joke, but only in English.

S2: Mas eu não sei…

T: Ah! [T starts collecting papers from Ss, and S2 asks for words in English] Yeah, ok, you think about it and you tell us in the end of the class. We're going…

S2: Como se diz vacina?

T: Ah? Vaccine. Guys!

S2: Como é tomar vacina?

T: You take the vaccine...Guys! guys ,guys, we're keeping the same groups, but I want you to sit down now, everybody go back… but you 3, you 3 go there [pointing at a corner of the room], cause you are on the same team, and you 2 stay here [pointing at the other corner] stay really together! [Ss get together in groups] Okay, for this game…

S2:Posso contar agora?

T: Okay, before the game he's gonna tell us the joke about internet safety in English.

S2: OK, if a nerd *takes vaccine*, *what's* he *says*?

T: Ah, if a nerd takes a vaccine, what does he say?

S2: The *definition of virus were* updated!

T: [T and Ss laugh] The virus definitions were updated! Very good! You like it? [looking at Ss] It's very hard to translate a… very good. Guys, for the next game, S3, please sit over there…[T explains the next task]

MS 8 brought this topic into discussion, as shown in Excerpt 37.

Excerpt 37: MS 8 (24:43-27:17)
TE: [TE was showing the Excerpt of the class above to T] So, what was this moment?

T: [speaking pausedly] It was supposed to be a link [laughs] to the next task… but I love S2, don't blame him!

TE: [laughs] What happened? What happened to the link?

T: It was screwed, over! But I don't know, I like him…

TE: I like him too! So, the link was broken.

T: Yeah

TE: because…

T: Because… first of all he wanted to tell a joke, and then I made him talk in English, and I said "you can do it in the end of the class if you

think in English". But then he thought about it and I forgot that I had said he could do it in the end of the class… and I just let him do it.
TE: But, you felt that the link was broken…
T: Yeah, yeah I did, but…
TE: You enjoyed…
T: Yeah, exactly! I did!
TE: What was the consequence, for the class, was there a consequence?
T: Yeah, they lost the…how do you say in English, the flow…
TE: The track, like "OK we're going to do this, oh, wait, S2 is going to do something. And then, what were we going to do again?" So you had to remind them…
T: Yes! And I thought at the time, maybe I leave them on the floor, I give instructions, then I go back … but then I thought, in my defense, that I was sick, and I thought "I don't want these kids to be sick as well", so I just made them stay where they were.
TE: You were protecting them!
T: Yeah, I was protecting them. No, but I see that this part was not good.
TE: Yeah, in the previous class that we saw, you were the one who interrupted the flow, remember? By remembering things in the middle of the link. Now you didn't! But you let Ss do it [laughs].
T: Again… yeah
TE: Yeah, I understand, it was the last class…but you had said, you had promised he would tell just in the end of the class, so it was like a broken promise, you know?
T: Aham.

As portrayed in excerpts 36 and 37, which showed that last

attended class and MS, although Nicole and I had talked for almost four

months about the concept of links, she still had difficulties performing it

sometimes, even though it was established in her class plan, in her

discourse and in most of her practice. The fact that she let the flow of

sequencing be broken by interruptions might be an indication that she

did not see this concept as essential to leading a good class, or that she

got lost in her class plan, or even that she aimed at seizing moments

when topics emerged, regardless of when they did, and of the consequence it would have on the class (flow break). Whatever explanation, it was clear that the path to forming the concept *link* was a twisting one, as she evolved and went backwards in the process throughout the study.

The analysis of the classes Nicole conducted during this study, in a nutshell, shows that her path into concept development was evident, though twisting, and by engaging in pedagogical reflection and reasoning, and through mediation of an expert other, she could realize and modify her practice. It also suggests that, even having been introduced to the concepts in the TEP, this novice teacher could only appropriate these concepts after the tutoring provided; this leads us to conclude that maybe the preservice should be more practical, or individualized.

Besides the classes and mediating sessions, Nicole also answered questionnaires, which intended to measure how she viewed herself in her developmental path. The next session will analyze this.

4.3 Analysis of Questionnaires

During this study, Nicole answered five questionnaires: one assessment questionnaire, three follow up questionnaires and one overall

questionnaire. The assessment questionnaire was answered before we started the study, the follow up questionnaires after months one, two and three, and the overall questionnaire after the study had finished.

The subsections that follow display extracts by Nicole and comments by myself from each of these moments.

4.3.1   Assessment questionnaire

Nicole had already taught English as a tutor for three years| before starting in the LI, but she had never had any training or course on pedagogy, she basically used *apprenticeship of observation* (Lortie, 1975) when teaching these private classes. It was not until her 3rd year of Dentistry that she decided to become an English teacher. Her first step was to find a job in a language institute. Right after that, she moved to the Letters/Languages Course at *Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina*. The only official training she had had before starting this study was therefore the 60-hour training course (TEP) offered by the LI. Her linguistic proficiency comes from a 5-year experience in the United States from ages 12 to 17.

The answers she gave in her assessment questionnaire showed that teaching was a new field for her, and despite overwhelmed, she was

fascinated by it. When asked how she viewed herself as a teacher before

the TEP, and how this view changed after she finished it, she answered:

Questionnaire Excerpt 1:
"*I used to think I was a great teacher. I thought that just having English
as a second language made me capable to teach. During the Pre-service
I realized how wrong I was about this. I started noticing that I never
really had input data in my classes and that I never let the student use
all his/her capability to do things for himself/herself. It´s like I
underestimated my student´s capability. The Pre-service changed my
whole idea of what "teaching" means. I have been trying to change my
style of doing things and this actually has made me become even more
passionate about my profession.*" (Assessment Questionnaire 1,
question 1)

Her reference to lack of input data is here interpreted as what

we later called lack of contextualization, like bringing extra materials to

class, so as to contextualize it. In this sense, the analysis so far presented

of the classes seems to be corroborated. Maybe the fact that she feels

having underestimated her students at first made her overestimate them

during the time our study took place (thus not seeing the necessity of

modeling). It was a way to counterbalance something she saw as a point

to improve in her practice.

The second question of the assessment questionnaire was about

what difficulty she had in the TEP, and her answer met what she had

mentioned in the MSs:

Questionnaire Excerpt 2:
"*I had a hard time preparing my lessons. I had never put so much time and effort into my lessons and finding new (and efficient) input data for my lessons was a hard task for me. Also, I had a hard time realizing that you really can teach English without speaking in Portuguese at all. At first I didn´t really agree with the methodology, but now that I have been using it I am sure it is the best way to teach somebody.*" (Assessment Questionnaire, question 2)

When we talked about modeling in the MSs, she mentioned that she did not do it because it was too time-consuming, class planning took a lot of time. The issue of Portuguese in class was dealt with in the MSs, but due to the limits inherent to a master thesis, I did not have space to analyze it.

The third question was about what she thought were her strengths and weaknesses in relation to the LI methodology, and her answer was:

Questionnaire Excerpt 3:
"*My strengths are that I am really dynamic and that I really am in love with teaching. I kind of foresee the mistakes the students will make, or I simply understand what´s going on in their minds. I think this is a plus for me. My weaknesses are that this whole methodology is a new thing for me. So...I spend hours and hours (and more hours) preparing my lessons. At least I enjoy doing this! (*Assessment Questionnaire, question 3)

What she considered her strengths could be perceived in her classes, although the focus of the constructs was not on class dynamics. Again, what she claimed to be her weakness was a point that she

mentioned in the MSs. At first, having to mold oneself to a specific

methodology is a process that takes some time, and it requires effort.

However, she sees this as a challenge instead of a setback.

The fourth question in the questionnaire was related to the previous one,

how she planned to improve the weakest points, and her answer was:

Questionnaire Excerpt 4:
"Well, they say practice makes perfect!!! So my plan is simply to practice and get a lot of feedback from everyone (including students)."
*(*Assessment Questionnaire, question 4)

This answer was very comforting, because it meant that she was

both willing to do her best, and expecting feedback, which is the whole

idea of the study: the mediation provided by me, intending to give her

feedback about her practice, suggesting that novice teachers may profit

from receiving feedback about their practice.

4.3.2   Follow-up questionnaires

After each month the study took place, Nicole answered three follow-up

questionnaires. The questions were the same in all of them, but the

answers reflected the process she engaged during our interactions and

her classes. In the analysis that follows, I put the answers of the three

questionnaires in a sequence so it is easier to perceive her

development/change.

Question 1 in the first questionnaire enquired if the points

elicited by me in the mediating sessions of that specific month resonated

to her, which ones in particular and in what way (this question was the

second one in questionnaires 2 and 3). The answers were:

Questionnaire Excerpt 5:
*"Yes. I agree with everything that has been pointed out and I can see
where every feedback comes from. I can see how my classes didn´t flow
naturally. There were (are) chunks in my lessons and I plan to fix that".*
(Follow-up questionnaire 1, question 1)

Questionnaire Excerpt 6:
*"Yes, all of them do! I agree with the importance of everything that is
said during the sessions, especially the ones about modeling and the
links between the tasks. I see how I need to improve many things,
although I have now come up with the conclusion that being a good
teacher takes a lot of effort.* (Follow-up questionnaire 2, question 2)

Questionnaire Excerpt 7:
*"Yes, all of them, I suppose. Especially the ones about modeling. I
realized how I wasn´t getting new different examples for my modeling.
Most of the times I was just using the same things from the book and I
end up killing the task. All her questions had a good point behind
them."(*Follow-up questionnaire 3, question 2)

Nicole's perception of how much this study was making sense

to her was evident in her answers above. After the first month, she

perceived *links* as what resonated more to her, after the second month

also *modeling*, and after the third month more about *modeling*. During

her trajectory, those were the aspects I also perceived as needing more

development, and that was corroborated with her remarks. During the

mediating sessions we talked about many other aspects, which she did

not feel as being as important as these ones.

In questionnaires 2 and 3, the first question was if the points

discussed in the mediating sessions of that month were the same as the

previous month, and if she perceived development of the points elicited

in the previous month, in what way. The answers were:

Questionnaire Excerpt 8:
"*Some things were the same and some things changed! I feel that I have learned many things, although **they are still not automatic to me**. I still need to improve my modelling!!!*" (Follow-up questionnaire 2, question 1)

Questionnaire Excerpt 9:
"*Some points were the same and some were different. I still had many problems with modeling, for example. I perceived a big development though. I started believing more in my beliefs, regardless of having to follow a specific approach and methodology. In one of the classes I even forgot to take my TAF with me and I decided to change an activity at the time of the lesson because I realized how there would be a smoother link between the two tasks. I think I earned a little more confidence in myself as a teacher, BUT I still feel like I am "a teacher-to-be" and not yet a teacher.*" (Follow-up questionnaire 3, question 1)

As mentioned before, there were many aspects discussed in the

MSs. However, the point she perceived she needed to improve more was

modeling, a subsection that was analyzed in her classes, and the one that

took more time to make sense to her. Again, our intersubjectivity was

there, the points she perceived as challenges are the ones I saw having

the biggest development. Another aspect that is worth noticing is her

agency into action, after the second month she was on the way to

internalization, and after the third month she started being self-regulated,

not so dependent on the TAFs during classes, changing her class plan

during the class, showing more confidence in herself (parts in bold).

Another question was if the interactions between Nicole and I

had helped her plan and conduct subsequent classes of that month, and

the answers were:

Questionnaire Excerpt 10:
"Yes, a great deal, actually. I try to follow the guide that was given to me at the beginning and I always read the feedbacks that were given based on the lesson that was last analyzed." (Follow-up questionnaire 1, question 2)

Questionnaire Excerpt 11:
"Yes! I now pay more attention to the Teacher's book and try to plan my classes even more carefully. And, when I don't have time to plan them so well (due to my college exams and etc.), I don't feel like I did a good job in my classes." (Follow-up questionnaire 2, question 3)

Questionnaire Excerpt 12:
"Yes, I always tried to plan my next classes based on what was previously discussed in the last meeting we had had. So I looked at my notes and started preparing for the next class. One example is that I started using more the teacher´s guide book." (Follow-up questionnaire 3, question 3)

We can perceive Nicole's process of agency into action in her

answers to this question. Before the first month she was dependent on

the interactions between us, and after the second and third months she

realized the importance of resorting to the Teacher's manual, something

that was commented on in the previous section. Also, the more

knowledge that was generated in our interactions during her

development, the more self-conscious she began to be (in bold).

There was one question about how the information and

knowledge generated in the mediating sessions of that month would help

her in her following classes, and the answers were:

Questionnaire Excerpt 13:
"Watching myself teaching isn´t the best thing to do. I learned a lot about myself and my teaching style as well. I was able to see many things that I want to take out from my lessons and many things that I actually think I do right. (Ok, not so many). I like the fact that I get to watch over my lessons and stop at each important moment to see what is being done correctly or wrong" (Follow-up questionnaire 1, question 3)

Questionnaire Excerpt 14:
"I try to take note of everything that is elicited in order not to make the same mistakes again. I hope to get better on my class planning and especially in following what I have previously decided to do during my lessons. (Follow-up questionnaire 2, question 4)

Questionnaire Excerpt 15:
"Well, I take more time now to look at the teacher´s guide and I take really good care with my links and modeling!!! And also, I try to not be the center of the class (I still need to work on this a lot though."
*(*Follow-up questionnaire 3, question 4)

The first answer reflects her initial feeling watching herself

teaching, and this had a great impact on her, so her answer was more

general. Answers in the second and third questionnaires reflect a

refinement in what she considered she needed to work more on her class

plan and finally resorting to the teacher's manual. Her perception that

the class was teacher oriented is something we had commented on one

of the first classes, but that we did not comment again. This was one

perception that she had that I did not have. Perhaps this feeling had to do

with other classes, because it was not something that called my

attention.

