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ABSTRACT

Leveraging the effectiveness of Concept-Based Language Instruction (C-BLI) in language teaching and learning, including in the teaching of specific linguistic features of target languages (Negueruela, 2003; Van Compernolle, 2012), pragmatic elements such as sarcasm (Kim & Lantolf, 2018), and even discipline-specific concepts (e.g., Casal, 2020; Kurtz, 2017; Yang & Sang, 2023), this project adds to the emerging scholarship on the use of C-BLI as a means of teacher professional development (Fogal, 2017; Lantolf & Esteve, 2019; Van Compernolle & Henery, 2015; Williams et al., 2013) and argues that C-BLI represents an effective pedagogical frame for language teacher development interventions for novice teachers.

A pedagogical intervention was conducted through a course on teaching English as a Second Language, which connected pairs of novice teachers to an existing language course. Pairs were then assigned a target concept from the course syllabus (e.g., conditionals, intonation, tone and register). The intervention used C-BLI as a pedagogical frame through which novice teachers developed their target concept knowledge, created lesson plans, and taught a lesson in their partner course. The intervention also employed narrative inquiry and responsive mediation as means to bring about and mediate novice teacher conceptual development of the target concepts. Data collected consisted of narratives on prior language learning and teaching experiences, weekly reflections, meetings with the teacher educators, practice and actual teaching sessions, stimulated recalls, and final teaching reflections. The novice teachers’ evolving conceptual knowledge of their target concepts, as well as the potential understanding and enactment of the principles of C-BLI in educational activity, were understood through both their
sociocultural history and the mediational space created in the intervention by the teacher educators.

Results from the case studies highlighted the potential benefit of employing C-BLI as a tool to mediate both conceptual understanding of target concepts and orientation to educational activity for novice language teacher teachers, as well as the importance of creating spaces for verbalization of evolving understandings in language teacher education courses. Further, results highlighted the importance of the teacher educator figure enacted as a responsive mediator to provoke and mediate novice teachers’ development.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Discussions within language teacher education research have placed considerable emphasis on the nature of knowledge teachers need in order to effectively engage in teaching activity, as well as ways to bring about and promote the development of such knowledge. Scholars now theorize expertise in language teaching as drawing on a diverse and complex range of knowledge types (e.g., Grossman, 1990). They also theorize knowledge as connected to educational contexts (e.g., Kim & Hannafin, 2008, 2011; Lave, 1988; Lave & Wenger, 1991) and the histories and identities of individual educators (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 1996; Connelly & Clandinin, 1987) and as dynamic in nature (e.g., Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1993; Farrell, 2007). Within this body of scholarship, narrative-based research on teacher identity has highlighted the diverse and individualized struggles that are characteristic of language teacher development. Particularly when adopting a Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986) perspective, narrative activity itself has been shown both to provide a mediational means of development and as an emergent arena for externalization and verbalization of personal, professional, and emotional struggles at the core of language teaching activity (e.g., Garcia-Alonso, 2022; Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Reiss, 2011, Zoshak, 2016).

Another way in which teacher knowledge and development can be provoked is through the use of Concept-Based Language Instruction (henceforth C-BLI, Gal’perin, 1970, 1992), a pedagogical approach rooted in Sociocultural Theory which places emphasis on conceptual knowledge. Some scholars have explored this application of C-BLI (e.g., Fogal, 2017; Lantolf & Esteve, 2019; Van Compernelle & Henery, 2015;
Williams et al., 2013) to language teacher education, arguing that a C-BLI informed curriculum can promote language teacher development in classrooms that follow C-BLI principles.

Building on these studies, this dissertation argues that introducing novice language teachers to the principles of C-BLI alongside engagement in responsive mediation and narrative discussion can be used as a pedagogical tool to mediate their development of their own understanding of the concepts they are expected to teach, as well as how to teach them in a principled (conceptual) way. An explicit emphasis on the central principles of C-BLI represents a means of preparing novice teachers for the context specific work set before them. This is because C-BLI places conceptual knowledge and its role on practical oriented activity at its core. Therefore, an emphasis on linguistic concepts in a C-BLI based classroom clarifies the type of subject matter knowledge that teachers must master. This not only has the benefit of sharpening pedagogical activities but also provides a clear pedagogical aim in course development and in preparation for teaching. This dissertation also argues that C-BLI provides a flexible structure for mediating novice language teachers in how to identify concepts and types of knowledge needed for teaching in their own educational settings, how to structure educational activity on a day to day and curricular level, and how to bridge concepts of content with teaching activity. Further, this study argues that C-BLI is uniquely empowering as an approach to teacher education and professional development, as it can be used as a psychological tool for novice language teachers by placing an emphasis on concepts (regardless of language and area of specialization) and help them orient to classroom activity.
1.1 The present study

A Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory-informed pedagogy not only prepares teacher educators and supervisors to support their teacher learners in their educational activity, but also provides a theoretically grounded pathway to developing novice teacher knowledge and expertise. From this perspective, many scholars have discussed ways in which language teacher knowledge could be provoked and mediated (e.g., Johnson & Golombek, 2016; Johnson et al., 2023; Reiss, 2011). Some studies (Fogal, 2017; Lantolf & Esteve, 2019; Van Compernolle & Henery, 2015; Williams et al., 2013) have also proposed the use of Concept-Based Language Instruction to bring about such development and orientation to classroom activity, but this is still an area that needs more attention when targeting novice language teachers.

To address this, this dissertation employed Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory, Concept-Based Language Instruction, and engagement in narrative activity to promote, mediate, and trace three novice language teachers’ conceptual development (content knowledge), as well as their overall orientation to educational activity. To do this, an 11-week pedagogical intervention was designed and implemented to introduce novice language teachers to Concept-Based Language Instruction, enabling them to not only develop a deep conceptual understanding of the target concepts they are expected to teach, but also a principled means of orienting to classroom activity. Similarly, the pedagogical intervention had as fundamental elements narrative reflection and responsive mediation to guide novice language teachers as they reflect on and discuss their evolving understandings of key target concepts (in this case: intonation, tone and register, and
conditionals) and their overall orientation to classroom activity. This study is motivated by the following research questions:

1. To what extent can C-BLI as a set of pedagogical principles serve as a mediational tool for orienting novice teachers to content knowledge and pedagogical decisions within their particular educational contexts?

2. To what extent can the engagement in narrative activity as a form of verbalization be leveraged as a means of orienting novice teachers to better meet the particularized demands of their specific pedagogical contexts and reflect on the nature of their content knowledge and their pedagogical decisions?

1.2 Chapter descriptions

After this introductory chapter, this dissertation is structured as follows. Chapter 2 provides a review of the different conceptualizations of teacher knowledge and ways to provoke and mediate teacher development, as well as a discussion of the proposed use of Concept-Based Language Instruction and narrative activity as pedagogical tools to mediate novice language teacher knowledge, novice language teacher development, and orientation to educational activity.

Chapter 3 provides a detailed overview of the methods for this study, including the research context, research design, discussion of key concepts, and discussion of role of teacher educator in the project.

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 each present a case study of a participant analyzed through a Vygotskian microgenetic analysis. The implications of these studies are discussed in Chapter 7, which functions as the discussion chapter. This chapter concludes by
discussing a series of limitations of the current study, as well as highlights avenues for future research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

This chapter reviews various theoretical approaches to language teacher education, as well as the scholarly motivation for this dissertation. Section 2.1 discusses important theorizations of teacher knowledge, covering seminal work that is part of the curriculum in the course that served as site for data collection in this project. Section 2.2 outlines Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory, which forms the theoretical basis for this project, and Concept-Based Language Instruction, which provides a pedagogical model for the current study. Section 2.2.1 discusses the key role of mediation in provoking and guiding language teacher development. Section 2.2.2 examines the significance of engagement in narrative activity from a Sociocultural Theory perspective and narrative inquiry for research in language teacher education. This section also reviews scholarship which has leveraged Narrative Inquiry and narrative reflection as a means of studying language teacher knowledge. Lastly, section 2.2.3 explores the role of Concept-Based Language Instruction for language teaching, outlines a gap in teacher professional development and motivate the current study.

2.1. Knowledge/expertise in language teacher education

The nature and development of language teacher knowledge is central to this dissertation. Therefore, a logical starting point is the review of developing notions of teacher knowledge, as well as a review of the highly influential work of Shulman (1986) and Grossman (1990). These theories were introduced decades ago, and they have been iterated on and developed since. However, they have played a key role in shaping the
complex multidimensional approach to language teacher knowledge that is characteristic
of more recent research. Similarly, Grossman’s work is part of the curriculum for the data
site course. Students discuss her model during class, and the model serves as a basis that
informs future discussions of language teacher knowledge in the course.

Considering the diversity in curriculum for second language teacher education
across programs in the United States and around the world, there appears to be a lack of
consensus regarding what teachers ‘need to know’ in order to teach a second language,
and consequently there is no apparent consensus regarding how to define, promote, and
assess language teacher expertise (Kubanyiova & Feryok, 2015). Clearly, this issue
relates more broadly to notions in general education regarding the nature of teacher
knowledge and how best to educate individuals for activity within a classroom space.
Broadly speaking, these questions rest on philosophical approaches to defining the nature
of knowledge itself, and within Applied Linguistics and related fields, a considerable
body of scholarship on language teacher education has addressed questions regarding the
type, degree, and nature of knowledge that teachers need in order to bring about effective
language learning.

This subject is perhaps most comprehensively theorized through the work of
Shulman, who identified (in his 1986 seminal paper) three types of teacher knowledge,
namely subject-matter content knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and curricular
knowledge. Shulman and colleagues (e.g., Carlsen, 1988; Grossman, et al., 1989; Wilson,
et al., 1987), later expanded this initial categorization into seven types of knowledge:
content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, knowledge
of curriculum, knowledge of learners and learning theories, knowledge of context, and
knowledge of educational philosophies, goals, and objectives. Identifying the cornerstones of this work on teacher knowledge, Grossman (1990) reorganized these components of teacher knowledge into four general areas: general pedagogical knowledge, subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of context. These four categories are represented in Figure 2-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT MATTER KNOWLEDGE</th>
<th>GENERAL PEDAGOGICAL KNOWLEDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Structures</td>
<td>Learners and Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantive Structures</td>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptions of Purposes for Teaching Subject Matter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of Students’ Understandings</th>
<th>Curricular Knowledge</th>
<th>Knowledge of Instructional Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KNOWLEDGE OF CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2-1: Model of teacher knowledge (From Grossman, 1990, p. 5).

General pedagogical knowledge refers to the knowledge that teachers have regarding student learning, knowledge of general approaches to instruction, knowledge related to classroom management, and general knowledge about educational goals and aims. General pedagogical knowledge, according to Grossman (1990), corresponds to the type of teacher knowledge that has been the focus of most educational research to date.
Importantly, pedagogy did not usually inform educational research, but rather research informed and dictated the body of knowledge that teachers needed, often arriving at this knowledge by conducting research that followed prescriptivist approaches and not informed by practice.

