

**“She didn’t know much about English teaching”:
planning classes together in the teachers’ room as a practice of
professional development**

“Ela não sabia muito sobre ensino de inglês”: preparação conjunta de aulas na sala dos professores como uma prática de formação de professores

William Kirsch*
Simone Sarmento**

ABSTRACT: This paper is a part of a larger research project, which focused on investigating the teacher development practices in a Languages without Borders community of a large university in the south of Brazil. The research is affiliated with the paradigm of Practice Theory (Young, 2009; Young, 2010) and relied on qualitative methods of data generation and analysis (Erickson, 1990; Gumperz, 2005; Mason, 2002; Tannen, 2014), as well as on semistructured interviews with focal participants. The data revealed that the practices that culminate in teacher development could be divided into two: (1) formal practices, that is, the ones consciously planned and carried out by the coordinator; and (2) informal ones, that is, practices that emerged from everyday life in this community of practice, chiefly in the teachers’ room. In this paper, we focus on a specific informal practice – that of planning classes together. Planning classes together was considered a productive practice in terms of professional learning both in the interviews and in the data obtained through participant observation.

KEYWORDS: Languages without Borders, Teacher Development, Co-teaching

RESUMO: Este trabalho é parte de um projeto de pesquisa maior, que teve como foco investigar as práticas de formação de professores em uma comunidade do Idiomas sem Fronteiras de uma grande universidade no sul do Brasil. A pesquisa é afiliada ao paradigma da Teoria da Prática (Young, 2009; Young, 2010) e contou com métodos qualitativos para a geração e análise de dados (Erickson, 1990; Gumperz, 2005; Mason, 2002; Tannen, 2014), bem como com entrevistas semiestruturadas com participantes focais. Os dados revelaram que as práticas que culminam no desenvolvimento docente poderiam ser divididas em duas: (1) práticas formais, ou seja, aquelas conscientemente planejadas e realizadas pelo coordenador; e (2) informais, isto é, práticas que emergiram da vida cotidiana nessa comunidade de prática, principalmente na sala dos professores. Neste artigo, nos concentramos em uma prática informal específica - a de planejar aulas juntos. O planejamento das aulas em conjunto foi considerado uma prática produtiva em termos de aprendizagem profissional tanto nas entrevistas quanto nos dados obtidos através da observação participante.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Idiomas sem Fronteiras, Formação de Professores, Docência compartilhada

*Professor adjunto de língua inglesa do departamento de Educação e Humanidades da Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre.

**Professora associada de língua inglesa do Instituto de Letras da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul e respectivo programa de pós-graduação.

1 Introdução

We welcome this issue of *Olhares&Trilhas*, dedicated to the Brazilian internationalization and teacher development program Language without Borders¹ (LwB). It is particularly relevant for us as we have both been involved with the program since its beginning – one of us as policy maker; both of us as LwB coordinators at our institutions and as researchers.

As we have written before (e.g. Kirsch & Sarmento, 2017; Sarmento & Kirsch, 2015), LwB was conceived to be an accessory to a bigger internationalization effort, the Science without Borders² (SwB). In 2012, at the beginning of SwB, few students applied for scholarships in English-speaking countries when compared to applications to Portugal. Simply put, Brazilian college and grad students lacked the language proficiency level necessary to achieve the required scores in the English tests mandatory to apply for a SwB grant.

In 2013, LwB started its activities. The goals of the program were three-pronged: (1) proctor English Language Proficiency tests for university students, especially the ETS TOEFL ITP; (2) provide online English courses for Brazilian higher-education students; (3) provide face-to-face English classes for students of federal universities on campus. At first, 43 federal universities submitted applications to open a TOEFL ITP and English Language Center (LC)³ and 20 others to become TOEFL ITP examination centers. The institutions created courses to be taught by English as an Additional Language (EAL) undergraduate and graduate students, who earned – still do – a monthly grant that equals that of an MA student’s. Furthermore, the LCs have general and pedagogical coordinators (professors with background in Applied Linguistics or English as an Additional Language), and from two to four Fulbright English Teaching Assistants (ETAs)⁴.

¹ Idiomas sem Fronteiras.

² Ciências sem Fronteiras. It was an effort to promote the consolidation, expansion and internationalization of science, technology, innovation and competitiveness in Brazil through exchange and international mobility. Between 2011 and 2015, SwB provided around 93,000 grants for exchange in about 30 countries, with students from undergrad to doctoral levels. It has been thoroughly described in (Sarmento, Thiago, & Andreotti, 2016).

³ Núcleo de Língua Inglesa (NucLi).

⁴ The program English Teaching Assistants (ETA) is a CAPES/FULBRIGHT initiative which recruits English teaching assistants (among US citizens) to work at Brazilian institutes of higher education. Their

In this sense, LwB was born to enhance proficiency in additional languages at our universities. However, research on the program (Sarmento & Kirsch, 2015; Augusto-Navarro & Gattolin, 2014; Augusto-Navarro, 2015; Pinheiro e Finardi, 2014; Nicolaides, 2014; Lamberts, 2015; Vial, 2017; Kirsch, 2017; among others) revealed that the activities carried out within the program had impacts concerning the professional development of EAL. In other words, the LCs were locally helping develop English teachers as, let us say, a backwash effect of the program.