The last question asked was about confidence: "Do you feel

more confident after this month? If yes, what do you attribute this

confidence to?" Her answers also reflect change:

Questionnaire Excerpt 16:
"No! They say the more you know about something the less intelligent you feel, right? Although I have learned many things over the past weeks, I´ve become more self-critical and now I am never truly happy with my lessons". (Follow-up questionnaire 1, question 4)

Questionnaire Excerpt 17:
"Yes, I do. I see my improvement, not only with this group, but also with my other groups! Whenever I catch myself doing something wrong I try to go over that lesson again and fix what I´m missing on. Although I feel more confident, I still think I take too much time planning my classes. Not as long as I did before, but it still takes a lot of effort". (Follow-up questionnaire 2, question 5)

Questionnaire Excerpt 18:
"Yes, I feel more confident about the fact that I have more knowledge about teaching. I question myself though, if knowing\believing that you have to do something actually means you are doing the thing you believe in. For example, I know I have to make smooth links and I believe in the importance of making smooth links between tasks... But will I always manage to do this since I work so many hours everyday, go to college and barely have time to prepare my classes? I don´t know...Probably not always. So, I don´t know if I am more confident after all. Because now I know everything that I should do, but I don´t always have time for that." (Follow-up questionnaire 3, question 5)

The answers to this question follow the twisting path Nicole went through (and is probably still going through) during the study: at first she felt insecure, maybe because there were so many things we discussed that she might have felt a little lost, in a way the saying "ignorance is a blessing" can be applied here!

After the second month, she felt confident, and generalized the knowledge generated in the MSs to other classes, showing her *sense of plausibility* and *reasoning* in action, when she mentioned reviewing her lessons. The perception of her improvement is then questioned with the reality shock of spending a lot of time preparing classes.

And this feeling persisted after the third month, to the point of questioning if all the effort is worth it after all. Then she knew what to do and why to do it, but verbalized maybe not doing it due to lack of time in class preparation. This answer came as a surprise and a disappointment to me; after all, Nicole showed such a great potential as a learner teacher, during this short time I helped her, that I thought this improvement would suffice as motivation.

4.3.3   Overall Questionnaire

As a positive surprise, in the final questionnaire Nicole acknowledged

this feeling was not present in the overall questionnaire, which Nicole

answered two weeks after the study had finished. In the first question, I

asked her to look back to the assessment questionnaire and analyze if

what she had answered about her weaknesses and strengths had

changed, and if so, in what way. Her answer was:

Questionnaire Excerpt 19:
"Yes, once you get good at something there´s always something else to work on. I made improvements in so many things but then I realized I have weaknesses in other areas. This is good, though. In this study I was able to start realizing things I had never realized about teaching, for example, my -always- lack of modeling. Also, I started thinking about how production needs to come before the language awareness, so that students can practice and try out the things before I just tell them the correct way to do things. This is something I did not believe in before but this study made me realize how it works best" (Overall questionnaire, question 1)

Although she had mentioned spending a lot of time on class

preparation as a weakness in her assessment questionnaire, this was not

mentioned in her overall impression. Maybe her initial comment (in

bold) reflects that she realized how much she improved, so the

weaknesses changed from not being comfortable with the methodology

to getting better in aspects she did not even consider before, due to lack

of knowledge about how things actually worked in practice.

Only after being confronted with the reality of everyday

teaching, watching herself teaching and being questioned and led to

reason upon her practice, did she notice that her initial weakness was

just a matter of time and practice to be improved. Therefore, she could focus more on the theoretical aspects of her practice, the aspects she knew now she had to improve (like modeling).

We can also perceive that Nicole's beliefs were confronted and changed during this study. When she was a private teacher, she first taught grammar (deductively), and then students applied it their practice in LI, she learned first to practice the target language items, and then analyze the grammatical aspects inductively. This was something that she did not believe as efficient, and with the everyday practice she saw it worked.

The second question was if she thought participating in this study contributed for her professional development and how. Her answer was:

Questionnaire Excerpt 20:
"Yes. It was my first reality shock as a teacher. Having to watch myself teaching and see myself as they -the students- see me was really overwhelming. I learned many new terminologies and was aware of how my previous beliefs affected my teaching style due to the lack of background information that I had. This study made me get even more interested in my future profession and made me read more articles on "task based teaching". I just really got interested in this area and I plan to develop myself as a teacher and maybe a researcher one day. Who knows..." (Overall questionnaire, question 2)

Her last answer showed that, although feeling confronted, questioned and maybe even doubting her beliefs, she had a very positive

experience, realizing improvement and growth, both in theory (the terminologies she learned), and in practice, to the point of even wanting to pursue a career in the research area.

Personally, I became truly happy with Nicole's answers, with her perceptions about her development and growth, and with the fact that, although questioning sometimes the use of spending so many hours preparing classes, in the end it was worth it, made her enthusiastic about her profession, and propelled her to want more.

CHAPTER 5

FINAL REMARKS

5.1 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to summarize the main findings of the

present study, which aimed at tracing the development of a novice

teacher in a case study, as well as raise pedagogical implications,

pinpoint to limitations and suggest possibilities for further research. This

chapter is divided into 3 sections. Section 5.1 presents the major

findings obtained from qualitative analysis of data, from the specific to

the general research questions. Section 5.2 highlights the pedagogical

implications of these findings. And, finally, section 5.3 features the

limitations of the study as well as suggestions for further research.

5.2 Main Findings

The goal of this study was to trace the developmental process that a

novice teacher undergoes as she is mediated by a teacher educator, in

this case, the researcher herself, who aims at motivating her to reason

upon her practice and to reflect upon what constitutes the teaching she

does, providing her with individual and continuous assistance. In order

to do so, there were three specific research questions that guided my

study, which are: (i) How do the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice teacher's discourse?; (ii) How do the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice teacher's practice? and (iii) Does the novice teacher perceive herself differently? Does she feel more confident about her teaching? In what ways?

In the next sub-sections, I will answer the specific questions, based on the analysis that was presented in the previous chapter.

5.2.1 Specific research question 1:

How do the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher reverberate on the novice teacher's discourse?

Knowing the nomenclature (or names) of what Nicole was doing seemed to be, in a way, an earlier and easier movement than the practice, which is a natural path according to the assumptions of SCT: knowing names precedes the awareness of their concepts. It seems that if concepts are verbalized and thus open to discussion and mediation, they will be more easily and more accurately assimilated and internalized. Thus, many times Nicole verbalized concepts that were not present in her practice, exemplifying what Vygotsky calls "empty

verbalism"- or "mindless learning of words" (Vygotsky, 2007 [1978]).

According to him

> ... the child learns not the concept but the word, and this word is taken over by the child through memory rather than thought. Such knowledge turns out to be inadequate in any meaningful application. (Vygotsky, 2007 [1978], p. 170)

In the first mediating session she displayed that the terms were still at an abstract level in her conceptual framework: she had been introduced to them in the preservice, she recognized the words, but she did not associate the name to what it really referred to, and sometimes she used her own terms (that were not incorrect, but that are not technical either nor are they what the LI used). She also mixed up some names, like *contextualization* and *links.*

With the mediating sessions, ranging from very explicit to implicit mediation, the names started making sense to her, that is, she could see in practice what she had been introduced to in discourse, in the preservice. Along the mediating sessions she used the names correctly and did not mix them up anymore. As Vygotsky pointed out, naming is paramount in concept formation: we ought to know what to call something in order to recognize it.

> Real concepts are impossible without words, and thinking in concepts does not exist beyond verbal thinking. That is why

> the central moment in concept formation, and its generative
> cause, is a specific use of words as functional tools.
> (Vygotsky,1962, p. 107)

However, sometimes Nicole did things without knowing its
name; thus, the mediating sessions were essential for her to acquire the
scientific concepts and relate them to the spontaneous ones, which was
her own practice.

Relating concepts from the outside to the inside is at the base of
the SCT: first we learn with others, and then we develop at an
intrapersonal level of abstraction. According to Vygotsky (1998) "the
transformation of an interpersonal process into an intrapersonal one is
the result of a long series of developmental events" (p. 75). This
movement was present in the way Nicole developed her discourse.

5.2.2 Specific research question 2:

*How do the interactions between teacher educator and novice teacher
reverberate on the novice teacher's practice?*

The study Nicole and I engaged in was aimed at developing her
teaching skills in consonance with the methodology proposed at the
language institute in which she was a novice teacher. During the time we
engaged in this study, it was noticeable that Nicole developed her
practice in teaching according to this pedagogy. At first, she showed that

spontaneous concepts, originated both from the way she was taught while in the shoes of a student (Lortie's [1975] *apprenticeship of observation*), and her initial practice prior to entering the LI (without any pedagogical training/ instruction), was what guided her practice.

In agreement with the assumptions of sociocultural theories, the scientific concepts that guide the pedagogy of the institute and that were introduced to her along the 60-hour training course before her first week of work did not suffice to make her indeed understand and thus apply them in her classes. It was only during the study she engaged in with me that she started making sense of some crucial concepts related to her teaching. Again, in line with SCT, this signals that it was only while in the activity of teaching that the concepts started to resonate to her. One of the biggest contributions of teaching practice, especially for novice teachers, is to "provide teachers with opportunities to 'develop the pedagogical reasoning skills they need when they begin teaching' (Richards, 1998: 78, as cited by Ochieng'Ong'ondo & Borg, 2011, p. 510). Yet, this development was not simply for the sake of teaching, but rather due to mediation provided along the teaching activity by an expert other. It is important to mention that the mediation I provided meant to be graduated and contingent, as Lantolf and Thorne (2007) explain:

Assistance should be graduated— with no more help provided than is necessary because the assumption is that over-assistance decreases the student's ability to become fully self-regulated. At the same time, a minimum level of guidance must be given so that the novice can successfully carry out the action at hand. Related to this is that help should be contingent on actual need and similarly removed when the person demonstrates the capacity to function independently. Graduation and contingency are critical elements of developmental productive joint activity. This process is dialogic and entails continuous assessment of the learner's ZPD and subsequent tailoring of help to best facilitate developmental progression from other-regulation to self-regulation." (Lantolf and Thorne, 2007, p. 215)

In this vein, one might say that the preservice might have been too theoretical (scientific) for her to grasp, and all that was studied then started making sense to her in the moment when she saw her own teaching (the videos that I recorded from her classes), and had the interactions with me in the mediating sessions, once we reviewed the scientific concepts she had been introduced to in the preservice, linking to the spontaneous concepts brought from her own practice According to Smagorisky, Cook and Johnson (2003) "while spontaneous concepts may be developed without formal instruction, scientific concepts require interplay with spontaneous concepts; hence the problematic nature of the theory/practice dichotomy" (p. 1).

This formation of concepts was possible because, along the study, Nicole's ZPDs, which started in the preservice, were developed,

creating new ones, which were then catered for and worked on. As

Lantolf (2007) puts it:

> Since a self-regulated individual is not the premise but the
> result of education (Kozulin 1995: 121), education does not
> wait for the learner to reach the appropriate developmental
> level for instruction to be effective, but promotes learner
> development through instruction. The most effective
> instruction is that which takes account of the learner's Zone
> of Proximal Development. (Lantolf, 2007, p. 44)

This movement was not linear, though; Nicole showed that, like

any path in concept development, hers was also twisting: she made

movements back and forth, presenting pseudoconcepts (Smagorinsky,

Cook & Johnson, 2003) intertwined with concepts. Her practice showed

that concepts which she had already presented as being internalized

returned to the state of her prior practice, thus exemplifying that she is

still in the process of internalization of the concepts this study dealt

with. However, the fact that she was able to generalize a concept, as she

does when applying one concept at a different context, shows that she is

not restricted to spontaneous concepts anymore, she can now work out

the reasons for conducting a certain practice, and the implications of her

attitudes as a teacher in a broader scope. As Lantolf explains, scientific

concepts "represent the generalizations of the experience of humankind

that is fixed in science, understood in the broadest sense of the term to

include both natural and social science as well as the humanities"
(Karpov, 2003, p. 66, as cited by Lantolf, 2007)

As the study ended before Nicole presented consistency in using
those concepts worked with, it is likely that she will continue this
movement between mastering and not mastering concepts. My hope, in
this sense, as above mentioned, is that she is now able to engage in
private speech and self-mediate or, if she is not yet ready for this much,
that she resorts to the teachers' guide for continuous external mediation
until she feels she can regulate herself. (Lantolf, 2007)

The mediation we engaged in was fundamental to achieving this
result: without the intervention and guidance of an expert other (me), it
would have been hard for Nicole to perceive things by herself. Bailey
(2006) poses that

> The supervisor's role is to help novice language teachers
> make connections between the material in their training
> courses and the classroom contexts they face … the
> supervisor may need to guide them as they build bridges
> between the research and theories they have studied and the
> realities of the classroom teaching … so in addition to
> providing practical tips, supervisors' feedback can promote
> reflective practice and socialize novices into the professional
> discourse community. (Bailey, 2006, pp. 240–44)

By highlighting what she needed to work on, and why, during
the activity of teaching, I tried to make Nicole aware of the implications

of her practice upon the class and students' performance and learning.
The mediation was a process that evolved from other regulated (by me),
to object regulated (the teacher's manual and the TAF), to self-
regulation (she started to reflect upon and realize aspects on her practice
before we had the mediating sessions).