During the mid-1970s, and from a more interpretive research approach, knowledge was understood as socially constructed, and thus scholars paid attention to the context in which the activity of teaching and learning took place. Similarly, during this decade and the early 1980s, research within education began to take scholarly interest in teachers’ mental lives (e.g., Freeman, 2002). Therefore, educational research started to consider how teachers made their pedagogical decisions, the nature of the knowledge that teachers possessed regarding pedagogical practice, and the means by which teachers came to acquire this knowledge. More specifically, historical approaches to language teacher knowledge would include various approaches to this pedagogy such as content-based instruction, task-based language instruction, or English for Specific Purposes (ESP).

Subject matter knowledge refers to the knowledge that teachers have regarding their content area. This type of knowledge contains knowledge related to syntactic and substantive structures specific to the discipline, as well as the beliefs that teachers have regarding their specific discipline subject matter and their orientation to such knowledge (e.g., Grossman, et al., 1989). Teachers’ subject matter knowledge encompasses an understanding of the facts and concepts specific to their discipline, why they are relevant, and how they fit within the discipline itself. Furthermore, teachers’ knowledge of the discipline includes substantive structures, which refer to the way knowledge in that
specific discipline is organized, as well as to the questions that are guiding and moving the discipline forward. Related to this, knowledge of syntactic structures refers to teachers’ understanding of “the canons of evidence and proof within the discipline” (Grossman, 1990, p. 6) that answer the questions being asked in the respective field, as well as how the discipline community accepts or refutes those knowledge claims. In other words, within a specific subject, the teacher’s subject matter knowledge encompasses not only the understanding “that something is so” but also “why it is so” (Shulman, 1986, p. 9). Subject matter knowledge, within linguistics and language teacher education, depends on the theoretical/pedagogical approaches to courses, and can include vocabulary items, speech acts, grammatical structures of the language, cultural conventions, or other linguistic constructs.

Even though subject matter knowledge is a key element of the body of knowledge that teachers should have in order to engage in effective teaching practice, research on subject matter knowledge has been mostly ignored in the educational research literature. In 1986, Shulman addressed this lack of educational research attention on subject matter knowledge as “the missing paradigm” (p. 7) which influences and is influenced by both researchers and policy makers. This missing paradigm refers to the identification of “teaching competence with pedagogy alone” (Shulman, 1986, p. 7), which leaves central questions about teaching and teaching expertise unasked. This conceptualization of expertise represents a clear shift from the understanding of teaching expertise as primarily a subject content expert and secondarily as a pedagogy expert that was prevalent during the last century in the United States (Shulman, 1986). Teacher expertise started to be conceptualized in terms of how a teacher organizes class (including lesson
planning, organization of activities and time allocated to them), whether the teacher provides positive or negative feedback to students, and/or how teachers assess student learning. The content related to these aspects of classroom activity and instruction, however, is not taken into consideration. This approach represents, according to Shulman, an important and significant gap in the understanding of teacher expertise. Importantly, a lack of knowledge in any of these subparts of subject matter knowledge results in teachers misrepresenting the discipline and its content, as well as in an impact on how teachers orient towards their teaching activity regarding their subject matter (e.g., Alexander et al., 1994; Loewenberg Ball et al., 2008).

The third element of teacher expertise is pedagogical content knowledge. This element of teacher knowledge comprises four different central components (see Grossman, 1990), and refers to the understanding of different approaches to teaching the specific concepts of the subject matter at various grade levels (different activities, strategies, and experiments that can be brought into the classroom to explain disciplinary concepts), as well as a theoretical understanding of what makes certain topics within the subject domain difficult for students to grasp. In addition, it also includes an awareness and understanding of the students’ existing knowledge of the concepts introduced in the class. This type of knowledge also emphasizes that the teacher should have knowledge of the curriculum. This encompasses teachers’ understanding of the content that has been and will be taught on that specific subject (within a course and in a broader curriculum), the different sources of information that can be accessed for a specific class (vertical curriculum knowledge), and knowledge of the curriculum students are studying in other courses (lateral curriculum knowledge). This type of understanding allows teachers to
make connections between their instruction and the materials that students are encountering in other courses.

Therefore, pedagogical content knowledge refers to how teachers make the subject matter comprehensible for students. As such, pedagogical content knowledge draws from both general pedagogical knowledge and subject matter knowledge. Various scholars have focused on pedagogical content knowledge and its application, assessment, and acquisition by teachers in various educational contexts (e.g., Ayers, 2016; Grossman, 2005; Reitano & Harte, 2016; Worden, 2019). In the field of language education, an educator may be working within a content-based language instruction approach to language learning, and they may have content knowledge regarding the specific elements of language (e.g., relative clauses) that they are trying to teach. Pedagogical content knowledge represents how language teachers would be able to engage students with the subject matter in a way that renders it accessible and facilitates learning. Notably, this scholarship highlights the importance of teachers’ understanding of the context in which their pedagogical activity takes place in order to enact pedagogical content knowledge successfully. Importantly, because pedagogical content knowledge is dependent on context and on the moment-to-moment activity of teaching, it cannot be codified in textbooks or teacher’s manuals.

Knowledge of context is the fourth core element in Grossman’s (1990) multidimensional framework for teacher knowledge. Teachers draw upon their knowledge of their various educational contexts in order to adapt their practice to fit their specific educational setting. Specifically, knowledge of context refers to the understanding teachers should have regarding the student composition they have in their
classes, as well as the students’ both personal and academic background knowledge. In addition, knowledge of context encompasses understanding of the setting in which the instructional activity takes place, such as knowledge of the school, the department, the district, and the ways in which such community teachers are expected and allowed to conduct their teaching activity, including both institutional and cultural expectations.

Given these four categories of teacher knowledge, some scholars have argued that pedagogical content knowledge can be identified as the distinguishing factor between expert teachers and subject content experts (e.g., Grossman, 1990; Shulman, 1986). It is, therefore, important to understand and explore the different sources of influence that may shape such knowledge. Grossman (1990) identifies apprenticeship of observation, disciplinary background, professional coursework, and learning from experience as notable sources of influence.

Apprenticeship of observation, introduced by Lortie (1975), refers to the existing experiences that teachers have had as students. Those prior experiences shaped teachers’ expectation of what teaching entails, as well as of how it should be conducted. Such impact can be seen in teachers’ understanding of their students and of their learning experience, as well as on teacher subject matter knowledge, which may be mixed with instructional strategies (e.g., Bailey et al., 1996; Johnson, 1994, 1999). This is particularly influential for novice teachers, who often enter their classroom contexts without having received any form of professional training. As a result, teachers draw from these past experiences to orient towards their classroom activity, teaching as they have been taught, or rather as they perceive having been taught. Therefore, the resulting
teacher knowledge “may be more tacit than explicit, more conservative than innovative, and may prove difficult to overcome in professional education” (Grossman, 1990, p. 12).

Disciplinary background refers to the training that instructors have received in their specific discipline. As previously noted, when instructors lack subject matter knowledge, their orientation to classroom activity and their engagement with the content specific to their subject is compromised. Teachers with a robust subject matter knowledge will also rely less on the organization of subject matter content presented in textbooks. Therefore, disciplinary background plays a significant role as a source of influence for pedagogical content knowledge.

Another source of influence on pedagogical content knowledge relates to professional coursework (e.g., Freeman & Richards, 1996). This influence is particularly relevant when considering the organization of teaching training programs’ content, an area for which not a lot of research is available. Grossman points out, however, that one important part of teacher training programs is to provide subject-specific methods courses. This applies to both first and second or foreign language teachers. Scholars such as Faez and Valeo (2012) and Farrell (2007, 2016) have raised concerns about how prepared second or foreign language teachers really are and have argued that teacher programs should be reconceptualized content-wise to fit the current and future needs of their teacher-learners better. They have pointed out that given the great variation in how teacher training programs are structured, with many focusing exclusively on theories of second language acquisition or linguistics, novice teachers often find themselves unprepared to teach their specific courses and experience situations that do not match their expectations for entering the respective professional community. For instance, Faez
and Valeo (2012) explored this further by investigating novice teacher perceptions about their own preparedness to teach in English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts. Results from a survey and follow up interviews indicated that teacher-learners were concerned with the role, nature, and duration of some key components of teacher training programs, particularly the lack of the practicum as an integrated component. The authors called for the use of regulatory bodies and professional associations to collaborate with teacher training programs.

Finally, the last source of influence is learning from experience. Pedagogical content knowledge acquisition is influenced by classroom experience. Grossman (1990) argues that when teachers engage in pedagogical activity, they put into practice the theoretical knowledge acquired in the classroom to an actual teaching setting (although the extent to which these claims represent the reality of instructors’ orientation to classroom activity are debatable). It is during this period that instructors also become aware of the points of collision between their own pre-conceived understandings of teaching and learning, as well as those of their students, and the reality they face in their classroom environments, which is important in order to re-orient and better understand instructors teaching orientation.

Notably, these sources of influence are clearly intertwined with one another and indicate the importance of teachers’ personal beliefs, personal prior teaching, and learning experiences. It is also worth mentioning that even though pedagogical content knowledge has been argued to be the decisive factor when distinguishing between a subject matter expert and an experienced instructor, scholars have also stated that experienced teachers displayed “an integration of knowledge of subjects with knowledge
of students, contexts, curriculum and pedagogy” (Tsui, 2003, p. 58). This indicates that expert teachers’ knowledge draws from all four core elements of teacher knowledge body, functioning as an organized whole, in order to orient to and engage in effective classroom activity. This, in turn, illustrates “their constant and critical interdependence” (Freeman & Johnson, 1998, p. 406). Yet, some academic contexts present additional challenges that complicate the traditional assumptions regarding teacher knowledge and expertise.

Overall, Grossman’s (1990) multidimensional framework of teacher knowledge and expertise brings together many of the important notions from scholarship previously discussed. The model integrates knowledge of the subject content, which occupies a primary role in traditional approaches to education, with theoretical understandings of pedagogies, dynamic understandings of teaching contexts, and the means of rendering subject content knowledge teachable and accessible to learners. Once more, while Grossman’s framework is not a particularly recent framework, it is utilized as the starting point in this discussion because it is a framework discussed in the data site course as part of the curriculum, and because of its influence informing discussions of teacher knowledge over the course of the semester.

2.2. Teacher knowledge and development from a Sociocultural Theory perspective

Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986) forms the theoretical basis for this dissertation project. This section outlines the tenants of Sociocultural Theory (henceforth SCT) as a theory of mind, reviews the types of knowledge as identified in Grossman’s (1990) taxonomy of teacher knowledge through an SCT lens,
reflects on the nature of teacher knowledge, discusses the importance of engagement in narrative activity to support teacher development, and proposes Concept-Based Language Instruction as a tool to address the existing gap.