This paper is a part of a larger research project, which focused on investigating the teacher development practices in the LC of a large university in the south of Brazil⁵. The research is affiliated with the paradigm of Practice Theory (Young, 2009; Young, 2010) and relied on qualitative methods of data generation and analysis (Erickson, 1990; Gumperz, 2005; Mason, 2002; Tannen, 2014), as well as on semistructured interviews with focal participants. In short, the data revealed that the practices⁶ that culminate in teacher development could be divided into two: (1) formal practices, that is, the ones consciously planned and carried out by the coordinator; and (2) informal ones, that is, practices that emerged from everyday life in this community of practice⁷, chiefly in the teachers’ room⁸. The formal practices happened mainly during the teachers’ meeting (microteaching, workshop with peers and lectures with specialists from outside the community), while the informal practices were mostly witnessed in the teachers’ room (planning classes together, requesting help, telling a classroom story, or sharing an artefact produced in/for class⁹).

In this paper, we focus on a specific practice that occurred in the teachers’ room – that of planning classes together. Many participants referred to this practice in the

aim is to enhance English language in those institutions in a number of different actions at the university (workshops, lectures, etc.), especially in the Modern Language departments.

⁵ The institution’s name will not be revealed here in order to preserve participants’ confidentiality. In addition, all proper names have been shifted, and dates have been omitted.

⁶ The concept of practice will also be discussed down the road.

⁷ The idea of communities of practice being places of learning comes from the work of Lave and Wenger (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). CoPs are defined as “groups of people who share a concern or passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger, n.d.). The three key elements of that definition are: (1) a shared domain of interest; (2) a defined community; (3) a shared repertory of practices and styles. Henceforth we will use the term community to refer to this the group of participants in the LC as a community of practice. At any rate, the concept will be better developed down the road in the article.

⁸ Where student teachers prepared classes, graded papers or just hung out together.

⁹ Lesson plans, pedagogical materials, etc.

interviews as productive in terms of professional learning¹⁰; also, this practice was pervasive in the data obtained through participant observation. As we understand, this paper has as its acumen describing what is probably the main locus for teacher development in the program – teacher to teacher and teacher to ETA informal interactions in the teachers’ room. Paradoxically, development arising from informal peer interaction has also been the least investigated so far in the LwB; in fact, it has been the least researched area of teacher development, as it involves extenuating field work.

2 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Teacher development

In the past two decades, the debate on education has paid strong attention to teachers – their career and, especially, their initial and continued development (Nóvoa, 1995, 2009; OCDE, 2006; Villegas-reimers, 2003), after the debate on the improvement of education had spent decades revolving around other issues, such as school management and teaching methodologies (Nóvoa, 2009). As the title of a popular OCDE (2006) report indicates, “teachers matter”.

This emphasis on teacher development has been welcomed by teacher educators, as it represents a much needed “appreciation of teachers’ work and promotes the concept of teaching as a *profession*” (Villegas-reimers, 2003, p. 7, emphasis in original). In this sense, professional development is a “lifelong process which begins with the initial preparation that teachers receive (whether at an institute of teacher education or actually on the job) and continues until retirement” (p. 8, emphasis in original). Thus, teachers are in development throughout their career.

Professional development includes formal experiences – such as attending workshops and professional meetings, mentoring, etc. – and informal ones – such as reading professional publications, watching television documentaries related to an academic discipline, etc. Examining professional development, thus, requires looking into the experiences and processes by which it occurs, as well as the contexts in which it takes place (Gasner, 2000).

¹⁰ The article is based on chapters 2 and 4 of the aforementioned doctoral dissertation.

Avalos (2011) defines teacher development in following terms:

a complex process, which requires cognitive and emotional involvement of teachers individually and collectively, the capacity and willingness to examine where each one stands in terms of convictions and beliefs and the perusal and enactment of appropriate alternatives for improvement or change. All this occurs in particular educational policy environments or school cultures, some of which are more appropriate and conducive to learning than others (p. 10).

Therefore, professional development is here understood as any formal and informal experiences teachers may have both before or after having got a certification or license of any kind. This would include but not be subsumed to attending classes, lectures, workshops and seminars; and teaching, talking to peers about their classes, preparing classes together and sharing artifacts (such as pedagogical materials, class plans, etc.). In short, the expression teacher development caters for both teacher education (usually grounded in a more formal and technical rationale) and teacher training (often referring to the more practical domains of the profession).

In this light, two studies help illustrate our take on teacher development. Merrill (2016) investigated the additional language teacher assistants (TAs) of a large public university in the U.S. Midwest, focusing on elucidating what aspects help communities of practice form and thrive. In this mix-methods study, the author conducted a survey with massive participation from the Additional Language TAs and interviewed focal participants. She found that the possibility to interact in both public and private spaces is one of the key elements that helps TAs form communities. Besides, she found that engagement in communities played a key role in the professional development of her participants, for participants do engage in a range of formal and informal interactions that help them develop professionally as teachers, such as department events, planning classes and writing evaluations together.