Besides our mediation, there was another fact that made Nicole
aware of the implications of her practice: preparing classes with a fellow
teacher, which is also an example of a mediation provided by an expert
other (she prepared a class with a teacher who had ten years' experience
in the LI methodology). This happened at the end of our study, so we
might say that, due to our interactions, new ZPDs opened up in Nicole,
and hence the interaction with this other teacher made sense to her. As
Vygotsky puts it: "The zone of proximal development defines those
functions that have not yet matured but are in the process of maturation,
functions that will mature tomorrow but are currently in an embryonic
state" (Vygotsky, 1980, p.86). Thus, one might say that our mediation
sessions fostered in Nicole the functions necessary for her to understand
the mediation of another expert other.

This movement was also possible due to Nicole's openness to
change, and the way she reflected upon her teaching, engaging in
pedagogical reasoning. To critically reflect upon one's pedagogy

"involves conscious recall and examination of the experience as a basis for evaluation and decision-making and as a source for planning and action." (Richards, 1995, p. 59). Without that, it would have been more difficult and longer to achieve the results we did.

5.2.3 Specific research question 3:

Does the novice teacher perceive herself differently? Does she feel more confident about her teaching? In what ways?

From the answers to the questionnaires, we can conclude that Nicole definitely perceived herself differently, she noticed her development, from class to class, both in the group that was accompanied, and also in her other classes.

The answers from her assessment questionnaire were aligned with what I perceived in terms of weaknesses: she felt that what she needed to work on was very broad, she could not yet detect what specific teaching constructs or aspects she had difficulty with, maybe because she did not know the nomenclature well. Therefore, what she really saw as a weakness was spending time on preparing classes, as all the way of teaching proposed by the LI was different from the way she was accustomed to, when she was a private teacher. This topic (preparing classes) was addressed in the mediating sessions, and little by

little, as she started to think in concepts - thus not having to think of the concept, of its meaning and of how to apply it in practice considering different classes and subject matters, she spent less and less time on it. At the beginning, her knowledge of the LI methodology was still very immature, therefore, it was only with the mediating sessions that she could perceive what aspects about her methodology needed to be worked on, and made an effort to develop them.

Along the follow-up questionnaires, Nicole's perception of development was clear and consistent: she saw improvement in the way she prepared, conducted and analyzed her own classes. She perceived the importance of the mediating sessions and valued them, besides detecting the points she needed to work on, which were in alignment to what I perceived and to the ones we gave more emphasis to, showing our intersubjectivity. This intersubjectivity is important because it shows that, even though we cannot say that she has appropriated the concepts we worked with, there have been created ZPDs that allow her a sharper perception: "The potential level of development is suggested by the kinds of assistance needed to carry out the activity and the visible ability of the learner to utilize forms of external assistance." (Lantolf & Thorne, 2007, p. 215).

Nicole's answers also show her agency into action: she pinpointed and tried to work on he weakest points, also realizing the importance of filling out the TAFs and consulting the Teacher's manual, which is an essential part of becoming an independent learner and practitioner: this study had a short duration, and it is paramount that she knows where to look for help and guidance when needed. As Johnson and Dellagnelo (2013) assert:

> However this trajectory, from external to internal [concept development], does not happen automatically, nor does it occur in a straightforward manner. Instead it requires prolonged and sustained participation in concrete goal-directed activity (i.e. actual teaching), supported by strategic mediation offered by an expert (i.e. teacher educator, mentor teacher, and/or peer teacher) that leads the development of sign meaning (i.e. theoretical and pedagogical tools or signs) so that sign meanings become more like those of experts (i.e. intersubjectivity), with the ultimate goal of enabling novices to use sign meanings flexibly and fluently in the activities of L2 instruction. (Johnson & Dellagnelo, 2013, p. 411)

In terms of confidence, we can perceive the twisting path Nicole went through again, this time relating to how she felt about her practice: an initial uneasiness and feeling of failure, due to the many aspects I pointed out during the first mediating sessions, to an eventual feeling of accomplishment and confidence in what she was doing, maybe because of the fact that we addressed the same points over and over again, so

each time she grew more confident about them. What hindered this feeling was, as she had mentioned in her assessment questionnaire, her discomfort about the time she spent on preparing classes. Maybe she was overloaded with other activities (university and personal issues), or she prioritized them over class preparation. And as mentioned before, the more she understands the concepts, the more she will be able to think in concepts, and thus the least time she will spend in preparation.

Nevertheless, eventually she saw the importance of a good class preparation: this issue was not present in her overall assessment, though. Maybe after some time she realized that she gained so much with this study that class preparation was not an issue anymore; she detected having learned many new terminologies, which reflects her awareness of how naming things made it easier to discuss them and observe them in practice. Again, this is aligned with Vygotsky, 1998), who poses that language complements thinking; i.e. the very fact that we can name a concept helps understand this same concept. Perhaps, still, it was not mentioned because, once she mastered filling out the TAFs, it started being more automatic, and thus easier.

Her final impression of the study was very positive, she really saw how much she improved, and her enthusiasm about it makes her

want to continue to pursue this career, which for me was a win-win situation: we both benefited a great deal from the study.

Ergo, answering the general research question of this study, based on everything that has been mentioned so far, it is safe to say that this study positively impacted a great deal on Nicole's discourse, practice and confidence.

Although it is not in the scope of the present study, these mediating sessions also show improvement in the quality of mediation provided by me, as a teacher educator. Notice that I started going explicitly to the point that I wanted to make, but later I tried to elicit from the teacher first. This goes hand in hand with Johnson's (1999) assertion that development occurs in situated activities. It was in the activity of mediating Nicole that I improved my mediation strategies as well. And not only did the activity itself mediate me into this change, but also the very fact that I was always watching our recalls and then observing her as a teacher and myself as teacher educator. I then noticed that I was too assertive, and needed to let her more often than not, come up with interpretations and conclusions herself.

5.3 Pedagogical implications

Providing student teachers (especially novice teachers) with systematic and individual support and assistance, by means of mediation, in light of Vygotsky's SCT, can be an important way of relieving the stress of not knowing what to do in the classroom, helping beginner teachers to develop pedagogically. (Johnson and Dellagnelo, 2013)

Novice teachers are most of the time so overwhelmed with the load of what they have to pay attention to and deal with in their practice that they sometimes rely on formulas that make the class plan and execution easier, despite making them more meaningless at the same time, something that novice teachers do not even realize by the time they step into a classroom in the shoes of a teacher. Fayne and Ortquist-Ahrens (2006), for example, refer to studies in which preservice teachers were open-minded and optimistic when they started teaching, but eventually grew did not show their initial motivation as they tried to survive the day-to-day classroom reality.

Helping teachers to perceive that each class and each student is unique and demands unique attention is something that teacher educators should aim at. It is the job of the teacher educator to detect the areas in which teachers need to grow, identify and develop their ZPDs, provide the necessary but not suffocating mediation in order for them to

develop and change; in order to do that, it is essential that teacher

educators lead teachers into reasoning and conceptual thinking, so they

can eventually become self-sufficient (Johnson and Dellagnelo, 2013).

The efficacy of mediation is also dependent on a trusting bond between

the expert other (in this case, the teacher educator) and the subject (in

this case the novice teacher).: the tighter the bond, the more trust and

rapport there is between the participants, and thus, the better result.

     Merging scientific knowledge and spontaneous knowledge,

which ultimately leads to the development of concepts, must happen at

an early stage of teacher development: this way, learning how to teach is

acquired more smoothly and indelibly. As Johnson and Dellagnelo

(2013) assert:

> It [the study] also points to the value of creating initial
> learning-to-teach experiences in which novice teachers can
> try out new sign forms in the activity of teaching before they
> fully understand their meanings and functional uses, receive
> mediation that supports sign meaning development, and have
> multiple opportunities to externalize their emerging
> understanding of new sign meanings in the context of actual
> teaching. (Johnson & Dellagnelo, 2013, p. 429)

     These findings, therefore, suggest that those who work in the

teacher education field should not disregard the beneficial aspect of

providing teacher learners with opportunities to reflect on their own

practice, verbalize their pedagogical choices, and be shown what and how to improve their teaching.

5.4 Limitations of the study and suggestions for further research.

One of the main limitations of this study, due to its restriction in size and scope, is that it only included one participant; therefore in-depth analysis of different teachers and different contexts would be necessary to validate the findings encountered in this research.

Yet another shortcoming is the fact that the constructs the analysis was based on were pre-established, taken from the TAF, which means that aspects that were not covered in the LI constructs, although having popped up during the mediating sessions, were not central to this discussion.

A further setback is that, due to time constraints, the mediating sessions were guided by the teacher educator's perspectives, not the teacher's. This means that what was discussed, apart from her general impressions at the beginning of the mediating sessions, was decided by me, what I considered to be more relevant for her to develop. Therefore, possible interesting moments of teacher reflection and reasoning were not taken advantage of, moments when Nicole could herself detect in

her practice aspects she considered faulty or in which she was feeling insecure.

Therefore, further research on the impact of mediation between teacher educators and teachers, exploring teachers' voice and perspectives would be an interesting way of following up with this study. Furthermore, a study on the quality of mediation provided by teacher educators could also be beneficial to the field.

REFERENCES

ABRAHÃO, M. H. V. (2002). Teoria e prática na formação pré-serviço do professor de língua estrangeira. In Gimenez, T. (Ed.) *Trajetórias na formação de professores de línguas. Londrina: UEL*, 59-94.

ALLWRIGHT, D. & BAILEY, K. M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom: An introduction to classroom research for language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ANJOS-SANTOS, L., & CRISTOVÃO, V. (2015). A produção de blogs profissionais como ferramentas reflexivas na educação inicial de professores de língua inglesa. In Dellagnelo, A.C.K. & Johnson, K. E. (Eds.) *Ilha Do Desterro A Journal Of English Language, Literatures In English And Cultural Studies, 68*(1), 033-045. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-8026.2015v68n1p33.

BARCI, M. S. T. (2006). *Investigating student teachers of a Letras program: their beliefs and expectations about being English teachers.* (Unpublished Master Thesis). Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina. Florianópolis.

BERGER, J. G. (2002) *Exploring the Connection Between Teacher Education Practice and Adult Development Theory* (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University). Retrieved August, 10th 2015 from http://www.garveyberger.com/writing_files/JGBerger%20final%20dissertation.pdf.

BROOKS, L.; SWAIN, M.; LAPKIN, S., & KNOUZI, I. (2010). Mediating between scientific and spontaneous concepts through languaging. *In Language awareness.* 19(2), 89-110. DOI: 10.1080/09658410903440755

CANALE, M.; SWAIN, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. In *Applied Linguistics* (1): 1–47. DOI: 10.1093/applin/I.1.1

CERUTTI-RIZZATTI, M. E.; DELLAGNELO, A. K. (forthcoming). Implicações e problematizações do conceito de Intersubjetividade: um enfoque na formação do profissional de línguas. *In Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada.*

DANIELS, H., & WERTSCH, J. V. (2007). *The Cambridge companion to Vygotsky.* Cambridge University Press.

FAGAN, D. (2015). When Learner Inquiries Arise: Marking Teacher Cognition as It Unfolds "In-The-Moment". In Dellagnelo, A.C.K. & Johnson, K. E. (Eds.) *Ilha Do Desterro A Journal Of English Language, Literatures In English And Cultural Studies, 68*(1), 075-090. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-8026.2015v68n1p75.

FESSLER, R. (1995). Dynamics of Teacher Career Stages. In Guskey, T. R. & Huberman, M. (Eds.). *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices* (pp.171-192). Columbia. Teachers College Press.

FAYNE, H. R., & Ortquist-Ahrens, L. (2006). *Entry-year teachers inside and outside of the academy.* College Teaching, 54, 320 – 3.

GIMENEZ, T., STEIN, A., & CANAZART, C. (2015). Recontextualização pedagógica e políticas de formação continuada de professores de Língua Inglesa: o caso do PDE-PR. In Dellagnelo, A.C.K. & Johnson, K. E. (Eds.) *Ilha Do Desterro A Journal Of English Language, Literatures In English And Cultural Studies, 68*(1), 061-074. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-8026.2015v68n1p61.

