

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM LETRAS/INGLÊS E LITERATURA CORRESPONDENTE

TEACHERS' USE OF AND BELIEFS ON LUDIC LANGUAGE IN THE FOREIGN
LANGUAGE CLASS

KYRIA FINARDI

Dissertação submetida à Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina em cumprimento parcial
dos requisitos para obtenção do grau de

MESTRE EM LETRAS

FLORIANÓPOLIS
Dezembro 2004

We are what we believe...

*To Leandro Mohr ,
To Janáína Weissheimer,*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Gloria Gil who agreed to guide me through this thesis and helped me to learn more about myself and the academic world.

I am also deeply indebted to the teachers who opened the door to allow me to share their classrooms, and also to the students who kindly accepted being participants of this enterprise.

I would also like to thank the following colleagues for the support during my course:

Janáina Weissheimer

Leandro Mohr

Valéria Barreira

Juliana Salvadori

CAPES for having granted me the scholarship which made this study possible.

My husband, Carlos Castillo, for the technical support and patience.

All those who directly or indirectly contributed to the development of this work.

ABSTRACT
TEACHERS' USE OF AND BELIEFS ON LUDIC LANGUAGE IN THE LANGUAGE
CLASS. WHAT'S THE RELATIONSHIP?

Kyria Finardi

**UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
2004**

**Gloria Gil
Supervisor**

Based on the assumption that to better understand teaching we must comprehend the beliefs held by teachers (Freeman & Richards, 1996), and specifically in the case of language teachers the beliefs about language (Woods, 1993), this research focuses on the relation between the use of and the beliefs on a specific kind of language, namely, ludic language, of two EFL teachers.

In order to investigate that, two experienced EFL teachers were observed for a semester, during which field notes were taken and audio-tapes recorded. Episodes of ludic language were identified in the recordings and transcribed to be used in the second stage of this study when they were shown to the teachers so as to stimulate their reflection on their action and express some of their beliefs about this kind of language.

This study adopted a qualitative, ethnography-oriented paradigm and has an interpretive and descriptive nature.

Key-words: beliefs, ludic language

Total number of pages: 91

Total number of words: 25.234

RESUMO
TEACHERS' USE OF AND BELIEFS ON LUDIC LANGUAGE IN THE LANGUAGE
CLASS. WHAT'S THE RELATIONSHIP?

Kyria Finardi

**UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SANTA CATARINA
2004**

Gloria Gil

Orientadora

Partindo do pressuposto de que a fim de entendermos melhor o processo de ensino nós precisamos primeiramente entender as crenças dos professores (Freeman & Richards, 1996), e especificamente no caso dos professores de idiomas as crenças sobre linguagem (Woods, 1993), esta pesquisa investigou a relação entre as crenças e o uso de uma forma específica de linguagem, qual seja, a lúdica, de dois professores de inglês como língua estrangeira.

Para investigar tal relação, dois professores experientes de inglês foram observados por um semestre, durante o qual notas de campo foram tomadas e fitas de audio gravadas. Episódios de linguagem lúdica foram identificados nas gravações e esses momentos foram transcritos para serem usados posteriormente durante as entrevistas com os professores a fim de estimular sua reflexão sobre sua prática e provocar a expressão de algumas crenças com relação a esse tipo de linguagem.

Este estudo adotou um paradigma qualitativo e etnográfico e tem uma natureza interpretativa e descritiva.

Palavras-chave: crenças, linguagem lúdica

Total de páginas: 91

Total de palavras: 25.234

Table of Contents

Chapter I – Introduction	Page
1.1 Objectives of the Study	1
1.2 Significance of the Research.....	2
1.3 Research Questions.....	3
 Chapter II: Review of Literature of Teachers’ Beliefs and Language Play	
2.1 Introduction.....	4
2.2 Teachers’ Beliefs.....	4
2.3 Teachers’ Reflection	7
2.4 Play	9
2.4.1 Play, Work and Motivation	10
2.5 Play in Education and in Human Development	11
2.6 Language Play in Foreign Language Education	13
2.7 Cook’s View of Current Foreign Language Teaching Orthodoxies and Language Play	15
2.8 Summary of Chapter II	19
 Chapter III – Method – A Qualitative, Ethnography-oriented Study	
3.1 Introduction	21
3.2 A Qualitative, Ethnography-oriented Study	21
3.3 Context	23
3.3.1 Class 1	24
3.3.2 Class 2	27
3.4 Participants	29

3.4.1 Teacher 1	30
3.4.2 Teacher 2	31
3.5 Procedures of Data Collection	32
3.5.1 Stage 1 – Observing Ludic Situations in the Classrooms	33
3.5.2 Stage 2 – Understanding Teachers’ Beliefs on Ludic Language	34
3.6 Procedures of Data Analysis	35
3.7 Summary of Chapter III	36
Chapter IV – Analysis of Teachers’ Use of and Beliefs on LL	
4.1 Introduction	37
4.2 Analysis of Ludic Language Situations in the Classroom – How Do the Teachers Deal with Ludic Language in the Classroom?	37
4.2.1. What Types of Ludic Language Situations can be found in this context?	
4.2.1.1 Appropriation	37
4.2.1.2 Performance	43
4.2.1.3 Word Play	47
4.2.1.4 Funny Comment	50
4.2.1.5 Anecdote	53
4.2.2 Which Types of Ludic Language Situations do the Teachers Use in their Classrooms?	56
4.2.3 Do the Teachers Adopt an Active or Passive Stance Towards Using Ludic Language in their Classes?	60
4.3 Analysis of Teachers’ Beliefs – How do the Teachers See Ludic Language in the Classroom?	63
4.3.1 How do the Teachers View Language Teaching?	64

4.3.1.1 Teacher 1 : The Input Provider	64
4.3.1.2 Teacher 2: The Clown, Entertainer and Counselor	67
4.3.2 How do the Teachers View the Language of the Classroom?	69
4.3.2.1 Authentic	69
4.3.2.2 Real	70
4.3.2.3 Meaningful	71
4.3.3 How do the Teaches View Ludic Language in the Language Class?	73
4.4 Summary of Chapter IV	78
 Chapter V – Final Remarks	
5.1 Introduction	80
5.2 Conclusion – What’s the relation between teachers’ use of and beliefs on ludic language in the language class?	80
5.3 Possible Pedagogical Implications	83
5.4 Limitations of the Study	84
5.5 Suggestions for Future Research	85
References	86
 Appendixes	
Appendix I – Field Notes	
Appendix 1A – Field Notes from C1	92
Appendix 1B – Field Notes from C2	94
Appendix II – Transcript Conventions	100
 Appendix III – Classroom Transcriptions	
Appendix III A- Transcriptions in C1	101
Appendix III B – Transcriptions in C2	106

Appendix IV – Interviews

Appendix IV A – Interview with T1	130
Appendix IV B – Interview with T2	137
Appendix V – Summary of Reflection Meetings with T2	141

List of Tables

Table 1 – Ludic Language episodes in C1	57
Table 2 – Ludic Language episodes in C2	59

Chapter I - Introduction

1.1 Objectives of the study

In the field of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teaching, most studies had a tradition of investigating the best approach to language teaching, aiming at discovering what would constitute the ‘best method’, which in turn, could be prescribed to be fully executed by teachers (Freeman & Richards, 1996).

However, these studies have proved to be inconclusive and useless, specially because teachers’ actions and approach to teaching seem to be guided by more than just the theory they receive. Freeman and Richards (1996) also suggest that these studies should be complemented by research aiming at investigating the kind of conceptions, knowledge and beliefs held by language teachers so as to better understand and improve teachers’ practice.

In the specific case of language teachers, their beliefs about what constitutes language and what is the best way to teach it may deeply affect what they teach and how they teach for language in this case is the means and the content (Woods, 1993).

Despite the growing number of studies on teacher cognition, only a few studies have looked at teachers’ beliefs about language (e.g., Carazzai, 2002) and even fewer have looked at teachers’ beliefs through their own perspective (Binnie-Smith, 1996).

Teachers’ beliefs on language may play a determining role on the kind of language teachers will select to teach and how they will teach that language. Prescriptive studies of the language used in language classes, specially those adopting the Communicative Language (CLT) Approach, have a long tradition of preferring language that is meaning-

focused, based on students' needs and authentic. Language Play has been outlawed in this perspective as being opposed to that model of best language usage in language classes since, very often, it is focused on form and more based on wants than needs.

Language Play represents a seminal area of investigation in the area of applied linguistics and there are very few studies on the functions of this kind of language in the language class. Nevertheless, since its theory diverges with some commonly accepted premises about language use prescribed for teachers, it is of the utmost importance to investigate teachers' beliefs on this specific kind of language.

Thus, this study proposes to look at the relationship between teachers' use of and beliefs on ludic language in the language class. In order to do so, a qualitative paradigm will be adopted to investigate the beliefs on this kind of language held by two EFL teachers, looking at their practice and stimulated reflection, thus giving them a voice through the inclusion of their own perspective.

1.2 Significance of the research

The objective of this study is to explore two teachers' use of and beliefs on ludic language in the language class. More specifically, it examined the beliefs of two experienced EFL teachers about a specific form of language (ludic language), and the extent to which these beliefs are expressed in and shape their action and decision making in the classroom. It is an exploratory study focused on two relatively recent areas of research interest in the EFL field, namely, teacher cognition and ludic language. This study is based on the assumption that teachers' beliefs guide their action and in order to understand that

action, descriptive studies of the language classroom have to be complemented with descriptive studies of teacher cognition.

In the specific case of language teachers, their beliefs about language may be even more important for language is the what and the how teachers will teach. Because of the lack of empirical studies on ludic language in the language class and its opposing nature to commonly accepted models of language use, this study proposes to investigate teachers' beliefs on this specific kind of language, looking at teachers' beliefs through their own perspective with descriptive accounts of the EFL class and teacher cognition.

1.3 Research Questions

In order to investigate that, this study proposes to answer the following research questions:

General Research Question: Up to what extent are the teachers' beliefs on ludic language reflected in their actions? which, in turn, will be subdivided into two specific research questions and sub questions:

- 1) How do teachers deal with ludic language in the classroom?
 - 1A) What kinds of ludic language situations can be found in the classrooms observed?
 - 1B) Which types of ludic language situations do each of the two teachers use in their classes?
 - 1C) Do the teachers adopt an active or passive stance towards using this kind of language in their classes?

2) How do the teachers see ludic language in the language class?

2A) How do the teachers see language?

2B) How do the teachers see themselves as language teachers?

2C) How do the teachers see ludic language?

By answering the previous questions, I intend to find out what the relationship between teachers' beliefs on and use of ludic language in the language class is.

Chapter II - Review of Literature

2.1 Introduction

The main objective of this chapter is to review the literature on teachers' beliefs and ludic language. First, I will review the literature on teachers' beliefs with some insights into teachers' reflection as a way of shaping future action. Next, I will review play in education and language play in language teaching, presenting Cook's view of current foreign language teaching orthodoxies and language play with some possible entailments for its functions in EFL teaching and learning.

2.2 Teachers' Beliefs

“Belief is a moral act for which the believer is to be held responsible.”

H.A. Hodges

Defining the term “beliefs” may prove a difficult task. As Pajares (1992) states, the concept is so involved in mystery that it may challenge clear and definite definitions. Beliefs have been associated to and even used interchangeably with other terms, some of which are: knowledge, perceptions, assumptions, principles and theories. Yet, despite the difficulty in conceptualizing this term, attempting to do so may be indispensable, specially when the concept is such a powerful construct used to understand teacher cognition.

Even though Pajares (1996, p. 316) pointed out the difficulty in defining such term, he also accepted the challenge to propose a definition of beliefs as the judgment made by an

individual about the truth or falsity of a proposition. According to the same author, beliefs can be inferred both from what people say and from what people do, and this is precisely the understanding of beliefs that will be adopted in this study.

Most of the theoretical knowledge of EFL teachers today comes primarily from Second Language Acquisition (SLA) studies which are more concerned with the learner and the language learning outcomes than with the teachers' process of decision-making and knowledge construction (Gatbonton, 1999; Binnie-Smith, 1996). Nevertheless, since teachers' decisions affect and shape learning outcomes, these studies have to be complemented with studies of teacher cognition, that is, studies of how teachers form and change their beliefs, knowledge and experience base. Basic to this work is the idea that teachers' beliefs and knowledge shape their mental acts, which in turn, guide their actions and decisions (Gatbonton, 1999).

Woods (1993) suggests that when information is not available (in the form of theory or knowledge), teachers will rely on beliefs to guide them (p. 192). However, Binnie-Smith (1996), in a study of teachers' beliefs, found that experienced teachers rely more on beliefs than on theory (knowledge), even when the latter is available. These teachers filter the theory (knowledge) through their beliefs on teaching, which are, in turn, grounded in their experience, adapting them to their reality. In her study, she concluded that teacher beliefs emerged as the critical factor influencing the types of decisions these teachers made.

How teachers know what they know has been studied in general educational research (Schon, 1995; Zeichner, 1999). Such efforts reflect a broad-based movement among academic researchers and school professionals to legitimize knowledge produced by teachers in their own realities. A number of studies in the field of general education have

focused on how teachers construct their philosophies and theories of teaching (e.g. Clandinin & Connelly, 1987).

Others, more specifically in the EFL field, have examined teachers' beliefs about teaching and decision making in the classroom (Woods, 1991; Nunan, 1990; Binnie-Smith, 1996; Carazzai, 2002). Larsen-Freeman (1990) suggests that there is only scant research on EFL teacher cognition taking into consideration that teachers act upon their beliefs. While researchers have been investigating the classroom, only a few studies have examined the EFL context from the teachers' perspective (Binnie-Smith, 1996).

In this sense this study will offer a contribution to the EFL teaching field by describing some teachers' beliefs expressed in their practice, adding their voice and perspective in the analysis of what goes on in the classroom and how their decisions are made.

According to Freeman and Johnson (2001), to understand the activity of language teaching through the perspective of teachers, it follows that we must gather descriptive accounts of how teachers arrive at what they know, how they use and adapt that knowledge in classrooms. Theories of SLA, classroom methodologies, or descriptions of the English language as subject-matter, need first to be understood within teachers' professional lives and within the settings and circumstances in which they work.

According to Woods (1993), in the specific case of EFL teaching, teachers' beliefs about language have an important effect in language teaching where language is both the means by which the content is taught and the content itself. People unconsciously internalize beliefs about language and these beliefs are often deeply held. In the case of language teachers, these beliefs are even more important since they affect the way teachers teach as well as what they teach.

2.3 Teachers' Reflection

Over the past decade, the reflective teaching movement (Schon, 1983, 1987; Lockhart & Richards, 1994; Telles, 2000; Zeichner & Liston, 1996), the predominance of action research and the teacher research movement (Freeman, 1999) have helped to legitimize both teachers' experiences and the importance of reflection on and inquiry into, those experiences as mechanisms for change in classroom practices as well as professional development (Freeman & Johnson, 2001).

Insights from teacher thinking have also contributed a great deal to the notion of reflective teaching in teacher education (Gimenez, 1999). According to Zeichner (2001, p. 4), the international movement in teacher education and reflection can be seen as a reaction against the view of teachers as technicians who merely apply formulas dictated by others who are, more often than not, removed from the classroom. Teachers should strive to be reflective practitioners, capable of analyzing their own practice.

For Zeichner (2001), reflective action entails active and careful consideration of one's beliefs and in this aspect he is supported by Schon (1983) who claims that one's own teaching must start from reflection upon one's experience and that the sort of knowledge derived from the experience of others is impoverished. For him, teachers must reflect on and in action.

Gimenez (1999) goes further to suggest that reflection may help to enable teachers to analyze, evaluate and change their own practice by fostering teachers' appreciation of the social and political contexts in which they work, enabling teachers to appraise the moral

and ethical issues implicit in classroom practices, including the examination of their own beliefs about teaching; encouraging teachers to take greater responsibility for their own professional growth, acquiring some degree of professional autonomy; facilitating development of their own theories of educational practice, understanding and developing a principled basis for their own classroom work; and empowering teachers so that they may better influence future directions in education.

Other philosophers of education, among whom maybe the most significant was Dewey (1938), have pointed out the need to reflect on the direction of education in general. He mentions the example of a burglar who, through practice, may become a more skillful criminal “developing” in crime. Nevertheless, this development is not good if its direction is not carefully considered. More important than developing is developing in the right direction and to do so, the direction of education must be carefully analyzed.

Zeichner (2001) also points to the need of forming reflective professionals, more specifically, teachers. He claims that teachers have to be viewed as more than simple policy implementers, they must be seen as significant agents in the educational process, exercising their judgment about educational matters either inside or outside the classroom to enable them to learn from their practice throughout their teaching careers.

In this reflection movement, teachers are usually left alone with their own practice to analyze and nothing else to foreground their analysis. Ideally, this reflection could be enhanced by the exchange of experiences in the classroom with other teachers, thus reducing the isolation with which teachers are faced in this process. Unfortunately, there are very few reports of what really goes on in the classroom and teachers’ reflection on their own practice to form a consistent database for teachers to explore and relate.

Thus, aiming at enhancing teachers' reflection on action through the analysis of some of their beliefs about language, this study sought to contribute with a descriptive account of two experienced EFL teachers' beliefs on language analyzed through their own perspective.

2.4 Play

Play may be one of the most difficult concepts to define since its nature changes depending on the perspective adopted. Different scholars have attempted to pinpoint its distinguishing features without, however, being able to draw definite lines around its definition. However, this review does not aim at doing so, and, for the purpose of this study I will present a brief review of the literature of play, selecting some important effects it may have on human evolution, development and education. For this purpose, a definition of play is put forward according to the specific needs of this study. This definition is neither comprehensive nor generalizable to other aspects of play which are not the focus of this study.

2.4.1 Play, Work and Motivation

One of the most important philosophers of education, Dewey (1916), saw play as the activity that involved anticipatory forecasts and rewards and these were part of the activity. For Dewey, the basic difference between play and work is that in the former the motivation is inside the activity whereas in the latter the motivation is outside. When

people work they do so expecting an external reward such as pay. In play the reward is intrinsic, people play for the pleasure they have in doing so.

In a first glimpse this 'intrinsic motivation in play' may seem like a secondary feature in play used to differentiate it from work, rather than to define play itself. Nevertheless, it may be that this is actually one of the defining characteristics of play, that is, play is doing what you want rather than what you have to do in order to get something (such as reward in work) which is outside the activity.

According to Cook (2000), if we accept this premise that play is doing what you want, then a second issue emerges: how do we know that an activity constitutes what people want to do rather than what they have to do? In order to answer that question, and ultimately define the activity as either play or work, we must look at the activity through the perspective of the person involved in it. What may look as work and serious activity for an outside observer, may in fact be play for the person carrying out the activity and vice-versa, thus, to define what play or work is, the perspective of the person doing the activity must be taken into account. Cook also suggests that by doing what we want we may be furthering what we have to do.

2.5 Play in education and in human development

Psychologists and educators nowadays would agree that play is an essential activity in human development, not only important for the ontogenic development of children but also for human development in general.

Among the scholars who studied the functions of play in human development, perhaps the most significant one was a Russian psychologist, Lev Vygotsky (1978), who

proposed that play was more than mere practice for adult life. He saw play as a fundamental tool in human development as it enabled people to act beyond their normal capacity through the creation of a zone of proximal development (ZPD). This ZPD can be defined as the area in which the potential capacity of a person to perform an activity can be extended through practice, play and/or the help of more experienced partners, to actually perform the activity. What is only potential capacity in this area, through practice, interaction or play, may become real capacity in the future.

Although Vygotsky specifically studied the development of children, his theory can be extended to human development in general. For him, all knowledge is transferred from one generation to another in what he calls the phylogenesis movement, and then this knowledge is transferred from one generation to the individual in a movement from the outside (object-regulation or other-regulation) to the inside (self-regulation), through a process of internalization and appropriation of concepts. Through play children move from the object-regulation stage to the self-regulation stage, internalizing and appropriating concepts, enabling the formation of abstract thought. Thus, play is an essential tool in the formation of higher order cognitive processes, one of which is abstract thought.

Another important philosopher of education, already cited in this review, was Dewey (1916) who proposed that play was important in human development. Dewey saw play as an essential activity in education, providing necessary recreation which, if suppressed, could find all sorts of illicit outlets, sometimes overt, sometimes confined to indulgence of the imagination. Education for him had no more serious responsibility than to provide opportunities for play, not only for immediate health, but still more if possible for the sake of its effects on the mind, although he did not specify which these positive effects on the mind were.

A much more encompassing and detailed view of play is the one held by Cook (2000), who claims that play is an evolutionary, psychological and biological tool of human development. For him, play, for example, enables contact between players and thus increases co-operative efficiency. Also, from an evolutionary perspective, there is evidence in human infancy that humans are the most intelligent species, perhaps not surprisingly, also the ones who play the longest among all species. Play promotes social exclusion and inclusion, establishment of hierarchies and maintenance of relationships. Play promotes collaboration; it regulates and maintains internal states; uses up surplus energy and burns off behavioral fat, helping humans to have self-awareness, alleviating boredom and enabling people to manipulate the environment without serious consequences.

As we can see from the arguments put forward by these authors, whether we see play as a tool for psychological, biological human development or education, the fact remains that it is an essential activity.

2.6 Language Play ¹ in language education

Guy Cook (2000) in a seminal work entitled *Language Play, Language Learning*, coined the term Language Play (LP) and developed a theory of language learning through Language Play. Whereas traditional models portray language production as the linguistic realization of pre-existing thought, the LP model shows that form can also generate meaning. Cook divided the features of LP in three categories: linguistic - such as rhythm and sound, repetition, and rhyming; semantic - such as in alternate realities found in role-

¹In this study, the term Language Play (LP) as coined by Cook and used in the review of literature will be seen as synonym to Ludic Language (LL) as operationalized and used by me in the analysis.

playing and inversions of the language/reality relation; and pragmatic, characterized by a focus on the performance and the speaker and often working toward or against the established social order (Warner, 2004). The major contribution of LP for Cook seems to lie in its ability to emphasize the interdependency of form and function in complex systems such as language. This model of language production, in which function not only determines, but is also determined by form, differs from traditional, referential definitions of communication.

In another article, Cook (1997) classified Ludic Language into two types: 1) play with language form, such as with the sounds of language, with rhyme, rhythm, song, alliteration, puns, grammatical parallelism, and 2) semantic play with units of meaning, combining them in ways which create worlds which do not exist such as in fictions. This kind of language typically is: 1) accompanied by smiles, laughter or marked shifts in pitch or voice quality or both, 2) used with language forms known to be mastered by the speaker, 3) fictional and 4) addressed to an audience.

Most of the other studies carried out about LP were based either on what the authors considered to be Cook's view of LP or on Vygotsky's heritage of Social Cultural Theory and the notion of Private Speech which were later appropriated and furthered developed by some of his followers such as Lantolf, in order to form a theory of language learning using some of his concepts.

For Lantolf, (as cited in Broner & Tarone, 2001) the purpose of LP is exercise or the rehearsal of target forms. In rehearsal learners produce language in the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), a Vygotskian construct used to define actual and potential knowledge. According to Vygotsky, what is potential knowledge today may become actual knowledge tomorrow through guided assistance. For Lantolf, who appropriated this term to

propose a model of language learning through LP, what is potential knowledge today may become actual knowledge tomorrow by the rehearsal of target (potential) forms.

In the aforementioned study published in 2001, Broner and Tarone challenged prevailing models of second language acquisition (SLA) which assume that negotiation of meaning is the only causal variable in SLA. According to these authors, Ludic Language may also play a role in the development of interlanguage. In the same study, the authors presented two notions of language play, namely, ludic language for fun as defined by Cook (2000) and for rehearsal as considered by Lantolf (1997), following Vygotsky's concepts of Private Speech and ZPD.

According to Broner and Tarone, whereas the purpose of language play in Cook's sense is clearly fun, the purpose of language play in Lantolf's (Vygotskyian) sense is clearly exercise, or the rehearsal, of target forms. In rehearsal learners produce language in the ZPD. Play for rehearsal involves talking out loud, repeating phrases to one's self, making up sentences or words in L2 and imitating to one's self sounds in L2. Language play for rehearsal typically: 1) is marked primarily by a shift in volume rather than in voice quality or pitch, 2) is not marked by laughter, 3) uses language forms known to be new to the speaker, 4) does not create a fictional world of reference, and 5) appears to be addressed to the self.

Although Broner and Tarone have clearly understood Cook's view of ludic language for fun (affective), they seem to have somewhat disregarded his view of ludic language as a cognitive tool, as will be later shown in the review of Cook's comprehensive view of ludic language.

Two other empirical studies using LP as a perspective rather than a model of language teaching were carried out by Kramsch and Sullivan (1996) and Sullivan (2000),

following Vygotsky's Social Cultural Theory, specially in what regards his notion of appropriation. The former proposes an appropriate pedagogy of appropriation of the language being learned and the latter proposes that language playfulness may be seen as a mediation in the interaction between participants and the language being learned. Although these two studies were not specifically about the functions of LP in language classes, they signaled to the importance of critically analyzing the language used in language classes and the possible mediation enhanced by LP.

Cook's theory of LP, which will be used as theoretical framework in this study is presented next.

2.7 Cook's view of current foreign language orthodoxies and Language Play

Although Cook was the first author to coin and set forward a theory of language play as a cognitive and affective tool in language learning, his book (2000) is highly theoretical and his conclusions are not based on empirical studies. Yet, his view of language learning through the prism of LP is the theoretical departure of this study.

Cook (2000) challenges and criticizes important aspects of SLA and foreign/second language teaching still prevailing nowadays. In this aspect his work is seminal and his argumentation, very relevant to the understanding of this work. According to him, there are four currently accepted second/foreign language teaching premises that have to be more carefully analyzed, namely, that the language used in language classes should be: 1) based on learners' needs, 2) focused on meaning, 3) real and authentic and 4) culturally conventional. He says that the Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach (the most widely used approach in S/FL teaching today), usually accepts these premises without much consideration and his aim in challenging these views of language is to propose a

model of language teaching in which there is: informed reconsideration of explicit attention to rules, deductive teaching, manipulation of forms, repetition and rote learning, translation, literature teaching, and the encouragement of competition between students, all elements which can usually be found in language play.