SCT represents a coherent theory of mind that focuses on “the development of higher mental functions” (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006, p. 1) and understands the individual in a dialectical relationship with the environment in which he or she exists. This development of human cognition is understood as inherently social, indicating that consciousness of the world around us is achieved and mediated through the engagement in activity with other individuals in specific socio-historical contexts. This is to say that consciousness occurs through the interaction with collective and personal understanding and emotional experiences with the help of mediating cultural-psychological tools and artifacts used to control and reshape an individual’s mental processes, such as language-based conceptual word meanings. At the same time, while becoming conscious of such reality, individuals act on it and reshape it (‘idealize’ it) for their own purposes and for specific contexts of use. Given this dialectical relationship of the individual and the environment, SCT is based centrally around the concept of cultural mediation, explained by Lantolf and Thorne (2006) as “the process through which humans deploy culturally constructed artifacts, concepts, and activities to regulate (i.e., gain voluntary control over and transform) the material world of their own and each other’s social and mental activity” (p. 79). Humans are born biological beings, clearly, and become ‘additionally’ social (or ‘cultural’) through mediation, for it is through mediation that they come to act in the world, rather than merely react to it. According to Vygotsky’s SCT (VSCT), consciousness of the world around us is socially constructed and mediated, and it
emerges from participation in social activity through which an individual will internalize a series of psychological tools that will then assist in mediating our future interactions with the context in which we act.

Regarding teacher learning and knowledge, SCT conceptualizes teacher cognition as both originating in and being directly shaped by the various educational contexts and social activities in which teachers engage (Johnson, 2009). As a result, teacher cognition is impacted by the normative ways of thinking about teacher knowledge, as well as by the beliefs surrounding teaching activity. These normative views are present not only in the contexts where teachers may engage in educational activity (in the future), but also in those they inhabited as learners, impacting and shaping their own conceptualizations of and expectations regarding teaching activity. This results in novice teachers entering educational spaces with deeply engrained notions of what teaching and learning entails (e.g., Borg, 2006; Freeman, 2002; Johnson, 2009) that may not reflect a principled way to teaching activity but rather their personal lived experiences. These different understandings are identified in SCT as everyday and scientific concepts. Everyday concepts are then subdivided into two categories: spontaneous and non-spontaneous. Spontaneous concepts illustrate the knowledge acquired through lived experiences of the socialization into a specific culture without the assistance of systematic instruction. Spontaneous concepts are not usually accessible to conscious inspection, and, as a result, “are unsystematic, unconscious, and often wrong” (Karpov, 2003, p. 65). Non-spontaneous concepts, while still spontaneous, are open to conscious inspection and are usually intentionally taught and consciously acquired. Johnson (2009) provides the example of everyday, spontaneous concept as the understanding of cooperative learning
as “group work”, and of everyday, non-spontaneous concepts as the organization of a “jigsaw” activity that requires the teacher to manage and reorganize activities for specific groups without necessarily having a scientific understanding of the principles of cooperative learning. Importantly, both spontaneous and non-spontaneous concepts “are closely linked to concrete activities in social contexts” (Johnson, 2009, p. 21).

Scientific concepts, on the other hand, represent “the generalizations of the experience of humankind that is fixed in science” (Karpov, 2003, p. 66). That is to say that scientific concepts emerge from the theoretical investigation of a specific discipline or domain. Once these scientific concepts are acquired, they transform everyday, spontaneous and non-spontaneous, concepts that students had. Therefore, experiential knowledge becomes conscious and structured, in that individuals are able to understand everyday experiences beyond immediate perception. In the particular case of teachers, everyday concepts represent teachers’ lived experiences both as a learner and as an instructor, whereas their scientific knowledge addresses the principled way knowledge in a particular community of practice is accepted and understood.

From an VSCT perspective, teaching activity has the potential to bring about development of learners’ understanding of concepts. Yet, the focus of attention is not on the learner, the teacher, or both, but rather the “character and quality of activities [students and teachers] are engaged in together, the resources they are using to engage in those activities, and what is being accomplished by engaging in those activities” (Johnson, 2009, p. 63). Therefore, instruction is conceptualized as teaching/learning activity that leads development and provides recurrent systematic analysis of everyday concepts, as well as explicit and schematic representations, explanation, and engagement
with scientific concepts relevant to the specific educational setting through dialogic mediation. This indicates a deep conceptual understanding of the subject matter at hand. As a result, teachers need to have a scientific understanding of the academic concepts relevant for their specific domain or educational contexts, as well as an understanding of the concept of mediation both at a theoretical and at a practical level. Moreover, in order to engage in such mediation, teachers need some degree of understanding of *responsive mediation* (Johnson & Golombek, 2016 – see section 2.2.1), or of how to dynamically and strategically assist and assess students in order to adapt and attune to their emerging potential (ZPD) within dialogic interactions and goal-oriented activities within a classroom space. An understanding of the students’ zone of proximal development (the arena for potentiality where partly formed, emerging knowledge can be targeted) would also be necessary in order to act as a responsive mediator for students. Therefore, the four core elements of teacher knowledge (Shulman, 1986; Grossman, 1990) are brought to the forefront.

### 2.2.1 The significance of mediation in provoking language teacher development

The concept of mediation is key in a VSCT-informed pedagogy for language teacher development (or development in general). In particular, this study adopts Johnson and Golombek (2016)’s conceptualization of mediation as *responsive mediation*. Johnson and Golombek (2016) argue that, even though responsive mediation can be considered similar to other interpretations and applications of Vygotsky’s SCT concept of mediation (e.g., Dynamic Assessment; Lantolf & Poehner, 2014), it differs in that it addresses the multidirectional nature of teacher educators’ dialogic interactions with teachers.
Additionally, responsive mediation does not necessarily occur while the teacher learner is engaged in the activity of teaching, often taking place instead \textit{before} or \textit{after} teaching, when teacher learners are preparing for or reflecting upon their activity. Fundamental to understanding the concept of responsive mediation are three constructs drawn from Vygotsky’s SCT and explained as follows: Obuchenie, Perezhivanie, and Growth Points.

\textit{Growth points} (Johnson & Worden, 2014) represent contradictions between the ideal and the reality of teaching that instructors experience when engaged in educational activity. When these growth points occur, they tend to “create a sense of instability, or cognitive/emotional dissonance” (Johnson & Worden, 2014, p. 130), that may deeply impact and negatively mediate future orientation to teaching activity. A common theme within language teacher education is that learning to teach becomes a “deeply personal matter, and often emotionally charged in ways that are rarely recognized in teacher education programs” (Johnson & Golombek, 2016, p. 44). However, during this process of \textit{becoming}, there may be moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance that can act as catalysts for development through expert-other responsive mediation.

\textit{Obuchenie} is defined by Vygotsky (1987) as “teaching/learning as collaborative interactions governed by a mutuality of purpose” (p. 212, as cited in Johnson & Golombek, 2016). In other words, obuchenie refers to the teaching/learning activity that leads development, and in doing so, this construct captures the intentions and actions of both teaching and learning that take place in activity. Obuchenie and the ZPD activity are two concepts that are intertwined, for obuchenie is concerned with both fully formed and developing capabilities of an individual. Johnson and Golombek (2016) conceptualize this construct in the particular environment of L2 teacher education as a tool that teacher
educators utilize to reorganize the way teacher learners approach or conceptualize the activity of teaching. Consequently, enacting obuchenie in an L2 teacher education context requires “context-specific, high-quality, teacher-teacher educator dialogic interactions that support sign meaning development as teachers engage in a broad range of activities associated with L2 teaching” (Johnson & Golombek, 2016, p. 42).

Obuchenie is, similarly, intertwined with the concept of perezhivanie. Perezhivanie was conceptualized by Vygotsky as the subjective significance of lived experiences and was regarded as a functional unit in his cultural-historical approach to psychology. Not surprisingly, from a Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory perspective, emotions are understood as contextually bounded, and as unique to each individual. Therefore, various individuals experience emotions that manifest themselves differently in different environments. Johnson and Golombek (2016) corroborate this statement by arguing that, in a teacher education program, “teachers draw heavily on their lived experiences as learners in classrooms, yet their emotional experiences (perezhivanie) grounded in their schooling histories may be vastly different” (p. 43). Therefore, it is important for teacher educators to understand different teacher learners’ perezhivanie as an ever-evolving conglomerate of emotions tied to lived experiences, and in order to provide effective, responsive feedback, teacher educators take into consideration past and currently developing emotional experiences of teacher learners in activity. Additionally, teacher educators should understand that there are various mediational means that can be applied (mediation as a continuum) when working within the ZPD activity. The application of different mediational means to bring about development is part of the construct of obuchenie.
With all of this in mind, Johnson and Golombek (2016) argue that responsive mediation is a psychological tool to help L2 teacher educators in their teaching/learning activity that leads development. As might be expected, both teacher learners and teacher educators come into teacher learner/teacher educator interactions with a preconceived/ideal in mind. However, this ideal model of teaching that both teacher learners and teacher educators have in mind changes as teacher learner/educator interactions take place, and as teacher learners are mediated towards the ideal of teaching by the expert-other. The authors argue that responsive mediation works “as the mechanism through which to resolve the dialectical relationship between the ideal (conceptual) and the material activity” (Johnson & Golombek, 2016, p. 167) during the activity of obuchenie.

2.2.2 Engagement in narrative activity to mediate teacher knowledge

Another way to enact responsive mediation and to bring about such teacher knowledge and development is through engagement in narrative activity. The importance of narrative activity in this project lies in the significant role it has played in research on language teacher knowledge and development and its emphasis on the dynamic and individualized nature of teacher experiences. Narratives are more than personal accounts; they are a means of constructing our identities and “creat[ing] meaning in our lives” (Clandinin, 2006, p. 44), and have been leveraged by many scholars to explore various issues within Applied Linguistics and Language Teacher Education (e.g., Bell, 2002; Canagarajah, 1996; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly 1996, 1998;
Narrative activity affords scholars a means of emphasizing and bringing to the forefront the voices of developing individuals. Narratives portray “knowledge from the bottom up” (Canagarajah, 1996, p. 327), and in the field of Language Teacher Education narratives have been particularly useful to explore the developing voices of instructors, as well as the landscapes teachers inhabit when engaging in educational activity. Specifically, Clandinin and Connelly (1996) have argued that such landscapes “create epistemological tensions that are understood narratively” (p. 24), indicating that narratives can provide a space in which the cognitive dissonance between what teachers know and how they portray their knowledge can be explored as they “interpret and reinterpret their experiences” (Johnson & Golombek, 2011, p. 487).

From an SCT perspective, narratives provide researchers with a personal account of development taking place, and SCT scholars argue that narratives can function as the mediational means of provoking teacher development. When narratives are understood through a Vygotskyan SCT framework and applied to the field of teacher development and education, they can provide the researcher with an emic understanding of how teachers come to know, as well as function as mediational spaces, resources, and experiences for such teacher development to occur. As such, prominent scholars in the field, such as Johnson and Golombek (2011), have argued that narratives are “the quintessential way through which teachers’ knowledge is structured” (p. 486). It is not surprising that a large number of SCT researchers have adopted narrative activity and
Narrative Inquiry as a methodology for supporting and provoking language teacher development.