GOLOMBEK, P. (2011). Dynamic Assessment in Teacher Education: Using Dialogic Video Protocols to Intervene in Teacher Thinking and Activity. In Johnson, K. & Golombek, P.*(Eds) Research on Second Language Teacher Education: A Sociocultural Perspective on Professional Development.* Routledge. New York

GRANT, C. A., & Zeichner, K. M. (1984). On becoming a reflective teacher. In Grant, C. A. (Ed) *Preparing for reflective teaching. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.*

HAMMOND, J. and GIBBONS, P. (2001). What is scaffolding? In Burns, A. and Joyce, H. de S. (Eds) *Teachers' voices 8: Explicitly supporting reading and writing in the classroom* . pp. 5-16

HARVEY, J., & VÁSQUEZ, C. (2015). Preparing for the Complexities of Teaching: Modeling Conceptual Thinking in Post-Observation Conferences. In Dellagnelo, A.C.K. & Johnson, K. E. (Eds.) *Ilha Do Desterro A Journal Of English Language, Literatures In English And Cultural Studies, 68*(1), 091-103. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-8026.2015v68n1p91

HUBERMAN, M. (1993). Research on teachers' professional lives. In Huberman, M. (Ed.) *International Journal of Educational Research*, (1989), vol.13(4), pp 343-466. Pergamon Press.

JOHNSON, K.E. (1999). *Understanding Language teaching: Reasoning in Action*. USA, Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

JOHNSON, K.E. (2009*). Second Language Teacher Education- A sociocultural Perspective*. New York: Routledge.

JOHNSON, K.E.; DELLAGNELO, A.C.K. (2013). How 'sign meaning develops': Strategic mediation in learning to teach. *Language Teaching Research*, 17(4) 409 -432. DOI: 10.1177/1362168813494126

JOHNSON, K., & DELLAGNELO, A.C.K. (2015). L2/FL Teacher Education: Bridging the complexities of Teaching and the Learning of Teaching. In Dellagnelo, A.C.K. & Johnson, K. E. (Eds.)*Ilha Do Desterro A Journal Of English Language, Literatures In English And Cultural Studies, 68*(1), 011-016. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.5007/2175-8026.2015v68n1p11

LANTOLF, J. P. (2007). Conceptual knowledge and instructed second language learning: A sociocultural perspective. In Fotos S.&

Nassaji H. (Eds.), *Form-focused instruction and teacher education: Studies in honour of Rod Ellis*, 35-54.

LANTOLF, J. P., & THORNE, S. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (p. 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 197- 221 Retrieved on July, 25th, 2014 from http://eslenglishclassroom.com/Art-05.pdf.

LANTOLF, J. P.; THORNE, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and the genesis of L2 development.* New York: OUP, 2006.

LANTOLF, J. P., & THORNE, S. L. (2007). Sociocultural theory and second language learning. In VanPatten, B., & Williams, J. (Eds.) *Theories in second language acquisition: An introduction*, 201-224. Routledge.

LORTIE, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MICHEL, H. A. (2013). *The First Five Years: Novice Teacher Beliefs, Experiences, and Commitment to the Profession*. (Doctoral dissertation).University of California. San Diego: b7762535. Retrieved from: https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3cq6954m

NUNAN, D. (1989). *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

NUNAN, D. (1991). Communicative tasks and the language curriculum.In Silberstein S. (Ed) *TESOL quarterly*, *25*(2), 279-295. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.2307/3587464

OLIVEIRA, M. K. D.(1993). *Vygotsky: aprendizado e desenvolvimento-um processo sócio-histórico*. Scipione.

OZTURK, M. (2008*). Induction into teaching: adaptation challenges of novice teachers.* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Middle East Technical University. Ankara. Retrieved on March, 2nd, 2015 from *etd.lib.metu.edu.tr/upload/12609585/index.pdf*

PARSONS, TALCOTT AND MIDIS, E. A. (1951). *Toward a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

POLIFEMI, Marcos. (2009). *Yázigi´s Preservice Program Power Point Presentation and COF (Class Observation Form)*. Retrieved on May, 12th, 2014 from www.yazigi.com.br/teacherscollege

POLIFEMI, Marcos. (2006). TEP booklet. Retrieved on May, 12th, 2014 from www.yazigi.com.br/teacherscollege

PRABHU, N. S. (1990). There's no Best Method. Why?. In SILBERSTEIN, S. (Ed) *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 24, No. 2. pp. 161-176.

RICHARDS, J. C., & NUNAN, D. (1990). *Second language teacher education*. Cambridge University Press.

RICHARDS, J. C. (1995). *Towards reflective teaching*. Retrieved November, 15th, 2015 from http://www.sanjeshserv.ir/Hamgam/Files/file/Towards%20Reflective%20Teaching.pdf.

RICHARDS, J. (2009). *Second Language Teacher Education Today*. Retrieved on May, 25th, 2014 from http://www.professorjackrichards.com/wp-content/uploads/second-language-teacher-education-today-2009.pdf.

SCHÖN, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

SIEGLER, R., & CROWLEY, K. (1991). The microgenetic method: A direct means for studying cognitive development. American Psychologist, 46, 606-620.

SMAGORINSKY, P., COOK, S.L., & JOHNSON, T.S.(2003). The twisting path of concept development in learning to teach. In *Teachers College Record, 105* (8) 1399-1436. Retrieved June, 25th, 2015 from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.458.3537&rep=rep1&type=pdf

SWAIN, M.; KINNEAR, P. (2010). *Sociocultural theory in second language education*. New York. Multilingual matters.

VERENIKINA, I. (2003) Understanding scaffolding and the ZPD in educational research. *In Proceedings of the International Education Research Conference (AARE - NZARE)*, November, 30 – December, 3 ,2003, Auckland, New Zealand. Retrieved May, 19th, 2014 from http://ro.uow.edu.au/edupapers/381/.

VYGOTSKY, L., HANFMANN, E. E., & VAKAR, G. E. (1962). *Thought and language*. MIT press. Cambridge, Massachusetts.

VYGOTSKY, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.

VYGOTSKY, L.S. (1987). In Rieber R. W. & Carton A. S., Eds. *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky (Vol. 1)*. New York: Plenum.

VYGOTSKY, L. S. (1998). *A formação social da mente.* Trad.. Cipolla J. N., Menna Barreto, L. S. & e Castro Afeche, S.

 WAITES, C. K. (1999). The Professional Life-Cycles And Professional Development Of Adult Teachers Of English To Speakers Of Other Languages (Tesol). (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved April, 10th, 2014 from National Library of Australia (TROVE) http://handle.unsw.edu.au/1959.4/17832.

WERTSCH, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind*. Harvard University Press.

WHITE, R. (2008). Teachers' Professional Life Cycles. In Scott, A. G. (Ed.)*International House Journal of Education and Development. Issue 24- Spring 2008*, retrieved May 23rd, 2014 from http://ihjournal.com/teachers-professional-life-cycles

WOOD, D., BRUNER, J. S., & ROSS, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry*, *17*(2), 89-100. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1976.tb00381.x

ZEICHNER, K. M. (1994). Research on teacher thinking and different views of reflective practice in teaching and teacher education. In

Carlgreen, I., Handal, G., and Vaage, S. (Eds.) *Teachers' minds and actions: Research on teachers' thinking and practice*, 9-27. Falmer press. London.

ZEICHNER, K. M., & LISTON, D. P. (2013). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*.2nd ed. Routledge.

APPENDICES

Appendix A- TAFs

A.1 Task Analysis Framework (TAF) model

TASK COMPONENTS	GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives (What for? Why?)	1. By the end of the task, what should students be able to do? 2. Which of the communicative competences (sociolinguistic, grammatical, discourse or strategic) is/are the focus of the task?
Input Data (What to use?)	1. What kind of input data is available for students to accomplish the task? 2. Besides the book, what sources of information can be explored/ used?
Setting/ Grouping (What kind of arrangement?)	1. How are students going to work? Individually, open pair, pair work, small groups? Why? What for? 2. How are you going to change the setting configuration? 3. What kind of interaction will this task generate? Teacher (T)-students (Ss)? Ss- Ss?
Instructions	1. How are you going to tell the Ss what they are expected to do? (i.e. will Ss read, silently or aloud; will you explain the instructions?) 2. Are instructions clear and brief?
Procedures: Preparation	1.How are you going to set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2.Do Ss perceive the goals of the task? 3.Will there be modeling? How is it going to be carried out? Why? 4.How can information brought up by Ss be incorporated into the lesson?
Procedures: Performing	1.Do Ss work at their own pace? 2.How will you deal with early finishers? In what occasions do you think you might interrupt Ss' performance?
Procedures: accountability	1.How are the learning results evaluated? 2.How do Ss share the outcome of their learning?
Link to the next task	How is the task linked smoothly into the next task?
Related Homework	1. Is the homework assigned by the teacher related to the goal of the class? 2. Do you explain/ model the homework

A. 2 TAFS Filled Out By Teacher

Teacher's answers to the guiding questions are in bold. The numbers before the answers refer to the guiding question numbers explicit in the TAF model. The questions whose numbers are not shown have not been answered. Teacher's answers have been transcribed *ipsis literis,* regardless of possible mistakes).

A.2.1. CLASS 1 (19/03/2015) TAF 1

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives **WARM-UP!!!** *This is a link to the last class activity. We watched a video about a girl who lost a lot of weight.* **To raise awareness about healthy eating habits and bullying. Also, for listening skills improvement.**	**1. They should be able to answer the five questions I gave them last class. (What did she do to lose weight?; What was the hardest part for her; How did her life change? And How do you think were her eating habits before?)**
Input Data	**2. We watched a video on *Youtube*.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Open Group!! Because there will be a debate on the topic of the video we watched previously** **2. There will be no need for this.** **3. Teacher-Students**
Instructions	**2. Yes**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. We will watch the video again.** **4. Since they have watched the video I am sure they will have enough information for the task**
Procedures: Performing	**3. Especially when they make mistakes with the 3rd person singular.**
Procedures: accountability	**1. By their reports.** **2. Reporting to the class.**
Link to the next task	**I´ll say that that girl was bullied and that she was called names. Does anyone know a bullying story from their school? We´ll raise awareness about the subject.**
Related Homework	

A.2.2. CLASS 1 (19/03/2015) TAF 2

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives **To raise awareness about bullying. Also, to practice more 3rd person singular* and to practive giving advice! (You SHOULD yadayadayada...)**	**1. They should be able to give meaningful advices to the other kids´ story characters.** **2. It´s closer to grammatical I think!?**
Input Data	**1. Each student will receive a picture of a kid that suffers bullying. Also, there will be a verb list on the ground for them to use.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Individually in the beginning. Then they´ll report in front of the class and somebody will give them an advice of what he/she should do.** **2. I´ll throw the verbs in the air and they´ll look for the ones they would like to use. They usually love this.** **3. Ss-Sss**
Instructions	**1. I will explain the instructions because these kids already understand everything. I wouldn´t really know another way to do this with this task!! ;/** **2. Yes**
Procedures: Preparation	**1.After the video we will talk about bullying.** **4. The video was about a girl that was bullied so I hope they bring their personal information into the task.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes and no. I will give them five minutes.** **2. I will correct the 3rd person singular mistakes.** **3. Same as before.**
Procedures: accountability	**1. By their reports** **2. Reporting to the class.**
Link to the next task	**I´ll show them a picture of a weird food that I ate in Africa. Pounded Yam! And I´ll explain what it was. Do you guys like weird food? Have you eaten something weird before?**
Related Homework	

A.2.3. CLASS 1 (19/03/2015) TAF 3

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives **To raise awareness about about other countries´ eating habits. Because this is also of the goals of this unit**	**1. Come up with a weird food for the person I give them to make the food**
Input Data	**1. I will give them little cards about weird foods in the beginning. They will have to read and report to the class.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1**. **Closed Pair. Because it will be fun to do this together. They will have cool ideas for this** **2. I will assign them numbers. One and Two. Ones will go to one side and Twos will go to the other side.** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. Instructions will be given.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Through the little cards about weird food.** **2. YES** **3. Instructions will be given.** **4. They will have great ideas about weird foods. I am sure.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. No, I will assign them ten minutes.** **2. I will check their papers.** **3. 3rd person singular mistakes**
Procedures: accountability	**1. By their reports** **2. Reporting to the class.**
Link to the next task	**I´ll say "Now imagine this is the only thing they serve in your school!!!!!"**
Related Homework	

A.2.4. CLASS 1 (19/03/2015) TAF 4

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Do a play role in which A B and C will be students and D will be a school principal.** **2. ?? I am really having trouble with this.**
Input Data	**1. The weird menu they wrote before.** **2. Books and Weird Menu.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Open Pair!?** **2. I will make the students actually enter the class thinking they are entering the principal´s office.** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. I will explain it. (I guess I´ve always just explained things. Is this bad?)**
Procedures: Preparation	
Procedures: Performing	
Procedures: accountability	
Link to the next task	**I will ask if they remember about our study!**
Related Homework	