In order to do that, he analyzes each of those four premises more carefully. The first one, which sees the language used in language classes as being based on learners' need is a reflection of the Western civilization which takes for granted that most students seek to learn a foreign/second language in order to stand a chance of professional advancement in the competitive work environment outside the class. Cook replies to this assumption by saying that this may not be always true, that is, maybe not all students who learn a F/SL need to use this language in work environments outside the class and, even if that assumption were true, there is no guarantee that by using language based on students needs they will be more prepared to use that kind of language outside the class. The end does not necessarily equate with the means in F/SL teaching. He also pointed to the fact that, contrary to work, fulfillment of needs may be furthered by doing what we want, that is, by allowing students to select the language they want to use, teachers may be helping them to use the language they will have to use in the future.

As for the second premise, that the language used in language classes should be focused on meaning and not on form, Cook says that it is impossible to detach meaning from form and, even if that were possible, the question should not be whether the sentence has meaning or not but instead, whether that meaning is relevant. As for form, Cook says that there is evidence in human development that people are attracted to form in language and the pure manipulation of form in language learning may help learners to be more

creative and less stressed because they are playing² with the language. By playing with the language (usually through the manipulation of its form), learners may be developing linguistically.

The third assumption Cook challenges refers to the origin of the language used in language classes. The CLT approach prescribes that the language used in language classes should be real in the sense that it really happened, as opposed to invented sentences that are usually created for classroom use; and authentic, that is, resembling as much as possible the language that native speakers would use in work-like environments outside the class. Cook claims that these assumptions about the authenticity of the language are usually made based on stretches of language and it is impossible to tell whether a sentence is real or invented out of context. The important question then should be whether these sentences are meaningful and relevant in the classroom context. As for the concept of authentic language, Cook argues that it is what we do with language that is authentic or not, not the fact that it was used by native speakers or happened in a conventional environment, in other words, it is not the origin of the language that will determine whether it is authentic or not but its use in a specific context.

Furthermore, if we analyze the language included in language course books we will find that most of it is what Cook, drawing on Wolfson's bulge theory of social relations, termed as "the language of the Bulge", or culturally conventional language which is, more often than not, semantic (instead of controversial, imaginary), pragmatic (instead of emotionally charged) and conventional (avoiding topics such as sex, racism, violence and religion, particularly the topics we find in humorous use of language and precisely the kind of topics strongly associated with LP). He claims that when people are free to choose the

² According to Cook, play happens in what Vygotsky termed as the ZPD.

kind of language they want to use, this is precisely the kind of language they choose, that is, language play, which would classify this kind of language as authentic if we accept the premise that authentic is what people do with language.

Finally, to look at the premise that the language used in language classes should be culturally conventional, Cook links this idea with the previous one. In other words, the use of the language rather than the culture from which the language originates that should be used as a parameter to decide whether the language used in language classes is culturally conventional or not. Besides, maybe the culturally conventional language is not the best choice to call students' attention to language and to prepare these students to interact in other cultures, as well as in their own.

Cook looked at these currently accepted premises in language teaching methodologies so as to propose a model of language teaching in which language play is seen as an integral part of language and as such, of language teaching, rather than a peripheral and outlawed language usage. He does not mean to imply that language teaching should equate with fun or play, conversely, he claims that fun should be part of learning, though it should not be replaced by it. Language teaching and learning, in his view, may benefit from the incorporation of playful elements which should not be seen as trivial or as an optional extra in language teaching but rather as a source of language knowledge, use and activity in its own right (p. 204).

In practice, Communicative Language Teaching models often turned out to be selective with the uses and functions of language, in particular, they neglect those pleasurable, emotive and controversial aspects of social interaction which are expressed through the genres of play. Perhaps not surprisingly, most language courses which claim to use the CLT approach have accepted this view of language without deeper consideration,

and passed it on to teachers who, nevertheless, represent no guarantee that this is the approach to language that will be used in language classes. In the specific case of language teachers, the theory guiding their practice may be downplayed by their beliefs about teaching and language. This is why this study will represent a breakthrough between what theories of language propose and what is actually done in language classes taking into consideration teachers beliefs on language.

2.8 Summary of Chapter II

The present chapter has presented a review of literature of teachers' beliefs and reflection, followed by a review of play in general and play in human development, play, work and motivation, language play in language learning and Cook's view of current foreign language orthodoxies and LP. The next chapter will present the methods used in the study. It will also describe the context, the participants and the procedures used in the study to collect and analyze the data.

Chapter III - Methods

3.1 Introduction

Chapter II has presented a review of the importance of investigating teachers' beliefs, reflective stances and some views on play and Ludic Language (LL). It has also emphasized the importance of looking at teachers' beliefs through their own perspective as a way of giving them a voice in descriptive accounts of the FL classroom. The objective of this study is, as mentioned before, to find out the relationship between teachers' beliefs on and use of ludic language through the observance of their practice and stimulated reflection. To this end, this chapter will describe the methodological procedures used in this research following this order: 1) the decision of carrying out a qualitative, ethnography-oriented research on teachers' beliefs on and use of LL in the language class, 2) the context and participants involved in this study, 3) the procedures of data collection and data analysis.

3.2 A qualitative, ethnography-oriented study

Watson-Gegeo (1998) defines qualitative research as the study in which hypotheses come out of the process of collecting and analyzing the data; it is not fixed beforehand. Thus, qualitative studies advocate theory generation through discovery. These kinds of study, are, by nature, more interpretive and descriptive, as opposed to quantitative studies which usually aim at measuring and counting the data. According to the same author, qualitative studies are concerned with identifying the presence or absence of something and

with determining its nature or distinguishing features, rather than with measuring or counting tokens so as to make generalizations as in the case of most quantitative analysis.

‘Qualitative’ is an umbrella term for many kinds of research approaches, one of which is ethnography, whose principles, among others are: it is focused on people’s behavior in groups, not individual; it is holistic as it attempts to describe this behavior in relation to the whole system of which the behavior is part and it includes the emic (insider) view in the etic (outsider) perspective (Watson-Gegeo, 1998).

In practice, different combinations of approaches of data collection and analysis are not only possible but often desirable in applied linguistic studies. According to Allwright and Bailey (1991, p.68): “ Increasingly, it appears, language classroom researchers are calling for judicious selection and combined approaches, rather than rigid adherence to one approach over another”. Thus, this study has a predominantly qualitative nature for it aimed at interpreting and describing more than counting and/or prescribing; it is ethnography-oriented for it included the insiders’ view (emic, in this case, the teachers’ perspective) in the study, linking it to the etic (outsider) data-base of teachers’ beliefs and, finally, it is field-focused, that is, it was carried out in the culture of the classroom, rather than controlled in laboratories.

The decision to look at the classroom discourse originated in language classes stemmed from the reading of Gil (1998), in which she claims that the classroom should be seen as a culture in its own right, with its own reality, rules and discourse. In this perspective, each classroom constitutes a different community in which different rules may apply and what is accepted in one, may not be accepted in another. There are no rule-of-thumb axioms about what constitutes the best language teaching approach or the best language use for each classroom culture in the applied linguistics field. This should be

determined by the analysis of each classroom context, as well as the participants' needs and wants (Cook, 2000).

Thus, this study is qualitative in the sense that its nature is more interpretive, descriptive and expressive than generalizable and prescriptive; it is also ethnography-oriented for it was carried out in the field (classroom) rather than controlled in laboratory environments and it includes the teachers' voice (emic perspective) in the analysis. Next, the context and the participants will be described.

3.3 Context

The following section of this chapter will describe the two classrooms where the data were collected, henceforth referred to as Classroom 1(C1) and Classroom 2 (C2), as well as Teacher 1 (T1) and Teacher 2 (T2).

The classes observed in this research are part of the Extracurricular Program at UFSC, in which regular students of the university, as well as employees, civil servants and members of the community can attend language classes. There are between 12 and 25 students per class and usually classes are held twice a week, for two hours without breaks. The teachers are MA and PhD candidates and although there is a method and course book suggested for use, teachers have certain freedom as to which approach they use in class, as well as materials, activities, tests and evaluations.

Due to the ethnography-oriented nature of this study, it was necessary to observe classes integrally during the whole semester so as to understand the culture of the class, as well as the participants' perspective. Although the levels of the classes were not the same (the initial aim was to select two classes of the same level so as to cater for differences in

language use caused by different levels of proficiency), these two teachers were the only ones to accept the presence of researchers in their classes during the whole semester. Thus, instead of selecting the groups according to the level, this study was selected by the availability of the groups to be participants in the research.

Class 1 had classes every Monday and Wednesday from 8:00 to 10:00 and this was their second semester of English; Class 2 had classes every Tuesday and Thursday from 10:00 to 12:00 and this was their fifth semester. Next, the two classes will be described.

3.3.1 Class 1 (C1)

This group was *Inglês 2A* and it used the *New Interchange Course book IB*.

There were 21 students, twelve women and nine men. C1 was a basic level class in which students were not able to communicate only in L2 although they were expected to understand most teacher's instructions in L2, formulating complete sentences using basic vocabulary.

During their first semester students had been taught the present, past and future forms by a teacher who followed the book step by step. This was their second semester and according to the course objectives they should start learning the present perfect by then. The teacher was different from the previous semester and he did not use the book in class during the first months, although, according to him, the classes were about the content in the book. The teacher would usually select one content and theme activity to teach that specific point and that routine would usually last all class. For instance, he would select the present perfect as content and organize students in two groups brainstorming its rules and later writing sentences with it as the theme activity.

In the first two months students were confused and frustrated for they tried to follow at home with their books what the teacher was doing in class, unsuccessfully. They then decided to meet before the classes to check what the others were doing and, in this sense, there was a lot of cooperation among peers.

After four meetings (usually held in the hall before classes started), they decided to ask the teacher for help. In the following class, they asked permission to use the L1 with the teacher and had a conversation which lasted all class. They asked the teacher to start using the book in class and said they were worried about not being able to understand the teacher's instructions as well as the classroom procedures. Some of them were worried about the tests and others about their performance. Most of all, students did not know what was expected of them at that level of English and more particularly, in that class.

The teacher, then, explained his rationale saying that he tried to bring authentic materials to class in the form of songs and tasks and he believed the book would not help them much for it was not authentic, according to him. He also said that he did not believe in tests but since they had to be tested, then the best way to study for the test was to increase contact with authentic materials such as films, songs or talks with native speakers since that was the only way to improve their English. When asked to modify speech or translate, he also said that he believed that, in order to help them learn English, his model should be authentic, that is, as native speaker-like as possible, without modifications.

Students were not completely satisfied with this explanation but seemed more willing to cooperate in class after the discussion. In the class following this discussion, the teacher used the book, step by step, reading instructions and using drills and chorus repetition following the exact sequence in the book, and in the end of the class, (which was very serious and mechanical), the teacher commented, in L1, that he hoped that students

had realized how artificial that approach was and so they would return to the normal class routine in the following classes, using songs and avoiding the book, which for him, was as artificial as it could be.

The rest of the classes were similar to those in the beginning of the semester, that is, the book was never used or referred to again in class. Most of the class was around a theme activity, usually done in two groups, where the interaction was in L1 among students and L2 with the teacher. The teacher never modified or used L1 except in that discussion about the book. The teacher would explain the task, divide groups and monitor in L2 while the interaction within the groups happened in L1.

Regarding the spatial organization of the class, the chairs were arranged in front of the teacher but usually the class was divided in two groups and the teacher would be sitting at his desk in the middle, where it was not possible for him to monitor individually or walk around the class as the two groups formed circles which occupied all the space in the class, leaving the teacher no choice but to sit at his desk, isolated.

The materials used were usually songs and sentences to be corrected. There were no other forms of visual aids or 'authentic' materials such as films, pictures or stories. The routine would be to discuss a grammar topic, that is, the teacher would explain and check comprehension in L2, next the groups would write some sentences using that structure and in the following classes, they would correct with the teacher what they had written. Whenever students asked the teacher to clarify a concept, the teacher would give examples using metalanguage or paraphrasing, and eventually drawing on the board without using L1 or speech modification. Sometimes students would then turn to their peers with bilingual dictionaries for clarification when they could not understand what the teacher had said and this interaction was usually done in L1. There seemed to be a lot of cooperation in the class

but it was usually among peers, not between students and teacher and the environment was somewhat tense, specially when students were confused as to what they were supposed to do next.

Since the teacher spoke only in L2 without speech modifications and this was a basic level class, there was little interaction or exchange of personal information between teacher and students for they would probably not be able to understand the teacher in L2. This lack of personal interaction may have been affected by the students' low proficiency level in L2 together with the teachers' refusal to either modify his speech or use L1 in class. The teacher usually talked only to instruct students on the assignment and most of the classroom interaction happened among the students, and always in L1. Even when students did not quite understand what they were supposed to do, they would only ask the teacher as a last resort, always trying to check with peers first. Although there was little interaction between teacher/students, among the groups, there was a lot of peer support, checking and talk, but always in L1.

3.3.2 Class 2 (C2)

This group was *Inglês 5A* or fifth semester, using the Course book *New Interchange III*, first part. There were thirteen students, eight men and five women. C2 was an intermediate level class where students communicated in L2 most of the time with the teacher and peers and only rarely switched to L1 to tell a joke or make a comment to other classmates. Most of the students were in their early twenties and attended different courses at the university, studying English for further education or career advancement. There was much cooperation among peers and the teacher seemed to motivate this by using pair work

and group work extensively in class so as to enhance different kinds of interaction. Students often changed partners without the teacher having to ask them to and whenever a weaker student was paired with a faster one, there seemed to be a lot of cooperation between them. There was a lady who was much older than the average in the group and contrary to my initial assumption that she would be segregated in the class, she was not only welcomed but also helped by the younger students. Whenever she had difficulty in hearing or understanding, there was always someone ready to explain the activity or repeat the expression to her. The others often treated her as a grandmother, that is, tenderly and with patience and there seemed to be an authentic attempt to involve her in all conversations and activities, both by the teacher and by the other students.

This cooperation seemed to be the distinguishing feature in this group for the environment of the class was very relaxed and supportive. The teacher played an important role here for she was always ready to listen to her students, and this was confirmed in the data by the number of referential (as opposed to display) questions she asked in class. She seemed to be really interested in her students and vice-versa, with a lot of real, personal information being exchanged in the classes and in both directions.

Although there was some code switching (very little and only among peers), most of the interaction in class was done in L2. Students had a good level of English proficiency for intermediate level. Those who did not were often helped by peers to stretch their interlanguage through negotiation of meaning to communicate in L2 or by the teacher who scaffolded, used a lot of mimicry, body language, visual aids and speech modification to avoid L1 use.

The classroom was organized in a semicircle with the teacher's desk and whiteboard in the middle. The teacher hardly ever sat at her desk. She was usually walking around the

class, monitoring students. Although she followed the book, the classes were not organized around the sequence of pages in it, but rather around its content, that is, the content was always presented and practiced but often using real examples rather than those presented in the book.

The teacher included songs, films and other forms of authentic materials to present the content and so every class there was an extra activity, that is, not included in the book; such as games, pictures or other forms of visual aids. It was evident that the teacher prepared the classes carefully, using real cues rather than limiting the aids to the ones suggested by the book.

3.4 Participants

Both teachers had more than 5 years of experience with EFL teaching and had been trained in the CLT approach in private language institutes in Porto Alegre, before coming to Florianópolis for their post graduation programs. T1 was concluding his MA and was teaching five groups that semester: one group in the extracurricular and 4 other groups in private language institutes; T2 was a PhD candidate and was teaching two groups in the Extracurricular at the time of data collection . Both teachers were familiar with current EFL methodologies as they had graduated in Letras Inglês course and were currently doing their post graduation courses in the area of applied linguistics in English.

3.4.1 – Teacher 1

Teacher 1 (T1) is an experienced teacher who had previously taught English in private language institutes before coming to Florianópolis to take his MA in phonology. He claims to be an autonomous learner and that may explain how his pronunciation is so native-like even though he never traveled abroad. When asked about his accent he said he had studied English only at university (and even then not for very long), but despite that, managed to speak fluently with a very good pronunciation by listening to songs, watching films and imitating the accents of native speakers with whom he had contact.

As a teacher he seems to be a little reserved for he does not engage in personal conversations with students in or out of the class, even when those opportunities are created by the students. His relationship with the students seems to be somewhat businesslike, that is, polite but impersonal. Most of the feedback he gives in class is on pronunciation and he takes pains to use metalanguage and paraphrasing to explain concepts without translating or modifying his speech.

He seems to be very driven by the theory he studied and by his plans in class for he never changes an activity in class even when students show signs of boredom or frustration. Just the same, he does not modify his speech or use L1 in class and when students do so, he either responds in L2 or chooses to ignore the comment made in L1.

I met T1 during my MA course and our relationship was strictly academic. When I asked him whether he would like to be a participant in my study he agreed on condition that I accepted to be his participant too when he started collecting data for his own dissertation. He made it clear that he was not really interested in reflecting about his own action as a teacher in that specific moment of his professional life, perhaps due to work overload, but

nevertheless agreed to let me observe his practice and meet me outside the class to talk about his beliefs. Consequently, the interviews I had with him were fewer than with T2 (who was interested in reflecting on her practice), and the possible benefits of the reflection enhanced during our meetings, reduced with T1 since the goal of reflecting, in his case, was not shared.

3.4.2 – Teacher 2

Teacher 2 is an extrovert, funny person and we were colleagues before I started my study. When asked to be a participant she immediately accepted and was as open and cooperative with me as she is with her students in class and with other people outside the class. We became friends as a result of the reflective sessions we had and got used to talking about our practice (she referred to these moments as her “therapy time”), sharing ideas and problems. Since both of us were, in different moments, teacher and researcher, we had a lot to exchange in both fields. Even after the data collection was concluded, we still met occasionally to reflect on our practice (as experienced teacher and/or novel researcher) and share ideas, problems and solutions. Because we had similar views as teachers and researchers, our reflection served as a mirror to our understanding of our own beliefs and practices and we agreed to continue this reflection (or therapy as she preferred) even after my data analysis had finished. As opposed to T1, with T2 it was very easy to get to know her for we had time to become friends as a result of the many talks we had.

She is very sensitive to her students’ difficulties and moods in class. She modifies her speech naturally and according to different levels of difficulty, that is, depending on her students’ level of proficiency, she modifies more or less her speech. She is very creative

and prepares the classes carefully, bringing different materials such as photos of her family and other cues so as to attract her students' attention and involve them in the class. As a result, students seem to be motivated and willing to participate in the games and activities she proposes. There is a lot of interaction in class, in all directions and usually with a very personal tone.

She seems to be more affected by her beliefs and what she "feels" in class than by theory. She frequently changes her plans in class in the middle of an activity that she has obviously prepared when she feels her students are getting bored by it. She often asks real questions to her students, listening to the answers. She seems to include the unexpected reactions of her students naturally in the interactions and the sequence of activities seem to have a very natural flow in her class as if it all had been planned, even though, many a times, it had not. Her most outstanding characteristic as a teacher is this quality of making everything look natural in class, even when students are role playing or pretending to be someone they are not. She is much more personal than T1 and seems to be guided by her feelings more than by her plans or theory in class.

As we can see from the above, the two teachers selected for this study had totally different personalities and opposing teaching profiles in class. This fact enriched the data for it was possible to analyze two contrasting actions and beliefs in the EFL class.

3.5 Procedures of data collection

This study was divided in two stages of data collection and analysis according to the kind of data being collected and/or analyzed. The first stage comprised the collection and interpretation of classroom data and the second stage consisted of collection and

interpretation of data originated in the debriefing interviews with the teachers. The data collection stages sometimes overlapped with the data analysis stages. Nevertheless, for the sake of clarity, they will be described separately.

3.5.1 First stage of data collection – Observing ludic language situations in the classrooms

The first stage of data collection aimed at observing classes in order to identify some ludic language episodes and how the teachers behave towards this type of language in the class. As class observation progressed and notes were taken, it was noticed that the nature of the language used by the two teachers was significantly different, one being more ludic than the other, thus, it was decided to select tokens of ludic language in the teachers' discourse as a way of uncovering some of their beliefs. In this sense, the decision to collect tokens of ludic language was grounded in the data, another reason why this study is qualitative in nature.

To the best of my knowledge, there are no empirical studies on ludic language in the language class, thus, it was necessary to operationalize ludic language in this context so as to make its collection and interpretation possible. Therefore, for the sake of this study, ludic language (LL) was considered as the type of language which originates from or causes laughter.

After deciding what to collect, this stage consisted of: observing classes, taking field notes (see Appendix I) and audio-recording and later identifying, selecting and transcribing (see Appendix II for Transcript Conventions) LL episodes (for a complete view of LL

episodes see Appendix III) found in this context. The research questions that guided this stage were:

General research question : How do the teachers deal with LL in the classroom?

And to answer that, three specific questions were analyzed:

1A – What types of LL situations can be found in this context?

1B- Which types of LL situations do the teachers use in their classes?

1C – Do the teachers adopt an active or passive stance towards using this kind of language in class?

3.5.2 Second Stage of Data Collection – Understanding Teachers’ Beliefs on LL

The second stage of this study consisted of talks with the two teachers so as to identify some of their beliefs on ludic language in the language class. In this study, beliefs were operationalized as being any underlying assumption or principle guiding the practice and somehow expressed in it. Two individual interviews with each teacher were done (see appendix IV A and B) following this model: first open questions about general topics in language teaching were asked so as to “break the ice” and get teachers “in the mood” for the more specific questions, then the transcriptions were shown to them and the teachers were asked to elaborate on their views and beliefs on what was going on in those instances in the class, finally more specific questions were asked so as to enhance teachers’ reflection on their own action. These interviews took place in December 2003.

During the period from March to April 2004, there were other interviews with T2. Since these interviews with T2 were done in the form of informal talks, usually over lunch

or tea, they were not recorded and only summaries of these reflection meetings were taken after the conversations and can be found in Appendix V.

The research questions that guided the second stage were:

General research question: How do the teachers see LL in the classroom?

In order to answer that, three other specific questions were asked:

2A – How do the teachers view language teaching?

2B – How do the teachers view the language of the classroom?

2C – How do the teachers view Ludic Language?

Next, the procedures and tools used to analyze the data will be described.

3.6 Procedures of Data Analysis

Data were analyzed in two different stages over a nine-month period. The data were analyzed within an ethnographic framework in the first stage of analysis focused on the use of LL in the classrooms observed. In the second stage of the study, the aim was to contrast the use of this kind of language with the teachers' beliefs on this kind of language and for that, a more qualitative, interpretive framework was used to analyze the teachers' data. The teachers' interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed using the interpretation of recurrent themes and metaphors in the teachers' discourse.

The first stage of data analysis aimed at identifying and selecting episodes of ludic language in the classes observed. In order to do that, the analysis involved class observation with the analysis of the field notes to help in the selection of these episodes to be transcribed.

The second stage of data analysis aimed at identifying teachers' beliefs on ludic language in the language class and contrast these beliefs with the analysis of the use of LL in the class by these two teachers. This stage of analysis involved the interpretation of the talks with the teachers and the relation with the first stage of analysis.

3.7 Summary of Chapter III

The present chapter has presented the methods used in this study with the theoretical background adopted to justify its selection. The context, participants and procedures of data collection and analysis were also described. The next chapter presents the analysis of the data with some illustrations.

Chapter IV - Data Analysis

4.1 Introduction

In order to find out the relationship between teachers' use of and beliefs on ludic language (LL) in the language class, this chapter will be divided in two stages of analysis, one which will analyze the use of ludic language in the two classrooms, and another that will specifically analyze the two teachers' beliefs on ludic language.

4.2 Analysis of Ludic Language Situations in the Classroom

In this stage, the classroom data consisting of the classroom transcriptions of the LL situations found and the field notes taken during class observation will be analyzed to find out how the two teachers observed deal with LL in the class. In order to answer this general question, first, I will attempt to answer the following specific research question.

4.2.1 - What types of ludic language situations can be found in this context ?

As previously mentioned in the review of literature, there are no empirical studies on LL in the language class, therefore, this study had to create a criteria for categorizing the types of LL found in this context. For the sake of this study, LL was operationalized as the

type of language that happens with or causes laughter. All the instances when laughter happened in the recordings were identified, then those situations were transcribed and finally, categorized. First, I will describe each of the five types of LL situations found presenting two examples of each type for illustration. As is the case, frequently, more than one type of LL situation can be found in the episodes transcribed. Nevertheless, I will explain the criteria used to categorize the types of LL situations and show examples in which, either the distinction among the types of LL situations found is more clear cut, or one type outstands from the others, thus, becoming more representative .

4.2.1.1 - Appropriation

Inspired in Vygotsky's theory of learning and very similar to the intersection between the natural and the pedagogical modes of classroom language referred to by Gil (2002), Appropriation is the kind of language that involves three different frames: the out-of-classroom reality, i.e., the teacher's and the students' reality frame (referred to as "the natural mode" by Gil, 2002), the frame of the task being performed in the class ("the pedagogical" for Gil, 2002) and the frame of the intersection of the two. A third frame is thus formed with elements of the two. The out-of-classroom reality (which I call "the real frame") is brought to the class (which I call "the pedagogical frame"), and the mixture of the two frames creates a third frame, that of the task being performed. This is often achieved by the appropriation on the part of the teacher of elements of either her own life or the students' own realities, mixing them with the frame of the classroom, in such a way that the two frames, the real and the pedagogical, make up another one. The teacher usually performs this alchemy either by asking referential questions, i.e., real questions (as opposed to display questions to which the teacher knows the answer) and by listening to the answers, reacting to them, including the students' reality in the class, or by weaving her

own reality with the reality of the class, thus appropriating (adapting, personalizing) this kind of language to the classroom.

This type of LL situation was the most frequently found in C2 as will be shown later in the tables with the frequency with which these types of LL were used by the two teachers. In C1 this type of LL situation was not very common and when it did appear it was usually initiated by the students, without the teacher's engagement. For a complete view of the episodes of Appropriation, see Appendix III, episodes: 1.15, 2.2, 2.6, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 2.20, 2.22, 2.28, 2.30, 2.31, 2.32, 2.33, 2.34, 2.39, 2.42, 2.43, 2.44, 2.45, 2.46, 2.47, 2.48, 2.51, 2.54, 2.55, 2.56, 2.59, 2.62, 2.66, 2.67, 2.69, 2.70, 2.72, 2.77, 2.80, 2.82, 2.86, 2.87 and 2.88. Next, two examples of Appropriation will be shown as illustration.