In the field of professional development of teachers of Portuguese as an Additional Language, Costa (2013) researched the teacher professional development practices in a CoP. Revisiting the work of the Portuguese educator António Novoa (1995), social scientist Donald Schön (1987) and literacy theorists (Heath, 1982; Heath & Street, 2008), Costa proposes the concepts of “teacher

development event” and “teacher development practice”¹¹. According to the author, these concepts are analytical tools to investigate teacher professional development from an ethnographic perspective in that they help the analyst attend to participants’ actions from an emic perspective. Costa’s scenario is a Brazilian Center in a Latin American country, where teachers with a wide variety of academic backgrounds teach Portuguese. His ethnography focused on describing and analyzing the interactional events in which participants are aligned to professional development activities; he calls these joint activities teacher development events and uses this concept as his main analytical unit to understand how teachers learn to be teachers by interacting with one another. He understands “teacher development event” as a speech activity that unfolds based on alternance of: (1) participants, and/or (2) objects, topics or themes of the interaction. Thus, the topic or theme has a central role to understanding this analytical unit. Moreover, since speech events have relatively stable routines of opening and closing, they are a promising category for the description and analysis of social action. In short, the author develops an understanding of teacher development event as a type of event whose goal is professional teaching and learning or the resolution of a pedagogical problem made relevant by the participants – such as ways to explain a grammar rule, organize a pedagogical task or design an evaluation instrument, and can be based on the sharing of material, stories and experiences (p. 76). According to the author, teacher development events are grouped around actions co-constructed by the participants, such as: presenting models and teaching strategies; reporting classroom experiences; answering questions about topics related to classroom; or offering help when someone asks for it (p. 80).

With the work of such authors in mind, we have put together the intellectual puzzle of this research. Merrill (2016) talks about types of interactions that happen in the communities and are relevant for teacher development, while Costa (2013) talks about recurrent interactional events that help shape teachers’ development in the community.

¹¹ In Portuguese, respectively *evento de formação de professores* e *prática de formação de professores*. Here I will stick to Villegas-reimers (2003) idea that professional development is a more thorough concept than teacher education (usually related to initial education) and more respectful than ‘teacher training’. For this reason, in alignment to Merrill (2016) we will stick to the terms professional development of teachers or teacher development as the best translation for *formação de professores*.

Bearing the work of these two authors in mind, we tried to develop what we have termed a practice-oriented approach to teacher development.

2.2 Using practice theory as a lens to investigate teacher development

In Theodore Schatzi’s introduction to the volume “The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory” (Schatzi, 2001), he states that

thinkers once spoke of ‘structures,’ ‘systems,’ ‘meaning,’ ‘life world,’ ‘events,’ and ‘actions’ when naming the primary generic social thing. Today, many theorists would accord ‘practices’ a comparable honor. Varied references to practices await the contemporary academician in diverse disciplines, from philosophy, cultural theory, and history to sociology, anthropology, and science and technology studies (Schatzi, 2001, p. 10).

The prestige of the concept of practice in the social sciences can be easily proven with a simple search on Google Scholar using the key words “social practice”, which yields over a half million entries in all fields of social sciences. This popularity of the concept at the same time reveals its power and creates us researchers a problem: how do we work with such a broad and plastic concept.

We align with Young’s (2009; 2010) take on PT, as a reference to the use of the term discursive practice in the field of Second Language Acquisition. According to the author, PT is a reference to the use of “the terms practice, practices, or praxis [which] denote a concept developed during the 1970s to refer to human actions that are both the medium through which social structure is enacted as well as the outcome of that structure” (Young, 2015, p.3), originated from the work of intellectuals of diverse walks of life, such as Anthropology, Social Sciences, Philosophy, Literacy Studies and Applied Linguistics (Malinowski, 1923; Wittgenstein, 1963; Bourdieu, 1977a, 1977b and 1991; Foucault, 1979; Goffman, 1974, 1981; Hymes, 1962; Certeau, 1990; Ortner, 1984; Wenger, 1998; among others).

In the first chapter of a volume entirely dedicated to elucidating the foundations of PT and its uses in research in the fields of Applied Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition, Young (2009) defines what he means by practice:

In the sense that I use the word, practice is the construction and reflection of social realities through actions that invoke identity, ideology, belief, and power. How does practice in this sense differ from DeKeyser’s definition? First, “practice” as used in this book is not a term of art in L2 studies and it can be applied to all human

activities. Second, although practice is goal-oriented, the goal of people who participate in practice is not necessarily L2 learning; in fact, participants’ orientation to some goal in a practice may not be deliberate at all, often because the goal is not available to their conscious introspection. Third, yes, the term “practice” as used in this book involves repetition, but what participants do in a practice is not necessarily to repeat their own performance; instead, a person may perform a practice for the first time in their life but, through direct or indirect observation, the person has knowledge of the history of a practice in their community, and it is that history that is extended in practice (p.1).

The author uses the term practice fundamentally as performance in context. In the author’s work, context is understood as the “network of physical, spatial, temporal, social, interactional, institutional, political, and historical circumstances in which participants do a practice” (p.3). Therefore, it involves attention to (1) a focal event; and (2) a field of action within which that event is embedded” (Goodwin & Duranti, 1992, p. 3).

Studying practices, then, involve paying attention not only to the “production of meanings by participants as they employ in local actions the verbal, nonverbal, and interactional resources that they command” (Young, 2009, p.2) but also to how employment of such resources reflects and creates the processes and meanings of the community in which the local action occurs. In other words, studying practices involves paying attention to interactions that happen as interactional events on a local level (people doing things with one another at given time-place) as well as considering that the recurrence of such events creates historical products in a given community (e.g. workshops, lectures, seminars, brown-bags, roundtables are well known examples in academia). As usual, resorting to an example may be enlightening.