A.2.5. CLASS 2 (26/03/2015) TAF 1

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1.They should have some knowledge of vocabulary concerning the Environment Awareness, such as Pollution, Global Warming, Forests, Deforestation...**
Input Data	**1. The Input Data is the book and the posters they made on last class. From there we will take the information to start this activity.** **2. Poster and Book only**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Individually.** **2. We will talk about environmental issues before they enter the activity.** **3. T-Ss**
Instructions	**1. "Let´s see more examples on page 14 and15 and see what we already know about this subject** **2. Yes**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Contextualization will be done through open-pair activity.** **4. Their personal experiences about what they already do to help the world´s environment will help. This is done before the task.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes** **3. If they do not understand what is demanded for them to do**
Procedures: accountability	**1. Report!** **2. Open Group Report. "I think yadayada**
Link to the next task	**Let´s go to page #16 and see what other kids are doing to preserve the environment**
Related Homework	

A.2.6. CLASS 2 (26/03/2015) TAF 2

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. This is meant to practice their listening skills and also to raise awareness.**
Input Data	**1. Audio CD**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Individually.** **2. I'll make them curious to hear what these kids have to say about preserving the Earth.** **3. At first, it is individual**.
Instructions	**1. First, they will read the questions and try to guess what the listening is about.** **2.yes**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Previous activity and they will read the questions.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. They work during the listening activity. Since they have to check things and write down which person is doing what.** **2. Especially if they don´t understand what the the kids are saying on the CD.**
Procedures: accountability	**1. They will report what they think is right** **2. Open Group Report.**
Link to the next task	**"Fulaninho, do you think Siclano recycles and etc? And you Siclano..?"**
Related Homework	**1. Yes it is.** **2. I'll explain it.**

A.2.7. CLASS 2 (26/03/2015) TAF 3

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. To share what their friends do or do not do in order to preserve the environment**
Input Data	**1. Book only**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Cocktail Party Format. They need to find someone who (always, never, sometimes) does different things, take the bus instead of a car. 3. Ss- Ss**
Instructions	**1. Let´s find out about our friend´s yadayada 2. Yes**.
Procedures: Preparation	**2. Yes 4.They already know the terms (sometimes, Never, always.....)**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes 2. They´ll start reporting 3. If they do not understand the goal of the task.**
Procedures: accountability	**1. Open Group Report. Fulano always never sometimes blabla**
Link to the next task	**HOMEWORK: Let´s learn more about this. Blabla**
Related Homework	**1. Yes**

A.2.8. CLASS 3 (09/04/2015) TAF 1

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Students should know how to manipulate the new lexical items: HOT, DRY, COLD, COOL, RAINY, SNOWY.** **2. ?**
Input Data	**1. Little Cards with pictures for them to analyze and come up with solutions.** **2. The little cards and background knowledge.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Closed Pairs. Each pair will receive one card at a time to reflect upon.** **2. I´ll let them choose a partner this time.** **3. Ss-SS**
Instructions	**1. I´ll ask them to reflect on what is the problem the person is facing on each picture.** **2. Yes**
Procedures: Preparation	
Procedures: Performing	
Procedures: accountability	
Link to the next task	**"So, what do you think these people must do to solve their problem?"**
Related Homework	**1. Yes** **2.**

A.2.9. CLASS 3 (09/04/2015) TAF 2

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. This is a controlled practice. By the end, students should be able to say "he/she _____ MUST blablabla** **2.**
Input Data	**1. The cards from the last task.** **2. Same as the last task´s background.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Same division as before.** **2. With the "link to the next task"** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. Write on a sheet of paper the ideas that you have. I will model one example on the board.** **2. Yes**
Procedures: Preparation	
Procedures: Performing	
Procedures: accountability	
Link to the next task	**"How is the climate in Florianópolis now?"**
Related Homework	

A.2.10. CLASS 3 (09/04/2015) TAF 3

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Recognize the new vocabulary. Sunny Windy Snowy Hot Warm Cool Cold**
Input Data	**1. Only the book for this one.** **2. Background knowledge**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Individually. After, they will switch books** **2. I´ll tell them to go back to their seats** **3. Ss-Ss during the report. Then I´ll ask what is different for them and what is similar.**
Instructions	**1. I´ll ask them to read the instructions** **2. Yes**
Procedures: Preparation	
Procedures: Performing	
Procedures: accountability	
Link to the next task	**Let´s find out about the weather in other countries!**
Related Homework	**I left the resource book at LI because I was checking the last unit´s exercises...so I will have to see their homework tomorrow morning.**

A.2.11. CLASS 3 (09/04/2015) TAF 4

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Students should be able to say what the climates of different countries are like.** **2.???**
Input Data	**1. They will receive pictures from different places and with the name of the countries.** **2. Pictures.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Cocktail Party format.** **2. Everyone will get up and walk around the room.** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. Let´s see what countries our friends have. They will say what the climate is like and we have to guess what the country is.**
Procedures: Preparation	
Procedures: Performing	
Procedures: accountability	
Link to the next task	
Related Homework	

A.2.12. CLASS 4 (23/04/2015) TAF 1

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Understand the meaning of Crazes, share ideas and raise awareness about the topic.**
Input Data	**1. Book** **2. Old objects.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Groups, individually.** **2. I will assign/ give papers with numbers** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. I´ll tell them to read and check if they understood** **2. Yes**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. I´ll bring old objects (Diskman, Harry Potter book, etc).**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes** **2. I´ll ask for more examples** **3. If they have questions about vocab.**
Procedures: accountability	**1. Reporting as a group**
Link to the next task	**Let's think about crazes of your time now**
Related Homework	

A.2.13. CLASS 4 (23/04/2015) TAF 2

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1.Talk about the topic (expand)**
Input Data	**1. Envelope with numbers to talk about.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. closed pair** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. I will explain**
Procedures: Preparation	**1.I'll give them sentences on slips, so they write their answers before talking** **2. I´ll say one example**.
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes** **3. If they're stuck for ideas**
Procedures: accountability	**1.They'll report**
Link to the next task	**Let's see what other kids are crazy about?**
Related Homework	

A.2.14. CLASS 4 (23/04/2015) TAF 3

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Develop listening skills, expand the topic.**
Input Data	**1. CD, book.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Individual, closed pairs to compare answers.** **2. by asking them to compare with different people.** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. I´ll ask Ss to read silently and check if they understand.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. "Let´s see what some kids are crazy about",** **and explain** **4. They might say what they think about those topics.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes** **3. If they don't understand.**
Procedures: accountability	**1.Reporting the answers**
Link to the next task	**I´ll write SPORTS on the board and ask them for examples**
Related Homework	

A.2.15. CLASS 4 (23/04/2015) TAF 4

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Expand vocabulary.**
Input Data	**1. Book.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Groups.** **2. I´ll make a letter game (with their initials, they choose the initial they want to work with).** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. I´ll ask them to read the instructions.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. I´ll write a topic on the board and ask for examples.** **3. Yes, the examples.** **4. I´ll ask for more examples .**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes.** **2. Give more examples of the topics.** **If they have questions.**
Procedures: accountability	**1. Reporting answers as a group.**
Link to the next task	
Related Homework	**1. Yes (Resource Book page 18, 23- vocab).**

A.2.16. CLASS 5 (07/05/2015) TAF 1

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	*(Teacher wrote in pencil, but erased, so it was unreadable)*
Input Data	**1. Book, pictures and contextualization.** **2. background knowledge will help.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Closed pairs** **2. Just sit with the person closer to them** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. I´ll ask them one of them to read the instructions out load to the class.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Link from the lest unit: what sorts of transportation are one of the crazes now? Why do people need cars now? Are cities big or small? What about Floripa?** **Yes- Fulano, I take the helicopter to school. Do you?** **-I do/ I don´t** **-Me neither** **-Me either**
Procedures: Performing	**2. Start sharing with their partners.** **3. in case they miss on those items**
Procedures: accountability	**1. Reporting: "tell me something you too have in common"** **"BOTH Fulano and I … (they learned this last class)**
Link to the next task	**Now, if we turn the page there's a map of another city…**
Related Homework	

A.2.17. CLASS 5 (07/05/2015) TAF 2

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	
Input Data	**1. Explore the pictures (on the book)** **2. Show a picture of a wax statue.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. They will listen individually and compare with a partner** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. Let´s see to which of these places they're going.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Exploring the pictures** **2. X** **New vocab: get off, pick up, give a ride**
Procedures: Performing	**1. During the audio.** **2. Checking with partners**
Procedures: accountability	**Open class report**
Link to the next task	**Remember guys I told you I had a flat tire? Do you drive everyday?**
Related Homework	

A.2.18. CLASS 5 (07/05/2015) TAF 3

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	*(Teacher wrote in pencil, but erased, so it was unreadable)*
Input Data	**1. Book only**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Cocktail party format** **3. Ss-Ss**
Instructions	**1. I´ll show them the exercise and ask them if they remember how to accomplish this kind of exercise.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Fulano, do you think Siclano _____? Let´s find out things about our friends.** **4. Knowing how to use DO will be a great help.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes** **3. In case they don't understand how to ask the questions**
Procedures: accountability	**1. Report** **2. Open group report.**
Link to the next task	
Related Homework	

A.2.19. CLASS 6 (21/05/2015) TAF 1

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Introduce the topic of the unit: reflection on the use of internet. Brainstorm <u>purposes</u> then talk about its dangers.**
Input Data	**1. Contextualization and the sentences from the handouts.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. In groups** **2. I´ll give them little handouts with their names.**
Instructions	**1. Task 1: read silently- instructions will be inside an envelope. Task 2: talk to your friends and add more tips here.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Link it to the last unit (remember to talk about the movie they watched last class and forum)** **4. They'll need to check their background knowledge to do this one.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes** **2. Start doing task 2** **3. In case they don't understand what the new ideas have to be about.**
Procedures: accountability	**1. From the reports.** **2. Open group report.**
Link to the next task	
Related Homework	

A.2.20. CLASS 6 (21/05/2015) TAF 2

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Wrap up (accountability) on internet safety.**
Input Data	**1. Internet.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Search for the class studiess.**
Instructions	**1. Aloud.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Look for Do's and DON'Ts on Internet safety.** **Report in the Resource Center and start making their profile on House of English based on these safety tips.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. yes**
Procedures: accountability	**1. Ss will check each others' profiles (probably next class, or today).**
Link to the next task	
Related Homework	**Check each others' profile and add a picture for your profile (a safe one!)**

A.2.21. CLASS 7 (28/05/2015) TAF 1

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. They should be able to understand what the new topic of the unit will be about and they should be able to answer all the questions concerning the audio cd.**
Input Data	**1. The audio CD.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Alone, then in pairs for TASK 2.** **2. I´ll just divide the students. Lazy.** **3 T-Ss and Ss-Ss.**
Instructions	**1. Read the tasks!** **2. Yes, I hope.**
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Link to the last class I was there, when we talked about internet safety. I´ll ask them to guess what the listening is about.** **2. Nope.** **4. The internet safety tips we talked about last lass will help them.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes** **2. Compare answers!!!**
Procedures: accountability	**1.Through the reports** **2. Report and also, they will compare the answers for the last task.**
Link to the next task	**Link the DO´S and DONT´s to the next activity.**
Related Homework	

A.2.22. CLASS 7 (28/05/2015) TAF 2

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. They should be able to express themselves using concerning DO´s and DONT´s.**
Input Data	**1. Cards on the floor + books.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. Individually. Because I want them to think.** **2. I´ll model one and ask them to help me.** **3 T-Ss**
Instructions	
Procedures: Preparation	**1. Come see on the floor some DO´S and DON'T´s to try to help me finish the first one.** **3. Yes** **4. The task done before will be a help for this one.**
Procedures: Performing	**1. Yes.** **2. They´ll start reporting.** **3. In case they don´t get what they are supposed to do.**
Procedures: accountability	**1. Report!!!** **2. Open group report.**
Link to the next task	
Related Homework	**1. They´ll do a do and don't´s study on internet safety.**

A.2.23. CLASS 8 (02/06/2015) TAF 1

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Ss should be able to formulate sentences using conditions.**
Input Data	**1. Cards from the Resource pack.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. They will be separated into 2 groups.** **3. Ss-Ss.**
Instructions	**1. I´ll explain that it's a competition and they need to finish quickly.**
Procedures: Preparation	**3. Yes, I´ll show examples of how the sentences can be made.**
Procedures: Performing	**2. Ss from the group that finishes before will report and the other group will say if they agree it's correct.**
Procedures: accountability	
Link to the next task	
Related Homework	

A.2.24. CLASS 8 (02/06/2015) TAF 2

TASK COMPONENTS	TEACHER'S ANSWERS TO THE GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR CLASS PRAPARATION
Objectives	**1. Same as before.**
Input Data	**1. Only book will be necessary.**
Setting/ Grouping	**1. They will be separated into 2 new groups.** **3. Ss-Ss.**
Instructions	**1. I´ll explain that it's a competition and I'll be the judge.**
Procedures: Preparation	**3. Yes, brief and clear this time! I´ll show them how to make the sentences.**
Procedures: Performing	
Procedures: accountability	**1. Open class report: Ss will report their sentences and I'll choose the best ones.**
Link to the next task	
Related Homework	

Appendix B- COFs (Classroom Observation Forms)

B.1. CLASS OBSERVATION FORM BASED ON TAF Class: 1

(March, 19th)

STEP	GUIDING QUESTIONS	TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS
Objectives (What for? Why?)	1. Were the goals of the task achieved? If not, has Teacher (T) realized it/ done anything to come around that? 2. Was the communicative competence(s) anticipated in the TAF contemplated? If not, why? Has T realized that?	1. Class objective seems confusing, a lot of different activities whose goals are to make students work and promote critical reflection of the topic (eating habits, weird food, diseases associated to bad eating habits). 2. No, T failed to provide them on most TAFs, only on 1 (out of 4). In one TAF, she mentioned having problems with this.
Input Data (What to use?)	What kind of input data did T make use of? For what purpose?	Video, questions on papers (given on previous class), pictures, papers with text, text written by students, slips, blank paper (menu), book, board, internet.
Setting/ Grouping	1. What setting was used? Why? What for? 2. Did T change the setting configuration during the class? 3. Did the kind of interaction generated serve its purposes?	1. From the 7 tasks, only 1 was done in pairs. 6 were done individually and 1 as a role play, involving all the group. 2. Twice in seven tasks. 3. Students lacked to work collaboratively, asking each other about vocabulary and ideas.
Instructions	1. How did T tell Ss what they were expected to do? 2. Did Ss understand the goal of the task? 3. Were the instructions clear/ brief?	1. In all 7 tasks, T explained in English what Ss were supposed to do. 2. Ss understood what was to be done. 3. Instructions were clear, but T could explain before giving out papers/ slips.