In the first example, the teacher brought some of her personal photos to the classroom. She distributed them among the students, told them to try to organize the photos in a temporal sequence according to when those actions portrayed in the photos had happened. The aim of the lesson was to teach the past perfect tense and so she wanted students to know about things she had done in the past before other actions had happened in the past. There were photos of her as a baby, then in Disney as a teenager, of her wedding, etc. Students were assembling the photos in a time line, according to how old they thought the teacher were in the photos. Once they had organized the photos in a correct sequence, they had to form sentences about two photos at a time, using the past perfect tense and the past simple tense, for example: "When she went to Disney, she had already studied English", holding a photo of the teacher as an English student in a school and another one, looking older, in Disneyland. After the students made the sentences, the teacher would tell them whether the information was correct.

Example 1 – Appropriation - (From Appendix III B, Episode 2.45)

- 1- S1= Jane had got married before she got pregnant. ((holding photo of the teacher's wedding and another one of the teacher, pregnant))
- 2- T = ahã + alright + anything else?
- 3- S2 = Jane had gone to Bahia before she got pregnant ((student is holding a photo of the teacher's honey moon in Bahia and the same photo which had been used before of the teacher pregnant. The student is looking suspiciously at the teacher))
- 4- T = very good + but she didn't get pregnant there! ((blinking to the students))
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))

In this example, the teacher is using her own examples (“real frame”), to teach the past perfect (“pedagogical frame”), and by mixing the two modes she appropriates her reality to be used in the class. In the example above, in line 4, the student looks at the teacher in a suspicious way, teasing her as if to imply that maybe the time sequence was not right, that is, if the teacher had gotten pregnant before she got married, (which culturally would be inappropriate in Brazil), then the time sequence, and as a consequence, the sentences that the students were making, were not right. The teacher understood the implication of the student's look, accepted the implicit invitation to play with her own reality as well as the language being used to talk about that, and replied, smiling and blinking to the student, that she had got married first, thus, giving a positive feedback on the structure they were using (“pedagogical frame”), as well as her personal information (“real frame”). In the next example, the Appropriation is not so much of the teacher's reality but rather, that of the students'.

The aim of the lesson in Example 2 is to teach expressions followed by the gerund form. The teacher wrote “I don’t mind + ing” on the board and now she is eliciting from the students, situations which they consider annoying. There are some situations written on their books and the teacher asks them which ones they consider least annoying. The aim is to have them produce sentences using the structure: “ I don’t mind + ing”, preferably using the examples given by the book. In the previous class one of the students (Doug) was offering another student a ride home. The teacher heard this comment and asked Doug if he would give her a ride too. He said that yes, he would and then, laughing, the teacher said that she needed to go to the airport, which is quite far from where they were. The students laughed for they understood that the teacher was joking, that is, she was really going to the airport but she did not expect Doug to give her a ride to such a distant place. In the next example there is an Appropriation of this situation:

Example 2 – Appropriation – (From Appendix III B, Episode 2.18)

- 1- S1= (XXX)
- 2- T= giving rides! by car + how old are you Doug?
- 3- Doug= ah? no + I go eighteen today
- 4- T= ahaa! that’s why he doesn’t + ((changing intonation as if she had just realized that it was his birthday)) today is your birthday?
- 5- Ss= ((laugh))
- 6- T= I can’t believe it! now we have to sing! but that’s why Doug doesn’t mind driving people to the airport
- 7- Ss= (((laugh)))
- 8- T= [because he has just started driving!]

9- Ss = ((laugh))

10- T= because when you have been driving for a long time + asking for a ride to the airport can be very annoying + it's your birthday today + and it was Diana's birthday last week wasn't it?

11- Diana = yes + and I

12- T = on the 8th

13- Diana = the 9th

14- T = the 9th + last week

15- Diana = and I missed the class

16- T = aaah! [because I noticed (XXX) it was her birthday]

17- Ss = [laugh]

18- Diana = yes

19- T = aha! and Diana + is here + so we have to sing happy birthday for two people

20- Diana =oh!

21- Ss= ((laugh))

22- T = where we put dear + we have to say dear Diana and Doug + ok ?

23- Ss = ((laugh))

24- ((They started singing the song and laughed when they were supposed to say dear Diana and Doug because it was too fast to include both names in the song))

In this example, we can see how the teacher, in line 6, intertwines Doug's birthday ("real frame") with the fact that he doesn't mind ("pedagogical frame") driving people to the airport because he's 18 years old (real age to get a driver's license in Brazil, pedagogical reason for not minding giving rides), forming a third frame with elements of the real and

pedagogical frames of the classroom discourse. Then, in line 10, the teacher goes on mixing “the real and the pedagogical frames” by inviting another student’s reality into the classroom, that of Diana’s birthday and the fact that asking for rides to the airport (which is quite far) could be very annoying, unless the person had just gotten their drivers license and was still very excited about driving anywhere (not Diana’s case, since she was obviously older than 18 and so, probably, had had her drivers license for a long time). The next LL situation found was that of Performance.

4.2.1.2 Performance

Differently from the Appropriation which involves three different, overlapping frames, Performance is a kind of ludic language situation which involves only one frame, namely, the fictional frame in which participants act out situations which are legalized by the classroom imaginary contract (Gil, 1998) in which participants take for granted that the actions performed in the classroom are real only in this context. This kind of ludic language situation is created through role-play, make believe, mimicry and other forms of imitation. For a complete view of the examples of Performance found in the data, see Appendix III, episodes: 1.3, 1.5, 2.1, 2.4, 2.5, 2.13, 2.21, 2.26, 2.29, 2.37, 2.38, 2.40, 2.41, 2.44, 2.50, 2.57, 2.58, 2.63, 2.64, 2.65, 2.66, 2.68, 2.76, 2.77, 2.78, 2.83 and 2.89. Again, similarly to Appropriation, this type of LL situation seems to be used much more by T2 than by T1. Next, two examples of Performance will be shown as illustration.

In the third example, the teacher has a box with words written on pieces of paper in it. She calls this box a “vocabox” and she uses it to keep the words that the students learned in previous classes. One class before this one, she had taught them adjectives to describe

feelings, such as: annoyed, upset, exhausted, etc. In this class, the teacher decided to use the adjectives in the “vocabox” to play a game. She organizes the students into pairs, then each pair gets a card from the vocabox with an adjective written on it. Each pair of students then has to act out a dialogue pretending to feel the adjective written on the card, without actually saying what the adjective is, and the other students have to guess what the adjective on their card is.

Example 3 – Performance – (From Appendix III B, Episode 2.5)

1- S1: we're running in Beiramar

2- Ss: ((laugh))

((S1 and S2 play the dialogue as if they were out of breath. After they finished teacher starts commenting))

3- T: ok +ok + what's the feeling?

4- Ss: tired

5- T: yeah! + tired + but you know when you are jogging you shouldn't stop and talk to other people

6- Ss: ((laugh))

7- T: it's bad for your heart

8- Ss: ((laugh))

In line 2, the students agree to role-play two friends jogging in Beira Mar (the avenue by the sea where people usually jog and walk in Florianópolis), performing the dialogue as if they were really tired (imaginary frame of the classroom). The teacher then joins in the

performance in line 5, advising them not to talk and walk at the same time, as if they were really doing that. In line 7, again, the teacher goes on performing, making a comment about their heart conditions.

In the next example of Performance, it is the teacher, rather than the students, who performs. As the “plot” being performed unfolds (the teacher is performing a fortune-teller now), the students, similarly to the example above where the teacher joined in the performance of the students, now join in the teacher’s performance pretending to be really interested in finding out what their future holds for them.

Example 4 – Performance – (From Appendix III B, Episode 2.77)

1 – T = what’s my job ?

2 – Ss = XXX

3 – T = what do I do ? + where do I work ?

4 – S1 = in a school + teacher

5– T = and do you think teachers are well-paid or badly-paid ?

4 S2 = badly-paid

5 T= that’s right + teachers are badly-paid so + I have an extra job + you know +to make extra money + in my free time I tell people’s fortune + do you know the name of the person who tells your future ?

6 S3= future-teller

7 T = FUTURE- teller ?

8 S4= fortune-teller

- 9 T = that's right + I'm a fortune teller but I don't use a crystal ball + now + you see + I have a device ((showing them her origami)) here to tell ((is interrupted by Valy who helps her open it as she was having some difficulty to show it to Ss))
- 10 V= I just love origamis + you see + this is what you do +
- 11 T = that's wonderful + now I have an assistant + like David Cooperfield and his assistants +now + listen everybody +Valy will be passing around collecting money +++
- 12 Ss = ((laugh hard))
- 13 T = you didn't think this was gonna be for free + now + did you ?
- 14 Ss = ((laugh))
- 15 T = and so you can give Valy your contributions + now seriously + what do you wanna know about your future ?

In this example, the teacher starts to “set the scene” for her Performance by inviting students to imagine what a teacher's job is like. In this moment, her movement is that of Appropriation for she is really a teacher and teachers in Brazil are generally under-paid. This Appropriation then overlaps with Performance when she tells her students that, due to the bad pay conditions that teachers are faced with, she needs to have a side job to complement her income. The Performance per se does not really start until line 9, when the teacher invites her students to join in her performance by pretending to be a fortune-teller. She uses her origami (representing the crystal ball that fortune-tellers usually use to see the future), just as actors use other props in stage. She is sitting in front of the students, looking completely puzzled as she manipulates the origami to find out what it is telling her about the students' future. She then invites them, once again, to join in the performance by asking questions about their future to the origami.

This episode is representative of what usually happened in the other episodes of LL situations found in the data, that is, there is usually some overlapping among the different types of LL situations found, just as in the previous example in line 1 there is Appropriation and then in line 5, there is Performance overlapping with the Appropriation. This kind of movement, from the Appropriation to the Performance, or from “the real to the pedagogic and imaginary” modes of the classroom was very common with T2, in fact, T2 seemed to be always moving among these three frames in the classroom in a very natural and subtle way. T1, on the other hand, hardly ever used these two types of LL situation in his classes, but seemed to prefer the Word Play type of LL situation which will be explained now.

4.2.1.3 Word play

Word play is a kind of ludic language situation which involves linguistic parallelism such as the one found in puns, rhymes and other forms of syntactic, phonological and/or semiotic contrasts as well as between two different languages, in this case L1 (Portuguese) and L2 (English). In this kind of ludic language situation, one domain (syntactic, semantic, phonological or translational) is used as reference to another of the same type. As is the case, in Word Play, as the name suggests, there is playing and manipulation of the language, be it in a phonological, translational or syntactic way. A total of 21 episodes of Word Play were found in the data, most of them drawing parallelism between L1 and L2. From the 21 episodes found, 6 episodes were found in C1 and 15 in C2. The Word Play instances can be viewed in Appendix III, episodes: 1.2, 1.4, 1.6, 1.7, 1.12, 1.14, 2.15, 2.23, 2.24, 2.25, 2.35, 2.36, 2.49, 2.61, 2.64, 2.71, 2.73, 2.75, 2.81 and 2.85. Next, two examples will be presented as illustration.

In the following example of Word Play, the teacher is showing the students a picture of a girl who looks like her. The teacher said that the girl's name is Janice (very similar to the teacher's name) and she asked students to imagine things about Janice, such as where she lives, what she does for a living, etc. The aim of the activity is to hypothesize about Janice's life, before actually listening to the CD where Janice is speaking. After listening to Janice in the CD, the students will check whether the things they imagined about her are right. There are two forms of parallelism in this example, one in the fact that the girl in the photo looks like the teacher (visual) and the other in the fact that her name is very similar to the teacher's name as well (morphological).

Example 5 – Word Play – (From Appendix III B, Episode 2.81)

1 – T = right + where + so where does she live ?

1- Ss = janaland

2- T = and what language does she speak ?

3- Andy = janalese

4- T = that's right + and Andy has not only been to janaland but he also speaks janalese fluently + it's amazing !

The students in the previous example recalled a situation that had happened previously in class when the teacher was giving the students names of countries and asking them for the nationality. The teacher made a joke about the fact that in Japan, people speak Japanese. She, then, said that, if that was correct, then she spoke Janalese and lived in Janaland for her name was Jane! She had previously made a joke using this linguistic parallelism between her name and the place where she lived and language she spoke and the students

appropriated her joke now using the same linguistic parallelism in the previous example to talk about the girl in the picture whose name was Janice. As previously mentioned, this overlapping of LL situation types (such as in this example when the students appropriate a Funny Comment to word play) was very common in the data. However, in the next example of Word Play, I will try to show a Word Play situation which does not overlap with other forms of LL situations.

Differently from the previous example where the linguistic parallelism is more of a morphological nature (Janice lives in *Janaland* and speaks *Janalese*), the next example of Word Play presented below shows a linguistic parallelism of a more translational nature where the teacher plays with the incongruence between the literal translation of phrasal verbs from English to Portuguese. This incongruence will be responsible for the bizarreness of the example, making everyone laugh at it. In this example, the teacher is checking the comprehension of some phrasal verbs that students learned the previous class by eliciting answers from the students.

Example 6 – Word Play – (From Appendix III B, Episode 2.49)

- 1- T= what's + I ran out of gas ?
- 2- Ss = (XXX)
- 3- T = it's not + eu corri pra fora da gasolina!
- 4- Ss = ((laugh))

In this excerpt, the parallelism is between L1 and L2. The teacher simply translated the phrasal verb literally so as to call the students' attention to the bizarreness of such expression when translated literally to the Portuguese. In line 3, the literal translation of the

phrasal verb in Portuguese, in English would be: “I ran out of the gasoline”, which absolutely makes no sense.

As previously mentioned, the Word Play category, which I understand as the playful manipulation of the language in this study, is somehow connected with the next form of LL situation, namely, the Funny Comment, for both are playful movements using language. Next, the Funny Comment category will be explained and illustrated.

4.2.1.4 Funny Comment

This type of ludic language situation refers to an invented comment which involves incongruity and is produced and told (usually in a contingent way) with the aim of making people laugh. In this sense, Funny comments are similar to jokes for both are created and told to make people laugh. Nevertheless, Funny Comments differ from jokes in that the latter are usually invented stories which were previously created to be told. Funny Comments, on the other hand, are not created previously but rather contingently and are more in the form of comments than stories. Similarly to jokes, Funny Comments usually involve a surprise element which causes laughter, nevertheless, this surprise element is not so dramatically build-up as the punch lines in jokes. Funny Comments are more contextual than jokes for they depend on the situation to be created and told.

This type of LL situation seemed to be the favorite one for T1, who resorted to a lot of irony (another element usually found in jokes and Funny Comments) in his classes. This will be shown in the first example of Funny Comment which happened in C1. T2 also made a lot of Funny Comments but she seemed to prefer more the Appropriation type, rather than the Funny Comment. The second example of Funny Comment happened in C2 and is one

of the few examples in which T2 uses irony, and even then, the irony overlaps with Appropriation as will be shown in the analysis of the example. A total of 18 episodes were found under this category, 6 in C1 and 12 in C2. The Funny Comment situations can be viewed in Appendix III, episodes: 1.1, 1.8, 1.9, 1.10, 1.11, 1.13, 2.3, 2.16, 2.27, 2.42, 2.43, 2.48, 2.50, 2.58, 2.59, 2.66, 2.74, 2.79, 2.80, 2.84 and 2.90. Next, two examples will be shown for illustration.

In the first example of Funny Comment shown, one student is reading a clear description of Rio de Janeiro while the other students have to guess what city is being mentioned. After the student finishes reading the description of Rio de Janeiro, the teacher comments cunningly:

Example 7 – Funny Comment – (From Appendix III A, Episode 1.19)

1- T = Mexico City + right?

2- Ss = ((laugh))

The unexpected element here is the comment made by the teacher, with certain irony, which is another ingredient often found in jokes and Funny Comments, that the city mentioned is Mexico City since all the students know that the description refers to Rio de Janeiro. In the next example, the Funny Comment happens when the teacher refers to the odd combinations of food that pregnant women have.

In this example, the teacher is dividing the students into groups to play a game. Each group must choose a name for their group and this name has to be connected with food. The reason why the name of the group had to be connected with food can be found two classes before when the students were learning idioms in English connected with food, such

as: 1) to play gooseberry, 2) to go bananas, 3) to be as different as chalk and cheese, 4) to be full of beans, 5) to be a pie in the sky, 6) to cry over spilt milk, 7) to be a breadwinner, 8) to be an egg head, 9) to be an apple polisher, 10) to be the apple of one's eye, etc. Some groups had already selected their names, such as “gooseberry”, “chalk and cheese”, “spilt milk”, and the teacher was walking around the room checking the groups' names and writing them up on the board so that she could keep the score once the game started.

In the previous class, when they were talking about idioms in English, one of the girls asked the teacher what would be the equivalent expression in English for “viajar na maionese”. The teacher laughed and said it was not “travel in the potato salad”, translating the expression literally and making everyone laugh (another instance of Word Play). The teacher then said that the equivalent expression in English would be “to go bananas”, and everyone laughed again for the incongruity of that expression when translated into Portuguese is very funny. When a student commented how odd the idioms sounded in different languages, the teacher exclaimed that that was nothing, what was really odd was the different combinations of food she used to have when she was pregnant, telling the students how she craved to eat “grated bricks” and other odd things (Appropriating her own reality). Everyone laughed again for the image of the teacher, pregnant and eating crazy combinations of food was, in fact, bizarre to say the least. As we can see, there were many different types of LL situations overlapping in that class and now, those instances of LL situation will be used in the next example by the teacher to create a Funny Comment:

Example 8 – Funny Comment – (From Appendix III B, Episode 2.74)

1- S1 = I don't know the name for our group

- 2- T = how about something that goes with barbecue? + something we usually have with barbecue? ((probably referring to potato salad which had been mentioned the previous class))
- 3- S1 = ice-cream ?
- 4- T = well + no + I mean + yeah + if you're pregnant + I guess
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))

In this example, in line 4 the teacher makes a Funny Comment by referring to the fact that pregnant women usually eat and crave for odd or unusual combinations of food, in this case, barbecue with ice-cream. The unexpected element here is the idea of having barbecue with ice-cream or yet, the idea of pregnant women having that or other odd combinations of food. Next, I will describe the Anecdote, which is another type of LL situation found in this context and that can also be found in the example previously shown when the teacher was telling her students about her “odd cravings” when she was pregnant.

4.2.1.5 Anecdote

This form of ludic language situation is similar to the Funny Comment, both are funny and told with the aim of producing laughter. Yet, anecdotes are different from Funny Comments in the sense that the latter refer to invented comments or situations whereas anecdotes, as I understand them in this study, refer to real situations which are later told to make people laugh. Funny Comments are usually produced and told in a contingent way, whereas the situation involved in the Anecdotes, happened prior to its telling. In this sense, Anecdotes are more personal than jokes in general or Funny Comments in particular for the

situation being told in Anecdotes actually happened and usually, as is the case, it is the person who witnessed the situation or went through it that retells it later on (in a contingent way or not). A total of 4 episodes of this type of LL situation were found, all of them in C2, no episodes of this kind of language were found in C1. The Anecdote situations can be viewed in Appendix III, episodes: 2.7, 2.53, 2.60 and 2.88.

If we recall Example 8 of Funny Comment, one class before the example given, there had been an Anecdote situation when the teacher was telling students that when she was pregnant she craved to eat odd combinations of food. As previously mentioned, this overlapping of LL situation types, such as the overlapping of Funny Comments and Anecdotes in example 8, was very common in the data. Next two examples of Anecdotes, both told by T2, will be shown as illustration.

The teacher was eliciting words from the students about weddings, such as: hen's night, stag party, bridal shower, honeymoon, etc. Someone asked the teacher about her hen's night party and the teacher told them what her friends did for her party. They had gotten her drunk, taken her to a club and made her do crazy things. In the next example the teacher is telling the students her story:

Example 9- Anecdote – (Appendix III B, Episode 2.53)

- 1- T= in Veneza + in this club + there was a fashion show + bikini fashion show +very trendy fashion show + and they put me on the catwalk!
- 2- Ss = ((laughs))
- 3- T= in the end + my friends arranged me to walk on the catwalk + I had to do that!
- 4- Ss = ((laugh))
- 5- T = but I don't remember anything about it

6- Ss = ((laugh louder))

The funny element here lies on the visualization, by the students, of their teacher walking on the catwalk on her hen's party. The bizarreness of the situation stems from the idea of their teacher walking on the catwalk, half drunk. This bizarre or surprise element is also usually found in jokes and Funny Comments, nevertheless, in this example, the teacher really walked on the catwalk and now is telling, rather than inventing the funny situation.

In the next example the teacher will tell another one of her many adventures. Now the teacher is telling a story about her host family in England. There was a little eight-year-old girl who hated Brazilians. The teacher soon found out why...

Example 10 – Anecdote – (From Appendix III B, Episode 2.60)

1- T= first I said hello and shook hands with her and she said +I hate Brazilians + I said +why ?+ because every time there are Brazilians in the house they do this ((she squeezes her cheeks)) + que bonitinha!+

1- S= ((laugh))

2- T= and she said +I hate when they touch my cheeks! +I hate when they say that +you're not gonna do that? + I said no

3- Ss = ((laugh))

In line 1, when the teacher tells the story of the girl and mimes her face, squeezing her cheeks until they turn red, students laugh because they again can, and in fact, do, visualize their teacher in this peculiar situation. Again, as in previous examples, there is overlapping of LL situation types here. When the teacher “appropriates” the voice of the girl, imitating

her squeezing her cheeks, there is a Performance moment in the class for the teacher is performing the little girl's behaviour. Yet, when she does that, she is referring to a situation in which she was a real participant and in this sense, this is an Anecdote.

This overlapping of LL situation types was very common in the data as would have been expected, after all, people play different roles and “appropriate” different voices many times a day, in order to interact in society. If we see the classroom as a culture in its own right (the stance adopted by me in this study as previously mentioned), then, in this culture, many voices and with them, many modes would have to co-exist and interact, and this is exactly what was seen in terms of LL use in the two classes observed.

As a final remark to this section, I just would like to add that, similarly to a person who, at the same time is a mother, teacher, sister and friend, people in a language class usually adopt different roles as a way of internalising different voices, thus, the overlapping of different modes of communication. When the aim is to communicate, it is important to bear in mind that many situations, roles and with it, modes, overlap and the ability to move between these modes is what ultimately enables people to become good communicators.

In order to understand the two teachers' involvement and moves within these types of ludic language in the language class, next I will attempt to answer which types of ludic language situations and how frequently the two teachers observed used this kind of language in their classes.

4.2.2 Which types of ludic language situations do the teachers use in their classes?

In order to understand the two teachers' use of and beliefs on LL in the language class, first, it is necessary to look at the types of LL situations that the two teachers did in fact use

in their classes, so as to relate the use of this specific kind of language to the underlying beliefs which possibly motivated this use.

As will be shown in Tables 1 and 2 with the frequency of LL situation episodes found in C1 and C2, respectively, the use of this kind of language was very different in the two classes observed. The figures shown in the aforementioned tables refer to the count of LL situations which were found in the classroom transcripts. The field notes were also analysed to verify the context, and thus, the nature, of the episodes of LL situations found.

As can be seen in Table 1, in C1, only four types of LL situations were identified and the total number of LL episodes was significantly smaller than in C2. No instances of Anecdotes were found in C1 and the Appropriation situations found in C1 happened without the teacher's engagement and therefore should not be considered when counting the frequency of LL situations used by T1.

Still looking at Table 1, we will see how T1 seemed to prefer the Word Play and Funny Comment categories among the other forms of LL found and even so, used LL much less than T2 (14 episodes in which T1 engaged in LL situations as opposed to 102 for T2).

Table 1- Ludic Language situations and episodes in C1

Situations	Episodes
Appropriation * (by students)	3
Performance	2
Word play	6
Funny Comment	6
Anecdote	0
Total	17 Episodes

As previously mentioned, in the count of frequency of LL situations found in Table 1, the teacher did not engage in the Appropriation episodes and so the number of LL situations found in C1 and represented in Table 1 does not really refer to the frequency with which T1 used LL in his class. This fact was corroborated and clarified by the analysis of the field notes.

By looking at the field notes, I noticed that there had been some instances of LL situations in C1 which had not been counted in the frequency for they had not been transcribed. These moments usually happened in the students' discourse, in L1 and students were usually whispering to each other, making it impossible to record or, as a consequence, transcribe these moments. Nevertheless, the field notes registered that there were moments in which there seemed to be LL among the students, although not engaged by the teacher and thus, not counted in the frequency of LL situations found in C1 in Table 1.

We conclude, looking at the figures extracted from the classroom transcriptions and the comments in the field notes that, T1 used LL much less than T2 and did not use the Appropriation type of LL situation at all, (which was, nevertheless, registered in his students' discourse). T1 seemed to prefer the Word Play and Funny Comment types of LL situations which involve more irony, and did not tell any stories of his own, that is, did not engage in any Anecdote situation type of LL in his class. This may point to the conclusion that T1 did not engage in "personal" exchanges of information with his students, preferring types of LL situations which did not involve his or his students' personal realities.

Conversely, in Table 2, the number of LL situations found in C2 and represented in Table 2 refer to the exact number of LL situations engaged by T2. As can be seen in Table 2, Teacher 2 used much more LL than T1 and her favourite type of LL situation seemed to be the Appropriation for she used this kind of language most of the time in her classes, in

fact, we can say that this form of LL was the distinguishing feature in her classroom discourse. The least used form of LL situation in her class was that of Anecdotes, with only 3 episodes of the 102 episodes of LL situations found in C2.

If we see the types of LL situation used by the two teachers and the frequency with which they used them in their classes we will conclude that: T1 used significantly less LL in his classes and seemed to prefer LL types which did not involve personal exchanges of information whereas T2, on the other hand, not only used much more LL in her classes, but also seemed to prefer the personal types (as opposed to the invented or ironic types) of LL situations in her classes as can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2- Ludic Language situations and episodes in C2

Situations	Episodes
Appropriation	46
Performance	26
Word play	15
Funny Comment	12
Anecdote	03
Total	102 Episodes

In order to understand why the two teachers used one type of LL situation more frequently than the other, and the relation that this issue has with the teachers' beliefs on this kind of language, next, I will analyze the role of the two teachers in the instances of LL situations found in this context.

4.2.2 Do the teachers adopt an active or passive stance towards using LL in their classes?

As can be seen from the analysis of the previous section, five types of LL situations were found in this context. Nevertheless, the frequency and nature of the LL situations found in the two classes observed were completely different. In order to understand this difference and determine its probable cause, we must analyze the teachers' role (whether they adopt an active or passive stance towards this kind of language) in the situations found for, depending on how the teacher reacted to this kind of language, its use would be different in class.