Johnson and Golombek (2011) provide a largely theoretical overview of the potential and power of narrative inquiry “as a meditational tool that supports and enhances teacher professional development” (p. 3) in the field of language teacher education. The authors examine the affordances of narrative inquiry for teacher development and the ways in which narrative functions as a meditational tool. They follow an argument they put forth previously in Johnson and Golombek (2004), that teacher development “is socially situated and socially mediated, non-linear, dialogic, and without an endpoint” (p. 323), and that narrative inquiry functions as a tool with which teachers can explore emotional and cognitive dissonance as they develop into language educators. According to Johnson and Golombek (2011), narratives in the field of second language teacher education can function as a meditational tool in the form of ‘externalization’, ‘verbalization’, and ‘systematic examination’. When narratives function as externalization, they work as a means of enabling teachers to make their understandings and perezhivanie explicit. Importantly, through this externalization, teachers’ thinking is now open to social influence, which is going to impact the way teachers reshape and reconceptualize their understanding of the activity of teaching, if mediated appropriately. This provides a theoretical account of the ‘windows’ that feature prominently in work discussed in the previous section.

Johnson and Golombek (2011) explain that when narratives function as ‘verbalization’, they become meditational tool for regulating teachers’ thinking process. A key factor of narratives as verbalization is that they require the use of scientific concepts
as tools for understanding the activity of teaching. If these scientific concepts are internalized, they become psychological tools that then guide teachers’ thinking in their teaching activity. The authors continue that narratives as verbalization have the potential to assist in the internalization process of the theoretical constructs that they are exposed to in their language teaching programs. Finally, narratives can also function as ‘systematic examination’, in which they are used as a vehicle for inquiry. Following SCT’s understanding of human cognition as socially constructed, Johnson and Golombek (2011) indicate that “what is learned is fundamentally shaped by how it is learned” (p. 493). Therefore, when it comes to language teacher education, the parameters of the narrative inquiry assessment will impact the way in which teachers engage in narrative inquiry activities, which will in turn shape what they learn from it. Johnson and Golombek (2004) made a similar claim stating that “learning to teach is a socially mediated activity and, as such, how different concepts and functions in teachers’ consciousness develop depends on the specific social activities in which they engage” (p. 309). Therefore, narratives are guided by parameters that depend on what activity the narrative is for. The authors also argue that narratives function as tools for building knowledge, as they mediate our thought process, and illustrate these arguments with two case studies of teacher-authored narratives from both a novice and expert SLTE instructors. In this way, Sociocultural Theory conceptualizes narrative activity as a means of understanding, as well as a means of bringing about development.

A number of studies have also integrated a VSCT perspective to Narrative Inquiry analysis of language teacher development. Focusing on how engagement in narrative activity impacted not only teachers’ conceptualizations of their own legitimacy, but also
teaching activity itself, Garcia-Alonso (2022) utilized narrative inquiry to trace developing notions of knowledge, expertise, and legitimacy of a graduate student and novice ESL/EAP teacher over the course of an academic year. The author, who took the role of a mentor and responsive mediator, engaged in dialogic narrative inquiry with the novice ESL/EAP teacher (mentee), and collected oral and written narratives in which the mentee, together with the mentor, collaboratively constructed a space in which the mentee could verbalize his thinking as he engaged in a new teaching context. From a VSCT perspective, “every idea contains some remnant of the individual’s affective relationship to that aspect of reality which it represents” (Vygotsky, 1987, p. 50). Therefore, engagement in dialogic narrative inquiry provided an environment for the mentee in which salient, growth points (Johnson & Worden, 2014) that emerged from teaching activity or social influence could be *externalized* and together with the mentor disentangled for future teaching activity.

This study highlighted the crucial role that engagement in narrative activity played in the ESL/EAP teacher’s developing understandings around subject-specific content knowledge and around his professional identity. Through these narratives, the mentor and mentee discussed all four types of teacher knowledge as presented in Grossman’s (1990) framework, paying particular attention to subject matter knowledge, as the mentee struggled with his perceived lack of discipline specific subject matter knowledge. Similarly, it emphasized the crucial role of a responsive mediator, her mediation, and the impact of the mediational space co-constructed through narrative in the mentee’s development.
Similarly, Reis (2011) utilized engagement in narrative activity to mediate non-native speaking teachers (NNST) identity formation as part of their language teacher development. In his study, he collected data from six instructors, their students, their supervisor and from Reis himself. Data consisted of narratives (via discussion board) of readings of the Native speaker/Non native speaker (NS/NNS) bias, narratives via dialogic journals (with Reis) through blogs on teacher’s professional identities, semi structure interviews about teachers’ background, teachers’ professional identity and attitudes about language learning and teaching, as well as the NS/NNS bias and the NS myth. Reis (2011) specifically brings up the presence and impact of larger dominant sociocultural discourses in his participants’ development as non-native English teachers, since, as a result of such discourses, “qualified NNESTs are positioned as less able professionals than native English-speaking Teachers (NESTs) by the public discourse, the institutions where they work, their colleagues, their students, and even their social acquaintances.” (p. 3). In other words, non-native English-speaking teachers (NNEST) in Reis’ study (and all throughout the world) are often positioned as having less subject matter knowledge of the language they teach, which actively impacts their perceptions of legitimacy and expertise. Through the use of narratives, Reis (2011) explored how participants became aware of, understood, and challenged such disempowering discourses as teachers co-constructed a legitimate identity as language educators. The author concluded that all these opportunities acted as “mediational tools, as well as mediated processes and spaces” (p. 17) through which teachers were able to rethink and develop their identity as educators.
2.2.3 Language teacher development through C-BLI

Another way to provoke language teacher development (and one in which the different elements of teacher knowledge discussed so far can be addressed in pedagogical activity) is through Concept-Based Language Instruction (henceforth C-BLI), which represents a pedagogical approach that is strongly rooted in SCT and that developed from Gal’perin’s (1970) theory of Systemic Theoretical Instruction (STI). This type of pedagogical approach adheres to the principles of concept-based teaching (Vygotsky, 1987), and its relevance to this discussion lies in the unique balance of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of context into a single pedagogical approach.

C-BLI targets the internalization of specific scientific concepts through a multiphase pedagogical approach that moves from the explanation and materialization of an academic concept, designed to develop explicit and schematic knowledge of target concepts, to participation in practical activity, where learners have opportunities for verbalization and are supported through dynamically attuned teacher mediation. As illustrated in Lantolf and Poehner (2014), C-BLI comprises three phases, which correspond to orienting basis of mental action, verbal action, and inner speech.

Orienting basis of mental action represents the most important of the phases in a C-BLI pedagogical approach. During this stage, learners are introduced to a systemic explanation of the concept of interest in the form of a SCOBA (Schema of a Complete Orienting Basis of an Action). This SCOBA provides as complete of a conceptualization as possible for learners to understand the essence of the concept at hand, as well as to deploy this understanding in novel contexts.
After the systematic explanation of the concept and its visualization or materialization has been introduced via a SCOBA, the verbal action phase engages learners in a series of communicative activities for them to verbalize and apply their understanding of the concept. Importantly, during this phase, the dependence on the SCOBA as external support to understand the concept is substituted by external support in the form of speech. By verbalizing their understanding of the concept (to a peer or to themselves), “an action is liberated from control by materialized SCOBAs or material objects” (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014, p. 66). Importantly, during this phase, an important developmental shift occurs in moving from speech directed at others to speech directed to oneself (dialogic speech). By directing the speech to themselves, learners move closer to having internalized a specific action/concept.

Finally, the third stage is inner speech. During this stage, learners are not bounded by reliance on the materialization of the target concept though a SCOBA or through other types of mediation, and their understanding of the specific concept is completely mental. That is to say that learners have internalized the essence of the concept (presented during phase one) and can now apply the concept to novel contexts of use.

The types of knowledge that teachers need for teaching within this approach fall across all four categories in Grossman’s (1990) framework. Content knowledge could be seen as deep knowledge of scientific concepts, which is central to all teacher activity in a C-BLI approach, including the explanation and materialization phases (orientating basis of mental action), as well as mediation that is provided throughout all pedagogical activities, given that mediation is dynamically attuned to learners’ emergent capacities and directed towards the ultimate internalization of concepts. In language education, the
scientific concepts introduced in classroom activity are linguistic in nature (e.g., Negueruela, 2003; Yañez-Prieto, 2008). However, recent projects from a Language for Specific Purposes (LSP) perspective have highlighted how target concepts can be linguistic as well as rhetorical in nature (e.g., Buescher, 2015; Casal, 2020; Kurtz, 2017).

Pedagogical knowledge from a C-BLI approach is represented by the teachers’ understanding of C-BLI and its principles, as it is a pedagogical approach which is strongly rooted in a theoretical tradition and is empowered by flexible, innovative, and strategic participation in educational activity, rather than “execution” of a pedagogical plan, as in previously discussed and more traditional pedagogical approaches.

Further, knowledge of context is represented in a C-BLI approach from the considerable emphasis that SCT and C-BLI place on the agency of individual learners and their intellectual and emotional realities as learners in, and human agents beyond, a classroom. Thus, the teacher relies on considerable knowledge of their learners – which may develop over the course of a term. From a Language for Specific Purposes pedagogy approach (a pedagogical site in which all participants teach their lessons), the importance of this contextual knowledge is heightened given that the emphasis on practical activity at the core of C-BLI is directed towards specific target community activities.

Finally pedagogical content knowledge plays a particularly salient role in C-BLI as educators have the responsibility to navigate explanation and materialization phases of the pedagogy in ways that render complex scientific concepts accessible to learners individually. Importantly, pedagogical content knowledge related to a particular scientific concept from a C-BLI/VSCT perspective is not a fixed, broadly applicable way of teaching a concept, but rather it is a set of strategies and approaches that may be flexibly
and dynamically enacted through responsive mediation (Johnson & Golombek, 2016) to facilitate the development of schematic, high quality explicit knowledge of concepts, and the ultimate internalization and development of conceptual resources relevant to course goals and desired outcomes.

Over the last two decades, a considerable number of C-BLI projects have emerged (e.g., Buescher, 2015; Casal, 2020; Doyle, 2021; Kim, 2013; Kurtz, 2017; Lai, 2012; Negueruela, 2003; Van Compernolle, 2012; Yanez-Prieto, 2008; Zhang & Lantolf, 2015), with some of these studies undertaking C-BLI to approach Language for Specific Purposes pedagogies (e.g., Casal, 2020; Kurtz, 2017).