Procedures	Preparation	1. Did T set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2. Did Ss perceive the goals of the task? 3. Was there be modeling? Was it effective? 4. Was information brought up by Ss incorporated into the lesson?	1. T elicited from Ss if they remembered the video. No contextualization. 2. Ss understood what they were supposed to do. 3. There was no modelling in any of the 7 tasks. 4. Yes, but rarely and not explored. T preferred to talk about her own experiences.
	Performing	1. Did Ss work at their own pace? 2. How did T deal with early finishers? 3. Did T interrupt Ss' performance? Why?	1. Yes, but sometimes T. hurried Ss to finish. 2. She didn´t. They just waited for the others to finish 3. She interrupted when requested, in order to provide vocab
	Accountability	1. How were the learning results evaluated? 2. How did Ss share the outcome of their learning?	1. Task 1: eliciting answers to questions in OG. Task 2: asking Ss to read what they wrote, and the others to come up with suggestions about it. Task 3: T asks about the content of the reading passage and shows a pic of hers. Taks 4 : T asks Ss to read the menu. Task 5: T asks which food they prefer (from the book), but failed to explore the questions on task 2 (p 13). Task 6: role play was interrupted because boy had to leave.. Task 7: T elicits what they found and

			talks about posters. 2. By answering the questions, reporting their findings and text.
Link to the next task		Was the task linked smoothly into the next task? How?	No. There was no link from one task to the other.
Related Homework		1. Was the homework assigned related to the goal of the class? 2. Did T explain/ model the homework?	1.Yes. 2. Yes, explain; No, model.

MAIN POINTS MENTIONED IN THE MEDIATING SESSION:

1. 3 phases: good accountabilities, but poor preparations. Pay attention to contextualization, warm up, links and modelling.
2. Too many tasks in one class: respect students' pace, explore more the tasks, bringing the discussion to their realities.
3. Early finishers: How can teacher make the most of class time?
4. Importance of changing setting in a class.
5. Awareness of communicative competences.

B.2. CLASS OBSERVATION FORM BASED ON TAF -Class: 2
(March, 26th)

STEP	GUIDING QUESTIONS		TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS
Objectives (What for?Why?)	1. Were the goals of the task achieved? If not, has Teacher (T) realized it/ done anything to come around that? 2. Was the communicative competence(s) anticipated in the TAF contemplated? If not, why? Has T realized that?		1. T Ssill shows lack of focus on the goal of the task, needs to look at the teachers' book to clear this up, but showed a little improvement. 2. T failed to provide communicative competences.
Input Data (What to use?)	What kind of input data did T make use of? For what purpose?		Book, CD, posters.
Setting/ Grouping	1. What setting was used? Why? What for? 2. Did T change the setting configuration during the class? 3. Did the kind of interaction generated serve its purposes?		1. OG, PW, IW. 2. Yes 3. Yes, and due to lack of Ss in class limited options
Instructions	1. How did T tell Ss what they were expected to do? 2. Did Ss understand the goal of the task? 3. Were the instructions clear/ brief?		1.T told Ss what to do in all the tasks. 2. Yes 3. Yes
	Preparation	1. Did T set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2. Did Ss perceive the goals of the task? 3. Was there be modeling? Was it effective? 4. Was information brought up by Ss incorporated into the lesson?	1. Yes, by eliciting from Ss what they remembered from the previous class (*visual aids-should), besides providing links between almost all the tasks 2. Yes 3. No 4. Yes

Procedures			
	Performing	1. Did Ss work at their own pace? 2. How did T deal with early finishers? 3. Did T interrupt Ss' performance? Why?	1. Yes 2. There was not, they were working together 3. Just when requested
	Accountability	1. How were the learning results evaluated? 2. How did Ss share the outcome of their learning?	1. By checking answers and expanding the conversation to Ss' reality 2. Reporting- talking about themselves
Link to the next task		Was the task linked smoothly into the next task? How?	Yes, most of the time. By saying something that related to the next task.
Related Homework		1. Was the homework assigned related to the goal of the class? 2. Did T explain/ model the homework?	1. yes, but T needs to explore the RB and HOE. 2. Yes

MAIN POINTS MENTIONED IN THE MEDIATING SESSION:

1. Visual aids- importance of contemplating Ss with different learning styles. Write on board and show them the book;
2. Pay attention to the goals of the different sections in the book
3. Improvement on links, but still no modelling;
4. Careful not to bore students, dragging the activity for too long;
5. Explore the resources offered by the school (site and workbook).

B.3. CLASS OBSERVATION FORM BASED ON TAF -Class: 3 (April, 9th)

STEP	GUIDING QUESTIONS		TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS
Objectives (What for?Why?)	1. Were the goals of the task achieved? If not, has Teacher (T) realized it/ done anything to come around that? 2. Was the communicative competence(s) anticipated in the TAF contemplated? If not, why? Has T realized that?		1. T failed to understand the procedures of 1 task and one of the linguistic goals of the class: asking "what's the weather/climate like". T needs to read the teacher's book carefully before planning the classes. 2. T failed to provide the communicative competence in the TAFs (again)
Input Data (What to use?)	What kind of input data did T make use of? For what purpose?		Book, board, cards
Setting/ Grouping	1. What setting was used? Why? What for? 2. Did T change the setting configuration during the class? 3. Did the kind of interaction generated serve its purposes?		1. OG, PW. 2.Yes 3. Yes, but could've changed the pairs, and not repeated the cocktail format.
Instructions	1. How did T tell Ss what they were expected to do? 2. Did Ss understand the goal of the task? 3. Were the instructions clear/ brief?		1.T varied the way of giving instructions, but failed to check comprehension when she asked Ss to read them. 2. Partly. 3.yes
Procedures	*Preparation*	1. Did T set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2. Did Ss perceive the goals of the task? 3. Was there be modeling? Was it	1. Yes, by eliciting from Ss what they remembered from the previous class (* visual aids-should), besides providing links between almost all the tasks 2. Yes/ no (last task) 3. No 4. Yes

		effective? 4. Was information brought up by Ss incorporated into the lesson?	
	Performing	1. Did Ss work at their own pace? 2. How did T deal with early finishers? 3. Did T interrupt Ss' performance? Why?	1. No 2. They just waited. 3. Just when requested
	Accountability	1.How were the learning results evaluated? 2.How did Ss share the outcome of their learning?	1. By checking answers and expanding the conversation to Ss' reality 2. Reporting- talking about themselves. Think about how to make it more interesting when reporting cocktail format.
Link to the next task		Was the task linked smoothly into the next task? How?	Yes, most of the time. By saying something that related to the next task.
Related Homework		1. Was the homework assigned related to the goal of the class? 2. Did T explain/ model the homework?	1. T assigned RB as homework, but HW was assigned in the Resource center, so Ss didn't copy it. 2. No, T did not even show what the homework was, just asked them to do the pages on RB.

MAIN POINTS MENTIONED IN THE MEDIATING SESSION:

1. Good job in changing setting
2. Good use of Visual aids- writing on the board.
3. Pay attention to Task procedures/ linguistic goals. Refer to Teacher's book.
4. Improvement on links, but still no modelling. Pay attention to task preparation (how to prepare Ss for the task)
5. Be careful when assigning Homework: explaining and showing how to do (modelling) is also essential. Explore the resources offered by the school (site and workbook)

B.4. CLASS OBSERVATION FORM BASED ON TAF -Class: 4 (April, 9th)

STEP	GUIDING QUESTIONS		TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS
Objectives (What for?Why?)	1. Were the goals of the task achieved? If not, has Teacher (T) realized it/ done anything to come around that? 2. Was the communicative competence(s) anticipated in the TAF contemplated? If not, why? Has T realized that?		1. T. understood the goals of the tasks, and from what was written in the TAFS it was evident T. consulted the Teachers' book. 2. T failed to provide the communicative competence in the TAFs (again)
Input Data (What to use?)	What kind of input data did T make use of? For what purpose?		Book, board, realia, CD
Setting/ Grouping	1. What setting was used? Why? What for? 2. Did T change the setting configuration during the class? 3. Did the kind of interaction generated serve its purposes?		1. OG, PW, trio 2. Yes 3. Yes
Instructions	1. How did T tell Ss what they were expected to do? 2. Did Ss understand the goal of the task? 3. Were the instructions clear/ brief?		1. T. varied the way of giving instructions, and checked for comprehension after asking ss to read silently, by asking them to explain what needed to be done. 2. yes. 3.yes, but a little time consuming (instead of showing in the book where ss were supposed to work, T. defined what blank space was)
	Preparation	1. Did T set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2. Did Ss perceive the goals of the	1. Yes, by eliciting from ss what they remembered from the previous class, linking to the new topic 2. Yes 3. No

Procedures		task? 3. Was there be modeling? Was it effective? 4. Was information brought up by Ss incorporated into the lesson?	4. Yes
	Performing	1. Did Ss work at their own pace? 2. How did T deal with early finishers? 3. Did T interrupt Ss' performance? Why?	1. Yes 2. T. asked them to think of more examples 3. Yes, T interrupted Ss performance to explain vocab from the listening. Bad timing.
	Accountability	1.How were the learning results evaluated? 2.How did Ss share the outcome of their learning?	1. By checking answers and expanding the conversation to Ss' reality 2. Comparing their answers to classmates'; Reporting and expanding the conversations to their realities
Link to the next task		Was the task linked smoothly into the next task? How?	Yes, most of the time. By saying something that related to the next task. Still needs polishing, especially related to the flow and sequence.
Related Homework		1. Was the homework assigned related to the goal of the class? 2. Did T explain/ model the homework?	1. T assigned RB as homework, both at the beginning and at the end of the class, writing on board. 2. No.

MAIN POINTS MENTIONED IN THE MEDIATING SESSION:

1. Good job in contextualization and links (still needs some adjustments, but it's on the right track);
2. Good job in changing setting;
3. Good use of Visual aids- writing on the board, realia;
4. Improvement on consulting the Teacher's book;
5.Improvement on Early finishers;
6. Improvement on HW assignment (exploring the materials, writing the pages on board), but still no explanations or modelling;
7. Work on preparation: explore pics, elicit vocabulary first, explain/ model the tasks.

B.5. CLASS OBSERVATION FORM BASED ON TAF -Class: 5
(May, 7th)

STEP	GUIDING QUESTIONS		TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS
Objectives (What for?Why?)	1. Were the goals of the task achieved? If not, has Teacher (T) realized it/ done anything to come around that? 2. Was the communicative competence(s) anticipated in the TAF contemplated? If not, why? Has T realized that?		1. T. understood the goals of the tasks, but failed to explore the linguistic aspect of the first task. 2. T failed to provide the communicative competence in the TAFs (again)
Input Data (What to use?)	What kind of input data did T make use of? For what purpose?		Book, board, , CD
Setting/ Grouping	1. What setting was used? Why? What for? 2. Did T change the setting configuration during the class? 3. Did the kind of interaction generated serve its purposes?		1. OG, PW, trio 2. Yes/ no for PW 3. Yes
Instructions	1. How did T tell Ss what they were expected to do? 2. Did Ss understand the goal of the task? 3. Were the instructions clear/ brief?		1. T. explained (Task 1), but did not elicit if they had understood. T also asked them to read and checked for comprehension (Task 2). 2. Some no (first task).Most yes 3.yes
Procedures	*Preparation*	1. Did T set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2. Did Ss perceive the goals of the task? 3. Was there be modeling? Was it effective? 4. Was information brought up by Ss incorporated into	1. Yes, by eliciting from Ss what they remembered from the previous class, linking to the new topic. T explored the pics a little, but failed to elicit the language items on the exercises. 2. Yes/ no for first task 3. No 4. Yes

		the lesson?	
	Performing	1. Did Ss work at their own pace? 2. How did T deal with early finishers? 3. Did T interrupt Ss' performance? Why?	1. Yes 2. T. asked them to do more exercises. 3. Just when requested.
	Accountability	1.How were the learning results evaluated? 2.How did Ss share the outcome of their learning?	1. By checking answers and expanding the conversation to Ss' reality 2. Comparing their answers to classmates'; Reporting and expanding the conversations to their realities
Link to the next task		Was the task linked smoothly into the next task? How?	Yes, most of the time. By saying something that related to the next task. Still needs polishing, especially related to the flow and sequence.
Related Homework		1. Was the homework assigned related to the goal of the class? 2. Did T explain/ model the homework?	1. No homework assigned, T just reminded Ss to bring it the following class. 2. No.