Two kinds of data will be analyzed to determine the teachers' role in the LL situations found, namely, the classroom transcripts and the field notes taken during class observation. The transcripts will be analyzed to determine the number and frequency with which these situations were used in each classroom and by each teacher. The field notes will be analyzed to determine the nature of the LL situations found, as well as the teachers' role in the type of LL situations found.

Looking at the classroom transcripts, we can see that a total of 26 hours of classes were observed, 16 of which were tape recorded. Each teacher was recorded for 8 hours and observed for 13. Episodes of ludic language situations were identified and then transcribed from these recordings. The analysis of the classroom transcripts found a total of 119 episodes of LL, 17 of which were found in C1 and 102 found in C2.

As we can see, the number of LL episodes found in C1 was much smaller than that found in C2. In order to explain this difference, we must turn to the field notes taken during class observation to verify whether this finding is either confirmed or refuted by them.

As previously mentioned, the class observation phase was longer (total 26 hours) than the tape recording phase (total 16 hours), thus, the analysis of the field notes taken during these class observations show a more comprehensive and realistic view of what really happened in the two classrooms observed.

The analysis of the field notes taken in C1 (Appendix I) shows that there were many instances of LL situations (signaled by laughter) in the students' discourse. Nevertheless, these instances were not clear enough to transcribe because students usually whispered to each other making it difficult to register these moments as the tape recorder was placed next to the teacher. Thus, the analysis of the field notes was essential to explain the difference of LL use in the two classes. The field notes provide a more vivid view of what really happened in the class since they registered these moments (in which LL was present but not transcribed).

By looking at the field notes we can see that there was much ludic language in both classes, although its nature seemed to differ in the two classes observed. In C1 this kind of language was more frequently used by the students, without the teacher's engagement and always in L1. It seemed that the students in C1 used LL in L1 as a way to release the tension caused by having to communicate in L2, perhaps due to their low level of proficiency in that language. T1 did not use L1 in class and so he was not only excluded from these interactions when LL was used, but also seen as a "language patrol" by the students who would usually lower their voices or whisper to each other when using L1 so as to avoid the teacher hearing them. Thus, these instances when LL was present in class but impossible to transcribe would have been completely missed had it not been for the analysis of the field notes taken during class observation.

Thus, although the analysis of the transcripts in C1 shows that there were very few LL episodes in this class (only 17 if compared with 102 in C2), this finding was not corroborated by the analysis of the field notes taken in this class which shows the opposite, that is, it shows that there was much LL in C1 although most of it was in L1 and used by the students, without the teacher's engagement and because of its nature (secret), impossible to transcribe. This difference can be explained and better understood by the analysis of the teacher's role in the LL episodes found in this class.

In C2 the analysis of classroom transcripts allows a more accurate interpretation of what happened in that classroom in terms of LL usage, since the LL situations registered in this class always happened with the teacher's engagement and in L2. Therefore, those instances were very clear in the recordings and possible to transcribe. Thus, the instances of LL transcribed in C2 are basically the instances in which this kind of language appeared in C2 as was corroborated by the field notes taken in that class.

The analysis of the transcripts in C2 shows that there were 102 episodes of LL found in the 13 classes observed. Similarly, the analysis of the field notes shows that the transcriptions in this case registered exactly what happened in that class, that is, there was considerably much LL in C2 (compared to C1) and it was usually in L2 and with the teacher's participation or, more frequently, initiation and/or invitation.

Thus, it can be inferred, both from the analysis of the transcriptions and the analysis of the field notes, that there are many instances of ludic language situations in the language classes observed, although not always engaged by the teacher.

T1 seemed to adopt a more passive role towards LL usage for, although there were many instances of this kind of language in his classes, he did not engage in those LL situations in which personal information was being exchanged (such as in Appropriation

and Anecdotes), preferring the types of LL situations in which the language involved was less personal and more ironic, (such as in Word Play and Funny Comments).

T2, on the other hand, adopted a more active stance towards LL usage in her classes engaging in all the instances of LL found, many a times not only participating but also initiating and inviting this form of language in her classes. She seemed to prefer the types of LL where personal information was being exchanged (such as in Appropriation) or when imaginary worlds were being created (through Performance), using less irony than T1 even when she used the Word Play and Funny Comment types of LL situation in her classes.

The fact that LL was present in both classes shows the nature of human relationships, since fun, laughter and other features of LL can be found in every culture (and remember the class is one here). It would only be natural to expect to find many instances of this kind of language in a language class where people have to interact with others to create opportunities and content to practice a foreign language. The teacher's participation in those moments when LL is present, however, seemed to be determined by the teacher's beliefs about teaching, language and LL, more specifically. Thus, in order to understand the relation between the use of LL and the beliefs on this kind of language held by the two teachers, the next section will explore some teachers' beliefs about language, language teaching and finally, ludic language.

4.3 Stage 2 – Analysis of Teachers' Beliefs on Ludic Language

The second stage of analysis will contrast the analysis of the previous research question with the analysis of the data originated in the interviews with the teachers in order to find out (research questions 2)- how the teachers see LL in the language class. In order

to do that, the analysis of research question 1 will be linked to the present analysis, looking at some metaphors and current themes found in the teachers' discourse to uncover their beliefs. I will start by answering the questions below.

4.3.1 – How do the teachers view language teaching?

The issue of how teachers view language teaching is connected with how teachers view their role in class and in order to answer this question, I will first analyze some metaphors found in the two teachers' discourse as a way of uncovering some of their beliefs about teaching. If we are to look at metaphors as a sign of how a person interprets and shapes reality (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980), we will see how the metaphors used by the teachers explain their role in class and their relationship with the teaching and learning processes. Metaphors are ways of summarizing whole philosophies and beliefs into single images. The unwrapping of these images may reveal, thus, some of the underlying principles and beliefs held by the people who expressed these metaphors and this is what I intend to do with the metaphors identified in the observation of the two teachers' actions and reflections, that is, unwrap them.

4.3.1.1 Teacher 1: The Input Provider

The analysis of T1's interview, (Appendix IV A), uncovered some metaphors, which, in turn, uncovered some of his beliefs about teaching and learning. When I commented, during the interview, how good his accent in English was, T1 laughed and said that he had never been abroad. In fact, he said that he had learned English mostly alone,

listening to songs and watching films in English. Yet, he believed that the best way to acquire a second language efficiently was to live in the target culture, interacting with native speakers who could provide a good model of language input. Nevertheless, he admitted that he himself was a *living proof* that living in the target language country was only an ideal condition and not a necessary condition in language learning for he himself had *never set foot in an English speaking country*, to use his words. For him, then, the determining condition for a person to acquire a second language was to have enough access to a good model of language input, which ideally would take place in the target language country but that could also happen in a language class or by listening to native speakers in songs and films.

We can see from this that he sees his role of language teacher as that of an **input provider**. Looking at the field notes taken in C1 (Appendix I A), this role becomes more evident. T1 never modified his speech to be better understood by his learners nor used L1 in class, despite his students' low proficiency level in L2 and some obvious signs that eventually, the students could not understand him (such as when they asked their peers to translate what the teacher had just said). He interacted with his students as if he was a native speaker who did not speak their L1. When I asked him, during the interview why he did this, he said that the classroom was an artificial environment and so, in order to help his students imagine a natural interaction with a native speaker, he acted like one.

He also said that his accent was good because he listened to native speakers talking (in songs and films), when he was learning. He said that his students needed as much input as they could get in order to acquire another language and he thought his major role in class was to provide his students with as many opportunities to hear a good model of English input as they could have.

The field notes taken in C1 corroborate this finding for I noticed, during the class observation, that T1 acted in a businesslike fashion with his students, that is, he would “provide the model”, which seemed to be his major job in the class, usually in a unilateral way, that is, he would not ask comprehension questions or modify his speech when a student could not understand. T1 did not seem to be worried whether students had understood or not, for he had “delivered” the message and that was his job. When I talked to him in the interview about this, he said that he believed that teaching was a serious job and people had to be professional in the sense that personal problems should be left outside the class. He explicitly said : “I think I’m a very professional teacher, I don’t give my personal problems a chance in class.”

As we can see, he believed that learning a language was a cognitive activity, not really affected by people’s emotions (such as the frustration for not understanding) and, in order to learn a language efficiently, learners needed enough native-like input in L2. The next extract from his interview illustrates this idea:

T1- ... learning a language is difficult enough, without having to deal with moods and all... it’s a highly cognitive process and in order to do that, people have to isolate emotions... just concentrate in the message, I mean, what I mean is ...

Researcher- ... but don’t you think that if they don’t understand they’re gonna feel frustrated and maybe because of that, I mean, maybe they don’t wanna learn anymore...

T1- ... sure, I see what you mean but... and again, some will learn faster than the others, we can’t really predict, as teachers, what will happen, all we can do is do our job, I mean, give them a good model of input, now, what, what they’re gonna do with this, I mean, if they feel frustrated or learn or else, I mean, that’s their problem, what can we do?

As we can see from this extract, T1 believed that the major role of the teacher was to provide enough L2 input, thus, suggesting again the metaphor of **input provider**. For him, ideally, this input would be had in interactions with native speakers outside the class, although this was not a necessary condition since it was possible to have enough input in a language class provided that the teacher imitated native speaker performance in L2.

4.3.1.2 Teacher 2: The Clown, the Entertainer and the Counselor

Teacher 2 had completely different metaphors. The analysis of her interview (Appendix IV B), and the field notes taken during class observation (Appendix I B) as well as the summary of the reflection sessions with her (Appendix V) shows how the roles of clown, entertainer and counselor, all relate to her role of teacher.

During the reflective part of the interview, for example, she said that she did not believe it was possible to learn anything without fun. She claimed to feel uncomfortable with silence in the class, feeling as though her students were bored. She tried to entertain them for she believed that if they had fun, they would be more motivated to learn, thus the metaphor of clown and entertainer. She said that learning was a cognitive process but people had to be motivated to process information cognitively, thus, her role as a teacher, was above all, to motivate her students to learn. She also said that *...when learners are stressed, afraid or frustrated, it is more difficult to process things cognitively, for the mind is busy processing negative emotions preventing the brain to process things cognitively...*

As we can see from the above, both T1 and T2 saw learning as an individual and cognitive activity. The difference is how these two teachers saw teaching in relation to this learning process. For T1, the teacher's role was to provide a model for students to process

and internalize, whereas for T2, the teacher's role, and not only the language teacher for that matter but all teachers, was to reduce the learners' anxiety and motivate them to process the information cognitively.

This also justifies the role of counselor and friend found in T2's discourse. She claimed that, in order to reduce students' anxiety, the teacher had to relate to them in a personal way, making them feel comfortable as they would in interactions with friends. This finding was confirmed in my field notes from her classes where she acted in a very personal way with her students (as opposed to T1 who acted in a businesslike fashion), asking real, instead of display questions in class. This was also confirmed by the number of Appropriation episodes found in the transcripts of her class. As we saw in question 3.2.1.1, this form of language is only possible by the inclusion of the personal (real) mode in the classroom discourse (pedagogical). She seemed to move from the personal to the pedagogical modes naturally and all the time, making it difficult for an outside observer to know when she was acting as a friend, a counselor or a teacher in class. She would often ask students about their personal lives, making comments and offering suggestions and advice. Since this all happened in L2, it was difficult to know when she was doing that to practice the language or really give advice. When I asked her, during the stimulus recall moment of the interview, which was the case, she herself claimed to feel confused, since she believed that she was practicing the language through real and personal interactions with her students, thus, appropriating the language, making it more meaningful for her students.

4.3.2 How do the teachers view the language of the classroom?

The question of how language teachers view teaching is strictly connected with how they view language for, in the case of language teachers, language is both, and at the same time, the content and the means through which they teach. Therefore, understanding how they see language will also illuminate our understanding of how they see their role in the class for language is the object and the way language teachers teach. Thus, understanding how they see the content may help us understand the decisions they make on how to teach that content in the language class.

Both teachers agreed (perhaps due to their training in the CLT), that the best language usage for language classes was to use language that was authentic, real and meaningful. Nevertheless, what they understood as being **authentic**, **real** and **meaningful** was completely different. Therefore, in order to understand how they see language, first we must understand what these three concepts mean for these two teachers. Next, I will analyze how these three concepts are understood and construed by the two teachers looking at their action in relation to their comments and insights.

4.3.2.1 Authentic

The question of authenticity, for T1, seems to be very similar to the authenticity model prescribed by the CLT approach and criticized by Cook (2000) in his book. During the interview, he said: *...I try to bring authentic materials to class, you know, like songs and films... cause the book is as artificial as can be...* For him, the concept of authenticity was linked to the origin of the material. The book had texts which had been prepared to be used

in class and in that sense, that material was artificial. He said that authentic was the material which had originated in real situations outside the class, and preferably with native speakers. That would include films, songs and any other kind of material that had not been prepared with the aim of being used in a language class. For him, the classroom was an artificial environment where people pretended to have real interactions imitating native speakers performance so as to practice the language. He also believed that learners needed a model to internalize and practice and this model should be authentic, that is, it should imitate, as much as possible, native speakers performance in real situations outside the class.

T2 had also been trained in the CLT approach but her view of language differed from the one prescribed by this method and was, somehow, more aligned with Cook's ideal of language teaching, that is, more connected with the function than with the origin of the language. She agreed that the concept of authenticity was connected with the origin of the language but she thought that this origin should derive from the students' discourse, rather than in native speakers performance outside the class. In her view, the language used in class was authentic in so much as it related to her students' reality (personal mode). This was confirmed by the number of Appropriation episodes found in her transcripts and the amount of real questions she asked in class.

4.3.2.2 Real

As for the concept of real language, these two teachers seem to hold opposing ideas as to what constitutes a model of real language. Again, for T1 this concept is compatible with the CLT approach prescription of language usage. As we saw earlier in the review of

literature, this method prescribes that the best language usage for language classes is to use language that really happened, as opposed to using stretches of language that were created to be used in class, such as in the case of invented sentences. This explains why T1 brings songs and films and avoids the book in class. He thinks that the language in songs and films is real in the sense that it was not created to be used as language input in class, which is precisely the case of most pedagogical books, specifically the one being used in his class.

Teacher 2, on the other hand, sees real language as the language that relates to her students' reality. In that sense, she also believes that the language used in pedagogical books is artificial and that is why she tries to use examples of her own and her students' reality in class. Both teachers think that the language of pedagogical books is artificial, the difference relies in the fact that for T1, it is so because this language was created (origin) only to be used in the class whereas for T2, this language is artificial because it does not relate (function) to her students' reality.

Real language, therefore, for T1, is the language which originated in real interactions and situations (preferably with native speakers), outside the class. For T2, real language is precisely the kind of language that happens in the class in real interactions with her students, it is the kind of language that relates to her students' reality rather than to a reality outside the class.

4.3.2.3 Meaningful

Again, the concept of meaningfulness, for T1 is similar to the one prescribed by the CLT approach whereas for T2 it is more similar to the one suggested by Cook (2000). T1 said that he believes that languages are learned in a deductive and implicit manner. He said

that the language used in classes should be focused on meaning and, when students tried to understand the meaning, implicitly they would be decoding and internalizing the form. For him, meaningful language is thus, the kind of language that is focused on meaning, rather than on form. In his view, there is no place in the language class for invented sentences and stretches of language focused on form since they have no meaning and thus, are not internalized by the students.

Teacher 2, on the other hand, sees meaningful language as the one which has meaning for her students, that is, the language that somehow relates to her students' reality. When I asked her, during the interview, why she asks so many personal questions (real, referential questions), she said that she tried to personalize the language to make it more meaningful for her students. She believed that it was difficult to learn something which was not meaningful and her way of making the language more meaningful for her students was to personalize it, that is, to make the language relate to her students' reality. Again, this was corroborated by the number of Appropriation situations used by T2.

The way these concepts of Authentic, Real and Meaningful Language are construed by the two teachers, in turn, reveal how these teachers see the classroom environment, namely, for T1 it is an artificial environment for there are no native speakers there. For T2, the classroom is a natural environment for the interactions that take place there are real, authentic and meaningful. Next, I will analyze how these concepts, in turn, relate to the way the two teachers understand ludic language in the classrooms.

4.3.3 How do teachers view Ludic Language?

In order to answer this question, we must bear in mind how the teachers view their role in class and how they view language in language classes. First, I will summarize their views on those two aspects and then analyze how they relate to their view of LL.

Teacher 1 sees the class as an artificial environment where people come to pretend to have real interactions so as to practice and internalize the language being learned. For him, learning is a cognitive process not really affected by emotions. In fact, when he talked about emotions he said that, if they have a role in the learning process, it is a negative one, usually interfering with the cognitive process, and thus, should be avoided when possible in class. During the interview, when I asked him why he did not include more humor in his class he said that humor could be a dangerous thing in class for it was connected with emotions and thus, interfered with learning. He said that, when the emotions were positive they distracted the learner and when they were negative they could prevent the learner from processing information cognitively for the learner would be processing negative emotions instead.

Another aspect of humor, highlighted by T1 during the interview was that jokes and other forms of humor usually had a very personal tone and thus, had no place in professional environments (such as the class for him), where people were doing serious activities. He said that some people might feel uncomfortable or even offended by the use of personal language. He himself admitted feeling uncomfortable talking about personal matters with his students.

A good example of this happened in the beginning of the semester when his students tried to tease the teacher, making a personal joke about his fiancé. The teacher had

been wearing a wedding ring in his right hand³ since the beginning of the semester but had never mentioned anything about his personal life or marital status in class. One day, the teacher was slightly late for class and the students were gathered outside the class, waiting for him, speculating what could have happened with the teacher. I was outside the class, quietly taking my notes while the students talked and laughed, they did not notice my presence there. It was a Monday morning and there had been a festival party called Oktoberfest the previous weekend. Students were talking about the festival when one of them suggested that perhaps the teacher had gone to the party, drunk a lot and, as a consequence, missed class. Just as they were speculating about this, the teacher arrived with a serious and rather sleepy face. Everyone entered the class, the teacher started correcting the homework immediately without making any comments about his weekend or his delay and suddenly, his mobile phone rang. The teacher looked very embarrassed, blushed, and turned the mobile off right away. Just then, some of his students laughed in a cunning way and one of them commented in L1:

1- S1 = Olha aí, gente, é o controle, é a noiva dele, ele foi na Oktober sozinho e olha só o que deu....

1- S1= *Look guys, it's the control, it's his fiancé, he went to Oktober by himself and look what happened...*

The student was trying to tease the teacher, implying that his fiancé was a jealous woman who had not liked the idea of him going out to a party by himself. Instead of making any comments about this attempt to talk about his personal life, the teacher ignored the comment, pretending nothing had happened and went on with the correction of homework. During the stimulus recall moment of the interview, when I asked the teacher

³ in Brazil this is a sign that people are engaged to be married

why he had decided to act this way he said that the student had tried to make a personal comment about him, and in L1(!), and so he thought he had better ignore it and go on with the class. He said that his private life should not be discussed with his students and when they made comments in L1 they were off the task and therefore, the teacher had no role there.

We can see from the example given, that T1 did not feel comfortable with personal exchanges of information, or humor, in class, specially in L1, a fact that was corroborated by the number of Appropriation, Anecdotes and LL episodes in general in his class. Humor and personal information are precisely two aspects usually involved in LL and so, we can conclude, that T1 did not really feel comfortable using this kind of language in class, the exception being those moments when LL could be conveyed through irony or linguistic manipulation without personal exchanges of information. Even when LL did not include personal information, it would include humor, which is another element usually associated with emotions and, as we saw previously, T1 believed that the use of emotions could in fact downplay cognitive processing. When I asked him about his view of LL, he said humor itself was not bad as long as it was not personal and offered no offense to students. When confronted with the transcripts and asked, then, why he did not include more humor in his class he claimed that, in that particular class, it was difficult to include humor in L2 using authentic examples, given the low proficiency level of his students in L2. He said that if he gave his students authentic examples of LL in L2 (such as jokes and comedies), without speech modifications or L1 use, his students would probably not understand the humor involved, thus, he opted not to include this kind of language in that class. Nevertheless, he claimed to include authentic examples of LL (in the form of jokes, songs and comedies) in

other classes which had a more advanced level of proficiency to understand such language use without the use of speech modifications or translation.

We can conclude, then, that T1 had nothing against LL use per se in the language class, as long as this kind of language could be conveyed in L2 without speech modifications or translation and offered no offense to students. Therefore, he believed that LL in the form of Jokes, Parodies, Performance and Word Play could be used in the language class as long as the teacher monitored the level of emotional and cognitive processing. However, LL in the form of Appropriation or any other kind of personal language, should be avoided so as not to make his students feel uncomfortable in class.

This finding was confirmed first in the transcripts of his class, where no examples of Appropriation initiated by the teacher were found and again in the field notes and during the interview when he expressively stated that humor was not a problem, the problem was the personalization of language in professional environments. T1 seems to believe that the language used in language classes has to be ... *culturally conventional and professionally appropriate...*, similarly to the language prescription made by the CLT and Wolfon's "Bulge Theory", which was later criticized by Cook (2000).

As for Teacher 2, she sees the classroom as a natural environment where real interactions happen. She thinks that the concept of the authenticity of the language stems from the use of the language (by the students), rather than in its origin (native speakers interacting in real situations outside the class). She also believes that the language has to be meaningful to be internalized and learned. She sees meaningful language as the kind of language that relates to her students' reality, rather than the kind of language that is more focused on meaning than on form.

As we can see, her view of the language seems to be more compatible with Cook's view than with the language model prescribed by the CLT approach in which she was trained. Although both teachers supposedly received the same theory (both claimed to have been trained in the same method), T1 seemed to be more guided by this theory in class than T2. In the field notes I noticed that T1 made less adaptations in class than T2 who seemed to be more guided in class by her experience than by the theory she received. This was later confirmed in the reflection sessions.

A good example of this can be found in the field notes taken in C1: ... *students seem to be bored many times, the teacher notices this but follows his plan of activity....students turn to each other to ask peers to translate teacher's instructions, teacher does not modify speech or translate...* When I asked T1 whether this was true, he said that he usually planned his classes based on the theory he believed in and made few alterations to his plan.

Teacher 2, on the other hand, was completely different in this regard. She seemed to be guided by her feelings in class more than by the theory she received or by her class plan and did not mind changing plans or making alterations in class in a contingent manner.

A good example of this can be found in the field notes taken in C2: .. *S1 arrives in late and starts telling a story of what happened to her and why she is late. The teacher interrupts class program, listens to S1 and starts talking about that situation, telling the class an anecdote that happened to her in a similar situation, everybody laughs....* When I asked T2, in the reflection moment why she did this she said that she did not mind changing her plans to add a student's contribution. She also said she did not mind being late in schedule due to these interruptions for, according to her, these moments were the

moments of real interactions in class and it was important to use the students' reality in the interactions.

If we consider how these two teachers relate to the theory they received it will be easier to understand how T1 seems to act in accordance with the CLT prescription while T2, on the other hand, seemed to act more in accordance with her beliefs of what constituted authentic, real and meaningful exchanges in class, which, in turn, are more aligned with Cook's theory of language learning.

Teacher 2 thought that LL, which is personal, authentic, ubiquitous and funny, was a perfect example of the kind of language that should be used in a language class. She believed that, because LL was funny and meaningful (personal), it helped her students to focus on the language being learned, ultimately memorizing it. This was corroborated by the number of LL episodes found in her class (102 as opposed to only 17 in C1) and by the number of Appropriation episodes (45% of all LL episodes in her class) found in her class.

As we can see, the teachers' view of LL depends on how they see teaching and language, as well as on the basis of their decision-making (theory or beliefs and experience), that is, whether they act based on the theory they received or on their beliefs.

4.4 Summary of Chapter IV

Chapter IV presented the analysis of teachers' use of and beliefs on ludic language in the language class by answering two questions: 1) How do the teachers deal with this kind of language in the language class? and 2) How do the teachers view ludic language in the language class?

The next chapter will present some final remarks with the conclusion, thus answering the general research question which motivated this study: What's the relation between the use of and beliefs on ludic language in the language class?

The last chapter will also present some possible pedagogical implications for using ludic language in the language class and analysing teachers' beliefs. Next it will present the limitations of the study and suggestions for future research.

Chapter V - Final Remarks

5.1 Introduction

This chapter will present the conclusion to the study answering the following question: What's the relation between teachers' use of and beliefs on ludic language in the language class? It will also present some pedagogical implications for the use of ludic language in the language class and the analysis of teachers' beliefs, and finally, the limitations of this study with suggestions for future research.

5.2 What's the relation between teachers' beliefs on and their use of ludic language in the language class?

As can be seen in the analysis presented in the previous chapter, the use of ludic language by the two teachers was intimately related to their beliefs about language in general, and language teaching more specifically. Depending on how these teachers viewed language and their role as language teachers, they would use more or less this kind of language and, in using this kind of language, use some types of LL situation more than the others.

When we contrast the use of and beliefs on this kind of language by the two teachers, we conclude that the two teachers' beliefs on this kind of language may have in fact, played an important role in determining the kind of language that they use in their classes.

As previously mentioned, both teachers had supposedly been exposed to the same theory and training, yet, one used LL much more than the other so, how can this fact be accounted for? In order to answer this question we must turn to the analysis of the two teachers' beliefs as this proved essential to understand their different practices.

Teacher 1 believed that the language teacher was a professional like any other, responsible for delivering the product (in this case, the language), without major concerns as to what would be of the product after its delivery. His belief of teaching as a technical process implied that he was responsible for attesting the authenticity of the product until its delivery phase but had no major role in its processing once the delivery had been made. He believed that students would process language in different ways and speed and all he could do as a teacher was to provide a good quality model of language. In his perspective, this language should be similar to the one used by native speakers in work environments, thus, ruling out most of the instances of LL which include personal exchanges of information. He also believed that the best model of language usage was to include authentic stretches of language in class, that is, language that had been produced by native speakers in real situations outside the class. Again, LL in the form of Appropriation, which refers to the students' reality and not that of native speakers, would be ruled out in his class in this perspective.

Looking at T1's practice in class, this is exactly what was noticed, thus, corroborating the assumption that in his case, his beliefs on what constitutes a good model of language may have determined the kind of language that T1 used, maybe in his case, as much as the theory he received since the CLT prescription of language usage is very similar to T1's beliefs on what constitutes the best language model.