If we ask any somewhat seasoned English teacher around the globe what microteaching is, she or he would most likely be able to summarize that is a make-believe class usually presented to a group of peers (and often a teacher trainer) in order to show command of some teaching method/strategy or simply to get feedback. In the data used for this research, student teachers often talk about microteaching in the data (both in interviews and in participant observation), as it is something that they do in the community. In addition to that, participants perform microteaching in twelve times in three different meetings for the sake of socializing class plans and getting feedback. Therefore, there are two levels of observation of such practice: (1) as performance in

context, here-and-now, as jointly constructed by participants in interactional events; and (2) at a more abstract level, as something they recognize as a more or less cristallized way of doing things together in their community; so much so that they can refer to it by name and explain its menadres in the interviews. In this way, participants both perform microteaching in the community and are able to name and explain it as something in itself. This understanding can be approximated to the concepts of utterance (performance in context) and speech genre (abstract historical products formed by the repetition of such utterances) developed by Bakhtin (1981). It can also be compared to Levinson’s (1992) activity types.

Thus, we conceive of practice as a historical, mediational, schematic and generic device for social action which is (re)constructed through and realized in social action. Practices are essential for human socialization, for they operate as a straddle between the individual actor and the overall social and historical structure in which (s)he is inserted.

3 Methodology

The university that we researched is one of the largest and most well-ranked in Brazil. At this university, the LwB is located at the Institute of Languages– together with the Department of Foreign Languages. The members of the community are:

- 3 Professors from the English Department (Ph.D.)
- 3 Fulbright ETAs (recently graduated from US universities)
- 15 undergraduate student teachers (sophomore to senior year)
- 1 graduate student teacher
- 1 master researcher who is herself a former student teacher
- 2 former undergraduate student teachers

The researcher went to the field on an average of three times a week, for a three-month period, during four-hourish shifts, attending all pedagogical meetings, lectures and workshops. In addition to that, the researcher spent dozens of hours at the student teachers’ room.

During the observations, the researcher generated field notes, took photographs, collected artifacts and produced audio recordings (Erickson, 1990; Mason, 2002). All

data was organized in a database on MaxQda 12¹². After that, six focal participants were interviewed. Finally, all the audio files were transcribed orthographically and engaged on initial and focused coding (Saldaña, 2009). The research questions that guided this investigation can be seen below.

What practices contribute to the student teachers’ professional development?

- Where do they happen?
- When do they happen?
- Who are the participants?
- What activities (structured routines and pathways that facilitate or regulate actions; rules of appropriacy and eligibility – whodoes/doesn’t, can/can’t engage in particular activities) are integral to these practices¹³?

After reading the data multiple times, a total of 497 of these segments were identified. Patterns encountered suggest there are constellations of events that seemed the same practices. That is, from empirical observation of interactional segments and from attending closely to their recurring features, it was possible to elucidate the practices (collection of events with recurrent themes and compositional features) which are at the same time structured and structuring to these events¹⁴.

4 Results

One of the themes that participants brought up in the interviews was of co-teaching, that is, two student teachers (or a student teacher and an ETA) teaching the same class at the same time. In informal conversations with the coordinators, more about the history of co-teaching in the community could be learned. Originally, this was a practice adopted by the coordination to deal with the shortage of classrooms as physical space is a hindrance at this university. Subsequently, the coordination realized co-teaching was interesting in terms of teacher development, and decided to capitalize this by pairing more experienced student teachers with less experienced ones. Since this seemed to be working, coordinators decided to pair the ETAs – as not all of them had

¹²<https://www.maxqda.com>

¹³ Adapted from Hamilton (1998).

¹⁴In Kirsch (2017) we discuss all the collection of practice identified in the community.

teaching academic experience or academic background – with student teachers to facilitate their socialization into the community and into teaching.

As time passed, the practice of co-teaching with ETAs continued healthy and strong. Student teachers and ETAs were required to co-teach a few times. In order to co-teach, they planned classes together. Thus, preparing classes together with ETAs was an epiphenomenon of co-teaching. In other words, their requirement to co-teach produced these joint moments of lesson planning which seemed to be quite interesting from a professional development view point – both for student teachers and for ETAs. The table below summarizes the events in which participants are oriented to joint lesson planning:

Table 1– Preparing classes together in the teachers’ room

Event	When	Where	Who
1. Mariana and Marilyn (ETA) discuss the class they will teach	Teachers’ room observation, eleventh week, day 3	Teachers’ room	Mariana and Marilyn
2. Adam and Pedro (ETA) prepare a conversation class revolving around cinema	Teachers’ room observation, twelfth week, day 2	Teachers’ room	Kelly, Josiana, Adam and Pedro
3. Adam and Pedro (ETA) prepare a conversation class using movies and music	Teachers’ room observation, twelfth week, day 3	Teachers’ room	Adam, Pedro and Grazi
4. Adriana and Marylyn (ETA) prepare a conversation class about euthanasia	Teachers’ room observation, thirteenth week, day 2	Teachers’ room	Adriana and Marylyn
5. Lucas and Heather (ETA) prepare a conversation class	Teachers’ room observation, Fourteenth week, day 2	Teachers’ room	Lucas and Heather
6. Adam and Pedro (ETA) prepare a conversation	Teachers’ room observation, Fourteenth week, day 3	Teachers’ room	Adam and Pedro

class Brazilian and American TV			
---------------------------------------	--	--	--

Source: Kirsch (2017)

The synoptic chart shows participants planning classes together in six events. In all these events, there was a student teacher and an ETA who would be co-teaching sometime soon; occasionally other participants joined the class preparation at some point, with a suggestion or something of the kind. In these events, participants spoke predominantly English. However, in Adam and Pedro’s class preparations they shift between English and Portuguese all the time. The fact that Pedro has been working hard to perfect his Portuguese may explain that.