For instance, Kurtz (2017) integrated C-BLI with English for Academic Legal Purposes education. Kurtz’ participants were Pre-LL.M. students who were enrolled in a criminal law course and a companion course designed to support the academic skills and language needs of second language English speakers enrolled in the program. The author used C-BLI to promote the development of students conceptual understanding of analogic reasoning, which is primary to legal reasoning and success in law school. This included the use of SCOBAs and other materializations of analogic reasoning, as well as one on one interactions with students that targeted verbalization. Data sources included student writing and participation in class, which were analyzed microgenetically to track the students’ learning of analogic reasoning and other concepts associated with legal reasoning in general. This study demonstrated the importance of a C-BLI pedagogical approach to help students identify and internalize key concepts necessary for success in an English for Academic Legal Purposes course.
Similarly, Casal (2020) provided an approach to ESP/EAP pedagogy consisting of two interdependent phases, and it demonstrates the pedagogical power of a wide angled approach to English for Academic Purposes. In phase one, the author conducted corpus-based genre analysis of academic texts across various disciplines to identify salient rhetorical moves and profile a set of pre-determined linguistic features in the realization of such rhetorical goals. The results from such analysis informed phase two, which consisted of a C-BLI pedagogical intervention in an EAP graduate writing course for second language graduate student writers, where the author was the instructor. The author adopted a microgenetic approach to analyzing text-protocol interviews, classroom interaction in corpus and genre analysis activities, and student writing to look for signs of increased conceptual understanding of course material (rhetorical and linguistic concepts including rhetorical moves, shell nouns, formulaic language, reporting verbs, nominalizations, and complex noun phrases), increased intentionality in writing decisions, and the ability to articulate writing intentions. This study highlights the potential of EAP pedagogy, through an SCT lens, to equip developing (L2) academic writers with the tools necessary to engage in their specific discipline practices, as well as to reorient them to their specific disciplines’ writing activity.

There are also a series of studies that have approached the use of C-BLI in teacher education contexts for varying purposes and with varying degrees of success. For example, Van Compernolle and Henery (2015) explored the development of pedagogical content knowledge through engagement in Concept-Based Pragmatic Instruction (CBPI). Their findings indicated that having an understanding of CBPI acted as a mediational tool for the teacher to reconceptualize and navigate classroom activity and to engage students
with the target concepts. This study also highlighted the importance of expert-other mediation to promote and guide teacher development.

Williams et al. (2013) introduced C-BLI to language teachers (both novice and pre-service) to analyze “how and to what extent teachers embrace or reject a pedagogical approach that does not necessarily align with a textbook’s explanation of a grammar point” (p. 363). Their findings indicated there were several facts impacting their attitudes towards taking up novel approaches and explanations, even when materials and content were not demonstrably superior for the pedagogical outcomes or learners. This provides interesting insights into teacher preferences and decision making. It relates to teacher preferences based on their previous lived experiences as language learners and teachers (Lortie, 1975), and deviation from familiar content or activities may present challenges to their identities as teachers and feelings of expertise, which could create uncomfortable moments of cognitive and emotional dissonance, or micro-versions of a state of novicehood (Verity, 2000). This resonates with Lantolf & Esteve’s (2019) argument that in order for teachers to engage in novel pedagogies, it is necessary to address teachers’ pre-existing understandings of teaching activity. While this is an important contribution to discussions of language teacher cognition, assessments of the effectiveness of C-BLI as a frame for conceptualizing teacher activity and as a mediational means for developing teacher education programs falls outside of their analysis.

Finally, Lantolf & Esteve (2019) analyzed how the understanding and appropriation of the principles of C-BLI could mediate pedagogical activity for experienced teachers from the Barcelona Formative Model (BFM). Their findings highlight a diverse array of positive impacts on teacher conceptions of language teaching,
of languages, of themselves as teachers, and of their own abilities as educators. In addition, the pedagogy was effective at reorienting teachers to the value of explicit language teaching, in contrast to Williams et al. (2013). However, it is important to note that this study is concerned with experienced rather than novice teachers.

This dissertation adds to this line of research by employing C-BLI and narrative activity to mediate conceptual understanding of content knowledge and overall orientation to educational activity for novice language teachers.
Chapter 3

Research Methods

3.1 Overview and research questions

Informed by Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory, an 11-week pedagogical intervention was designed with the goal of introducing novice language teachers to Concept-Based Language Instruction as a set of pedagogical tools, as well as engaging participants in regular narrative reflection to provoke and trace conceptual development of content knowledge and pedagogical decisions, and to mediate, through responsive mediation, their development and orientation to classroom activity. The research questions addressed in this dissertation are as follows:

1. To what extent can C-BLI as a set of pedagogical principles serve as a mediational tool for orienting novice teachers to content knowledge and pedagogical decisions within their particular educational contexts?

2. To what extent can the engagement in narrative activity as a form of verbalization be leveraged as a means of orienting novice teachers to better meet the particularized demands of their pedagogical contexts and reflect on the nature of their content knowledge and their pedagogical decisions?

3.2 Research context

3.2.1 Class description

The research site for this project was a Teaching English as a Second Language course (APLNG 493) in the department of Applied Linguistics at Penn State. This course was part of the curriculum for the Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Second
Language that the department offered and was also part of the courses that undergraduate students needed to take as part of the Teaching English to Speakers of other languages (TESOL) minor. In both the master’s degree and minor, APLNG 493 was part of the required, foundation courses. This course was offered twice every semester. As stated in the syllabus (see Appendix G), this class focused on the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. Specifically, the course discussed three themes regarding the teaching of English to speakers of other languages as organized in Freeman and Johnson (1998). These themes were the teacher as a learner of teaching, the social context of schools and schooling, and the pedagogical process of language teaching and learning. Therefore, the course placed emphasis on the multidimensional nature of teacher knowledge and teaching activity, and it explored sociocultural approaches to language learning and the inherent social nature of language learning, language teaching, and language use. These texts were part of the mediational environment of the novice teachers, and they were utilized as part of the intervention, but they were not introduced as part of it.

After completing the course, students would be able to critically reflect on their own understanding of the various dimensions of teacher and student knowledge, reflect on the relationship of theory and teaching activity, and understand and identify the sociocultural factors that surround and impact educational environments.

As part of the course, students were required to engage in six core course requirements, namely weekly reaction papers, a language learning and teaching narrative, a language skill workshop, a conversation partner project, the extended team-teaching project (explained more in depth in the following subsection), and a course development project. This dissertation focused on the Extended Team-Teaching Project assignment.
Data was analyzed from a Sociocultural Theory perspective, which emphasizes signs of use and appropriation of course materials as conceptual tools, as well as awareness of subject matter knowledge and informed pedagogical decisions in students’ verbalizations.

3.2.2 Extended Team-Teaching Project (EXTTP)

This intervention targeted the Extended Team-Teaching Project assignment, which was a required component of the APLNG 493 course. In this project, students were assigned to teach one 55–75-minute session of an English as a Second Language (ESL) course. This placement could be in the ESL/English for Academic Purposes program, the International Teaching Assistants program (ITA), or the Intensive English Communication Program (IECP). For this dissertation, participants were assigned to one ITA program course, and two ESL/English for Academic Purposes program courses, one graduate and one undergraduate ESL. Students in this assignment worked in groups of 2 to engage in pedagogical activities including classroom observation, lesson planning and materials design, practice teach, actual teach, stimulated recall with an expert other, and narrative reflection regarding their teaching experience. Below is a description of each of the steps as they happened chronologically throughout the semester:

1. **Classroom observations**: Starting in week 5, students were required to observe their assigned course at least twice before their practice teach session. These observations were important for students to familiarize themselves with their learners’ goals and the educational context in which they were going to be working. During these visits, teams could also create opportunities to build relationships with educational agents, including the ESL students.
2. **Collaborative lesson planning – pre practice teach:** Students were assigned to a specific lesson by their host instructor. The content of these lessons was the content dictated by the date they were scheduled to teach. That is to say, rather than students choosing their own content for their lessons, that content was already assigned by the host instructor in the syllabus. This arrangement posed a challenge for the student teams, as it was often the case that they did not have a deep understanding of the content they needed to engage with for their lessons. After the host instructor had assigned a particular lesson for the team to teach and had provided materials, teams collaboratively worked on developing a lesson plan. This lesson planning work took place from weeks 6 to 9.

3. **Practice-teach:** In weeks 9 and 10, each team had a one-hour teaching session. During this practice teach session, the teacher educators/PI and peers provided feedback, asked questions, and offered suggestions regarding the teams’ teaching activity. This practice teach session was video recorded, and the recordings were made available to the teams for pedagogical purposes.

4. **Collaborative lesson planning – after practice teach:** In weeks 10 to 12, teams revised and adapted their lesson plans to reflect the mediation provided during their practice teach sessions. Once this was done, the lesson plan was submitted to the teacher educators/PI for additional feedback, and once this additional feedback was addressed, the lesson plan was sent to the host instructor.
5. *Actual teach:* During weeks 11 to 13, teams engaged in teaching activity in their assigned courses. These actual teach sessions were video recorded by the teacher educator(s), and the recordings were made available to the students for pedagogical purposes shortly after their session was finished.

6. *Stimulated recall:* Within 24 hours of their actual teach session, students met with the teacher educators/PI for a stimulated recall session. During this session, the team and the teacher educators/PI watched the recording of the actual teach, and the team was encouraged to and mediated through the externalization of their thinking regarding their actual teach teaching activity. These sessions were video recorded and shared with the students for pedagogical purposes after their session was finished.

7. *Reflection paper:* As a final step in the EXTTP assignment, each student was asked to write a 5–7-page reflection paper focusing on their teaching activity experience and their evolving understanding of themselves as language teachers.

### 3.2.3. Participants

#### 3.2.3.1 Recruitment

Enrollment for the APLNG 493 course is normally capped at twenty, and the student population for the course tends to be a combination of undergraduate and graduate students. In the particular iteration that served as the data site for this dissertation project, there were 10 students enrolled (6 domestic, and 4 international students). For participant recruitment, the author sought approval from the instructor of
record of APLNG 493. Once approval was granted, during the Fall of 2022, week 3, the author explained the study goals and aims to the target students in the course. After that, the researcher (who was also the co-instructor of record for the course) and the instructor left the room in order to ensure that neither one of the teacher educators knew the identity of who had consented for the study, as well as to avoid potential influence on the participants’ choice to participate. A faculty member not affiliated with the project then distributed and collected consent forms and kept them in a locked cabinet until the end of the semester. Once grades had been submitted to the college, in December of 2022, the researcher was able to access the consent forms and begin selecting potential participants.

### 3.2.3.2 Case study selection

All 10 students/novice teachers consented to participate in the study, and all were considered for inclusion in data analysis. Students were in the second and third year of their undergraduate studies and enrolled in the course as part of the minor in TESOL, the English as a Second Language specialist certificate, or as part of their International Cultures courses requirements (from the College of Education). Novice teachers in this course came from a variety of disciplines, as seen in Table 3-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disciplinary Majors</th>
<th>Disciplinary Minors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linguistics</td>
<td>TESOL Minor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Korean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Education Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>ESL Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TESOL</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Theory and Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition, novice teachers’ teaching experience at the time of enrollment varied widely. Some novice teachers from the College of Education entered this course with some teaching experience, some others, from the same college, enrolled in this course as they were undergoing their teaching practicum in their home departments. The rest of the novice teachers had no significant prior experience in teaching or interacting with speakers of other languages, and this course represented their first time engaging in educational activity.

The selected 3 case study participants were chosen due to their differences in overall developmental trajectory during the intervention. They were also selected based on the degree of completion of all requirements of the intervention, and because the three of them were the leading or the sole novice language teachers in their pairs (meaning they did most, if not all of the work for the Extended Team-Teaching project themselves).