As for T2, again, her beliefs on LL seem to have strongly affected, not to say, perhaps determined, the kind of language she used in class. She believed that in order to learn, students have to be relaxed with lowered affective filters and she sees the role of the teacher as two-fold, that is, in one hand the teacher must guarantee enough access to authentic, meaningful language (which for her, is personal language which relates to her students' reality) and , on the other hand, the teacher must help students to reduce their affective filters and become motivated in class. This is not only helped by humor and personal exchanges of information, but maybe, enhanced by these two features which are, in turn, strongly associated with LL. In her view, then, we can see how LL should be an integral part of (rather than a break from) any learning environment in general and, more specifically, the language learning process.

In the case of T2, her beliefs seemed to have played a stronger role in her action than in the case of T1. She received the same theory as T1, yet, her action was much more aligned with her beliefs than with the theory which she received.

Due to the qualitative nature of this study, the conclusions arrived at here are not meant to be used as a model or prescription for other classrooms. As previously mentioned, the position I adopt (following Gil, 1998) is that each classroom constitutes a culture in its own right, with its own rules and models. In this perspective, what is acceptable in one classroom may prove ineffective in another. Thus, the insights originated in this study apply only for the two classes observed.

Nevertheless, by describing what happened in terms of ludic language use and teachers' beliefs in these two classes, a database of teachers' beliefs and the use of ludic language is formed and it is my hope that this database can be later used to feed further studies of classroom discourse, ludic language and teacher cognition.

5.3 Some Pedagogical Implications

Looking at the two classrooms observed, it is safe to say that the frequent use of ludic language seemed to have helped to create a more supportive and relaxed atmosphere for learning. In fact, the proficiency level of the students, when compared in the beginning and end of the semester, seemed to have been significantly better in C2 where students were eager to interact in L2 all the time. Conversely, in C1, students were usually stressed when they had to use L2, specially because the atmosphere was tense and the interactions were not considered real or funny, but rather drills and exercises. As a consequence, in C1 students interacted considerably less in L2 and whenever they needed to interact in a personal way they would do it in L1, thus, often being off task and off target language.

Because of these two different kinds of atmospheres created by the use of or the lack of use of ludic language, one possible pedagogical implication for the use of ludic language in the language class that can be drawn is the reduction of the affective filter and the invitation, through language, for students to play in another language, thus, creating a more supportive environment for learning.

Another pedagogical implication of this study relies on the fact that the two teachers observed seemed to be guided by their beliefs, the difference being that one teacher reflected more on her beliefs than the other. Since teachers' beliefs are so important in determining or affecting their practice, it seems to be of the utmost importance for teachers to critically access their beliefs if they are to improve their practice.

Teacher 2, who seemed to reflect more on her practice and beliefs created a more relaxed atmosphere for learning and in turn, a better rapport with her students, thus, allowing more opportunities for L2 usage in a natural way.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

The aim of this study was to analyze the use of ludic language by two different teachers in classes of the same level so as to cater for differences in use caused by the proficiency level of the students. However, it was not possible to control for that and the two classes observed were not exactly of the same level. This may have caused some difference in the findings, that is, had the two classes been of the same level, the use of ludic language may have been less different or, yet, accounted for in terms of teachers' beliefs on this kind of language instead of the proficiency level of the students to play with the language.

To account for this, in the beginning of this study I observed some classes of T1 (the one who used less ludic language) in more advanced groups, to certify whether the use of this kind of language was more connected with his beliefs or with the proficiency level of his students, since he had claimed that, due to the low proficiency level of C1, it was very difficult to convey humor without making speech modifications of translation. I attended only three classes of T1 in more advanced groups and could not see any significant difference in terms of ludic language use, what leads me to the conclusion that T1 had similar approaches to language teaching in different classes and his teaching approach was more determined by his beliefs than by the proficiency level of the group.

Nevertheless, since I observed only three classes, it is impossible to make strong claims as to T1's practice in other level groups. In order to make such a claim, that is, that the use of ludic language is, in fact, different in the two classes, it would be necessary to investigate two classes of the same level. However, as I mentioned in the beginning of this study, since I believe that each classroom constitutes a different culture with different rules

applying, the different proficiency levels of the two classrooms observed, in my opinion, would not have been any more determining, in terms of classroom interaction, than the students' personality, the teachers' personality and beliefs and/or other variables that also affect the classroom environment.

5.5 Suggestions for Future Research

As previously mentioned in the pedagogical implications of this study, it was noticed that the class in which ludic language was used more frequently had a better environment for learning. In order to verify whether this kind of language is, in fact, a variable that may contribute to interaction in L2 or improve the classroom environment, further studies should be carried out aiming at investigating the possible effects of using this kind of language in language classes and language learning in general.

One of the major findings of this study is that the two teachers' beliefs were in fact, consistent with their practice, that is, their beliefs shaped and perhaps, determined their practice. In order to help other teachers critically think about their beliefs, more studies on teacher cognition should be carried out, so as to increase the database of teachers' beliefs and, as a consequence, teachers' reflection on action.

References

- Allwright, D. & Bailey, K.M. (1991). *Focus on the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barcelos, A.M.F. (2001). Metodologia de pesquisa das crenças sobre aprendizagem de línguas: estado da arte. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, v.I, n.1, p.71-92.
- Bateson, G. (1972). A theory of play and fantasy. In *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Beel, J.S. (2002). Narrative Inquiry: more than just telling stories. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, v.36, n.2, p.207-212.
- Binnie-Smith, D. (1996). Teacher decision making in the ESL classroom. In D. Freeman & J. Richards (Eds), *Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Broner, M. & Tarone, E. (2001). Is it fun? Language play in a fifth-grade Spanish immersion classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 85 (3), 363-369.
- Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in educational discourse*. London & NY: Continuum.
- Carazzai, M. (2002). *Grammar and grammar teaching: a qualitative study of ELF teachers' beliefs and behaviors*. Unpublished MA dissertation. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Cook, G. (1997). Language Play, Language Learning. *ELT Journal*, v.51/3.
- Cook, G. (2000). *Language Play, Language Learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cook, G. (2001). The philosopher pulled the lower jaw of the hen. Ludicrous invented sentences in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 22/3: 366-387.

- Cook, V. (2002). The functions of Invented Sentences: A reply to Guy Cook. *Applied Linguistics*, 23/2:262-269.
- Cortazzi, M. & Jin, L. (1999). Bridges to learning: Metaphors of teaching, learning and language. In L. Cameron & G. Low (Eds), *Researching and applying metaphor* (pp. 149-176). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cox, M.I.P. & Assis-Peterson, A.A. (1999). Critical Pedagogy in ELT: images of Brazilian teachers of English. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, v.33,p. 433-452.
- Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (1998). *Focus on form in classroom second language Acquisition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience & education*. New York: Touchstone.
- Elbaz, F. (1981). The teacher's "practical knowledge": Report of a case study. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11(1), 43-71.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Second Language Acquisition*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frank, C. (1999). *Ethnographic eyes*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Freeman, D. & Johnson, K. (2001). Teacher learning in second language teacher education: a socially-situated perspective. *Revista Brasileira de Linguística Aplicada*, 1(1), 53-69.
- Freeman, D. & Johnson, K. (1993). Concepts of teaching and the education of second language teachers. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, v.27, n.2, p.193-216.

- Freeman, D. and Richards, J. C. (Eds). (1996). *Teacher learning in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gatbonton, E. (1999). Investigating experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83 (1), 35-50.
- Gil, G. (1997). A dimensão imaginária da sala de aula de língua estrangeira. *Revista Intercâmbio*, 6, 452-470.
- Gil, G. (1998). El marco imaginario de la clase de lengua extranjera. *Lenguas Modernas*, 25, p.139-150.
- Gil, G. (1999). *The metalinguistic dimensions of the foreign language classroom: Discourse perspectives on focus-on-form episodes*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Gil, G. (2001). Two complementary modes of foreign classroom interaction: the natural and the pedagogical. *ELT Journal*, 56(3), p.273-279.
- Gimenez, T. (1999). Reflective teaching and teacher education contributions from teacher training. *Linguagem & Ensino*, 2(2), 129-143.
- Holliday, J.A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kramsch, C. & Sullivan, P. (1996). Appropriate pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, v.50/3.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lantolf, J. (1997). "The function of language play in the acquisition of L2 Spanish" in W.R. Glass and A.T. Pérez-Leroux (eds): *Contemporary Perspectives on the Acquisition of Spanish. Volume 2: Production, Processing and Comprehension*. Somerville: Cascadilla Press.

- Lantolf, J. P. & Appel, G. (1994). *Vygotskyan approaches to second language research*. Norwood: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1991). Second Language Acquisition Research: Staking out the Territory. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25:315-50.
- Lockhart, C. & Richards, J.C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maláter, L.O.S. (1998). *Teachers' beliefs on foreign language teaching and learning: a classroom study*. Unpublished master thesis. Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Mello, H. & Mello, A.C. Metaphors in EFL teachers' discourse. No prelo.
- Nespor, J. The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, v.19, n.4, p.317-328.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. et al. (1998). Clashing metaphors about classroom teachers: toward a systematic typology for the language teaching field. *System*, 26,1-48.
- Pajares, M.F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of educational research*, 62/3, 307-332.
- Pavlenko, A. (2002). Narrative study: whose story is it, anyway? *TESOL QUARTERLY*, V.36, N.2, P.213-218.
- Pennycook, A. (1999). Introduction: critical approaches to TESOL. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, v.33, n.3, p.329-349.
- Richards, J. C. (1990). *New Interchange: English for international communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. & Nunan, D. (1990). *Second language teacher education*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. , Plat, J. & Platt, H. (1992). *Dictionary of language teaching and applied*

linguistics. Singapore: Longman.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T.S. (1986). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*.

New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schon, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. London: Temple Smith.

Sullivan, P. (2000). Playfulness as mediation in communicative language teaching in a

Vietnamese classroom. In Lantolf, J. (2000) *Socio-cultural theory and second language*

learning. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swan, J. (1993). Metaphor in action: the observation schedule in a reflective approach

to teacher education. *ELT Journal*, v.47, n.3, p.242-249.

Telles, J.A. (2000). Biographical connections: experiences as sources of legitimate

knowledge in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in*

Education, v.13, n.3, p.251-262.

Tsui, A. B. M. (1995). *Classroom interaction*. Penguin English Applied Linguistics.

Vygotsky, (1978). *Mind and Society: The development of higher psychological*

processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, (1986). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wallace, M.J. (1991). Relating theory and practice: The reflective model. *Training*

foreign language teachers: a reflective approach. Cambridge: Cambridge.

Warner, C. (2004). It's just a game, right? Types of Play in Foreign Language CMC.

Language Learning & Technology. Vol. 8, Number 2, pp. 69-87.

- Warner, C. (2004). It's just a game, right? Types of Play in Foreign Language CMC. *Language Learning and Technology*. Volume 8, Number 2, pp. 69-87.
- Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher cognition in language teaching. Beliefs, decision making and classroom practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2001). Educating reflective teachers for learner-centered education: possibilities and contradictions. Plenary paper presented at the sixteenth Meeting of Encontro Nacional de Professores Universitários de Língua Inglesa, University of Londrina, Brazil.
- Zeichner, K.M. & Linston, D.P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: an introduction*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zeichner, K.M. & Linston, D.P. (1987). Teaching students to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57(1), 23-49.
- Zeichner, K.M. & Linston, D. P. (1990). Reflective teaching and action research in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Education for teaching*, 16(3), 235-254.

Appendix I A

Field notes C1

Class 1, Oct. 13

Greg comes in rather late, with a bit of hang over and students joke with him about Oktoberfest. He starts the class with a game (four in a row), dividing the group in two, the objective of the game is to review and consolidate the present perfect. The game lasted all class actually but I think he hadn't planned for this, he probably planned this as a warmer activity but ended up allowing them to go on with it until the end.

The mobile rang a couple of times, the first time it was his and students joked about being his fiancé, angry about Oktoberfest. He didn't take the call. The other student, whose phone rang 4 times, left the room the 4 times to answer it and apologized saying that she was having some problems.

No instances of Ludic Language, perhaps due to the fact that Greg was a bit tired? Students joked with each other but always in L1, teacher does not participate then.

Class 2, Nov. 3

Students are discussing some aspects of the class outside the classroom, Greg is late again, class starts at 8:30 and students take the floor, in Portuguese, talking to Greg about some aspects of his methodology that they would like to discuss. One student says she feels the book should be used more (eu sei que o livro é um esqueleto mas o professor tem que dar uma recheadinha, usar mais em sala para não ficarmos perdidos). When asked about his reasons for not using book Greg replies that when he studied at Puc there was a teacher he remembers, that used to say that in order to learn an L2 one must have a meaningful experience, that's why he believes in making his classes a meaningful experience rather than simply following the order of the book. He said he thought that working with the book was boring so he tried to bring meaningful, real examples to his classes rather than using the ones in the book. Students accept his justification and class starts at 10:15 with him switching code to English but eventually making an apart in L1, probably to make sts feel more confident and comfortable after the discussion that opened the class. The topic of the class is adjective order and he goes about it really slowly, writing up examples from the book on the board and checking vocab with sts. There's only one joke, an emic one. Apparently he'd asked sts to research something about the polar bear for homework and some of them had got the wrong pronunciation saying "beer" instead of "bear". I knew this because they'd talked about this during the discussion (Greg mentioning how they wouldn't forget the difference if an American, for instance, had corrected them on the wrong pronunciation). He's eliciting words to describe objects and the one he writes on board is "champagne glasses":

T : What kind of glasses are these ?

Sts : Champagne glasses.

T : That's right, they could be polar beer glasses but they're not, they're champagne glasses.

Class 3 – Nov. 10

Tokens of LP for rehearsal: chorus repetition, Greg reads one part of the sentence and students the other, maybe because of pressure to use the book, they are repeating sentences from the book.

LP for fun (spontaneous) – a student was talking about how Japanese people are always busy and on account of that they are allowed to have a “quicky” on the subway... Greg : Too much work, sex in the subway...

Class 4 – Nov. 17

Greg tells students they will have test next week and the whole class is the re-construction of a song: Tom's Diner by Suzanne Vega. Students ask what they should study for the test, Greg replies that they should forget the book and watch films and listen to songs in English as a way of preparing for the test.

Class 5 – Nov. 22

Discussion about using the book, students complain, Greg lets them speak in L1, the discussion lasts all class, Greg explains some of his views on language teaching, in the end promises to use book the following class

Class 6 –Nov. 24

Teacher uses book in a very artificial way, step by step, students seem very bored. In the end of the class he comments, in Portuguese, that he hopes students could realize, with this sample class, how artificial the book is.

Class 7 Nov. 29

Greg starts class saying he hopes students understand how artificial book is, now they will go back to old way of doing things in class, using authentic materials

After the class I talked to Greg and we arranged to meet for our reflection session. During the classes in which students were discussing with Greg in Portuguese, I decided to leave and not take notes so as not to embarrass the group with my presence.

General impression:

There are many instances when LL is present in class but I can't understand what they say. Tape recorder is placed next to teacher, students laugh a lot, whisper to each other, Greg pretends not to hear, he ignores students when they speak in L1. Students usually turn to peers to ask what is going on in class, seem lost and don't understand teacher, Greg does not modify speech, translate and uses book very little. Teacher acts in a business like fashion, acts like a native speaker who does not understand a word of Portuguese. Students are always sitting in groups, teacher is isolated in the front of the class, never walks around interacting with students, sits at his desk while students interact among themselves, usually in L1. Greg only uses L2 in class and without modifications.

Appendix I B

Field notes for C2

Class 1 – Sept. 25th

Context : Teacher is revising idioms miming and showing pictures.

1. The apple of my eye
2. An egg head
3. Don't cry over spilled milk
4. As different as chalk and cheese
5. Football is not my cup of tea
6. The greatest thing since sliced bread
7. A pie in the sky
8. To go bananas
9. He's full of beans

Talking to herself : T :OK, now , let's close the door, who is missing ?

To the tape : T : Is it like this or like that ?

T : Did you believe my lie ? Well, then, I guess I could be a politician... who knows?

T : You know Brad Pitt is my pie in the sky, but I'm married, he's married, too bad...

T : André, you look like you have a question mark on your face.

T : Do you remember the difference between gay and guy ? ((reviewing words from the vocabox)) . Well, I'm very gay today !

T : What's nephew ?

St : It's a boy.

T : But then if nephew is a boy and niece is a girl, then Diego is a nephew !

((explaining to sts the name of the " bubble gum " she uses to stick things up on the board)) ; Don't worry, you don't have a disgusting teacher.

T : Blue tak is the greatest invention since sliced bread !

Class 2 – Sept. 30

Emic Joke :

T: I had to throw away the sausages... I thought, what if someone eats it and then dies... and then it'll be my fault !

Group is divided in two, they're going to play memory game to review vocab on food and idioms. Each group has to choose a food name :

St : I don't know the name for our group.

T : How about something that goes with B_B_Q ?Sth we usually have with B_B_Q?

St : Ice-cream ?

T : Well, no, I mean, yeah, if you're pregnant...

St : ((laughter))

T : There's another thing, a salad, we have this kind of salad with B_B_Q. What is it ? ((trying to elicit potato salad))).

St : Green salad.

T : Green salad ? Well, yes, there you go then. This group is the green salad ((now talking to herself while writes on board)), and it's actually healthier than potato salad...

Conecting words from memory game box to see if they form an idiom :

T : A pie of my eye... yes, it sounds beautiful but I don't think it's an idiom...

T : You're the egg of my eye... now, I don't think that's very romantic, is it ?
((To a group that's taking a long time to answer))

T : They're clueless, look at their faces... let's put some pressure.. 10, 9, 8...

- Scaffold

T: What's the continuation of to play ? Segurar vela ?

St ? Gooseberry.

T : Yes, to play gooseberry.

Sits in front of class with serious look on :

T : What's my job ?

SS : XXX

T : What do I do ? Where do I work ?

S: In a school, teacher.

T : And do you think teachers are well-paid or badly-paid ?

SS : XXXX

T ((with a sad look))

S : Badly-paid.

T: That's right, teachers are badly-paid so, I have an extra job, you know, to make extra money in my free time, I tell people's fortune. Do you know the name of the person who tells your future ?

S : Future-teller .

T : **Future**-teller ?

S : Fortune- teller.

T : That's right, I'm a fortune teller but I don't use a crystal ball, now, I have a device ((shows origami)) here to tell((is interrupted by Vania who helps her open the origami))).

Vania : I just love origamis, this is what you do...

T : That's wonderful, now I have an assistant, so , now, listen everybody, Vania will be passing around collecting the money, you didn't think I was gonna do this for free did you ? And so you can all give your contributions to Vania.. now , seriously, what do you wanna know about your future ? Ask me anything, really...

S : Will I be a millionaire ?

T ? ((after consulting origami)) : Definetely

S : Will I go to London next year ?

T : ((after consulting origami again)) : You see, there are many variables... ((showing MAYBE in the origami))).

S : Will I find a crazy-haired guy ?

T : ((consults origami again)) : Well, not in this room ((looking around)), everyone's here's got normal hair. .. Hum.. Maybe ((shows origami)), but, you know, when it says maybe yo get a discount...

Eliciting unique jobs

T : I'd love to be a chocolate taster, you know, going to Gramado, staying in a fancy hotel, all paid, having lots of chocolates and then.. going straight to a spa!

SS are guessing Diane's profession

Vania : She could be a personal designer.

T : Do you think she's concerned with fashion ?

Diego (ou André ?) : Well, she's a woman, isn't she ?

Class 3, Oct. 2

Leandro and I are observing, Jane seems very comfortable with it, introduces Leandro and jokes about her students being famous, signing autographs since now everyone wants to get to know them.

Warmer : Janaland / Janalese (I wonder whether she got these ideas from the book or came up with it herself, very nice activity to review previous vocab)

(To André who has already figured out what the words are)

T : André already has the answer to the first question, not only has he been to Janaland but also speaks Janalese fluently... (laughs)

T catches two sts cheating and acts really offended (but laughing really), while explaining they're supposed to use their memories.

(to review, elicit word " date ")

T : If you wanna tchan, tchan, tchan with Mainá, what do you need ?

Vania : Crazy hair.

T : Right, but what the tchan, tchan, tchan...

Marcel : To date

T : Yes, to date.

Shows sts her photo as tour guide in Disneyland .

T : Promise you won't laugh ? (knowing they will)

(sits with cunning look and tells sts they're going to interview her for Caras magazine, after they'd written a couple of questions about her summer job)

I noticed lots of scaffolding, referential questions and elicitation.

(talking about the picture of the woman they're discussing in the book who looks very stressed)

T : Well, that was before she became Heloísa in Mulheres Apaixonadas.

Class 4 - Oct. 7

Part 1

Context

Two volunteers sit at the front of the class, they have to talk about a topic they selected while the others show them cards with words they have to include in the conversation. Very good activity to develop improvising and conversational skills, the atmosphere is very relaxed, funny and after the activity is over Jane asks them if they know why they were doing that activity (awareness raising ?), and talked a little about the importance of developing these kind of conversation strategies.

Part 2

Jane is warming up for the listening activity, there are three people in the listening, namely, Tina, Mike and Phill . Jana asks them if they remember this people (from the book), and Diego gets it wrong and says :

Ss : Phill ? Is this Phill Collins ? Yes, I remember him !

T : Well, that's not the one I meant but... well, do you know any famous Tinas ?

((going along and welcoming the language play with famous names instead of simply correcting and getting ahead with activity))

Ss : There's Tina Turner.

T : That's right, and how about Mike ?

Ss : Mike Tyson !

T : Is he still in jail : ((referential question))

Part 3

Context : They are working on collocations, Jane is going around the class helping them figure out which verbs they can use with certain complements, Ss are working in pairs.

Ss : return xx return a problem ?

T : well, return a problem ? I don't think that would be very nice like, you say, hey, I don't like this problem, take it ((miming giving the problem as a present))

Ss : offer a problem ?

T : offer a problem ? xx what do you think if I say, hey, Cirlene, I have a very hairy problem, would you like it for you ?

Ss : no xx

Ss : return yourself...

T : yes, that's a funny one, like, I'm returning myself to ... to my mom !

Part 4

Context : Mainá leaves the room, there are two groups, one is Reginaldo Rossi and the other is Marco Palmeira (both with crazy hair the way Mainá likes). They rehearse what to say, Marco's group only bad answers and Reginaldo's only good things. Mainá comes back and asks the two groups three questions :

1. Where are you taking me on our honeymoon ?
2. If you had a million dollars, what present would you get me ?
3. What do you admire most in a woman ?

Reginaldo's answers

Venice

a mansion / limo

her soul

Marco's answer

Cubatão

washing machine

her buttocks

Mainá decides to go out on a blind date with Reginaldo Rossi.

T : So, did you like your date ?

M : But he doesn't have, you know, crazy hair ?

T : So , what kind of crazy hair were you thinking of ?

M : You know, like that guy from the band ((couldn't get his name))

T : Oh, I know, he has this ' I just woke up ' type of hair, you see guys, if you wanna go out with Mainá this is what you have to do : stop brushing your hair ! Just get up in the morning and , hey, come to class !

Class 5 - Oct.9

Part 1

Warmer : Sts are miming words from the vocabox to their partners (pair work). Jane asks a volunteer to mime to the whole group.

Cilene : I always volunteer, today I'm not !

Jana : That's right, Cilene is the official volunteer but today she's on holiday so you'd better do something about it.

Part 2

Review of previous lessons (indirect questions), two students (male, female) volunteered, they pretend to be newly-wed, one of them leaves the room, the other stays and sts ask indirect questions about his partner's breakfast habits (Jane had allowed everyone 2 minutes to discuss this topic, without them knowing why or selecting volunteers previously), the "wife" returns to room and double checks answers to see if they get a holiday to Hawaii. The questions asked are :

Could you tell us _____ ?

1. favorite fruit
2. coffee or milk
3. what time on Sundays
4. who with or reads newspaper

Jane: The more correct answers they get, the longer the marriage will last.

After activity is over Luciana (the "wife "), talks about how embarassed she felt when she was outside and a man arrived with a bunch of flowers, called a girl in one of the rooms and they hugged and kissed and she was standing there, in the corridor, waiting to go back in the room... Mainá, who rarely volunteers, all of a sudden starts to talk about what happened to her in the lab, which made her very embarassed too, she touched a girl's "boobs" by mistake , she stands up, goes to the door and mimes what happened ! Everybody laughs...

Jane: She probably thought, Oops, there's a lesbian here at UFSC ! (to Mainá's miming).

Class 6 – Oct.16

Part 1 – Students are arriving, Jane is greeting them and asking them about their week, Taina's talking about two Dutch guys she met at the bus stop and the messages they sent her in the mobile, Jane looks very excited about Taina's "foreign" affair.

Part 2 – Sts are sitting in two circles, one within the other. The sts in the middle talk while the ones in the outter circle take notes about their language and communication strategies. After activity is over Jane talks to them about the rationale of this activity using metalanguage but not L1.

André says he didn't give a negative feedback to the girl he was supposed to watch for she was a girl, afterall, and besides, he believes that saying good things will motivate learning, very interesting...

Part 3 – Jane’s preparing sts for a discussion of cultural differences and she does that by telling them a story of how her host sister in England hated Brazilians because they always squeezed their cheeks (this word was introduced last class and reviewed in the beginning of this class), saying that it was so cute !

When asking for students’ feedback on the task about matching countries with weird customs she says :

T : I wonder why you can’t point your foot at people in Thailand, that’s weird, isn’t it ? I mean, who would you point your foot at something, like, oh, that’s a beautiful dress you’re wearing Karine ((pointing with foot)) and , where’s Kyria ? Oops, there she is ((pointing with foot to Kyria in another direction of the class, very funny indeed))).

Part 4 – She’s preparing her sts for a listening where they’ll hear a woman talking about what she’s supposed to do before going to a dinner party. She sticks picture on whiteboard and starts building the story with sts by eliciting from them.

What’s her name ? Marta

What’s she doing ? Fixing her hair

Why is she doing that ? She’s having dinner at her teacher’s house today

All of these is elicited and scaffolded by her for students came up with slightly different ideas, for instance, that she was drying her hair (instead of fixing), and that she was going out on a date (not with teacher), and they thought it was weird that she was doing her hair to have dinner at her teacher’s place but it only made the story more bizarre and funny.

T : Don’t you think you should look your best when you have dinner with your teacher ? So, for our end of semester dinner party, you must all have your hair fixed....