MAIN POINTS MENTIONED IN THE MEDIATING SESSION:
1. Good job in contextualization and links (still needs some adjustments, but it's on the right track);
2. Improvement on Early finishers;
3. Improvement on consulting the Teacher's book; however, try to read it carefully and see why they suggest doing things;
4. Work on preparation: explore more pics, elicit vocabulary first, explain/ model the tasks.
5. Study the vocab of the class first, so you won't have surprises in class;
6. Don't overestimate Ss (maybe they know a lot of things, but they're studying English so as to learn more. Provide opportunities for this to happen, by modelling, eliciting the vocab on the book, etc.).

B.6. CLASS OBSERVATION FORM BASED ON TAF -Class: 4
(May, 21st)

STEP	GUIDING QUESTIONS		TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS
Objectives (What for?Why?)	1. Were the goals of the task achieved? If not, has Teacher (T) realized it/ done anything to come around that? 2. Was the communicative competence(s) anticipated in the TAF contemplated? If not, why? Has T realized that?		1. T. understood the goals of the tasks, and clearly consulted the teacher's book. 2. T failed to provide the communicative competence in the TAFs (again); instead, T wrote on TAF procedures for conducting the task.
Input Data (What to use?)	What kind of input data did T make use of? For what purpose?		Book, board, slips, computers
Setting/ Grouping	1. What setting was used? Why? What for? 2. Did T change the setting configuration during the class? 3. Did the kind of interaction generated serve its purposes?		1. OG, trio 2. Yes/ no for trio 3. Yes
Instructions	1. How did T tell Ss what they were expected to do? 2. Did Ss understand the goal of the task? 3. Were the instructions clear/ brief?		1. T. explained (Task 1), but did not elicit if they had understood. T also asked them to read and checked for comprehension (Task 2). 2. Some no (first task).Most yes 3.yes
	Preparation	1. Did T set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2. Did Ss perceive the goals of the task? 3. Was there be modeling? Was it effective?	1. Yes, by eliciting from Ss what they remembered from the previous class, linking to the new topic. 2. Yes 3. No 4. Yes

Procedures		4. Was information brought up by Ss incorporated into the lesson?	
	Performing	1. Did Ss work at their own pace? 2. How did T deal with early finishers? 3. Did T interrupt Ss' performance? Why?	1. Yes 2. T. asked them to do more exercises. 3. T interrupted S's talk to hand out papers
	Accountability	1. How were the learning results evaluated? 2. How did Ss share the outcome of their learning?	1. By checking answers and expanding the conversation to Ss' reality 2. Talking about the questions in OG. and expanding the conversations to their realities
Link to the next task		Was the task linked smoothly into the next task? How?	Yes, most of the time. By saying something that related to the next task. Still needs polishing, especially related to the flow and sequence.
Related Homework		1. Was the homework assigned related to the goal of the class? 2. Did T explain/ model the homework?	1. Homework was assigned in the Resource Center, Ss did not write it down. 2. Explain, yes. Model, no.

MAIN POINTS MENTIONED IN THE MEDIATING SESSION:

1. Good job in contextualization and links; however, pay attention not to interrupt Ss' performance to do something else; there's the need of linking within the task as well;
2. Improvement on Early finishers;
3. Improvement on consulting the Teacher's book;

4. Work on instructions and preparation: when giving instructions, make sure Ss are paying attention, and do it before Ss engage in an activity. Also, model the tasks;
5. Don't forget to write new words on board (visual aids);
6. Homework assignment: make sure Ss write down what they're supposed to do; find a way of informing all Ss about the homework;
7. Make sure correction works on Ss' best intereSs (overcorrecting x undercorrecting)

B.7. CLASS OBSERVATION FORM BASED ON TAF -Class: 4
(May, 28th)

STEP	GUIDING QUESTIONS		TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS
Objectives (What for?Why?)	1. Were the goals of the task achieved? If not, has Teacher (T) realized it/ done anything to come around that? 2. Was the communicative competence(s) anticipated in the TAF contemplated? If not, why? Has T realized that?		1. T. understood the goals of task1, but failed to understand the linguistic goal of task 2 2. T failed to provide the communicative competence in the TAFs (again
Input Data (What to use?)	What kind of input data did T make use of? For what purpose?		Book, board, cards, CD, computers
Setting/ Grouping	1. What setting was used? Why? What for? 2. Did T change the setting configuration during the class? 3. Did the kind of interaction generated serve its purposes?		1. OG, PW, individual 2. Yes 3. Yes
Instructions	1. How did T tell Ss what they were expected to do? 2. Did Ss understand the goal of the task? 3. Were the instructions clear/ brief?		1. T asked S to read and checked for comprehension; T explained what to do 2.Yes/ sort of 3.Most of the time, yes. Task 2, no
	Preparation	1. Did T set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2. Did Ss perceive the goals of the task? 3. Was there be modeling? Was it effective? 4. Was information brought up by Ss incorporated into the lesson?	1. Yes, by eliciting from Ss what they remembered from the previous class, linking to the new topic. 2. Yes 3. Yes, for task 1.3 and 2. For task 1.3, yes, for task 2, clearer modeling was needed. 4. Yes

Procedures			
	Performing	1. Did Ss work at their own pace? 2. How did T deal with early finishers? 3. Did T interrupt Ss' performance? Why?	1. Yes 2. T asked Ss to compare answers. 3. Just when requested.
	Accountability	1. How were the learning results evaluated? 2. How did Ss share the outcome of their learning?	1. By checking answers and expanding the conversation to Ss' reality 2. Talking about the questions in OG. and expanding the conversations to their realities
Link to the next task		Was the task linked smoothly into the next task? How?	Yes, most of the time. By saying something that related to the next task.
Related Homework		1. Was the homework assigned related to the goal of the class? 2. Did T explain/ model the homework?	1. No homework assigned

MAIN POINTS MENTIONED IN THE MEDIATING SESSION:

1. Good job in contextualization and links; however, pay attention not to interrupt the flow of the class (or a link) to talk about something else…
2. Improvement on consulting the Teacher's book. For task 1, but failed to understand the goal of task 2. (conditions and consquences)
3. Improvement on preparation: pre- listening warm up for topic, explored the pics, read the options before engaging in the listening activity.
4. A little improvement on modelling: there was an example on how to do, but T used the same sentence as the exercise and did not model the entire sentence (either on the board or orally). From the TAF, T did not perceive the linguistic goal of Task 2 (use of conditionals).
5. Homework assignment: especially for this class, homework was supposed to be assigned, as the goal of the class involved use of conditions with do's and dont's. Homework should always be linked to what Ss are learning.

B.8. CLASS OBSERVATION FORM BASED ON TAF -Class: 8

(June, 3rd)

STEP	GUIDING QUESTIONS		TEACHER EDUCATOR PERCEPTIONS
Objectives (What for?Why?)	1. Were the goals of the task achieved? If not, has Teacher (T) realized it/ done anything to come around that? 2. Was the communicative competence(s) anticipated in the TAF contemplated? If not, why? Has T realized that?		1. T. understood the goals of task, but failed to make clear for Ss (talking about conditions and consequences) 2. T failed to provide the communicative competence in the TAFs (again)
Input Data (What to use?)	What kind of input data did T make use of? For what purpose?		Book, board, cards
Setting/ Grouping	1. What setting was used? Why? What for? 2. Did T change the setting configuration during the class? 3. Did the kind of interaction generated serve its purposes?		1. OG, GW 2. Yes 3. Yes
Instructions	1. How did T tell Ss what they were expected to do? 2. Did Ss understand the goal of the task? 3. Were the instructions clear/ brief?		1. T asked S to read and checked for comprehension; T explained what to do 2.Ss understood what to do, but not that they were talking about conditions and consequences 3. Yes
Procedures	*Preparation*	1. Did T set the mood for the activity and contextualize it? 2. Did Ss perceive the goals of the task? 3. Was there be modeling? Was it effective? 4. Was information	1. Yes, by eliciting from Ss what they remembered from the previous class, linking to the new topic. 2. How to do, but not the goal. 3. Yes, but not exactly as the task was (with more than 2 cards), and the example on board had a grammar mistake. 4.Yes

		brought up by Ss incorporated into the lesson?	
	Performing	1. Did Ss work at their own pace? 2. How did T deal with early finishers? 3. Did T interrupt Ss' performance? Why?	1. Yes 2. T asked her to do the homework. 3. Just when requested.
	Accountability	1. How were the learning results evaluated? 2. How did Ss share the outcome of their learning?	1. By checking answers and comparing to the other group. 2. Reporting what they did.
Link to the next task		Was the task linked smoothly into the next task? How?	Yes, but it was broken because of S's interruption. By saying something that related to the next task.
Related Homework		1. Was the homework assigned related to the goal of the class? 2. Did T explain/ model the homework?	1. No. It was about the previous class. 2. Yes.

MAIN POINTS MENTIONED IN THE MEDIATING SESSION:

1. Good job in contextualization and links (make sure links are not broken with interruptions, though)
2. Improvement on modelling: examples written on the board, using a different example from the exercise; however, pay attention not to write a model with a grammar mistake.
3. Improvement on instructions: shorter, clearer, with examples; however, try to put yourself in Ss' shoes and see if everything necessary for task completion was explained.
4. Pay attention to preparation: besides modeling, T should clarify vocabulary problems before Ss engage in the activity.

Appendix C - Questionnaires
C.1. Assessment questionnaire

(Questionnaire applied prior to the beginning of the study. Answers are in

italics)

Name: Nicole   Date: 16/03/2015

1. Before the Pre-service, how did you view yourself as a teacher? How has this

view changed after you've finished it?

A: *I used to think I was a great teacher. I thought that just having English as a*

second language made me capable to teach. During the Pre-service I realized

how wrong I was about this. I started noticing that I never really had input data

in my classes and that I never let the student use all his/her capability to do

things for himself/herself. It´s like I underestimated my student´s capability. The

Pre-service changed my whole idea of what "teaching" means. I have been

trying to change my style of doing things and this actually has made me become

even more passionate about my profession.

2. During the Pre-service, what did you have more difficulty in?

A: *I had a hard time preparing my lessons. I had never put so much time and*

effort into my lessons and finding new (and efficient) input data for my lessons

was a hard task for me. Also, I had a hard time realizing that you really can

teach English without speaking in Portuguese at all. At first I didn´t really agree

with the methodology, but now that I have been using it I am sure it is the best

way to teach somebody.

3. From what you've learned at Pre-service, what do you think are your strengths and weaknesses in relation to this school's methodology?

A: *My strengths are that I am really dynamic and that I really am in love with teaching. I kind of foresee the mistakes the students will make, or I simply understand what´s going on in their minds. I think this is a plus for me. My weaknesses are that this whole methodology is a new thing for me. So...I spend hours and hours (and more hours) preparing my lessons. At least I enjoy doing this!*

1. How do you plan to improve the weakest points?

    A: *Well, they say practice makes perfect!!! So my plan is simply to practice and get a lot of feedback from everyone (including students).*

C.2. Follow up questionnaires

C.2.1. Follow-up Questionnaire 1

(Questionnaire answered after the first month of classes and

mediating sessions. Teacher's answers are in italics).

Name: Nicole   Date: 06/04/2015

After the attended classes and mediating sessions of this month, answer

the following questions:

1. Do the points elicited by the Teacher Educator (TE) in the mediating

sessions of this month resonate to you? Which ones? In what way?

Yes. I agree with everything that has been pointed out and I can see where

every feeback comes from. I can see how my classes didn´t flow naturally.

There were (are) chunks in my lessons and I plan to fix that.

2. Have the interactions between the TE and you helped you plan and

conduct subsequent classes?

Yes, a great deal, actually. I try to follow the guide that was given to me at

the begining and I always read the feedbacks that were given based on the

lesson that was last analyzed.

3. How will the information and knowledge generated in the mediating

sessions of this month help you in your next classes?

Watching myself teaching isn´t the best thing to do. I learned a lot about

myself and my teaching style as well. I was able to see many things that I

want to take out from my lessons and many things that I actually think I do

right. (Ok, not so many). I like the fact that I get to watch over my lessons

and stop at each important moment to see what is being done correctly or

wrong.

4. Do you feel more confident after this month? If yes, what do you

attribute this confidence to?

No! They say the more you know about something the less intelligent you

feel. Right? Although I have learned many things over the past weeks, I´ve

become more self-critical and now I am never truly happy with my lessons.

C.2.2. Follow up questionnaire 2

(Questionnaire answered after the second month of classes and

mediating sessions. Teacher's answers are in italics).

Name: Nicole   Date: 05/05/2015

After this month's classes and feedback sessions for this research, answer

the following questions:

1. Were the points discussed in the mediating sessions of this month the same as

the previous month? Did you perceive development of the points elicited in the

previous month? In what way?