Table 3-2 below presents the information regarding the demographics of the three case study participants selected for analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants Name (Pseudonym)</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Disciplinary Major/Minor</th>
<th>Previous Teaching Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Major in Spanish and Linguistics Minor in TESOL and Korean</td>
<td>Spanish and English tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yichén (逸尘)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Major in Education and Public Policy Minor in TESOL</td>
<td>English tutoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Major in Political Science Minor in TESOL</td>
<td>English tutoring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2.4 Teacher educators

The teacher educators for this study were Dr. Smith (pseudonym) and the author of this dissertation. Both acted as the instructors of record and teacher educators throughout the semester and pedagogical intervention. Dr. Smith is a Vygotskian scholar and a leading figure in language teacher education. Her work investigates praxis-oriented pedagogy targeting novice language instructors, as well as ways to develop teacher reasoning, and ways in which that reasoning can be provoked and traced. Dr. Smith has taught the APLNG 493 course for several years and has been one of the scholars in charge of creating its curriculum.

3.2.4.1 Researcher positionality

The author was the researcher for this study and one of the instructors of record and teacher educators for the course. The researcher is an emerging language teacher educator and language teacher researcher informed by Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory. In this dissertation project, the researcher refers to herself as teacher educator (rather than co-instructor or researcher), since that was her role during the implementation of the pedagogical intervention. During this project, the role of the researcher/teacher educator was to design and implement a VSCT-informed pedagogical intervention to include, by design, spaces for critical thinking and verbalization to work through developing understandings of target concepts and educational activity, as well as to provide responsive mediation attuned to the individual needs of the enrolled students.
3.3. Overview of methods

The pedagogical intervention for this dissertation project spanned 11 weeks and targeted the Extended Team-Teaching Project (EXTTP). The intervention started in week 4 with the initial pairings of the novice teachers and their pairing with a host instructor. Weeks 5 through 10 were dedicated to workshop sessions during which novice teachers worked through their understanding of target concepts and development of their pedagogical materials, and weeks 11-13 were dedicated to stimulated recall sessions after novice teachers’ actual teach sessions. The pedagogical intervention ended in week 14 after students had submitted their final reflection. Each step of the pedagogical intervention is discussed below. Table 3-3 illustrates the intervention timeline.

Table 3-3: Intervention timeline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week 4</th>
<th>Week 5</th>
<th>Weeks 6-8</th>
<th>Weeks 9-10</th>
<th>Weeks 11-13</th>
<th>Week 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pairing of teams with host instructors</td>
<td>Workshop: C-BLI Lesson, Scientific vs everyday concepts</td>
<td>Workshop: Concepts of interest for each educational context</td>
<td>Workshop: Practice teach session</td>
<td>Actual teach session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLT narrative</td>
<td>Narrative reflection</td>
<td>Narrative reflection</td>
<td>Narrative reflection</td>
<td>Stimulated recalls</td>
<td>Final teaching reflection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: LLT stands for Language Learning and Teaching*

3.3.1 Intervention overview

This section presents a brief overview of the intervention and the activities that took place within it. More details regarding the prompts and materials used for each of the activities and parts of the intervention can be found in section 3.3.2 onward.
In week 4 of the semester, novice teachers completed their first assignment, which was a language learning and teaching narrative. This narrative asked novice teachers to reflect on their previous experiences learning, using, and teaching language. It also required novice teachers to reflect on how those experiences may have impacted the language users, learners, and teachers they are or want to become, and their understandings of teaching and knowledge within a classroom (see section 3.3.2).

During that same week, novice teachers were paired and assigned to a course for their EXTTP, and teams met with their host instructors and discussed what lesson they were to work on for their actual teach. They also discussed the content of that lesson with the host instructor. Generally, host instructors share materials they have used for these lessons in previous iterations of their courses, but it is also often the case that host instructors do not have materials to share. In either case, teams are required to gather information regarding their assigned topics in order to prepare their lessons. Table 3-4 presents the pairing of novice teachers with host instructors, as well as the concepts they were assigned to teach.

Table 3-4: Course and Concept Pairings for EXTTP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novice Teacher</th>
<th>Target Course</th>
<th>Target Concept</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jaime</td>
<td>ESL 118 G – American Oral English for ITAs III (Graduate, ITA Program)</td>
<td>Conditionals (during office hours interactions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yichén (逸尘)</td>
<td>ESL 015 - ESL Composition for American Academic Communication II (Undergraduate, ESL/EAP Program)</td>
<td>Tone and Register (in academic writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>María</td>
<td>ESL 114 G – American Oral English for Academic Purposes (Graduate, ESL/EAP Program)</td>
<td>Intonation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Starting in week 5, a series of workshops following the principles of C-BLI took place. These workshops focused on the content knowledge, in the form of scientific/academic concepts of interest, that novice teachers had to work with for their practice teaching and actual teaching lessons, as well as the pedagogical decisions and rationale behind the creation of their materials for these sessions. The first workshop served as the model for C-BLI to be introduced to the novice teachers, as it was designed to follow the different phases of C-BLI. During this workshop, teams were presented with a lesson on the concept of cohesion in academic writing. This concept was chosen as practice because it represents a specific example of a scientific concept that many students in the class were unlikely to have a scientific understanding of and would rather enter the class with an everyday conceptual understanding of it. After the lesson was over, novice teachers were prompted to discuss their understanding regarding the structure of the lesson, as well as the concept of cohesion itself. This discussion was followed by an explicit explanation of C-BLI, scientific and everyday/spontaneous concepts, and the different steps or phases that C-BLI presents (see section 3.3.3). This session was video-recorded and the materials from the session shared with participants.

In weeks 6 through 8, weekly workshops focused on the scientific concepts of interest for each team, following C-BLI as a pedagogical approach that emphasizes scientific concepts in practical activity with the ultimate goal of learners internalizing key concepts. During these workshops, novice teachers worked on creating and preparing a systemic explanation of the concept of interest for their EXTTP placement course. Novice teachers were also prompted to discuss how they would promote the learning of such concepts, as well as how they would assess their learning (see section 3.3.3.2).
These sessions, as previously stated, constituted an opportunity for novice teachers to work together with their partners, and an opportunity for them to receive responsive mediation from the teacher educator. The workshops were intentionally designed to provide a recurrent and safe space for verbalization and mediation for the novice teachers as they made sense of their evolving conceptual understanding of both the scientific concept of cohesion and their understanding of C-BLI.

After each workshop, novice teachers were prompted to verbalize (in written form) their current understandings of their target concepts and their rationales for their activities. These discussions were documented as field notes, and the written reflections post-workshop collected via Canvas. During the workshop sessions and the following written narrative activity, scientific/academic concepts and their materialization/verbalization for goal-oriented activity became a focus of both oral and written narrative discussion. The prompts for each workshop session can be found in section 3.3.3.2.

In weeks 9 and 10, novice teachers’ practice teach sessions took place. During these sessions, novice teachers entered a mediational space where the teams’ instructional activities were co-constructed and analyzed by the teacher educators and the rest of the classmates, and adapted accordingly as the teams were in the activity of carrying them out. These sessions corresponded to the second phase of C-BLI, which is that of verbal action. During the practice teach, the teams presented their lessons (organized around orientation, presentation of the concept, verbalization and application of the concept in activity) and engaged their peers in APLNG 493 in a series of activities (as part of their lessons) to allow them to verbalize and apply their understanding of the concept.
presented. During these sessions, novice teachers also received mediation and feedback from the teacher educators. These practice teach sessions were video recorded and included in the data analysis.

During weeks 11 through 13, teams engaged in their actual teach sessions. During these sessions, teams went to their assignment host instructors’ classroom and taught the lessons they worked on during the workshops. These actual teach sessions were video recorded and included in the data analysis. After the actual teach sessions, teams met with the teacher educators, watched the video recordings of the actual teach sessions, and engaged in a stimulated recall session, where the teacher educators and the pairs discussed their teams’ teaching activity. The stimulated recall sessions were video recorded and used as part of data analysis.

Finally, during week 14, novice teachers completed a final teaching reflection. In this narrative reflection, they were asked to revisit their initial language learning and teaching narrative and reflect on their understandings of the same topics after having completed the course requirements and having had their practice and actual teach experiences. They were also asked to reflect on their experiences teaching in their assigned educational contexts, and their overall engagement and development over the EXTTP. These reflections were collected from Canvas and included in the data analysis. The prompts can be seen in section 3.3.3.6.

3.3.2. Language learning and teaching narrative

The Language Learning and Teaching Narratives were collected in week 4. These narratives were collected for two reasons. The first was for the teacher educator to
understand the perezhivanie of the students. It was important to understand individuals’ previous lived experiences in the context of learning how to teach a language, as well as to understand their impact on future decisions and conceptualizations of language learning and teaching. It was also important for the teacher educator to understand novice teachers’ perezhivanie to help attune her responsive mediation. The second was to leverage the power of narratives as a space for and means of provoking development for the novice teachers themselves, as they were asked to reflect on their experiences and the way those had impacted their conceptualizations of teaching at the time of the pedagogical intervention.

For their Language Learning and Teaching Narratives, novice teachers were asked to reflect on their previous experiences learning, using, and teaching language as well as to critically analyze how those experiences may have impacted the language users, learners, and teachers they are or want to become, and their understandings of teaching and knowledge within a classroom. The prompts for this assignment are presented below (Figure 3-1).
A language learning and teaching narrative is an opportunity for you to explore what has shaped and continues to shape who you are as a language learner and teacher. Your narrative will be a combination of reflections on your prior language learning and teaching experiences, a critical analysis of those experiences, and the application of insights you have gained from them to your current and future language study and language teaching. Please note that ‘teaching’ can refer to any type of teaching/tutoring experiences, not just those related to language.

Consider the following as you construct your language learning and teaching narrative, and feel free to take your narrative in your own direction.

A. Reflection
   1. Memories and impressions of yourself as a user/learner of other languages and as a teacher. These may be based on experiences with your family and/or friends, living in another country or culture, and/or more formal classroom language learning experiences.
   2. Beliefs and assumptions about how languages are learned and taught at the time you had those experiences.
   3. Beliefs and assumptions about the role of the teacher and students in learning another language when you had those experiences.
   4. Your motivations for becoming an English language teacher and how your decision reflects your identity.

B. Critical Analysis
   1. Consider how your prior experiences and beliefs shaped the kind of language user/learner and teacher you are today.
   2. What do you believe are your greatest strengths as a language user/learner and as a language teacher?
   3. What challenges have you had to manage? How did you manage them?

C. Application
   1. Describe one or two critical incidents that encapsulate you as a user/learner of other languages and as a teacher.
   2. How did you understand these incidents? How did you respond to them?
   3. How does your understanding of and response to these incidents reflect your conceptions of yourself as a user/learner of other languages and as a teacher?
   4. Now that you have written this narrative, how would you describe who you are today as a language user/learner and as a teacher?

Figure 3-1: Guidelines for language learning and teaching narratives.

3.3.3. Concept-Based Language Instruction workshop series

A series of Concept-Based Language Instruction workshops took place from weeks 5 until weeks 10 of the semester. These workshops introduced the theoretical underpinnings of C-BLI as a pedagogical approach to language instruction and aimed to
provided novice teachers with a mediational tool they could use mediate their orientation to classroom activity and their developing understanding of target concepts.