Class 7 – Oct.28

She’s reviewing (supposed to and expected to do) giving sts slips of papers with different situations (wedding, bridal shower, bachelor party, hen’s party, housewarming party, graduation, etc) and they have to decide what they’re supposed to do in these situations...

Anecdote : She tells her own story of her bridal shower and hen’s party, very funny, sts love it.

Slip of tongue : It was a Suzan, I mean, a nuisance

Joke : she has to turn off the air conditioner so that sts can listen to CD

Jana ; so, let’s turn off the air conditioner and burn a few calories in this sauna.

Class 8, Oct. 30

S1 arrives in late and starts telling story of what happened to her and why she is late. The teacher interrupts class program, listens to S1 and starts talking about that situation, telling the class an anecdote that happened to her in a similar situation, everybody laughs..

General Impression:

Jane is very friendly, she’s always smiling and walking around the class, monitoring, teasing and talking to Ss in a very personal way. She arrives early to “gossip” with students and always brings different stuff to the class. Many times I felt she interrupted her plans to include what a student was saying. She seems really interested in her students. She always asks referential questions and talks about her personal life with her students. She seems to act, in different moments, like a friend, a counselor and a clown. She uses lots of scaffolding, speech modification, body language and games in class. Lots of LL !!

APPENDIX II TRANSCRIPT CONVENTIONS

The following transcript conventions were adapted from Hatch (1992):

[]	overlappings
(())	analyst's comments
+	pause
++	long pause
(XXX)	inaudible
:	long sound
CAPITAL	stressed word
?	questioning intonation
T	teacher
S	unidentified student
Ss	students altogether
Ric:	Abbreviated name of identified student

Obs: All the real names of the participants have been changed in the transcriptions

Appendix III A

Classroom Transcriptions in Class 1 – Basic

Episode 1.1

Teacher arrived in late. Ss joke about the fact that he was probably in the Oktoberfest which was the day before. Teacher ignores comment and start class. As soon as they start activity the teacher's mobile rings.

- 1 – S1 = é a noiva + é o controle + foi na Oktober sem ela + olha o que deu +
- 2 – Ss = ((laugh))
- 3 – T = sorry + ((serious look, not welcome joke)) + so whose turn is it now ?

Episode 1.2

- 1- T= guys + we have a break now + + er + and then we go back
 - 2- S1= coffee break?
 - 3- T= yeah+ coffee break + you can have a water break
 - 4- S2= water break?
 - 5- T= or bathroom break + you decide+
 - 6- Ss= ((laugh)).
- (OBS: No LL in one whole class Oct 22nd)

Episode 1.3

The teacher had given homework for students to complete a story with an end. The story started with a baby polar bear asking many questions to his mother to make sure he was really a polar bear. Then the students had to write a reason why the polar bear had so many doubts about his nature.

- 1- T= you have yours there right?
- 2- M= the baby polar bear woke up and said + “so now I'm totally convinced that I am a polar bear + I was in an exis + não sei dizer essa palavra
- 3- T= EXISTENTIAL
- 4- M. = existential crisis (XXX) I'm cured! ((laughs))
- 5- T= right +right! ((laughs))
- 6- M = now I'm so happy! ((laughs))

Episode 1.4

The teacher had a list of six categories on the board: 1) general appearance; 2) hair, 3) face, 4) clothes, 5) body size and image, 6) attitude towards people. The students had some words to match with the categories on board.

- 1- T= BALD!
- 2- Ss= bald? bald+ ((play for rehearsal))
- 3- S1= hair+ hair!
- 4-S2= no hair!
- 5- S3= oh! face+ face! + no +no +no

- 6- T= oh! there is a connection+ I would say there is a connection + but I would say [number...]
- 7- S3= [hair!]
- 8- T + Ss= number 2!
- 9- T= bald is NO hair!
- 10- S3= no hair?
- 11- T= yeah!
- 12- Ss= ((laugh))
- 13- S4= careca?
- 14- T= so it's number 2.
- 15- SS= ((laugh))
- 16- T= It's number 2, even though it's NO hair!
- 17- Ss=((laugh))

Episode 1.5

Same activity as episode 3, students are still matching.

- 1- T= what about DARK?
- 2- Ss= clothes +clothes
- 3- T= it can be + [clothes]
- 4- Ss= [(XXX)]
- 5- T= [and (XXX)] if you're talking about eyes +yes
- 6- S1= six?
- 7- T= yeah + I thought about something like that+ like "it"'s dark in the movie" ((using a "dark" voice))
- 8- Ss= ((laugh))
- 9- T= something underground + + vampires maybe
- 10- S1= ((laughs))
- 11- T= Darth Vader+ he was dark +yeah
- 12- S1= ((laughs))

Episode 1.6

- 1- T= HANDSOME!
- 2- S1= five + five and [one]
- 3- S2 = [one]
- 4- S3 = teacher+ escreve essas palavrinhas
- 5- T = oh + sorry + which ones?
- 6- S3 = friendly
- 7- T= friendly is FRIEND plus LY
- 8- Ss= (XXX)
- 9- T= and then HANDSOME is like this HAND ((showing his hand and writing on the board))
- 10- Ss = ((laugh , maybe thinking how easy this part was))
- 11- T= and SOME like something or someone
- 12- S4 (girl) = for example: BRAD PITT
- 13- S3 (girl) = [oh!]

- 14- S4 = [is handsome]
- 15- S5 (man) = ((laughs)) isto é um julgamento muito específico!
- 16- S4 +S3 = ((laugh))
- 17- S5 = nisso a gente não pode admitir exemplos

Episode 1.7

- 1- T= OVERWEIGHT.
- 2- S1 = peso?
- 3- T= yeah +weight +yes+ but then not this one+++
- 4- Ss = ((demonstrating they did not understand))
- 5- T= technically there is an ideal height and an ideal weight right?
- 6- S2 = guarda-roupas?
- 7- T = uhm?
- 8- S2 = um guarda-roupas seria +
- 9- T= oh +no! we're talking about people
- 10- Ss= ((laugh))
- 11- T= like a person who is 1,70m should +quantos quilos? 60Kg right? so if the person is 1,70m and weights a 100 +120 ok + is OVERWHEIGHT
- 12- S1 = peso médio?
- 13- T= that would be average weight+++ but then overweight would be
- 14- S3 = ACIMA!
- 15- S2 = por isso que eu disse um armário
- 16- Ss= ((laugh hard))

Episode 1.8

They are discussing which word in Portuguese would be the correspondent of double-bed in English.

- 1- T = in Portuguese we have three words for this
 - 2- S1 = cama de casal
 - 3- T = then I thought + and I did a little research + then I came with ONE word for that in Portuguese+ it's a very OLD word+ I think it's the kind of word that Machado de Assis would use+ and this word refers to the BED and sometimes it refers to the ROOM+ which is ALCOVA
 - 4- Ss = ah: ((did not really get it))
 - 5- T = some people say that ALCOVA is the ROOM that after people get married they go to the alcova to do what normally couples do after they+++
 - 6-S2 = ((laughing)) sleep!
 - 7- T = what?
 - 8- S3 = ela disse SLEEP!
 - 9- T = sleep! right! because they are so tired! ((laughs cunningly))
 - 10- Ss = ((laugh))
- Obs: ((Students are commenting in Portuguese that this is what the teacher will do when he gets married, as sts know that he is engaged to be married))

Episode 1.9

One student is reading a clear description of Rio de Janeiro from the students' book, they have to guess what city is being mentioned. After the reading the teacher says:

- 1- T = Mexico City +right?
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 1.10

They are discussing the difference between lose and miss, teacher says that you miss big things and lose small things.

- 1- T = normally when you say miss with the sense of losing you miss the TIME when something should happen+ like I miss the bus+you missed the TIME to get to the bus+ or the train
- 2- Ss = (XXX) but I lose +
- 3- T = or if you lose the bus+ I really don't know where the big thing is
- 4- Ss = ((laugh))
- 5- S2 = não sabe onde deixou
- 6- T = yeah.
- 7- S1 = ((laughs))
- 8- S2 = às vezes você perde o carro no estacionamento
- 9- T = ((laughing)) that's right!
- 10- S1 = (XXX)
- 11- T = you lost your car right? ((laughs))

Episode 1.11

- 1- S1 = como é favela?
- 2- T = como é favela?
- 3- S2= (XXX)
- 4- T = yes +yes+ favela is one of + I think it's + normally we have linguistic nouns from other countries+ we have words in Portuguese that come from French+ come from English+come from Spanish+and now we have our word+ our own word that +we EXPORT ((laughing)) the word favela+favela is favela all over the world
- 5- S3 = olha que bonito!
- 6- T = yes
- 7- S4 = (XXX)
- 8- T = yes [we have something]
- 9- S3 = [uma palavra]
- 10- Ss = ((laugh a lot))
- 11- T = yeah+ something we can be very proud of

Episode 1.12

They are filling the blanks of a song.

- 1- Song = and I'm turning to the horoscope ((teacher stops the tape))
- 2- Some Ss= horoscope!
- 3- Some Ss = come é ?
- 4- T = (XXX) listen+ listen
- 5- Ss = (XXX)
- 6- T = listen to it again
- 7- Song = and I'm turning to the horoscope
- 8- S1 = horáscope
- 9- S2 = ((laughs))

10- S1 = Horácios Cope ((laughs))

11- T = ((with the right pronunciation and laughing)) HOROSCOPE!

Episode 1.13

The teacher is drawing on the board the pictures that appeared in the oral test they had done. The students should describe what happened in the pictures , while he draws he describes what is drawn.

1- T = and the two children were her ((they were poor children)) there was a small girl +only she + ela estava de fralda com uma sandalhinha de salto alto

2- S1 = bem sensual

3- T & Ss= ((laugh))

Episode 1.14

Teacher was going over the results of the oral test, telling sts how they used the possessive pronoun incorrectly, instead of using “her” mother, they’d use “your”.

1- T = whenever I asked the relationship between the woman and the boy everybody would say + the woman is your mother

2- S1 = ((laughs))

3- T= outra coisa +do they live alone? +no+ they live with YOUR parents

4- Ss= ((laugh))

1- T = ah +ele mora com os meus pais ((laughs))

Episode 1.15

Teacher was asking the same pair what the best sites for tourism in their cities were. They were talking about Florianópolis this time, right after the blackout.

1- S2 = Hercílio Luz

2- S1 = +bridge ((laughs because they were talking about the blackout))

3- S2 = (XXX) ((laughs))

4- S1 = com ou sem light! ((laughs))

5- T = with or without lights

Appendix III B

Classroom Transcriptions in Class 2 (Intermediate)

Episode 2.1

Teacher is miming some idioms then she asks the group:

1 – T: did I forget anything?

2 – S1: to go bananas?

3 – T: ah + do we have a miming for that? did we have an action for this last class?

4 – Ss: no

5 – T: no + but we could have one + + to go bananas ((the teacher makes mimes a crazy person))

6 – Ss: [laughs]

7 – T: [what dos it mean +to go bananas?]

8 – Ss: [laughs]

9 – T: to go bananas is to

10 – S2: go crazy

11 – T: crazy + could be crazy crazy or crazy MAD+ for example +driving can make you go bananas

12 – S2: (xxxxx)

13 – T=make you mad ((mimes mad face))

Episode 2.2

1 – T: give me an example + an example+ C+ give me an example

2 – C: go to the movie with er + (xxxx)

3 – T: uhuh+ that's an example+ uhuh+ you go to the movies+++ Tess goes to the movies with her boyfriend +right? ((playing the role of Tess)) oh I invited my English teacher to go to [the movies with us]

4 – Ss: [((laugh))]

5 – T: [and then it can be Tess her boyfriend and me.]

6 – Ss: [((laughs))]

7 – T: [and I'm gonna be playing]

gooseberry+ right? ok

Episode 2.3

The teacher is showing some pictures of faces to elicit feelings. She shows one with a mad face.

1 – T: uhuh.+ and what about this one? + I don't know what this person is +how can you + define the feeling of this person here?

2 - S1: Japanese?

3 – T: ((laughs)).

4 – Ss: ((laugh)).

5 – T: maybe the person is speaking Japanese+++

6 – Ss : ((laugh))

7 – S2: [opinionated]

8 - T: a person speaking Japanese + [what do you think]

9 – Ss: [sick, sick]

10 – S3: ah! furious

11 – T: ah +maybe + it could be furious

Episode 2.4

Task: Students have to play the dialogue with the intonation of one kind of feeling. Teacher is going to demonstrate and she wants a volunteer to role play with her.

1 – T: we are going to try to say the dialogue +in a hurry+ + how can you say the dialogue in a hurry? + any volunteer to do it with me?

2 – Ss: ((students remain in silence))

3 – T: any volunteer? + + let's choose something easier+ IN LOVE!

4- Ss: [((laugh))]

5- T: [any volunteer?]

6- S1: ((raises her hand to ask a question+ not to be the volunteer))

7- T: yes? [I see a volunteer there!]

8- S1: [no, no]

9- Ss: ((laugh))

10- T: C!

11- C: [I'm a girl!]

12- Ss: [((laugh))]

13- T: we're two girls in love

14- S1: [oh +so beautiful] ((in a cunning tone))

15- T: ok ((they start role playing the dialogue))

Episode 2.5

Task: two students play a dialogue in the same activity and the others have to guess which feeling they're interpreting))

9- S1: we're running in Beiramar

10- Ss: ((laugh))

((S1 and S2 play the dialogue as if they were out of breath. After they finished teacher starts commenting))

11- T: ok +ok +what's the feeling?

12- Ss: tired

13- T: yeah! tired + but you know when you are jogging you shouldn't stop and talk to other people

14- Ss: ((laugh))

15- T: it's bad for your heart

16- Ss: ((laugh))

Episode 2.6

Task: Students are asked to complete the sentences the teacher is sticking on the board. She uses pieces of papers with some clauses on them. The sentence is: I like it when...

1- Tess: I like it when people remember my birthday

2- T: aha! when is your birthday+ Tess+ by the way

3- Ss: [((laugh))]

4- T: maybe she's dropping a hint +maybe her birthday is today ((laughs))

5- Ss: ((Laugh))

6- T: when is your birthday? tell us

- 7- Tess: November 8
 8- T: hmm+ so it's close!
 9- Ss: [(((laugh)))]
 10-T: so +guys + write it down (((laughs)))+I like it when people remember my birthday.

Episode 2.7

Teacher is asking students for some of their examples with the feelings. Then she asks an example for "I can't stand it..."

- 1- T: great + and I can't stand it +++ one thing you feel very strongly + + against
 2- S1: I can't stand it when + + the person listen to music that I don't like
 3- T: oh+ [yeah]
 4- Ss: [(((laugh)))]
 5- T: this weekend I was on the beach and this kombi appeared + and they opened this + sound system +and put this very loud + I don't know if it was sertanejo [but it was very...]
 6- Ss: [(((laugh)))]
 7- T : [they liked it very much] and it was very loud+ they started making a barbecue
 8- Ss: ((laugh))
 9- T: and then they spent the whole morning listening to that very loud song + and I was very + + upset

Episode 2.8

- 1 – T: you were talking something about laughing
 1- S1: yes + ah +++
 2- T: what were you saying +Michael?
 3- Michael: it embarrasses me when people laugh me and I don't why + don't know why
 4- Ss: ((laughs))
 5- T: [ah +yeah +this can be really embarrassing when people laugh at you and you don't know why + yeah+this is terrible. ++ and what really embarrasses me is when I can't remember a person's name and the persons says: hello Jane]
 6- S2: [(((laughs)))]
 7- T: [it's been a long time] and I want to call the person by his name+ and I can't remember

Episode 2.9

- 1- T: tell us + tell us what you did last weekend
 2- S1: went out with boyfriend
 3- T: oooooohh (((laughs)))
 4- Ss: [(((laugh)))]
 5- T: she's recording! ((pointing to researcher as if she was advising the student to watch out for what she was going to write about that))
 6- Ss: [(((laugh louder)))]
 7- T: ((to another student)) tell us one interesting thing you did last weekend
 8- S1: we eat sushi+ sashimi
 9- T: you did? where? at home? or did you go to a sushi place?

- 10- S1: er + it were with a friend of us
 11- T: really? ah + er + a friend + at his house?
 12- S1: mhm.
 13- T: that's nice + and does he know how to prepare sushi?
 14- S1: my boyfriend knows also
 15- T: mmmh: so+ maybe in December for our end of the semester party we're going to invite Selma's boyfriend to prepare a sushi for us
 16- Ss: ((laugh))

Episode 2.10

- 1- T: ((asking another student about his weekend)) it was quite warm wasn't it?
 2- J: I went to the beach on Saturday and spent all day
 3- T: really? yeah+ Saturday was the best day because on Sunday it was already a little bit cloudy
 4- J: yeah
 5- T: where did you go J? what beach?
 6- J: er + Moçambique
 7- T: mmm: did you practice any sports there?
 8- J: surfing
 9- T: surfing + mmmm : I could tell by his tan! ((He's not tan at all!))
 10- Ss: ((laugh))

Episode 2.11

- 1- T: anybody else went to the beach?
 2- Tania: I
 3- T: you? where did you go+ Tess?
 4- Tess: I + er + I went to + Jurerê
 5- T: Jurerê? international or the other one? ((frowning as if to show that the other one is not so good as the international beach))
 6- ((laugh a little))
 7- Tess: international
 8- T: oh+ good ((as if she was relieved to hear that))

Episode 2.12

One student arrives late. He has a t-shirt with the sentence "Are you ready?" at the front

- 1- T: hi +R.+how are you? ((reading)) are you ready [for what?]
 2- Ss: [((laugh))]
 3- T: turn! is there something on the back of your shirt?
 4- S1: no?
 5- T: no?
 6- S1: oh just + ((then he turns his back to the teacher))
 7- T: "are you ready?"+ show them ((S1 turns the back to the group. There is a number 40' on the back of the t-shirt))
 8- S2: ((laughs))
 9- T: did you understand?
 10- Ss: no
 11- T: no+ so R is gonna explain to us + are you ready for what?

- 12- S1: it's just a number!
 13- Ss: ((laugh)).

Episode 2.13

Teacher is explaining game, they write a word on somebody else's back with their fingertips and they have to guess the word.

- 1- T: now I need a volunteer + to get a massage+ I'm gonna give this person a massage + so+ it's something very good + anybody would like a massage? ++ nobody wants my massage? ((miming disappointed face))
 2- Ss: ((laugh))
 3- T: nobody wants my massage +it won't hurt + it's relaxing + very relaxing. + remember? what's my second job? I'm a teacher + my second job is +
 4- Ss (xxx)
 5- T: what we saw last class + last week
 6- S1: a person who sees the future (xxx)
 7- T: ah! a person who sees the future is a
 8- S2: fortune teller?
 9- T: so + I'm a teacher + a fortune teller and now I have a third job
 10- S2: a massagist?
 11- T: a masseuse + I give massage to people + very relaxing + anybody wants to try?
 12- Ss : ((laugh))
 13- T: you don't trust me! you don't trust my massage + come on! I'm gonna call Grace ((the researcher))
 14- Ss: ((laugh))

Episode 2.14

They were revising list of professions and the teacher asks with a sad face:

- 1- T= did anybody say teacher? I was worried
 2- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.15

Teacher is trying to divide the class in three groups for a game:

- 1- T= so + this group here + from A to + B + you are going to be the doing group
 2- S1= quêt?
 3- T= what?
 4- S1 = ((laughs))
 5- T = don't worry + it doesn't make any sense
 6- Ss= ((laugh))

Episode 2.16

Referring to the episode when Alanis Morissette made a show in Peru and in the end of the concert she said : " Thank you Brazil".

- 1- T= ok, + I need you to promise something + say + ((raises her right hand)) + dear teacher Jane
 2- Ss= ((laughing))dear teacher Jane
 3- T= I promise
 4- Ss= I promis

- 5- T= I won't laugh
 6- Ss= I won't laugh
 7- T = at your pictures
 8- Ss = ((laugh))
 9- T = you promised + ok? you're gonna see some pictures ((starts showing them))
 10- Ss = ooohhh! ((as admiring the pictures))
 11- T= thank you!
 12- Ss = ((laugh))
 13- T= this is a story + it's a song by Alanis Morissette + do you know Alanis Morissette?
 14- S1= [yeah]
 15- S2 = [thank you Brazil(XXX)] ((referring to what Alanis said in the end of the show))
 16- T= [thank you Brazil + yeah! she was in Brazil] ((with cunning tone as if to test Ss))
 17- S2 = [in Lima] in Lima!
 18- T= oh! + she said + thank you Brazil + in Lima?
 19- Ss= ((XXX))
 20- T= oh +but she was in Brazil
 21- S3 = yeah + Brasília
 22- S1 = [she was]
 23- T= [in Brasília?] and there she said + thank you Peru? ((laughing))
 24- S3 = ((laughs))

Episode 2.17

They were talking about researches in Brazil.

- 1- T= is research in Brazil well paid or badly paid?
 2- Ss = badly paid
 3- T= so + it's not good business?
 4- S1 = sometimes it's NOT paid
 5- T= not paid ((laughs)) + for example + Grazi ((the researcher)) can't pay you to be the participants in her research + if she could + imagine she had a thousand dollars and we would divide it into all the participants
 6- Ss= ((laugh a little))
 7- T= I bet students would talk more in the classes ((with reproaching face and smiling after))
 8- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.18

They have some situations written on the book and they have to say which of the situations is the least annoying for them.

- 25- S1= (XXX)
 26- T= giving rides! by car + how old are you Doug ?
 27- Doug= ah? no + I go eighteen today
 28- ahaa! that's why he doesn't + ((changing intonation as if she had just realized that it was his birthday)) today is your birthday?
 29- Ss= ((laugh))

- 30- T= I can't believe it! now we have to sing! but that's why Doug doesn't mind driving people to the airport
- 31- Ss= ((laugh))
- 32- T= [because he has just started driving!]
- 33- Ss = ((laugh))
- 34- T= because when you have been driving for a long time + asking for a ride to the airport can be very annoying + it's your birthday today + and it was Diana's birthday last week wasn't it?
- 35- Diana = yes + and I
- 36- T= on the 8th
- 37- Diana= the 9th
- 38- T = the 9th + last week
- 39- Diana= and I missed the class
- 40- T= aaah! [because I noticed (XXX) it was her birthday]
- 41- Ss = [laugh]
- 42- Diana = yes
- 43- T= aha! and Diana+ is here + so we have to sing happy birthday for two people
- 44- Doug=oh!
- 45- Ss= ((laugh))
- 46- T = where we put dear + we have to say dear Diana and Doug ok ?
- 47- Ss = ((laugh))
- 48- ((They started singing the song and laughed when they were supposed to say dear Diana and Doug because it was too fast to include both names in the song))

Episode 2.19

They are talking about the listening exercise the teacher had just played. In the exercise, one man asks the other to borrow his video camera. So the teacher asks:

- 1- T= I want to film my baby + would you lend me your video camera?
- 2- S1 = yes ((other students nod their heads in approval))
- 3- T= you're such nice people
- 4- Ss = ((laugh))
- 5- T= you are exceptions
- 6- S2 = but I don't have a video camera!
- 7- Ss + T = ((laugh))

Episode 2.20

They are talking about the expression "What's up?" Ss say it is informal. The teacher asks whether they would say that to their professors at University and they say they would. Now she asks:

- 1- T= ok. + if you met the queen of England ((with formal look))
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))
- 3- T= +++ in the corridor + would you say + hi + queen + what's up?
- 4- Ss = ((laugh more now))
- 5- T= what would you say in this situation? ((students still laughing))
- 6- S1 = how are you?
- 7- T = ah!
- 8- S1 = hi + queen + how are you? ((laughs))

Episode 2.21

- 1- T= how many if clauses do we have?
- 2- S1 + S2 = four
- 3- T= ((wrong answer and the teacher makes a noise as if it was a bell)) bééééé!
- 4- S3 = nove?
- 5- T = bééééé!
- 6- S4 = six? ((laughs))
- 7- T= yeah!

Episode 2.22

The group is giving definitions for words they had already seen. They were talking about the word DATE.

- 1- T= do you have a date for this weekend?
- 2- S1 = yes
- 3- T= is it a new date?
- 4- S1 = [the same old date]
- 5- S2 = [the same old date] ((Ironically))
- 6- Ss = ((laugh))
- 7- T= so are you planning to go out with your date this weekend?

Episode 2.23

They are discussing collocations. The verb is RETURN and they are discussing which words go better with it.

- 1- T= compliment is elogio + you can return a compliment
- 2- S1 = (XXX)
- 3- S2 = and a problem?
- 4- T = return a problem?
- 5- Ss = ((laugh)) (XXX) return a problem
- 6- T = I don't want this problem! ((miming she's returning a package or something))
- 7- Ss = ((laugh))
- 8- T = I'm returning it to you !

Episode 2.24

Still on collocations...

- 1- T = what can you offer?
- 2- S1 = a gift
- 3- T = uhm?
- 4- S1 = a gift
- 5- T = a gift
- 6- Ss = (xxx)
- 7- T = you can offer yourself! ((laughs))
- 8- T & Ss = ((laugh))
- 9- T = oh + yes + why not?

Episode 2.25

Still on collocations..

- 1- T= alright + what can you return?
- 2- Ss =(XXX)
- 3- T = return an offer
- 4- Ss = (XXX)
- 5- T = return yourself! [((laughs))]
- 6- Ss = [((laugh))]
- 7- T = to whom? ((laughs)) to God! to your parents! ((laughs))
- 8- S1 = to your mother
- 9- T = yeah + I'm returning myself mom !
- 10- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.26

- 1- T= we have the word in Portuguese declinar + but it's VERY formal + vou declinar seu convite ((with formal face and a bow))
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.27

They have a picture of a man in the book.

- 1- T = is he good looking + Kary?
- 2- K = yes + he's pretty good looking ((cunningly))
- 3- T = ((laughs)) yeah
- 4- K = blue eyes
- 5- T = ((laughs)) yes + he wears a tie + so probably he's well off

Episode 2.28

They are talking about a new idiom they have added to the "vocabox" = "pain in the neck".

- 1- T =tell me somebody famous you think is a pain in the neck. + + I think Silvio Santos is a pain in the neck
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))
- 3- T = what else can I say?
- 4- S1 = Fasutão
- 5- T = Faustão!
- 6- S2 = Gugu Liberato
- 7- S3 = Xuxa
- 8- T = all these (XXX)
- 9- S4 = Gugu is the greatest pain in the neck ((laughs))
- 10- Ss = ((laugh))
- 11- T = he's the champion!