We will present two prototypical events to give an idea of what this practice looks like. Lucas is in the teachers’ room, talking to Antonia and Grazi while sitting at the computer and looking something up. Heather walks and greets everyone. She sits next to him and they begin talking about the class in English¹⁵.

Excerpt 1: “I can talk about a camping trip”¹⁶

277 **Heather:** Hey

278 **Lucas:** Hi

279 **Will:** Hey

280 **Lucas:** I’ve got the book here. Two A. I couldn’t 281 think of any games. But I think this time we should 282 use the book first. Especially this text because we 283 only did games last time because they had already 284 seen the simple present before.

285 **Heather:** Yeah

286 **Lucas:** It was their last lesson. This will be their 287 first lesson on simple past. I mean, this is 288 supposed to be only a review, but I’m sure they 289 will have questions.

290 **Heather:** Okay

291 **Lucas:** So, I don’t know, I think we should do this 292 text ((shows her a page on American English File 293 1B)), and if we have any idea of games or whatever.

294 ((Heather looks down to the text))

295 **Lucas:** Do you wanna talk about it or

296 **Heather:** Can I read the whole text?

297 **Lucas:** Of course. ((Inaudible))

298 ((Inaudible for a few seconds, voices with a muffled 299 sound))

300 **Lucas:** We could even turn this last activity into a 301 game ((inaudible)) and play, we call it Snowball. 302 Like, you write all

¹⁵ Transcription conventions in appendix 1.

¹⁶ Corresponds to event 5 in the synoptic chart.

those questions and you crump 303 then in a ball. And students have to throw on each 304 other. Maybe we can play snowball
305 ((Heather laughs))
306**Lucas**: And when we stop the song, they grab the ball. 307 Then, get a piece of paper with the question. Then 308 they have to answer the question.
309**Heather**: Uhum
310**Lucas**: Or maybe they can read the questions and
311 choose somebody to answer it.
312**Heather**: Yeah
313**Lucas**: I think we have to do this first for them to 314 acquire vocabulary first.
315**Heather**: Yes, I think so.
316**Lucas**: It has pictures so we could show them.
317**Heather**: Yeah
318**Lucas**: So maybe we could talk about our vacations 319 using this vocabulary. They would have to pick up 320 the ones we've done. Like, I went swimming.
321**Heather**: Yeah
322**Lucas**: And then lake, blablabla, a couple of them 323 for them to guess.
324**Heather**: I can talk about a camping trip.
325**Lucas**: Yes
326**Heather**: Because I used to do that a lot. And we'd 327 go camping, we were out at night, we had bonfire
328**Lucas**: Perfect
329**Heather**: ((Inaudible))
330**Lucas**: I think they're more interested in knowing 331 about your vacation than mine.
332**Heather**: ((Laughter)) OK
333**Lucas**: I'm sure they are.
334**Heather**: Ok, so we can start with that.
335**Lucas**: Perfect. Do you think we should talk about 336 our vacations before we do this or after this?
337**Lucas**: I think we should do it after.
338**Heather**: Okay, or we could do it first.
339**Lucas**: Could do this first. Then we repeat the
340 story to compare it to the first story.
341**Heather**: Okay, I feel I can do the speaking.
342**Lucas**: Do you want some cookies?
343**Heather**: I'm OK, thank you.
344 ((Music on the background))
345**Heather**: We could play Catchphrase. That worked
346 really well.
347**Lucas**: Which one is Catchphrase?
348**Heather**: The one I played in the big circle.
349**Lucas**: OK
350**Heather**: They set for, they have this one-person 351 thing, and they have a minute to describe what they 352 want. It's just like two teams, so they all go at 353 the same time and there's a lot of talking. They 354 pull out like go abroad, and have to say they're 355 going abroad without saying going abroad. So
356 357 they're all talking.
358**Lucas**: Maybe we can try this ((inaudible)) with
359 pictures on google, and project them on the board. 360 And have them describe it.
361**Heather**: Yeah
362 ((A lot of noise in the background, mostly music))

363 ((Muffled conversation between Lucas and Grazi))
 364 **Heather:** Ok, so we'll be matching and then I'll
 365 tell them a story about camping.
 366 **Lucas:** Uhum
 367 ((The event continues for some more minutes until 368 they finish
 preparing class. Sensing they are done, 369 Kelly, who has just come
 in, invites Heather to 370 dinner))

In the first lines of the segment, Lucas and Heather greet (lines 277-9), and, right after that, get down to work (line 280). Lucas shows Heather the textbook they will use in class (line 280) and suggests they should start with the textbook (line 280-1), and explains that in the previous class that they did games to explore the simple present, something that had already been taught (lines 283-5). Then, Lucas explains this lesson will be a review, but that he thinks students will have questions (lines 286-9). It seems here that Lucas is taking the lead of this lesson planning session, since he is the one responsible for the group and the one who is expected to make the final calls regarding the decisions. Lucas indexes this position by modalizing his speech in an assertive way – “I think we should” (line 281 and line 290) and “I’m sure” (line 288). Up until this point, Heather only backchannels Lucas’ turns (lines 285 and 289).