3.3.3.1. Workshop 1: Cohesion and information flow in academic writing, Concept-Based Language Instruction, and scientific/everyday concepts

The first workshop took place in week 5, after all novice teachers had been paired with their respective host instructors. The lesson, titled “Cohesion and Information Flow”, consisted of two parts: part 1 focused on the concept of cohesion in academic writing and was organized around the principles of Concept-Based Language Instruction; part 2 focused on an explicit explanation of Concept-Based Language Instruction and its link to Sociocultural Theory. Figure 3-2 presents the PowerPoint slides used in the first part of the lesson, dedicated to a lesson on Cohesion organized around C-BLI.

Cohesion

What does cohesion mean in writing?

- A cohesive text is one where the language and content that a writer employs work together to convey a clear message to the reader.

What are some ways that you can make texts cohesive?
A cohesive text

Research has shown that caffeine reduces sleepiness and can lead to better academic performance since students can spend more time studying. Despite its effectiveness in counteracting sleepiness, caffeine can have a negative impact on subsequent sleep, which for many students may already be compromised. Specifically, caffeinated beverages consumed near bedtime at night can prolong sleep onset and reduce sleep efficiency and depth, thus affecting both sleep quality and duration. Most of the research on how caffeine affects sleepiness/alertness has focused on coffee or no-doze pills. However, a new kind of caffeinated product has become increasingly popular, functional energy drinks (FEDs). FEDs are marketed as products that can improve both mental and physical performance. In addition to containing caffeine, FEDs have other active ingredients such as taurine, glucose, and glucuronolactone. Exactly how these ingredients together affect alertness remains unclear (Swales & Feak, 2012, p. 30).

3 Dimensions of Cohesion

- Repetition
- Old-New Information flow
- Shell/Signaling nouns
Cohesion through repetition

Research has shown that caffeine reduces sleepiness and can lead to better academic performance since students can spend more time studying. Despite its effectiveness in counteracting sleepiness, caffeine can have a negative impact on subsequent sleep, which for many students may already be compromised. Specifically, caffeinated beverages consumed near bedtime at night can prolong sleep onset and reduce sleep efficiency and depth, thus affecting both sleep quality and duration. Most of the research on how caffeine affects sleepiness/alertness has focused on coffee or no-doze pills. However, a new kind of caffeinated product has become increasingly popular, functional energy drinks (FEDs). FEDs are marketed as products that can improve both mental and physical performance. In addition to containing caffeine, FEDs have other active ingredients such as taurine, glucose, and glucuronolactone. Exactly how these ingredients together affect alertness remains unclear (Swales & Feak, 2012, p. 30).

3 Dimensions of Cohesion

- Repetition
- Old-New Information flow
- Shell/Signaling nouns
Cohesion Through “Old-to-new” Information Flow

“Although your first instinct in establishing a smooth flow of ideas is to use logical connectors such as however or furthermore, many writers try to follow a progression from old or given information, which is in the subject position or early at the left end of the sentence, to new information, which is placed at the right end of the sentence” (Swales & Feak, 2012, p. 31)

Cohesion Through “Old-to-new” Information Flow

Yesterday I went to the store and something funny happened. When I got to the store, I saw a man with a dog.

Yesterday I went to the store and something funny happened. When I got to the store, I saw a man with a dog.

Cohesion Through “Old-to-new” Information Flow

“Although your first instinct in establishing a smooth flow of ideas is to use logical connectors such as however or furthermore, many writers try to follow a progression from old or given information, which is in the subject position or early at the left end of the sentence, to new information, which is placed at the right end of the sentence” (Swales & Feak, 2012, p. 31)

“If old-to-new cannot be easily maintained, writers will often opt to use a logical connector to make relationships clear” (Swales & Feak, 2012, p. 33)
Cohesion Through “Old-to-new” Information Flow & Connectors

Research has shown that caffeine reduces sleepiness and can lead to better academic performance since students can spend more time studying. Despite its effectiveness in counteracting sleepiness, caffeine can have a negative impact on subsequent sleep, which for many students may already be compromised. Specifically, caffeinated beverages consumed near bedtime at night can prolong sleep onset and reduce sleep efficiency and depth, thus affecting both sleep quality and duration. Most of the research on how caffeine affects sleepiness/alertness has focused on coffee or no-doze pills. However, a new kind of caffeinated product has become increasingly popular, functional energy drinks (FEDs). FEDs are marketed as products that can improve both mental and physical performance. In addition to containing caffeine, FEDs have other active ingredients such as taurine, glucose, and glucuronolactone. Exactly how these ingredients together affect alertness remains unclear (Swales & Feak, 2012, p. 30).

3 Dimensions of Cohesion

- Repetition
- Old-New Information flow
- Shell/Signaling nouns
### Cohesion Through “This/these + shell/signaling noun”

- Non-specific and specific meanings
- Concrete (e.g., table/book); Abstract (argument/problem)

- Shell/Signaling noun -> Focus on how words ‘label’ each other (e.g., problem) and on how a word is specified
  - Alba has class today. This problem has caused her distress.
  - The problem that Alba has class today caused her distress.
  - Alba has class today. This wonderful opportunity will provide an important boost for her CV.

- Cohesion -> Repackage an old idea.

### Shell/signaling Nouns in Action

- Sample 1:
  When propagating through a medium, a pulse of light can travel with a group velocity that is much slower that its vacuum value. This phenomenon of slow light has been extensively studied due to its potential for applications ranging from optical buffers to enhanced light-matter interactions (and thus nonlinearity).

- Sample 2:
  Males of many species of hoverfly spend much of the day hovering in one spot, thus keeping their flight muscles warm and primed so that they are ready to dart instantly after any passing female that they sight. This chasing behavior is on such a hair-trigger that all manner of inappropriate targets elicit pursuit (pebbles, distant birds, and midges so small as to be scarcely visible to a human observer) as well as a very occasional female.

- Sample 3:
  Without the right incentives, these agents might be tempted to shirk on their responsibilities or succumb to possibly unchecked corruption. Naturally, this problem appears in many other economic realms, such as management and supervision of workers, especially in service industries.
After the concept of cohesion in academic writing had been explained and discussed through the initial four phases of C-BLI, novice teachers were encouraged to practice their verbalization of their understanding of cohesion in academic writing (Figure 3-3). They were also encouraged to use the blackboards in the room to externalize their thinking and create visualizations for the concept of interest. These visualizations were collected but not used in data analysis.
Figure 3-3: Excerpts from workshop 1 (Cohesion in academic writing).

After this verbalization, novice teachers engaged in another exercise regarding the application of the elements of cohesion presented in the lesson to a novel text (Figure 3-4).

**Cohesion Activity**

- With your partner:
  - Create a visualization of your current understanding of cohesion
  - Explain your visualization to the class

**Discourse Analysis**

- Look for Cohesion through:
  - Repetition of words/phrases -> Chains & Knots
  - Old-New Information Structure -> Building Blocks
  - This + Shell/Signaling Nouns -> Repackage Ideas
Cohesion Activity – Can this text be more cohesive?

- Lasers have found widespread application in medicine. Lasers play an important role in the treatment of eye-disease and the prevention of blindness. The eye is ideally suited for laser surgery. Most of the eye tissue is transparent. The frequency and focus of the laser beam can be adjusted according to the absorption of the tissue. The beam “cuts” inside the eye with minimal damage to the surrounding tissue— even the tissue between the laser and the incision. Lasers are effective in treating some causes of blindness. Other treatments are not. The interaction between laser light and eye tissue is not fully understood (Swales & Feak, 2012, 36).

Cohesion Activity – Is this a more cohesive text?

- Lasers have found widespread application in medicine. For example, they play an important role in the treatment of eye disease and the prevention of blindness. The eye is ideally suited for laser surgery because most of the eye tissue is transparent. Because of this transparency, the frequency and focus of the laser beam can be adjusted according to the absorption of the tissue so that the beam “cuts” inside the eye with minimal damage to the surrounding tissue— even the tissue between the laser and the incision. Lasers are also more effective than other methods in treating some causes of blindness. However, the interaction between laser light and eye tissue is not fully understood (Swales & Feak, 2012, 36).

Figure 3-4: Excerpts from workshop 1 (Cohesion in academic writing – content adapted from Casal, 2020).

After this part of the workshop, novice teachers were presented with an overview of Concept-Based Language Instruction, which emerged from Gal’perin’s work on STI (Systemic Theoretical Instruction). The goal of Concept-Based Language Instruction is the internalization of scientific concepts as tools for future activity, and C-BLI as a pedagogical approach provides a systematic means of bringing Vygotsky’s work into language learning classrooms. In this workshop, C-BLI was explained as a set of pedagogical tools that place focus on assisting learners in developing schematic
knowledge of target concepts, an emphasis on materialization of concepts and verbalization of learners' understandings, and on concepts deployment in concrete practical activity (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014). The excerpts for this part of the workshop are presented below (Figure 3-5).

**Figure 3-5. Excerpts from workshop 1 (C-BLI).**
After a brief in-group discussion and verbalization of those pre-existing understandings, novice teachers were presented with an explanation of scientific versus everyday concepts as understood through VSCT. In this workshop, the differences between spontaneous and scientific concepts were presented through Lantolf’s (2011) example of a sunset. As Lantolf (2011) argues, the everyday knowledge regarding the setting of the sun can be seen through the use of words such as the sun “sets”, “rises”, or “moves” through the sky (p. 33). These words relate to and reflect the everyday experiences of individuals as they see the sun move through the sky from their fixed position. These words and understanding of a sunset differ from the scientific knowledge individuals may have regarding the planetary rotation around the sun in the solar system. As a result, the explanation of a sunset based on scientific knowledge would indicate that the sun does not move around the earth but rather rotates around itself and around the center of the Milky Way galaxy. The Earth is the planet that rotates around the sun and given that the direction of the Earth’s rotation is prograde (or counterclockwise when viewed from above the North Pole), the energy from the Sun lights the planet from west from east (Figure 3-6).
Concept-Based Language Instruction (CBLI)

- CONCEPTS

  - Everyday/spontaneous:
    - unsystematic in nature, as they arise from “generalization of everyday personal experience” (Karpov, 2003, pp. 65-66).

  - Scientific:
    - systematic in nature and “represent the generalization of the experience of humankind that is fixed in science” (Karpov, 2003, pp. 65-66).
    - relatively fixed and stable; abstract
In the lesson, novice teachers were also able to see the five steps that compose the phases of C-BLI as proposed by Gal’perin (orienting at a basic level, acting at the material level, acting at the verbal level, acting at the mental level, and orienting at a more advanced level). The teacher educator then reviewed the different steps of C-BLI superimposed on the different sections of the PowerPoint discussing cohesion in academic writing (Figure 3-7).
Concept-Based Language Instruction (CBLI)

- CBLI Wheel

1. EXPLORATION OF LEARNERS’ UNDERSTANDING OF CONCEPT
2. EXPLANATION OF CONCEPT (SCOB)
3. VISUALIZATION/MATERIALIZATION OF CONCEPT
4. VERBALIZATION OF CONCEPT
5. INTERNALIZATION OF CONCEPT TO GENERALIZE

Cohesion

What does cohesion mean in writing?