Episode 2.29

Ss get a word from the vocabox, they have to make a sentence with the word but instead of saying the word they have to clap and other Ss have to guess which word it is.

- 1- S1 = teenagers ((claps)) a lot about their parents
- 2- S2 = complain
- 3- T = ((laughs)) very good!

Episode 2.30

The teacher is explaining another task. She has a backpack full of things and students had to take one object and make a request to have it borrowed and give an explanation for that.

- 1- T = it's going to get interesting if + for example + a boy gets + the nail polisher
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.31

1- S1 = would you mind if I borrowed your cappuccino + because I need to do a cake + then I bring a piece of cake for you

- 2- T = oh ! I don't mind at all!
- 3- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.32

They had to answer the question "What upsets you?" .Teacher corrected the homework at home.

- 4- did you see M's sentence? + the question is+ what upsets you? + and his answer was+ when I have to do English homework
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))
- 6- T = It was raining in a Sunday afternoon and I was correcting this+ I almost jumped out of the window !
- 7- S1, S2, S3 = ((laugh))
- 8- T = he said he would explain + we're going to give him a chance
- 9- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.33

Teacher had asked students to ask the researcher a personal question:

- 1- T = just think about a personal question not too personal ((blinking in complicity))
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.34

They were working with indirect questions

- 1- S1 = Jane+ can you ask Grace if she lives alone or with + er + or with your family?
- 2- T = Grace+ do you live alone or with your family?
- 3- G = I + I don't live alone
- 4- T = uhmm ((cunningly))
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))
- 6 -G = I live with my fiancé
- 7-S1 = can you ask Grace what does she do with the recorded?
- 8 -T & Ss = ((laugh))
- 9 -S1 = can you ask Grace where were she born?
- 10 T = ((saying to the student)) where she was born. ((to the researcher))where were you born?
- 11 G = I was born in Porto Alegre
- 12 T = were you born in Moinhos de Vento?
- 13 G = yes!
- 14 T = me to! ((very enthusiastic with the coincidence))
- 15 G= yeah!?

16 Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.35

- 1- T= What is a flat tire Kary?
- 2- K = When the tire of the car is +
- 3- T = flat!
- 4- T & Ss= ((laugh))

Episode 2.36

The teacher wrote the last part of a word in the vocabox and she asks Ss to guess. Kary has already guessed two words.

- 1- K = gossip!
- 2- T = yeah! ((laughs)) uau! Kary is a walking vocabox!
- 3- T & Ss= ((laugh))

Episode 2.37

Ss were miming adjectives for others to write as a review of that vocab. Later teacher checked the silent dictation.

Episode 2.38

Teacher asked them to talk about breakfast in pairs. After 3 minutes, invited two Ss (a boy and a girl), to come to the front of the class and said that they were a newly-wed couple and that now they were going to be interviewed to see if they knew a lot about each other's habit. The girl left the room and the boy stayed to answer the questions which were later checked with when the girl returned (they used indirect questions).

- 1- boy= they want to know if you have breakfast with somebody
- 2- girl= alone ((she forgets she is answering as a newly-wed wife)) ++ but + I prefer with my husband ((in a sensual tone, she suddenly remembers))
- 3- T& Ss = ((laugh very loud))

Episode 2.39

The teacher is explaining what the listening task is about, the girl who had been the wife in the previous episode asks:

- 1- Ss= (XXX)
- 2- S1 = (XXX) today is?
- 3- T = no + it's about two people + two people having a conversation
- 4- S1 = ah!
- 5- T = husband and wife +by the way ((looking cunningly at the boy and the girl of the previous episode))
- 6- T & Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.40

Game: groups have to give definitions to words given.

- 1- S1 = someone who has a limited point of view
- 2- T= oh
- 3- S2 = oh ((laughs))
- 4- T = opinionated is not someone who has a limited point of view

- 5- some Ss = no + no
- 6- T = that's what? what was the vocabox word for that?
- 7- S3 = narrow-minded
- 8- T = yeah!
- 9- S3 = haha! ((laughs as he won the contest))
- 10- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.41

After they decided which group won the contest the teacher pretends to have a chocolate prize .

- 1- T= ok + they won + they won + they got the confeti + open your mouth!((pretending she will throw the candies into their mouths))
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))
- 3- T = I'm going to thrown + I have to throw the confeti from here + if the confeti falls inside your mouth + ok
- 4- Ss = [((laugh))]
- 5- T= [if it doesn't...] ((laughs))
- 6- Ss = ((laugh))
- 7- T = no + I'm just kidding

Episode 2.42

Ss are looking at the teacher's pictures to make her time line. She makes a comment about her picture as naked baby.

- 1- T = oh + a porno picture!
- 2- Ss = [((laugh loud))]
- 3- T = [(XXX)] a baby!+ you got the porno pictures!
- 16 -Ss = ((laugh))
- 17 S1 = ((laughs)) I told them ((laughs)) not this one!

Episode 2.43

They have to take one picture each and put in the correct order in the teacher's time line.

- 1- T= who has the first one? ((the baby naked))
- 2- Ss = M + M has.
- 3- T= so + M
- 4- M = who? the baby? ((the teacher has a baby son, Pedro, and he thought it was Pedro's picture))
- 5- T = but +who is the baby?
- 6- M = who is this?+ baby? + oh:
- 7- T & Ss = ((laugh loud))
- 8- T = it's not Pedro +right?
- 9- T & S = ((still laughing))
- 10- T = it's definitely not Pedro + because Pedro is not a hermaphrodite! ((laughs))

Episode 2.44

The researcher is asking if the group agrees to have the classes videotaped .

- 1- R = would you mind if I videotaped the classes?
- 2- T = oh +I have to go to the hairdresser's !

- 3- Ss = ((laugh loud))
- 4- T = oh + my God + I have to call and make an appointment + I have to wear my Sunday clothes + can we watch it later?
- 5- R = sure!
- 6- S1 = I don't want
- 7- T = ((laughs)) you don't want to watch?
- 8- S2 = (XXX)
- 9- T = we're going to be history + people! she's going to be a famous linguist + soon + and we're going to be part of this history + when she's a millionaire + she's very wealthy
- 10- Ss = ((laugh louder))
- 11- T = she's going to share her wealth with us!
- 12- Ss = ((laugh)) (XXX)

Episode 2.45

Now they are making sentences about the teacher's life.

- 6- S1 = Jane had got married before she got pregnant.
- 7- T = ahã + alright + anything else?
- 8- S2 = Jane had gone to Bahia before she got pregnant
- 9- T = very good + but she didn't get pregnant there!
- 10- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.46

The teacher makes a comment about a girl who was having trouble concentrating.

- 1- T = Mai + you know who she's thinking of + she can't concentrate anymore
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))
- 3- T = she's thinking about whom?
- 4- T + S1 = Reginaldão
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.47

- 1- T = do you remember? + it was before the blackout+
- 2- S1 = yeah!
- 3- Ss = (XXX) before the blackout
- 4- T = now + our lives are going to be divided before the blackout [and after the blackout] ((laughs))
- 5- Ss = [((laugh))]

Episode 2.48

- 1- T = medieval times + no internet!
- 2- Ss = [((laugh))]
- 3- S1 = [but I liked] I liked the blackout
- 4- T = you did Dani? why? tell us (XXX).
- 5- S1 = because I don't need to work ((laughs))
- 6- T = uhm:
- 7- Ss = ((laughs))
- 8- S1 = and I stay home
- 9- T = uhm:

- 10- S1 = do the things that I + normally
- 11- T = Uhm: ((in a cunning tone))
- 12- Ss = ((laugh))
- 13- S2 = like playing cards ((laughs))
- 14- T = [ah! playing cards!] alright ((as if she expected sth else))
- 15- Ss = [((laugh))]
- 16- S1 = alone!
- 17- Ss = [((laugh))]
- 18- S2 = [I + I bought a bottle of wine] I was + er +I was
- 19- T= [uhm + she's got drunk ((laughing))]
- 20- S2 = + reserved for a [good +]
- 21- T = [a good occasion?] ((laughs))
- 22- S2 = ((laughs)) + occasion +++
- 23- T = she drank a bottle of wine! ((laughing))
- 24- S2 = with my daughter!
- 25- T = you got drunk on the beach? ((laughs))
- 26- SS = ((laugh))
- 27- T = specially wine because when you get drunk you get sleepy
- 28- S2 = yeah!
- 29- T = you get drunk and then you cry ((because of the situation of the blackout))
- 30- T&Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.49

- 5- T= what's + I ran out of gas ?
- 6- Ss = (XXX)
- 7- T = it's not + eu corri pra for a da gasolina
- 8- Some Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.50

They were organizing two circles. One inner circle with boys and the bigger circle with girls. They outer circle observed while the inner circle talked. There were too many girls.

- 1- T= one lucky guy is gonna have two girls!
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.51

They are discussing what they are and what they aren't expected to do in a wedding reception.

- 1- S1 = eat and drink so much (XXX)
- 2- Ss & T = ((laugh))
- 3- T = But SO much?
- 4- S1 = yeah!
- 5- T = are you expected to get drunk?
- 6- S2 & S3 = no!
- 7- T = and make a big mess?
- 8- Ss = ((laugh))
- 9- T = no +alright

Episode 2.52

They are talking about bridal showers. The teacher was asking the married girls about theirs.

- 1- T = and you Cil? are you married?
- 2- C = I am ((not sounding very sure about it))
- 3- T& Ss = ((laugh))
- 4- T = what do you mean + yeah?
- 5- SS & C = ((laugh))
- 6- C = not officially
- 7- T = uhm: so + you're married
- 8- C = I just had a party or
- 9- T = did you have a bridal shower?
- 10- C = no
- 11- T = ok

Episode 2.53

The teacher was telling Ss about her "hen's night". She was saying that she was already drunk when she arrived at the club.

- 1- T= and then they ((her friends)) decided that I had to drink one tequila with each friend
- 2- S1 = oh + my God!
- 3- Ss = oh!
- 4- T = the second time I was already
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))
- 6- T= I don't remember how I got home +the driver + the model+ was carrying me ((laughing))
- 7- Some Ss = ((laugh))
- 8 -T= in Veneza + in this club+ there was a fashion show+ bikini fashion show + very trendy fashion show+ and they put me on the catwalk!
- 9 -R= ((laughs))
- 10 T= in the end +my friends arranged me to walk on the catwalk+ I had to do that!
- 11 Some Ss = ((laugh))
- 12 T = but I don't remember anything about it
- 13 Ss = ((laugh louder))

Episode 2.54

The teacher was saying some social situations and the students, in pairs, had to say what they are expected to do in each situation.

- 1- T= what about you guys? graduation?
- 2- S1 = (XXX) + ((he does not know))
- 3- T = you're expected to get a good job
- 4- T & Ss = ((laugh loud))
- 5- T = your parents =your parents expect that

Episode 2.55

They are talking about customs.

- 1- what do they say about Brazil here?

- 2- S1 – people don't go to be early
- 3- T = is it true?
- 4- Ss = no
- 5- T = where did they get this idea?
- 6- S2 = maybe in Rio de Janeiro ((laughs))
- 7- T = oh+ yeah+ or Bahia+ in Salvador
- 8- Some Ss = ((laugh))
- 9- T= maybe they think + ok+ Brazil+ carnival +mulatas +party+so+they don't sleep
- 10- Some Ss= ((laugh))

Episode 2.56

They are talking about two Dutch guys that one of the girls met at a bus station. They phoned her back.

- 1- T = and they called you?
- 2- S1 = they sent a message to (XXX)
- 3- T = uhm: ((cunningly)) is it a private message?
- 4- ++ yeah
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))
- 6- T = they called you on the cell phone! but did they call from Netherlands? or did they call from Brazil?
- 7- S1 – er + they+ they are here
- 8- T = and what did they say? tell us+ I'm curious
- 9- Ss = ((laugh))
- 10- R = that she's got beautiful hair ((she's got beautiful long hair))
- 11- S1 = ((she interpreted as if the Dutch guy got beautiful hair)) AND beautiful eyes!!
- 12- Ss & T =uhm: ! ((laugh))
- 13- T = the two of them or only one?
- 14- S1 = only one
- 15- T = the one who has strange hair?((referring to the fact that the girl said that she would only fall in love with a guy with crazy hair previously))
- 16- Ss = ((laugh))
- 17- T = you see +it's destiny

Episode 2.57

The teacher is calling some students to check their answers. He's calling a pair of one boy and a girl.

- 1- T= so +girls + what about...((realizes the mistake)) girls...((laughs))
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))
- 3- T = Mil and Kary
- 4- SS = (XXX) ((laugh))
- 5- T = ok guys + what about this one? ((laughs))

Episode 2.58

They formed two circles, one inner circle where people were talking and another circle of students who should observe the conversation that was happening inside. First the boys had observed the girls and now it was the other way around.

- 1- T= so +Andrew + do you think you can observe two girls at the same time?

- 2- Ss & T = ((laugh))
- 3- T = can you try?
- 4- S1 = if they are + er boys +
- 5- T = ((laughs)) if they were boys you couldn't! ((laughs))

Episode 2.59

The teacher asks about the comments the boys have made about the girls' conversation.

- 1- T = what comments did you get? can you give me examples?
- 2- S1 = good comments
- 3- T = only good ones?
- 4- S2 = only good ((ironically)) + of course teacher they are girls !
- 5- Ss = [((laugh))]
- 6- T = [they're perfect!]
- 7- Ss & T = [((laugh))]
- 8- S2 = he's a gentleman! ((laughs))
- 9- T = (XXX) yes, he's a gentleman!
- 10- Ss = ((laugh))
- 11- T = or maybe he wants another chocolate

Episode 2.60

Now the teacher is telling a story about her host family in England. There was a little eight-year-old girl that said she hated Brazilians.

- 1- T= first I said hello and shook hands with her and she said +I hate Brazilians + I said +why ?+ because every time there are Brazilians in the house they do this ((she squeezes her cheeks)) + que bonitinha!+
- 10- S= ((laugh))
- 11- T= and she said +I hate when they touch my cheeks! +I hate when they say that +you're not gonna do that? + I said no
- 12- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.61

After watching an episode of "Friends" where Rachel was referred to as "half and half" for she was a hermaphrodite. Teacher is checking True and False about video.

- 1- S1 = Rachel wants Ross to call everyone at school and tell Rachel is skinny.
- 2- T= true or false?
- 3- Ss = false!
- 4- T = why?
- 5- S2 = because she wasn't fat
- 6- T = but she wants Ross to call them + why?
- 7- Ss =(XXX)
- 8- S3 = to tell she was not half and half
- 9- Ss & T = ((laugh))
- 10- T = to tell she was not half and half + she's not hermaphrodite!

Episode 2.62

One student starts talking about the two Dutch guys she had met in the bus stop. This is the same girl who said she'd fall in love with a guy with crazy hair.

- 1- T = was he good looking?
- 2- S1 = good looking + handsome!
- 3- Ss = ((laugh))
- 4- T = did he have blond hair?
- 5- S1 = ((laughing)) yes!
- 6- Ss = [((laugh))]
- 7- S1 = [they had blue eyes!]
- 8- T= blue eyes and blond hair + in Holland they are all blond right?

Episode 2.63

The teacher calls two girls and asks one to introduce her to the other student as if they were in the US. The teacher is trying to show how different the customs in each country are.

- 1- M = Dani + this is Jane + Jane this is Dani ((laughing))
- 2- D = ((with a surprised face)) hi + how are you?
- 3- T = how are you? ((shaking hands))
- 4- D = nice to meet you
- 5- T = now + the same situation+ but we are in Brazil+ ok? + now May is going to introduce us
- 6- M= Jane essa é a Dani + Dani + essa é a Jane
- 7- D & T = [oi tudo bom?] ((they kiss and hug each other)) prazer!!
- 8- Ss & T = ((laugh))

Episode 2.64

Teacher has some pictures of gestures and they are discussing the meanings of these gestures in each country.

- 1- T= for example + I have a sign here + my sign is this ((she moves her shoulders up and down repeatedly)) + what does it mean in Brazil?
- 2- S1 = não me importo?
- 3- S2 = não tô nem aí ((laughs))
- 4- T = I don't care + não tô nem aí
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))
- 6- T = ((laughs)) like the song + what do you think?+ can you do this in a another country? + like + it's our teacher's birthday today ((she does the gesture again))
- 7- Ss = ((laugh))
- 8- T = I'm going to Hawaii after the class ((does it again)).
- 9- Ss = ((laugh))
- 10- T = I have a new boyfriend ((does it again))
- 11- Ss = ((laugh))
- 12- T = can you do that in Brazil?
- 13- S3 in Brazil + yes?
- 14- T = yeah! and what about in other countries + is it ok +or is it a little bit impolite?
- 15- S3 = impolite
- 16- T = yeah +it's the same thing here in Brazil + you can be a little impolite

Episode 2.65

The students mime the signs they have.

- 1- T= and you Dug?

- 2- D = ((turns his finger around his ear))
- 3- S2 = oh + this is crazy!
- 4- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.66

They have to identify situations that are unproblematic in Brazil. They are discussing if it is ok to ask people's religion in Brazil.

- 1- T = and you think it's alright here to ask people's religion?
- 2- S1 = yeah
- 3- S2 = [it's ok]
- 4- T = [yeah?]
- 5- S3 = only in the Israel + oh + you are judeu? ((makes as if he was pointing a gun to someone , shooting))
- 6- Ss = ((laugh))
- 7- T = that's a good point + in some countries that wouldn't be a good thing
- 8- Ss = ((laugh))
- 9- T = it would be something very personal + but here in Brazil+ I think it's ok
- 10- S4 = here people change the religion every time
- 11- T = as people change clothes right?
- 12- Ss = ((laugh))
- 13- T = as politicians change political parties ((laughs)) + we change the religion all the time
- 14- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.67

May is the girl who met the two Dutch guys and the same one who said she'd fall in love with a guy with crazy hair. There's an emic joke in the class for everyone follows her quest to find the right guy.

- 1- T = what if you go to your boyfriend's or girlfriend's house for the first time and you don't like the food +and your mother in law insists
- 2- Ss =((laugh))
- 3- T = would you like a second helping?+ what would you do?
- 4- S1 = I would die ((laughs))
- 5- T = you would accept or say +I'm on a diet + or I'm full ?
- 6- Ss = (XXX)
- 7- T = even if you really don't like the food + for example + I hate dobradinha+ even if it's dobradinha + would you accept May?
- 8- M = yes.
- 9- T = uhh! ((disgusted))
- 10- Ss = ((laugh))
- 11- T = or figado + ((some sts laugh some other are disgusted as well))

Episode 2.68

The teacher makes a list of words in the board related to a piece of movie they are going to see later. She asks if the words are positive or negative.

- 1- T = anxious + negative
- 2- S1 = o que é anxious? + what is anxious?

- 3- T = anxious? + what does anxious mean?
- 4- S2 = when you have + when you feel + ((makes an anxious face))
- 5- Ss = ((laugh))
- 6- S1 = ((laughs)) I understand!

Episode 2.69

- 1- T = comfortable?
- 2- Ss = ((silence))
- 3- T = for example + are you comfortable or uncomfortable with the camera? ((the researcher's camera))
- 4- Ss = ((laugh))
- 5- T = COMFORTABLE! ((answering for them))
- 6- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.70

Teacher taught them 10 idioms (1. you're the apple of my eye, 2. he's an egg head, 3. don't cry over spilt milk, 4. as different as chalk and cheese, 5. it's not my cup of tea, 6. it's the greatest thing ever since sliced bread, 7. he's my pie in the sky, 8. to go bananas, 9. he's full of beans, 10. to play gooseberry) and now she showed them 10 mimings, one for each idiom, students watch first and then mime themselves.

- 1- T = pie in the sky + you don't remember pie in the sky + well + let's see + Brad Pitt + he's my pie in the sky + but I'm married + he's married + too bad +++

Episode 2.71

Teacher is reviewing words from the vocabox.

- 1- T = do you remember the difference between gay and gay ? + well + I'm very gay today

Episode 2.72

Teacher uses blue tack to stick things on the board. When asked by a student, she said it was similar to bubble gum.

- 6- T = now + don't worry + it's like bubble gum but it's not bubble gum + you don't have a disgusting teacher !

Episode 2.73

- 1- S1 = what's a nephew ?
- 2- S2 = it's a boy
- 3- T = but then if nephew is a boy + then Dug is a nephew ! boys + you are nephews !

Episode 2.74

Teacher is dividing class in groups, each group must select a name connected with food (because they were looking at idioms with food the previous class).

- 6- S1 = I don't know the name for our group
- 7- T = how about something that goes with barbecue ? + something we usually have with barbecue ?
- 8- S1 = ice-cream ?
- 9- T = well + no + I mean + yeah + if you're pregnant +
- 10- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.75

Students are playing a memory game to revise the idioms, they have to match the two halves, if it's an idiom, the teacher marks a point.

- 1- T = a pie of my eye + yes + it sounds beautiful but I don't think it's an idiom +
- 2- Ss = ((laugh))
- 3- T = you're the egg of my eye + now + I don't think that's very romantic + is it ?
- 4- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.76

They are playing the memory game and one group takes too long to answer.

- 2- T = they're clueless + look at their faces + let's put some pressure + 10 +9+8+++
- 3- Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.77

- 1 – T = what's my job ?
- 2 – Ss = XXX
- 3 – T = what do I do ? + where do I work ?
- 4 – S1 = in a school + teacher
- 5– T = and do you think teachers are well-paid or badly-paid ?
- 18 S2 = badly-paid
- 19 T= that's right + teachers are badly-paid so + I have an extra job + you know +to make extra money + in my free time I tell people's fortune + do you know the name of the person who tells your future ?
- 20 S3= future-teller
- 21 T = FUTURE- teller ?
- 22 S4= fortune-teller
- 23 T = that's right + I'm a fortune teller but I don't use a crystal ball + now + you see + I have a device ((showing them her origami)) here to tell ((is interrupted by Valy who helps her open it as she was having some difficulty to show it to Ss))
- 24 V= I just love origamis + you see + this is what you do +
- 25 T = that's wonderful + now I have an assistant + like David Cooperfield and his assistants +now + listen everybody +Valy will be passing around collecting money +++
- 26 Ss = ((laugh hard))
- 27 T = you didn't think this was gonna be for free + now + did you ?
- 28 Ss = ((laugh))
- 29 T = and so you can give Valy your contributions + now seriously + what do you wanna know about your future ?

Episode 2.78

Still playing with origami, telling Ss their future.

- 1 – S1 = will I be a millionaire ?
- 2 – T = this is a difficult one to answer ((looking puzzled at the origami)) + you see + there are many variables +
- 3 – M = will I find a crazy-haired guy ?
- 4 – Ss = ((laugh))

5 – T = well + not in this room ((looking around)) + everyone's here's got normal hair + hum + maybe ((showing origami)) + but + you know + when it's maybe you get a discount
 6 – Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.79

Teacher is trying to elicit possible jobs for a picture of a woman that will appear in the listening.

1 – S1 = she could be a personal designer
 2 – T = do you think she's concerned with fashion ? ((trying to show that she doesn't really look like a personal designer))
 4- Dug = well + she's a woman + isn't she ?

Episode 2.80

There are two researchers observing today and when we come in the class the teacher explains why now there are two.

1 – T = well + this is Leandro + he's a researcher too + like Kyria and Graziela and he's here because he heard how famous you'd become and he also wants to get your autographs
 2 – Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.81

The teacher's name is Jana and she's creating a fiction about her.

1 – T = right + where + so where does she live ?
 7- Ss = janaland
 8- T = and what language does she speak ?
 9- Andy = janalese
 10- that's right + and Andy has not only been to janaland but he also speaks janalese fluently + it's amazing !

Episode 2.82

t + so if you wanna + tchan tchan tchan tchan ((with cunning look and miming kissing)) with May + what do you need ?

2 – Valy = crazy hair !
 3 – T = right + but what does tchan tchan tchan tchan mean ?
 4 – Ss = to date

Episode 2.83

Teacher brought some photos of when she worked as a tour guide in Disney and now she told them that they are going to interview her for Caras magazine about her job there.

1 – T = ok + but I will only show you the photo if you promise not to laugh ((showing photo))
 2 – Ss = ((laugh))
 5- T – you broke your word as reporters !
 6- Ss = ((laugh harder))

Episode 2.84

They are describing some photos that teacher will use in the listening activity. Teacher shows a photo of a very stressed woman and Ss have to guess which woman in the book looks stressed.

1 – S1 = the short hair woman

2 – T = well + but that was before she became Heloísa in *mulheres apaixonadas* ((referring to a character in a soap opera who is very stressed and jealous for the woman with short hair look like the character but she doesn't look stressed at all)).

3 – Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.85

They are warming up for the listening activity where there are three people, namely, Tina, Mike and Phill. The teacher asks them if they remember any people in the book with these names (from previous listening activities). Doug gets the question wrong :

1 – D = Phill ? is this Phill Collins ? + yes + I remember him !

2 – Ss = ((laugh))

3– T = well + that's not really the one but + well + do you remember any other famous Tina ? + if you remember Phill Collins then you must remember Tina Turner too !

4– D = yes + yes + of course !

5 – Ss = ((laugh))

6 – T = and how about Mike ?

7– Ss = Mike Tyson !

8– Ss = ((laugh))

9 – T = is he still in jail ?

10 – Ss = ((laugh))

Episode 2.86

May has finally got a date in the game they were playing for reported questions.

1 – T = so + May + did you like your date ?

2 – M = but + he doesn't have + you know + crazy hair

3 – T = so + what kind of hair did you have in mind ?

4 – M = you know + like that guy from the band ((XXX))

5 – T = oh + I know + he has this + this + I just woke up kind of hair + ++

6 – Ss = ((laugh))

7 – so + you see guys + if you wanna go out with May this is what you have to do + stop brushing your hair! + just get up in the morning and + hey + come to class !

Episode 2.87

Teacher is asking volunteers for next game.

1 – C = I always volunteer + today I'm not !

2 – Ss = ((laugh))

3 – T = that's right + Cybil always volunteers + but today she's on holiday so you'd better start thinking of someone else !

Episode 2.88

May told the class why she was late. She was in the laboratory and was worried about time and reached for what she thought was the door handle and touched a girl's breast by mistake. She said she was so embarrassed that she froze and couldn't say anything. Ss laugh

a lot and teacher says she's not sure she understood and starts to mime (going towards door, looking at her watch, opens door and pretends to touch a girl's boobs). Ss laugh a lot. She then turns to May and says :

- 1 – T = she probably thought + oops + there's a lesbian here at UFSC !
- 2 – Ss = ((laugh harder))

Episode 2.89

They're working on cultural differences. Ss get slips of paper with different customs written on them and have to explain.