Then, Lucas, off record (Brown and Levinson, 1987), invites Heather to participate in the construction of the class, requesting for ideas of games or other activities (lines 291-2). Before, answering to Lucas’ request, Heather looks down to the text with which Lucas wants to begin their class. With her prolonged silence, Lucas asks Heather if she wants to discuss the text (lines 294) and she asks if she can have a minute (line 295) to read the text first.

After a few seconds, Lucas suggests they could transform the last task into a game, named Snowball (lines 299-300) and explains how it is supposed to be played (lines 300-7). After that, Lucas suggests they use music in the game (lines 305-7) or that they choose students to answer the questions (lines 309-310). Subsequently, Lucas proposes working with vocabulary first (lines 312-3), maybe using pictures to do so (lines 315) or talking about vacation using the vocabulary (lines 317-9). In this moment, once again, Lucas takes on the leadership, suggesting tasks for the class, while Heather backchannels his turns (line 308, line 311, line 316, and line 320) or expresses agreement (line 314). However, Lucas modalizes his turn in a way that leaves room for

Heather to jump in – “we could” (line 299), “maybe we can” (line 302), “maybe they can” (line 309), “maybe we could” (line 317).

In line 323, there is a game changer as Heather steps in and offers a suggestion for the class – she offers to talk about a camping trip. Lucas expresses agreement (line 324), and tells her that he thinks students are more interested in her vacation than in his. Then, Heather suggests that they start with her story about a camping trip (line 333). In the next turn, Lucas agrees with Heather and asks if she thinks that they should start with the story or do it afterwards (line 334-6), and Heather says that she thinks that they should do the story first (line 337). After that, Heather says that she could do the speaking (line 340).

Then, Heather suggests that they play a game named Catchphrase with students (line 344-5). As Lucas does not know what the game is like (line 347), she explains how it works (lines 349-354). Next, Lucas proposes playing the game with pictures on the board (line 355-7). Heather sums up saying they could do matching pictures with verbs as a vocabulary task and then tell students the camping story (lines 361-2).

In this segment, there are indeed two people constructing a class together. Lucas is responsible for the group, so he begins by introducing his expectations regarding the class. However, Heather soon starts contributing with her own ideas, and Lucas seems to accept them – occasionally adding his own perspectives. There is, thus, a sense of partnership and shared responsibility regarding participants’ joint goal – teaching a class. We chose this segment because we understand that it has a script that other segments have, too. For instance, the student teachers start the segment leading and, soon, the ETA starts offering suggestions and taking some responsibility for the decisions of the class. Besides, there are two specific things that each participant learns from the other – two games, Snowball and Catchphrase.

Although the events grouped in this category, as mentioned earlier, are quite similar, they are not exactly the same. For instance, in the events where Adam and Pedro are preparing classes together, they conduct the conversation in a very similar way, but participants codeswitch all the time – they use Portuguese or English indiscriminately, or a combination of both:

Excerpt 2: “My Jackson 5 nostrils”

571 **Adam:** Here, glamour. Glamour ((speaking slowly and 572 really opening the lips in the vowel)). Here it's 573 glamour.
 574 **Pedro:** Grammar?
 575 **Adam:** No, it's glamour.
 576 **Pedro:** Glamour, glamour. ((speaking slowly and 577 really opening the lips in the vowel))
 578 **Adam:** Glamour
 579 ((Fran sings))
 580 **Adam:** Glam, glamour.
 581 ((Inaudible))
 582 ((Pedro raps))
 583 **Pedro:** ((Inaudible)) and then talk about the
 584 interviews. All the social things in it, and then 585 we can talk about all the meanings of the lyrics 586 because she uses a lot of slang.
 587 **Adam:** Pois é. Eu pensei em fazer isso na segunda 588 parte da aula, quando eles voltarem do intervalo, 589 porque daí eu acho que vai levar, it'sgonnatake590 longer
 591 **Pedro:** It's a lot about race and about being, you 592 know, like my nigger nose, with Jackson 5 nostrils. 593 Isto é muito, entende, the Jackson Five, like
 594 **Adam:** They have like
 595 **Pedro:** Mas daí o Michael Jackson fez a cirurgia
 596 para fazer o nariz mais branco, mas, tipo, eu tenho 597 orgulho de ser negra e parecer negra
 571

In the segment above, Adam and Pedro are planning a conversation class. In this class, they are thinking of using the song “Formation”, by Beyonce, which is in her 2016 album *Lemonade*¹.

Pedro suggests that they use the song in order to discuss the social meanings of the lyrics as well as its slang (line 583-6). Then, Adam adds to that by saying that they do this when they come back from the break (lines 587-590). Similarly to the first class planning event presented, participants construct the class together, both participants chipping in suggestions for the class. In the whole segment, Pedro and Adam shift at ease from Portuguese to English or English to Portuguese, and there is no apparent pattern in how or why they do so. However, differently from the first segment presented and similarly to most others, participants shift from Portuguese to English, often in the same utterance² (Kirsch & Sarmiento, 2017).

¹ Corresponds to event 3 in the synoptic chart.

² As we did in Kirsch & Sarmiento (2017), we will stick to the concept of code-switching (Poplack & Meechan, 1998) as the one that best explains alternance of language in the context studied. Here, code-switching is understood as referring to the alternation between languages in a specific interactional event, like a conversation or an email exchange, which often occurs at specific points of the communicative episode and is dictated by interactional conventions.