Some things were the same and some things changed! I feel that I have learned

many things, although they are still not automatic to me. I still need to improve

my modelling!!!

2. Do the points elicited by the Teacher Educator (TE) in the mediating sessions

of this month resonate to you? Which one(s)? In what way?

Yes, all of them do! I agree with the importance of everything that is said during

the sessions, especially the ones about modeling and the links between the tasks.

I see how I need to improve many things, although I have now come up with the

conclusion that being a good teacher takes a lot of effort.

3. Have the interactions between the TE and you helped you plan and conduct

the subsequent classes along this month?

Yes! I now pay more attention to the Teacher's book and try to plan my classes even more carefully. And, when I don't have time to plan them so well (due to my college exams and etc), I don't feel like I did a good job in my classes.

4. How will the information and knowledge generated in this month help you in your next classes?

I try to take note of everything that is elicited in order not to make the same mistakes again. I hope to get better on my class planning and especially in following what I have previously decided to do during my lessons.

5. Do you feel more confident after this month? What do you attribute this confidence to?

Yes, I do. I see my improvement, not only with this group, but also with my other groups! Whenever I catch myself doing something wrong I try to go over that lesson again and fix what I´m missing on. Although I feel more confident, I still think I take too much time planning my classes. Not as long as I did before, but it still takes a lot of effort.

C.2.3. Follow-up Questionnaire 3

(Questionnaire answered after the third month of classes and

mediating sessions. Teacher's answers are in italics).

Name: Nicole   Date:30\5\215

After this month's classes and feedback sessions for this research,

answer the following questions:

1. Were the points discussed in the mediating sessions of this month the

same as the previous month? Did you perceive development of the points

elicited in the previous month? In what way?

Some points were the same and some were different. I still had many

problems with modeling, for example. I perceived a big development

though. I started believing more in my beliefs, regardless of having to

follow a specific approach and methodology. In one of the classes I even

forgot to take my TAF with me and I decided to change an activity at the

time of the lesson because I realized how there would be a smoother link

between the two tasks. I think I earned a little more confidence in myself as

a teacher, BUT I still feel like I am "a teacher-to-be" and not yet a teacher.

2. Do the points elicited by the Teacher Educator (TE) in the mediating

sessions of this month resonate to you? In what way?

Yes, all of them, I suppose. Especially the ones about modeling. I realized

how I wasn´t getting new different examples for my modeling. Most of the

times I was just using the same things

from the book and I end up killing the task. All her questions had a good

point behind them.

3. Have the interactions between the TE and you helped you plan and

conduct the subsequent classes along this month?

Yes, I always tried to plan my next classes based on what was previously

discussed in the last meeting we had had. So I looked at my notes and

started preparing for the next class. One

example is that I started using more the teacher´s guide book.

3. How will the information and knowledge generated in this month help

you in your next classes?

Well, I take more time now to look at the teacher´s guide and I take really

good care with my links and modeling!!! And also, I try to not be the center

of the class (I still need to work on this a lot though.

4. Do you feel more confident after this month? What do you attribute this

confidence to?

Yes, I feel more confident about the fact that I have more knowledge about

teaching. I question myself though, if knowing\believing that you have to do

something actually means you are doing the thing you believe in. For

example, I know I have to make smooth links and I believe in the

importance of making smooth links between tasks... But will I always

manage to do this since I work so many hours everyday, go to college and

barely have time to prepare my classes? I don´t know...Probably not

always. So, I don´t know if I am more confident after all. Because now I

know everything that I should do, but I don´t always have time for that.

C.3. Overall feedback

(Questionnaire answered after the study was conducted. Teacher's answers are in italics).

Name: Nicole   Date:14\6\215

Please, answer these two questions evaluating this study as a whole

1. Comparing to the answers of the assessment questionnaire, do you think your weaknesses and strengths have changed? In what way?

Yes, once you get good at something there´s always something else to work on. I made improvements in so many things but then I realized I have weaknesses in other areas. This is good, though. In this study I was able to start realizing things I had never realized about teaching, for example, my -always- lack of modeling. Also, I started thinking about how production needs to come before the language awareness, so that students can practice and try out the things before I just tell them the correct way to do things. This is something I did not believe in before but this study made me realize how it works best.

2. Do you think that participating in this study has contributed for your professional development? If so, how?

Yes. It was my first reality shock as a teacher. Having to watch myself teaching and see myself as they -the students- see me was really overwhelming. I learned many new terminologies and was aware of how

my previous beliefs affected my teaching style due to the lack of

background information that I had. This

study made me get even more interested in my future profession and made

me read more articles on "task based teaching". I just really got interested

in this area and I plan to develop myself as a teacher and maybe a

researcher one day. Who knows...

Appendix D: Consent forms

D.1 Consent form for the teacher

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO LIVRE E ESCLARECIDO

O(a) senhor(a) está sendo convidado a participar de uma pesquisa de mestrado, realizada pela Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), departamento de Pós- Graduação em Inglês (PPGI), intitulada "Traçando o desenvolvimento do professor: um estudo de caso de um professor iniciante", que fará entrevistas, questionários e filmagens, tendo como objetivo traçar o processo de desenvolvimento de um professor iniciante, ao participar de um programa de formação continuada mediado por um colega mais experiente e, portanto, dispor de oportunidades para desenvolver o Raciocínio (Reasoning), de modo a verificar o grau em que as sessões de mediação entre ele e o formador de professores (a pesquisadora desse estudo) reverbera em seu ensino, bem como em seu discurso. O objetivo secundário refere-se à percepção do professor em relação ao seu próprio desenvolvimento. Serão previamente marcados a data e horário para assistência e filmagens de aulas e de sessões de feedback, utilizando gravações de aula e entrevistas. Estas medidas serão realizadas no Yázigi. Também serão realizados questionários de auto-avaliação. Não é obrigatório participar do estudo, sua natureza é voluntária.

Os riscos destes procedimentos serão mínimos, pois o objetivo do projeto é o de auxiliar o desenvolvimento do professor. Por envolver gravações de aulas e de sessões de feedback, os possíveis riscos são de natureza psicológica, como stress, ansiedade, constrangimento, e desconforto, que serão minimizados com conversas entre o professor e a pesquisadora, antes do projeto, a fim de que o professor se sinta confortável com a pesquisadora; essas gravações serão fundamentais para a percepção do professor sobre sua prática, porém haverá sigilo sobre seu conteúdo, sendo visto somente pelo professor, a pesquisadora e a orientadora do projeto. Além disso, há um possível risco de iminência de conflito de interesses na relação de poder entre a condição de professor iniciante e a direção da escola; esse risco será minimizado com a certificação que os resultados da pesquisa não prejudicarão em nenhuma forma a atuação profissional do participante dentro ou fora da instituição, pois o conteúdo das gravações não será divulgado para o diretor da escola.

A sua identidade será preservada, pois você será identificado por um pseudônimo.

Os benefícios e vantagens em participar deste estudo serão imediatos e a médio e longo prazo, já que você pode aplicar o conhecimento gerado nas sessões de mediação em suas aulas subsequentes. Mais especificamente, o desenvolvimento pedagógico de um professor iniciante, tornando-o mais confortável nas questões envolvidas com a prática pedagógica, mais seguro com relação às atitudes tomadas durante o lecionar, e a sua maturação pedagógica. Os

benefícios teóricos serão de informar a prática docente e de formação de professores, principalmente iniciantes, em como o processo de desenvolvimento do professor pode ser maximizado através do acompanhamento do formador de professores, e da reflexão do professor sobre a sua prática.

As pessoas que estarão acompanhando os procedimentos serão os pesquisadores: a estudante de mestrado Paola Gabriella Biehl, e a professora responsável e orientadora da pesquisa Adriana Kuerten Dellagnelo.

O(a) senhor(a) poderá se retirar do estudo a qualquer momento, sem qualquer tipo de constrangimento.

Solicitamos a sua autorização para o uso de seus dados para a produção de artigos técnicos e científicos. A sua privacidade será mantida através da não-identificação do seu nome

Este termo de consentimento livre e esclarecido é feito em duas vias, sendo que uma delas ficará em poder do pesquisador e outra com o sujeito participante da pesquisa.

Agradecemos a sua participação.

Paola Gabriella Biehl - e-mail: paolabiehl@yahoo.com.br.
Endereço-UFSC é Campus Universitário Reitor João David Ferreira Lima - Trindade, Florianópolis - SC, 88040-900. Telefone (48) 3721-9000
Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa Envolvendo Seres Humanos – CEPSH/UDESC
Av. Madre Benvenuta, 2007 – Itacorubi – Fone: (48)3321-8195 – e-mail: cepsh.reitoria@udesc.br
Florianópolis – SC88035-001

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO

Declaro que fui informado sobre todos os procedimentos da pesquisa e, que recebi de forma clara e objetiva todas as explicações pertinentes ao projeto e, que todos os dados a meu respeito serão sigilosos. Eu compreendo que neste estudo, as medições dos experimentos/procedimentos de tratamento serão feitas em mim, e que fui informado que posso me retirar do estudo a qualquer momento.

Nome por extenso _____
Assinatura _____ Local: _____   Data:

D. 2 Consent form for students

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO LIVRE E ESCLARECIDO

Você está sendo convidado a participar de uma pesquisa de mestrado, realizada pela Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina (UFSC), departamento de Pós- Graduação em Inglês (PPGI), intitulada "Traçando o desenvolvimento do professor: um estudo de caso de um professor iniciante", que fará filmagens das aulas do seu professor de inglês, tendo como objetivo traçar o processo de desenvolvimento de um professor iniciante, ao participar de um programa de formação continuada mediado por um colega mais experiente e, portanto, dispor de oportunidades para desenvolver o Raciocínio (Reasoning), de modo a verificar o grau em que as sessões de mediação entre ele e o formador de professores (a pesquisadora desse estudo) reverbera em seu ensino, bem como em seu discurso. O objetivo secundário refere-se à percepção do professor em relação ao seu próprio desenvolvimento. Serão previamente marcados a data e horário para assistência e filmagens de aulas. Estas medidas serão realizadas no Yázigi. Você não é o foco da pesquisa, mas sua participação é importante para que a pesquisadora possa verificar os objetivos supra citados do professor. Não é obrigatório participar desse estudo, sua natureza é voluntária.

Riscos e benefícios do estudo para os alunos: Como o foco da pesquisa é o professor, os riscos em participar deste estudo para os alunos são incidentais (sua participação e imagem não são o foco da pesquisa, somente serão gravadas aulas em que os alunos participam, mas seu desempenho não será analisado nem avaliado), e mínimos, pois sua participação das aulas deverá acontecer de forma natural, uma vez que a pesquisadora não irá interferir na aula, estará somente filmando as mesmas; essas gravações serão fundamentais para a percepção do professor sobre sua prática, porém haverá sigilo sobre seu conteúdo, sendo visto somente pelo professor, a pesquisadora e a orientadora do projeto. Os possíveis riscos podem ser de natureza psicológica, como ansiedade, constrangimento, stress e desconforto. A sua identidade será preservada, pois cada aluno (se necessário) será identificado por um número.

Os benefícios e vantagens em participar deste estudo para os alunos é o desenvolvimento pedagógico do professor, o que poderá melhorar a qualidade do ensino e das aulas, auxiliando na sua aprendizagem, já que os alunos terão aulas com um professor que estará se desenvolvendo pedagogicamente, e assim uma possível melhora no seu desempenho.

As pessoas que estarão acompanhando os procedimentos serão os pesquisadores: a estudante de mestrado Paola Gabriella Biehl, e a professora responsável e orientadora da pesquisa Adriana Kuerten Dellagnelo.

Você poderá se retirar do estudo a qualquer momento, sem qualquer tipo de constrangimento.

Solicitamos a sua autorização para o uso de seus dados, para a produção de artigos técnicos e científicos. A sua privacidade será mantida através da não-identificação do seu nome.

Este termo de consentimento livre e esclarecido é feito em duas vias, sendo que uma delas ficará em poder do pesquisador e outra com o sujeito participante da pesquisa.

Agradecemos a sua participação.

Paola Gabriella Biehl

e-mail: paolabiehl@yahoo.com.br.

Endereço-UFSC é Campus Universitário Reitor João David Ferreira Lima - Trindade, Florianópolis - SC, 88040-900. Telefone (48) 3721-9000

Comitê de Ética em Pesquisa Envolvendo Seres Humanos – CEPSH/UDESC

Av. Madre Benvenuta, 2007 – Itacorubi – Fone: (48)3321-8195 – e-mail: cepsh.reitoria@udesc.br

Florianópolis – SC- 88035-001

TERMO DE CONSENTIMENTO

Declaro que fui informado sobre todos os procedimentos da pesquisa e, que recebi de forma clara e objetiva todas as explicações pertinentes ao projeto e, que todos os meus dados serão sigilosos. Eu compreendo que neste estudo, as medições dos experimentos/procedimentos de tratamento serão feitas em meu professor, e que fui informado que posso me retirar do estudo a qualquer momento.

Nome por extenso _____

Assinatura _____Local: _____ Data: ____/____/____