- 1 – T = I wonder why you can't point your foot at people in Thailand + that's weird + isn't it ? + I mean + why would you point your foot anyway ? + like + oh + ((point foot at researcher)) that's a wonderful dress you're wearing Kyria !
- 2 – Ss = ((laugh))
- 3 – T = and + like + ((pointing foot at Kary)) + where's Kary ? + oops + there she is!
- 4 – Ss = ((laugh))
- 5 – T = where did I leave my marker ? + ((points foot at table)) + oops + there it is !
- 6 – Ss = ((laugh harder))

Episode 2.90

Teacher has to turn off air conditioner so that Ss can understand what's said in the CD.

- 1 – T = right + so let's turn off air conditioner ((walking towards it)) and burn a few calories in this sauna !
- 2 – Ss = ((laugh))
- 3 – S1 = XXX guard
- 4 – T = that's guard + not guard+ remember the film we saw with Kevin Costner ?
- 5 – Ss = yeah
- 6 – T = well + that was the BODY GUARD + now + repeat + GUARD
- 7– Ss = GUARD
- 8 – T = yes + that's right + now do you think this man is sexy ? ((showing photo of man who will appear in the listening))
- 9 – Ss = XXX
- 10 – T = like Kevin Costner + but you have to think of him in the old days +

Appendix IV A Interview with T1

Dec. 3rd, 2003

K- So, Gus, how do you view teaching?

G- Well, I think it's a very serious job, I mean, most people think that it's a lotta fun, I'm saying this 'cause I think I know where you're getting at, I mean, your dissertation is about LL, isn't it? And Rob told me you're very funny in class and all, he was your participant in your pilot, wasn't he?

K- yeah.

G - and I think that's fine but I think teaching is a business, a serious one. People don't come here to play, specially here in the extracurricular, I mean, they're all adults and they need to learn English and...

K – Right, so what can you tell me about that, I mean, how do people learn? How did you learn English?

G – Well, not really playing, not with language play if that's what you mean...

K – Most people don't even know what language play is, so, the first thing I'd like to ask you really, is, is what you think about language play, ludic language, when we say any of those terms, what is it that comes to your mind?

G – The resources that teachers have to make sts understand sth, there must be some kind of way to explain these words that, that are not easy for them to understand and this way of explaining words and playing with them might be what you call language play.

K – paraphrasing, miming, this kind of thing?

G – actually, I wasn't thinking about miming cause that would involve body language, I was thinking more of word play and to me, all it has to do with words, I don't know, I can't think of an example to give you right now

K- because you use this a lot, I mean, not body language, but you resort a lot to paraphrasing, drawing, remember when you drew the champagne glasses and..

G – Yeah, I use a lot of drawing...

K – and I was wondering whether you use that because it's sth natural in you or because you believe that this is the right way to...

G – although I have learned all those different things about pedagogy and the best way to teach, and also individual differences, for instance, how some people are more visual while others are, I don't know, but, to be honest with you I don't really think about those things when I draw or paraphrase or when I'm teaching, what happens is that I try do what would fit the needs of the majority of my sts

k- so most of the time you're improvising? There's this theory that most of teachers' actions are contingent, in other words, made online, in the spur of the moment and I was wondering if you agree with this...

G – probably that's what happens even because, after 6 years teaching you kinda develop some,, you're always making hypothesis and then you test them to see if they work and once you know what works and what doesn't, and I guess when you know that something works you kinda stick to that formula, well, so pretty much comes to, what I mean is, these resources come from experience because I used to prepare classes from the warm up

until the production... but now I don't anymore, I just kind feel what sts need and then apply my experience to...

K- so you have contingent decisions based on their needs and on your experience of what works best, is that it ?

G – I would say so, yeah, of course I know what I have to teach but I'm also flexible to see that if I'm teaching the present perfect and if they don't have notions of the simple tenses, by their look I feel that they need more information I stop the explanation of the present perfect and .. I'm not really worried about being behind schedule, I've never been really interested in that, all what the book says... and my idea of giving tests...

K- Hold on, let's go deeper in this... you said you don't mind changing plans but I wrote in my field notes that most of the time you seem to follow your programation. For instance, here, I wrote and I guess you agree with me that many times students can't understand what you say or what you're doing and still you don't modify your speech or translate, even when they ask you to do that and...

G- Right, I mean, I don't, I think I have to give them a good model of English input and if I modify my speech or translate things for them in class, I mean, what will happen when they talk to Americans? They're gonna feel lost and... but about changing plans, I did change plans, with the book, but about my decision to give them tests, that's what you're getting at, aren't you?

K – what's that ?

G – I feel that the whole idea of giving them tests makes them feel uncomfortable so I don't really give them tests, I give them tasks instead and evaluate them on a daily basis, I tell my sts that if they want to study for the test they should see a film or listen to a song...huhm, it works very well for me and for the sts, I've always heard when I was in the undergraduate course that learning a lge. should be as natural as possible, the classroom is an artificial environment so how can I make this environment more natural for the sts, maybe by making them so the exercises on the book or taking tests won't make it more natural, you know ? Tests are uncomfortable for any learning environment and language learning is special , you know ?

K- so how would you try to make this environment more natural ? What's is natural G - natural is sth impossible to be conveyed in the class so, what I mean by natural is making them go through situations that they will really need, well, like , lemme try to illustrate, it's a pair work, right ? And for one person's activity is necessary the info that the other person has so if you don't have that info you don't go ahead so you'd have to force yourself to use the language to do the ask and you're not really thinking about English at that time, you're thinking about your needs

K- so you think that by carrying out tasks they'd be learning the lge. implicitly

G – I do, I do, even though I'm not strickly attached to any model of learning.

K- I see this a lot in your class, this "implicit teaching" if we can say that...

G – Yeah, I don't use a lot of metalanguage and this might be due to my undergraduate course which was very much cognitive, UG oriented, from the Chomkyan line, you know ?

K – and how has this affected your teaching ?

G – well, a lot because if you're there for four years hearing that this model is the best one and , when I came to Fpolis where there was a different approach and what I learned here in my MA in two years might be the same or more than I learned in my 4 years of graduate school

K – How is it different ?

G – all that cognitive thing, top-down, bottom-up theories I never had before except in reading, this is all new to me as far as learning is concerned...

K – how did you learn English ? I was wondering about that, I mean, you have such a nativelike accent, have you ever lived abroad?

G – Even though some of my classmates learned English at that time while they were in the graduate program, I started studying when I was nine in P.A. in Languages do Brasil and in that time we learned in chunks, you know, but, most of the learning I did was on my own, believe it or not, I never set foot in an English speaking country and yet, here I am, an English teacher.

K- How come?

G – my accent, you mean? I don't know, I guess by listening to songs and films in English.

K – so you didn't really learn much English with the communicative approach and I feel that in spite of that you have a lot of this theory ingrained in you, for instance , when you talk about a natural or authentic environment and maybe that's because when you teach you use the knowledge from graduate program instead of your experience as a learner

G – well , actually I started teaching and my graduate program at the same time and so they two developed at the same time , plus I took a teaching training course with Magaly at that time and she was the first one to train me on that and that was my first input on the communicative approach, actually

K – do you see yourself repeating or refuting things you liked as a learner now as a teacher ?

G – well, I had so little English classes in my life that I can't say that that much is true, but I like to say that I do to my sts what no other teacher had ever done to me and that I would have liked them to do and I can even give you a very important example, when we were in class and the teacher sb asked a question and the teacher would immediately answer the question without giving a chance to other sts first and maybe, you know, maybe I knew the answer because I had studied or whatever, but I never had a chance to answer it and so this is sth that I try to do with my sts, I mean, I always try to elicit from them first, before I actually answer the question, so I try to give them the opportunity I never had... But this was not really taken from my English learning experience but from my whole school experience

K – it's interesting to see how some teachers refer to their experience by either imitating or refuting it...

G – I wish I had a better understanding of how the teacher felt by then because when I was at school I didn't really care about that and maybe that's why I can't really recall what was the method they used or whatever, I didn't pay attention to those things back then...

K – Not consciously, at least, I mean, that was not the aim , anyway.

G – I had some good teachers but I can't really consciously say what they did, the only conscious part, if any, is, like you said, the opposite, I mean, trying to give them experiences that I didn't have, the negative, not the positive... learning a language is difficult enough, without having to deal with moods and all.... it's a highly cognitive process and in order to do that, people have to isolate emotions... just concentrate in the message, I mean, what I mean is

K- but don't you think that if they don't understand they're gonna feel frustrated and maybe because of that, I mean, maybe they don't wanna learn anymore...

G - sure, I see what you mean but... and again, some will learn faster than the others, we can't really predict, as teachers, what will happen, all we can do is do our job, I mean, give

them a good model of input, now, what, what they're gonna do with this, I mean, if they feel frustrated or learn or else, I mean, that's their problem, what can we do?

K – let's go back a little bit about this thing you said about the class not being a natural or authentic environment, how would feel then , what would be the natural learning environment ?

G – well, huh, what I've been reading with a few exceptions, to be emerged, like to go to the country where the lge. is spoken would be the perfect , natural environment, in other words, if you go there, you'd have a bidirectional reaction, contact, I mean, when you speak and this would be the perfect environment, but you know, but there are some exceptions and I pretty much identify with the exceptions cause I never had any bidirectional contact

K – well , the opposite, actually, you always had lots of explicit teaching

G – well, I wasn't even thinking of having been taught formally, I would guess that 70 % maybe of what I learned was on my own, listening to a song or a movie, maybe, but this kind of experience I had is what I call unilateral, I didn't have any bidirectional contact and so , how come I learned ? So, it is true that the bidirectional thing is the perfect thing but it's not the only one, if you really want to you can learn on you own, it worked for me

K- You didn't have much interaction and still you learned

G – that's right, I never set foot in any English speaking country and now I'm an English teacher

K – you're an exception really, you're autonomous and highly cognitive for what I see, very responsible for you own learning and in this perspective, I mean, thinking that the class should strive to be as authentic and natural as possible, how would you feel about repetition or drilling, for example ?

G – repetition or drilling is as artificial as it can be, I would never go for that, actually, when you talked about that something else came to my mind, about never underestimating you sts, when you have 20 sts or more, it's really really difficult to give sts what they really need...

K – I brought this thing with repetition up because I know that you're pretty much into phonetics and I've always thought people would have to repeat sounds to get them right, repeating difficult words, you know, this kind of drilling.. Yes, there was one transcription, here you see, when you were repeating a dialogue with you sts...

G _ really, I can't recall that.. yeah, you see, that was right after they'd asked me to use the book and I don't know, it's been so long since I used a book in class I don't even know how to do it anymore and I guess I was trying to show them how boring it could get by repeating the dialogue in the book with them.... and after that they realized that it wouldn't work, I mean, I can't teach like that...I remember feeling very weird using the book and then I just gave up...

K- so you actually think you're Ss have to have fun to learn, I mean, are you saying you can't teach like that cause it's boring?

G – no, not really, I mean, learning is a cognitive activity, not an emotional one. As a matter of fact, now that you brought it up, I mean, I actually think that fun and humor can interfere with that, with the learning, I mean. It sets students off the track and sometimes it can even offend them or make them feel uneasy in class and that's not good, I mean, ideally, they should be concentrating in processing information in cognitive way.

K- so humor is bad?

G- well, not really, I mean, it depends on how it is used... but personal comments are not really helpful, I think...

K – what kind of humor would be OK to use in class, then?

G _ I don't know, jokes which were told by Americans, comedies or any form of authentic material which is not too personal or does not affect negatively the students in class.

K – yeah, but, when I looked at the transcripts from your class, I could not find much humor...

G – right, but then, you have to remember that this is a basic level class and Ss have a very bad level of English, I usually tell more jokes in advanced groups, you should come and see, but with this group, I don't know, I felt like they wouldn't get the punch line, they simply wouldn't be able to understand the humor...

K- well, not without speech modifications or translations, no, they wouldn't...

G – See? And then, I mean, it wouldn't be an authentic input model anymore, now, would it?

K- but then, I mean, if only that is authentic, what about ... look here, remember when you had them repeat things in class...

G – where? Oh, yeah, that...

K – since you like pronunciation very much, do you think it's OK to have them repeat difficult words ?

G _ yeah

K – but then it's not authentic...

G – I like repetition when sts are making a sentence and they pause a lot and then it would be OK to have them repeat the sentence in a more natural way, without pausing so much or speeding up a little bit

K – what if a sts constantly misspells a word, would you have him repeat ?

G – no, I wouldn't even correct them , this kind of fossilized thing, working with fossilized mistakes is difficult

K – how about invented sentences, I mean, how would you feel, for instance, about using an invented sentence to convey a particular meaning of the present perfect you're teaching them ? Sth to call their attention to the form ?

G _ I don't really have a problem with that, sometimes I try to do this with a st, Paulo, who hardly ever comes to class and when he does, to play with him I tell him , the group, actually, have you done your homework yet, Paulo ? And everyone knows that sentence, I used it a lot when I was teaching the present perfect and they seemed to have memorized it for they use it even when Paulo is not in class, sts identify with it and this helps them to understand...

K – and what about jokes and parodies, how do you feel about that, because you don't use them very much in your classes, see ?

G – well, specially because it's been so long since I taught English 2, you know , I've always taught advanced levels, it's been quite some time since I taught a beginners or intermediate level and , although we sometimes wander away or diverge with jokes, I mean, that's OK but it's a shame that not all of them follow

K – so maybe you think that if they were more proficient you'd have more jokes in class ?

G – I don't know if this have to do with formal teaching or SLA theory , it's just personal, I mean, it's an idysioncratic characteristic... the value of the joke is, well, it's natural, you know, it happens in real life all the time and if my sts watch a TV show or go abroad they'd probably come up lots of jokes, and I never really thought about it but now that I think about it I guess it would be really nice to use more jokes in class cause it's really natural, you know

K – what about parodies, making fun of somebody in class or, I mean, I don't see you doing that, I can't recall you teasing, insulting or playing with your sts that way, I mean, you're very politically correct and reserved when it comes to personal life, I don't see you touching that in class...

G – You're right, I think it's nice to have this open and friendly contact and I hope that my sts feel that they can make this kind of joke but I don't do it very often with the whole group but individually, like before or after the class, so that I don't expose them

K – I remember one of the classes when you're mobile rang and they tried to joke with you saying that it was maybe your fiance checking on you, I guess you'd just come back from a trip to Oktoberfest and they really try to get “cute” with you there but you didn't really open to their request

G – well, it's good to have this kind of joke, specially because as a teacher you have this opportunity to talk a lot, which normally I don't, but I don't really like to talk about my personal life with my sts, I'm actually very picky about whom I talk to about my personal life.

K – I'm the opposite, I realized this with my action research and I was completely shocked to see how open I am about my personal life, or anyone's, for that matter, to the point of being very indiscreet and you, you are always very discreet..and I came to the conclusion that we are as teachers what we are as people first

G – that's right, our personalities do affect our teaching...but then, my best classes I taught in my worst days when I was really feeling sad...

K – how come ?

G – I don't know, I've always heard people saying that you can't take your personal problems to work, in business and all, and although I don't care much about what businessmen say , that happens with me, even when I'm very sad, it's not about me, it's about them, and sometimes it's the only time when I don't think about my personal problem but theirs, you know...

K – yeah, but even if you can do that, I still think that a lot of your personality is in there, don't you think ? Like, you're so professional....

G – Right, I don't think I would give my personal problems any chance...

K – What about story telling ? Do you tell your sts a lot of stories ?

G – Yes, I think they really like listening to stories but I don't really do any of those pre-reading activities, it's just something extra, you know ?

K – You're talking about the stories in their books ?

G – no, I mean, any story, even a funny email, I would bring it to class and read it to them...

K – what about your stories ? Your personal stories, like today's class is about getting married and you're getting married next year, so do you talk to them about your situation ?

G – probably not, I would use tons of resources from movies or other but not my stories, it's not conscious, I just wouldn't do it

K – how funny, I mean, we're totally opposites, I think of so many examples to give them and when I do, it's my story again I see myself repeating...

G – I might even make up a story which is not true, like this once I told them this story when I was in this hotel in San Francisco with a couple of friends and we went partying and I got really drunk and when we got back to our room my friends helped to my bed and then , in the middle of the night it was too hot so I took off my clothes and then I went to the bathroom but I didn't realize that the hotel room door clicked behind me and then I was in this really embarrassing situation, outside my room, completely naked and then there was

this Sunday news and luckily there were telephones in the halls so I could call reception and explain what had happened and they asked me if I had any idea and I told them no, I didn't have any pockets either and this hispanic man came down the hall and ... and I tell them as this was all true and they look at me and then I tell them it's all made up.

K – and is this all planned ?

G – no, actually , this is a story I memorized from Dave Matthew's band and he told this story and I could tell the same story again and again with the same words even, I memorized it when I was learning English

K – you see how sometimes this kind of bizarre stories sometimes helps to memorize, you never forgot this story.

G- yes, I did this as a student and as a teenager all the time and I tell my sts that if they want to study for my “ test “ then they should listen to a song or film and try to do the same

K – so , because you are a very autonomous learner you think it would work the same for you sts, that is, they would actually have to select the kind of language they want to focus on, you can't really teach them to memorize or repeat, is that it

Maybe you believe in repetition to learn but you just don't believe in teaching it ?

G- maybe

K – what is your general idea of this kind of language, that is, story telling, parodies, jokes and this kind of language after our talk ?

G – now I get where you're getting at and well, after what we talked about, I don't blame you for telling them so many stories and jokes and making fun of them because maybe you're right, I feel glad for your sts for they're getting a natural experience and now I realize that there are more ways of doing it in class, I just don't know whether I could do it because I'm more reserved , but I try to give them natural lge. in other ways, for instance, I don't slow down or modify my speech even when they asked me because I know that when they travel this is the kind of lge. that they will be exposed to and I want them to be ready for it, so , in my own way I try to be natural and as authentic as possible.

Appendix IV B

Interview with T2

Dec. 3rd – 2003

K – So, did you have a chance to look at the transcriptions ?

J – yes, I think it's very funny, can I keep this one ?

K – yeah, this is for you.

J – I'd really like to have it, it's so strange to look at it, I had no idea of doing this, I mean, for instance, here when I talk to myself, I guess I do it all the time, though I'm not aware of it, I, I have a problem with silence, I don't know how to deal with it, specially in the classroom , I feel like everyone's looking at me, waiting for me to do something, say something... I get really uncomfortable...and I was observing Meggies class and I noticed how cool she is, she'd never talk to herself, even when everyone's looking at here, waiting for her to do sth or say sth, that's why I speak all the time, I think I speak too much... I think my TTT is too long and this is sth that I wanted to work in my action research... When I was taking this teacher training course this is sth that they pointed out, you know,that maybe I could try to reduce my TTT

K – I don't feel this way, I think your group is very large so there's no way you can have them all talk and you're always putting them in pairs to talk, besides you're always asking referential questions, I guess you're not even aware of that but you're very authentic, you really listen to your sts and welcome their participation and weave their participation with your class and..

J – yeah, I always personalize everything, I think books are too cold, I don't even like this new interchange and so I try to teach my way, you know, using my sts' experience and mine....

K – are the games and activities you do in class suggested by the book ?

J – well, some of them I take from teachers' book, grammar books, teacher training programs, not from the teachers' manual and certainly not from the book

K – this brings me to my next questions, how much of this is planned, I mean, obviously some of the activities and games are planned for I see you bring a lot of stuff from home and you really prepare your classes...

J – I always have my classes very well planned and I always try to include something ludic either in the beginning as a warm up or later with a funny wrap up so that they always have this fun element in class

K – why do you do that ?

J – because that's the way I like learning and for me learning is having fun, maybe because I've always liked learning English and I had great teachers, and we always had this naturalistic setting bringing elements from the outside and my relationship with people is based on fun, I always focus on the positive side, I try to have fun and when I plan my class I think, how would my sts have fun with this, you know ? Many people criticize me for this

because they say, you know, that English teachers don't have to be clowns but I don't think so, I think it's just my personality trait and I don't think it's because I taught at private language institutes where we were trained to be fun because I also studied letras which was very serious and , I mean, I guess this is more of my personality than my background as a student or teacher. It's always been my style as a person no matter where I was, like in England it was all very serious, there was no place for fun and then, also, I attended this talk at Laurels and the guy was very funny and I just loved it, but, you know, that's just me, I'm like that. And about the games, most of them I create myself but the rest of the class, I mean, the jokes and stuff are spontaneous, I mean, I don't plan that, no, it just sorts of happens

K – and I think it's really nice how you welcome this kind of thing in your class when it comes from your sts

J – yeah, you can plan games but you can't plan to be friendly or funny, that's just your personality, and another thing I thought is by looking at the transcripts of my classes is that I usually remember things that are funny, for instance, that thing that happened with Mainá, it was so funny and when I read I remembered it, I wouldn't remember the rest because it wasn't funny and I think it's the same with them, I think they remember what is meaningful to them so I try to bring natural, meaningful things to class, that's why I always ask Mainá about the Dutch guys, for example, instead of maybe just using a fiction example from the book

K – good, and why do you try to make this environment more naturalistic ?

J – I don't think you have to make it more naturalistic, I think it is, everytime you talk about a person's life you're talking about real things, English is being used to talk about real, natural things, not a planned discourse as the exercises from the book, I wouldn't say they're naturalistic cause they're just applying a rule and I think they see it as something or a burden, they don't like it, what they really like about the classes is when we use English to talk about real things

K – some people say that if you adopt the communicative approach then the lge. used in class should try to be as authentic as possible, that is, imitating the kind of lge, they'd hear outside the class and

J – no, that's not what I mean, I mean natural and authentic is something that has to do with them, it's personalizing things, talking about personal matters, people have so much to teach us, there are so many real stories to illustrate what we need in class, we just have to listen to them

K – and how do you feel if you're a bit behind schedule and a st is trying to tell this interesting story

J – I don't mind, later on I'll just skip an exercise in the book, I really don't mind because I think that this is what makes the class really interesting, active participation with meaningful lge.

K – what about drills, repetition and...

J – I think there's a moment for that in the class, like when we're practising pronunciation and I think this control practice of grammar is important as well but what I'm against is having to automatically apply sth that they've just learned, I think it doesn't work like that, I think they can't be forced to talk , they'll do it when they have sth to say and are ready to say it

K – what about pronunciation then, repeating is not naturalistic

J- I'm not saying that the class has to be 100% naturalistic but we should try to include more naturalistic moments or at least, welcome them when they happen since we can't really plan this, you know

K – what about jokes

J- I like jokes, I'm not a good teller, at least the official jokes, I'm funny and I guess that could be criticized, like when Mailce said that there are moments in learning that require a lot of cognitive effort and sometimes by being so funny I'm not giving them enough time to concentrate and make this effort

K – you know what I think, cause I had the same problem you had and I realized it in my action research, I think I tell jokes to make it more meaningful to them and so they will remember it and perhaps, then, learn, I think it helps instead of “desconcentrar”, I may implicitly help them concentrate because they remember it

J – yeah, cause it's so much easier to remember sth when it's related to a story or to you or when it's bizarre and meaningful and also we make them relax

K – we seem to have the same dilemma, I mean, we can't seem to help being funny and yet, we wonder whether we're doing this to help sts or because we're like that and that's all

J – I guess I could even try to be serious but it wouldn't work cause I'm not really like that, and I love it when my sts tell their stories and jokes and well,, that's me

K- if you had to summarize your action in class, how would you define it ?

J – I think it's a reflex of my personality because even if the theory says, for instance that we need to be serious and give time to concentration, I seem to do what I am as a person, I am funny and I don't plan to do it, actually, I tried to stop being funny but it didn't work so...

K – Do you recall any positive experience as learner ?

J- There was this really nice teacher who actually listened to us, she'd always asked me about my stuff, even though she had like 300 sts or so...

K – do you think you became what you are because of this experience ?

J – maybe, I try to copy the teachers from whom I learned more I guess

K – Do you think you could learn sth without fun ?

J – NO, I don't think so, maybe you can learn sth that you don't like if you like the teacher, but you can't learn sth that you don't like if you don't like the teacher too, I think that's how people are in general and that has to do, not with being or not a good teacher but with this chemical relation that people have and ... I feel more connected with some sts than with others and I think they feel the same way, people relate or identify more with some than with others...

K – empathy, you mean ?

J – yeah, that's it, empathy is what helps people learn

K – yes, that's very important and that could explain why you're so nice and open, and friendly with your sts...

J – yeah empathy is the key to them and I use ludic language to empathize and maybe that's why I personalize everything, to identify with my sts.... oh, this is like therapy for me... but then again, it's just my personality again, I don't think that being aware of that would help if I weren't funny and open, you know... Sometimes I feel a little down and I think, oh, no, this is not how they know me so I have to try to be fun and but you see, it doesn't really matter cause when I start to teach I forget about it anyway and have fun... Do you think we're victims of the communicative approach ?

K – for me I don't think so, I think it's more my style, it's just me...

J – yes, people are very different and I don't think they could be standardized by theory or principle or whatever...

K – yeah, you can become aware but that doesn't mean you can change what you are... I don't see you doing that consciously, I mean, being funny, just to please your sts and be accepted, I think it's just you...

Appendix V

Summary of Reflection meetings with T2

March 23rd

I showed Jane transcripts, we talked about categories of LL, she didn't like the term emic/etic joke but Gloria told me to change it so I'm still unsure. The other ones we agreed with, including Performance, Word Play, Anecdote.

She said she feels a little guilty looking at them, she thinks she uses too much TTT and sometimes she's too funny, maybe that doesn't help Ss. I told her I felt exactly the opposite.

April 15th

We had lunch, talked about teaching, I showed her my pilot and the paper I wrote for Gloria's class, my action research, she laughed a lot and said she identified a lot with me for she's also very personal and funny in class. We talked about teaching in CLT and in private language institutes where we have to entertain Ss all the time.

May 4th

We had chimarrão and I showed her my final version of the categorization for the LL types. I was very excited about the Appropriation (after reading Vygotsky again!), in the beginning she did not really get it, but when I talked about Vygotsky and his idea of appropriating concepts and the mediation... she completely agreed and said it was brilliant! I'm very happy with the Appropriation and she admitted this is what she does all the time in class!