In the interviews, participants mentioned how much they learned from preparing classes together, both with ETAs and with fellow student teachers. Let us take a look at Maria Julia’s comments on the matter of planning lessons with a peer:

at the end, because there were no rooms available for everyone at the same time, we had the same group at the same time. So Maria was like, ok maybe you can teach your groups together and you both go to class. And prepared classes in a very light way, it was nice because we understood each other. And, ok, so this class is about introducing yourself, so how can we do it? Ok, there is this website. Ok, we could do this kind of warm-up activity and, ok, we can do this after. How can they group? So I noticed I could plan a class and do it in a more fun way than in a more, like, grammar way (Interview with Maria Julia).

Now, let us take a look at similar passage, but regarding preparing classes with an ETA:

we prepared classes together [...] she didn't know much about English teaching, but she had the cultural background that I didn't have. So that was nice to prepare classes, we prepared the classes here at UFRGS but also in cafeterias, in our houses. So for me this was nice because I could have more integration with one person [...] She is American, if it was with a Brazilian teacher it would also be really nice I think (Interview with Maria Julia).

In the next session, we debate some of the main take aways from this data analysis.

5 Final (and analytical) remarks

In this article, we sought to elucidate the practice of planning classes together in a community of teachers of the LwB program in the South of Brazil. As we have demonstrated, the teachers’ room is a space where student teachers regularly interact about their practice, which, both observing interactions and interviewing student teachers point that such interactions are relevant to their professional development. This converges with recent research in communities of teachers (Costa, 2013; Merrill, 2016).

As we discussed earlier, the interactions that appear in the data are patterned. That is to say, there are interactions with regular features (place, participants, goals, modes of participation). We have termed these constellations of regular interactions, or better, the ones focused on one or more aspects of getting the job done or learning how to get it done (or done in a better way) as practices. In this sense, we agree with Young (2009) in that practice is both performance in context and how these performances create history within communities.

As we can see, it is possible to look at this practice of planning classes together in two manners: as performance in context (participant observation in the teachers’ room) and in a more reified way, that is, a historical product of the community. It is possible to state that there are evidences of professional development in both levels.

To finish, we would like to restate our commitment with empirical research in communities such as the ones investigated here as both a possibility of understanding professional development in a more situated manner and as a big lack in our literature on teacher development.

6 References

- AUGUSTO-NAVARRO, E. The design of teaching materials as a tool in EFL teacher education: experiences of a Brazilian teacher education program. **Ilha Do Desterro A Journal Of English Language, Literatures In English And Cultural Studies**, Florianópolis, n. 68(1), p. 121-137, 2015.
- AUGUSTO-NAVARRO, E. H.; GATTOLIN, S. R. B. Transpondo fronteiras na formação de professores de inglês. In: Formação de professores, ensino de inglês e processos de Internacionalização no programa Inglês sem Fronteiras. **ABRAPUI, IV**, Maceió-AL: 2014 (conferência em mesa redonda).
- AVALOS, B. . Teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher Education over ten years. **Teaching and Teacher Education**, Oxford, n. 27(1), p. 10–20, 2011.
- BAKHTIN, M. **The dialogic imagination : four essays**. Austin : University of Texas Press, 1981.
- BOURDIEU, P. (1977a). **Outline of a theory of practice**. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977. 248 p.
- BOURDIEU, P. The economics of Linguistic Exchange. **Social Science Information. Thousand Oaks**, n. 16(6), 645–668, 1977b.
- BOURDIEU, P. **The Social Institution of Symbolic Power** . Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.302 p.
- BROWN, P.; LEVINSON, S. (1987). **Politeness : some universals in language usage**. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire] ; New York : Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- CERTEAU, M. de. **A Invenção do Cotidiano**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1990. 352 p.
- COSTA, E. V. (2013). **Práticas de Formação de Professores de Português de Língua Adicional em um Instituto Cultural Brasileiro no Exterior**. 162 f. (Mestrado Letras). PPGLET, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, 2013.
- ERICKSON, F. (1990). **Qualitative Methods . Quantitative Methods, Qualitative Methods** Londres: Macmillan, p. 0–77.
- FOUCAULT, M. (1979). **Discipline and punish : the birth of the prison**. New York : Vintage Books, 1979.
- GASNER, T. An ambitious vision of professional development for teachers. **NASP Bulletin**, Bethesda, n.84(618), p. 6–12, 2000.
- GOFFMAN, E. **Frame analysis : an essay on the organization of experience**. New York : Harper Row, 1974. 600 p.
- GOFFMAN, E. **Forms of talk**. Philadelphia : University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981. 335 p.
- GOODWIN, C.; DURANTI, A. Rethinking context: an introduction. Duranti, A. & Goodwin, C. (Eds.), **Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 1–42.
- GUMPERZ, J. Interactional sociolinguistics: A personal perspective. **The Handbook of Discourse Analysis**, 2005, p. 215–228.
- HEATH, S. B. (1982). What no bedtime story means: Narrative skills at home and school.

- Language in Society**, Cambridge, n. 11(01), 49.
- HEATH, S. B., & Street, B. (2008). **On ethnography : approaches to language and literacy research**. New York: Teachers College Press: NCRL/National Conference on Research in Language and Literacy, 2008. 152 p.
- HYMES, D. (1962). The ethnography of speaking. Gladwin, T.& Sturtevant, W. (Eds.), **Handbook of language and social interaction**, Washington, DC: Anthropological Society of Washington, p. 15-53.
- KIRSCH, W. (2017). **Teacher development in a community of practice in southern Brazil**. 256 f. (Doutorado Letras). PPGLET, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, 2017.
- KIRSCH, W.; Sarmiento, S. Fulbright English Teaching Assistants : preparação conjunta de aulas e codeswitching numa comunidade de prática do programa idiomas sem fronteiras. **BELT**, Porto Alegre,v. 8 n. 2, 2017,p. 209–219.
- LAMBERTS, D. **O livro didático de língua inglesa em uso: análise de pesquisas e observações de aula no programa idiomas sem fronteiras**.235 f.(Mestrado Letras). PPGLET, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, 2015.
- LAVE, J.;WENGER, E. **Situated learning: legitimate peripheral participation**. Cambridge; New York : Cambridge University Press, 1991. 140 p.
- LEVINSON, S. C. Activity types and language. In Drew, P.& Heritage, J.(Eds.), **Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings**. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 66-100.
- MALINOWSKI, B. The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In Ogden, C.; Richards, A.; Malinowski, B; Crookshank, F.;& Postgate, J.P. (Eds.), **The meaning of meaning: A study of the influence of language upon thought and of the science of symbolism** (pp. 296–336). London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1923, p. 296-236.
- MASON 1958-, J. (2002). **Qualitative researching**. Second edition. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif. : Sage Publications, 2002. 223p.
- MERRILL, M. **Communities of Foreign Language Teachers as a Source of Professional Development**.233 f.(Doutorado em Second Language Acquisition). SLA PhD, University of Wisconsin Madison, 2016.
- NICOLAIDES, C. S. "English without Borders": teaching English through a sociocultural perspective towards an autonomous learning. In: Nicolaidis, C.; Stella, P.R.; Cavalcanti, I.; Tavares, R.; Ifa, S. (Org.). **Transculturalidade e De(s)colonialidade nos Estudos de Inglês no Brazil**. Maceió: Edufal, 2014 p. 203-226.
- NÓVOA, A. Formação de Professores e Profissão Docente . In:Nóvoa, A. **Os Professores e a sua Formação**. Lisboa: Don Quixote, 1995.
- NÓVOA, A. (2009). **Professores: imagens do futuro presente**.Lisboa: Educa, 2009. 96 p.
- OCDE. (2006). **Teachers Matter**. Paris:OCDE Publishing, 2006. 12 p.
- ORTNER, S. B. (1984). The Anthropology in the Sixties. **Comparative Studies in History and Society**, Cambridge,n. 26(1), p. 126–166.
- PINHEIRO, L. ; FINARDI, K. (2014) Políticas públicas de internacionalização e o papel do inglês: evidências dos programas CsF e Isf. In: II CONEL.Vitória: UFES, 2014, p. 76-78.
- POPLACK, S.;MEECHAN, M. How Languages Fit Together in Codemixing. **International Journal of Bilingualism**, Thousand Oaks,n. 2(2), p. 127-138, 1998.
- SALDAÑA, J. (2009). **Qualitative Researchers**. London: Sage Publications, 2009
- SARMENTO, S.;KIRSCH, W. Inglês sem fronteiras: Uma mirada ao contexto de prática pelo prisma da formação de professores. **Ilha Do Desterro**, Florianópolis, n. 68(1), p. 47–59, 2015.

- SARMENTO, S.;THIAGO, E. M.; Andreotti, V. (2016). Science without Borders – An alternative framework for evaluation. *Interfaces Brasil/Canadá*, Pelotas, n. 16(1), 40–71, 2016.
- SCHATZI, T. (2001). Introduction: Practice theory. In T. Schatzi, T.; Cetina, K. K.& Von Savigni, E. (Eds.).**The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory** London: Routledge, 2001 p. 10-23)
- SCHÖN, D. A. (1987). **Educating the reflective practitioner : toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions**. First edition. San Francisco : Jossey-Bass, 1987. 376 p.
- TANNEN, D. Sociolinguistics: Interactional Sociolinguistic. In:**Oxford International Encyclopedia of Linguistics** . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014, p. 8-13.
- VIAL, a. P. S. (2017). “**Um Everest que eu vou ter que atravessar** ”: **formação de professores para o ensino de inglês acadêmico no programa Idiomas sem Fronteiras**. 173 f. (Mestrado Letras). PPGLET, UFRGS, Porto Alegre, 2017.
- VILLEGAS-REIMERS, E. Teacher professional development : an international review of the literature. **Paris: IIEP**, 2003. 197 p.
- WENGER, E. (1998). *Communities of practice : learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, U.K. ; New York, N.Y. : Cambridge University Press, 1998. 318 p.
- WITTGENSTEIN, L. *Philosophical investigations*. Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell, 1963. 129 p.
- YOUNG, R. (2009). **Discursive practice in language learning and teaching**. Chichester ; Malden, Mass. : Wiley-Blackwell, 2009. 280 p.
- YOUNG, R. F. (2010). Discursive Practice in Language Learning and Teaching. **The Modern Language Journal**, Hoboken, n. 94(4), 2010, p. 683–684.
- YOUNG, R. F. (2015). Syllabus Seminar in Discursive Practice.6p.