- A cohesive text is one where the language and content that a writer employs work together to convey a clear message to the reader.

What are some ways that you can make texts cohesive?

3 Dimensions of Cohesion

- Repetition
- Old-New Information flow
- Shell/Signaling nouns
Figure 3-7: Excerpts from workshop 1 (C-BLI).

Afterwards, novice teachers were introduced to the lesson plan document that they were expected to use for the development of their specific lesson plans. This lesson plan was also organized around the principles of C-BLI, which were now somewhat familiar to the students. The lesson plan document can be found in Appendix C.

3.3.3.2. Workshops 2-4: Scientific concepts of interest for EXTTP

During weeks 6 through 8, weekly workshops focused on the scientific concepts that each team had been assigned for their ESL lessons. The concepts that the three
selected case studies (and their partners) had to cover were tone and register, word stress and intonation, and conditionals use during office hours.

During these workshops, novice teachers were asked to conduct research on their target concepts (students’ first step was to search for information about their target concepts online). Some host instructors also shared materials they had used in previous iterations of their ESL courses, but students were still required to gather information on their own and to use the materials provided by some host instructors as a guide or as a reference.

During these workshops, novice teachers worked together (grouped in their EXTTP teams) either in their own group or in teams of two groups, focusing on a specific team’s concept at a time in order to promote peer mediation when verbalizing each key concept. In addition to this, the teacher educator interacted with each novice teacher and provide mediation as needed. Novice teachers were given prompts to mediate and organize the workshop session. These prompts were the same that they would need to answer in their written narrative reflections. Therefore, a sample of prompts has been included in section 3.3.3.3.

3.3.3.3. Narrative reflections

At the same time that the Concept-Based Instruction workshops took place, novice teachers were asked to engage in a series of narrative reflections regarding their evolving understandings of the content knowledge they explored and engaged with during the workshops. These narrative accounts were on-going, as novice teachers started their narratives in week 5 and continued their writing throughout the pedagogical intervention (until week 13). These narratives provided a space where novice teachers
could reflect and verbalize their evolving conceptualizations of the content knowledge they were expected to teach, such as their developing understandings of the abstract scientific concepts themselves, as well as the ways in which they could promote such conceptual learning and assessment in their assigned lessons. In addition, novice teachers were prompted to explore and to provide their reasonings behind their pedagogical decisions. Figure 3-8 illustrates two sample prompts from weeks 2 and 4 in the pedagogical intervention. A full list of prompts given at each stage of the intervention can be found on Appendix D.

**Workshop 2:**
Please provide detailed answers to your responses (350 words minimum, but feel free to write more!). Try to make connections to the content of the class we have seen so far. Following our C-BLI lesson plan:

1. Please provide your current understanding of the concept you will be teaching (explain the concept). It is okay if you don't know how to explain this concept thoroughly yet! Just write what you can and what makes sense to you as of now. You can also think of how you would explain the concept to your students.
2. What would be a possible visualization of this concept? (This is an initial visualization - it may change as you keep working on your lesson)
3. What are possible orienting activities to explore students’ pre-existing understanding of the concept?
4. How might you engage students with this concept?

Further questions:

1. How do you feel about teaching in your assigned course? Why?
2. How do you feel about teaching this concept? Why?

**Workshop 4:**
After working on your lesson plan during today’s session:

1. How do you currently understand your concept? Please elaborate.
2. What do you think the importance of teaching this concept is?

Regarding the activities you are thinking about for your lesson plan:

1. Please elaborate on your reasoning for choosing these activities. Also, please discuss the importance of using these activities. Please feel free to add/discuss anything that you feel is relevant in this discussion.

Figure 3-8: Prompts for workshops 2 and 4.
Similarly, novice teachers were asked to reflect on their experience and understanding of their target concepts after their practice teach. Figure 3-9 presents the prompts for that workshop reflection.

**Practice Teach Reflection:**
Before answering these questions, please review the feedback from your peers, instructors, and the recording of your practice teach.

1. How do you feel about your practice teach?
2. In what ways has your understanding of the teaching of your concept changed after experiencing your practice teach? What about your understanding of yourself as the instructor?
3. In your opinion, what aspects of the practice teach went the way you had expected, and what others went in an unexpected way?
4. What are you planning on changing from your practice teach for your actual teach session? How? (e.g., activities, the way you position yourself, etc.). Please elaborate.
5. Please focus on the feedback that you have received from your classmates: what are some salient comments that you would like to address? Is this feedback useful? How or how not?
6. Please focus on the feedback that you received from your instructors - what are some salient comments that you would like to address? Is this feedback useful? How or how not?

350 words minimum.

Figure 3-9: Prompt for practice teach.

These on-going narrative accounts were housed and collected through Canvas. Each novice teacher was assigned a private discussion board that only that individual novice teacher and the teacher educator had access to. Once novice teachers were introduced to scientific and everyday concepts, in the first workshop, scientific concepts became a focus of oral and written narrative discussions throughout the remaining workshops. As novice teachers advanced through the remaining workshops and were guided through the materialization of various scientific concepts, both scientific/academic concepts and their materialization/verbalization for goal-oriented activity became a focus of both oral and written narrative discussion.
3.3.3.4. EXTTP practice teach

After the completion of the first two C-BLI workshops and the lesson plan, teams engaged in a practice teach session. This session took place during weeks 9 and 10, before teams went into their host ESL classes to teach their assigned lessons. Therefore, these sessions represented a teaching simulation where the teams had the opportunity to engage in teaching activity with their classmates as hypothetical ESL students. Each practice teach session lasted for sixty to ninety minutes. During these sessions, teams entered a space where their instructional activities were discussed, analyzed, co-constructed alongside and based on the mediation provided by the teacher educators and feedback received from peers, and adapted as they were carried out in a novel educational context. Importantly, feedback and mediation by both the teacher educators and the peers was provided as teams were in the activity of teaching, as well as at the end of the session. This practice teach session corresponded to the second phase of C-BLI, which is that of verbal action, as it was during these sessions that teams engage in the activity of verbalizing their understanding of the scientific concepts relevant for their assigned ESL contexts, how to teach those concepts, and what their rationale and choices were for their assessment of such concepts. Similarly, it represented a space where the teams engaged their peers in a series of communicative activities to allow them to verbalize their own understanding of the concept(s) presented. During this phase, teams also asked their peers to apply such understanding in various activities/contexts. After this session, teams implemented the feedback received from both classmates and the teacher educators in their lesson plans and sent them to the teacher educators. After their approval, teams sent the lesson plan to the host instructor. In the instances where the host instructor provided
additional feedback on the lesson (this feedback was not collected as data for this study),
the students updated their lesson plans and resubmitted their finalized lessons to the
teacher educators prior to their actual teach session.

3.3.3.5. EXTTP actual teach and stimulated recalls

After implementing the feedback for the practice teach session, teams engaged in
an actual teach session. During these sessions, which took place during weeks 11 through
13, teams went to their host ESL classrooms and taught their prepared lessons. Both the
host instructor and the teacher educator were present in the classroom, although they did
not engage in teaching activity, as is always the case during these sessions. This actual
teach lesson represented a novel environment in which the teams applied their
understanding of the key scientific concept(s) of their lesson, as well as their application
to various educational activities in a novel context. These sessions were audio and video
recorded and shared with the teams. Within 48 hours of their actual teach session, teams
met with the teacher educators for a stimulated recall session. During this session, novice
teachers rewatched the video of their actual teach session and reflected on their teaching
experience, as well as on moments that either they or the teacher educators considered
salient. These stimulated recall sessions lasted for 60 minutes and took place via Zoom.
The novice teacher pairs joined the teacher educators in a private Zoom room from a
quiet, private environment so that novice teachers could feel comfortable discussing their
experiences and emotions regarding their teaching experience.
3.3.3.6. Final teaching reflection papers

After their actual teach and stimulated recall sessions, novice teachers were asked to write their own final reflection regarding their overall EXTTP experience. In this assignment, they discussed the workshops, the initial class visits, the lesson planning process, their practice and actual teach sessions, their stimulated recall sessions, and their engagement in narrative activity throughout. They were also asked to establish and discuss connections with course materials. Figure 3-10 illustrates the prompts created and used for this assignment (see Appendix E).

In a narrative format, please respond to the following questions:

**Part 1:**
1. Explain the concept that you taught in your own words.
   a. Then describe how you decided to teach it and why you taught it that way.
   b. Finally, describe how the C-BLI workshop series (weeks 5-9) helped you understand your concept and your approach to teaching it.
2. What did you learn about yourself as a new teacher of English?
3. If you were to teach this lesson again, what might you do differently and why?
4. What did you learn about each of the following?
   - Teaching as connecting
   - Collaborative teaching and planning
   - Building rapport with your students
   - Emotions and teaching (frustrations and celebrations)
   - Lesson planning, activity design, and materials development
   - Engineering participation
   - Teaching off, not at your students

5. If you have any suggestions for making this assignment more meaningful, please feel free to share them with me.

**Part 2:**
Please review what you wrote for Part 1 of your language learning and teaching narrative and briefly write your responses to each of the following prompts:

1. Did writing your language learning and teaching narrative at the start of the semester in any way shape your experiences throughout our class, raise your awareness of how you came to choose language teaching, and/or help you think differently about your identity as a language teacher?
   a. If so, why do you think that was so? If not, why do you think that was so?
2. Now that we are at the end of the semester, what would you change about what you wrote in Part 1 of your narrative?
   a. Why would you make those changes?
3. What might you add to your initial narrative, and why?
4. What is your motivational level/your investment now for being a language teacher? Why do you believe that is so?
5. If you are still interested in becoming a language teacher, what will you do/continue to do to grow?

Figure 3-10: Prompts for final teaching reflection papers.
3.4 Data collection and analytical procedures

There were several sources of data for this project: a series of narratives that took place throughout the workshops series around the principles of C-BLI and after the teams practice teach, a language learning and teaching narrative (at the beginning of the intervention), video recordings of the practice and actual teach sessions, as well as additional sessions to discuss students lesson plans, stimulated recalls that occurred after the actual teach sessions, lesson plan materials, and final teaching reflections regarding students’ actual teach and overall EXTTP experience. Data for this project was longitudinal and spanned 11 weeks.

The initial narrative reflections were completed during week 4 of the semester. These narrative reflections were collected via Canvas through an assignment submission box. Each novice teacher submitted their own individual narratives. The reflective, on-going narratives completed after each workshop were also collected via Canvas. For these narratives, each novice teacher got assigned a private discussion board through Canvas that only they and the teacher educator could access. Following each workshop, the teacher educator posted a series of prompts in the individual threads for novice teachers to respond to. These prompts targeted the verbalization of the evolving understanding of novice teachers’ concepts (see Appendix D).

After data collection was completed, the initial and final narratives, as well as the dialogic narrative threads were downloaded from Canvas and saved in a secure university server that only the teacher educator had access to. The C-BLI workshops were audio and video recorded using a video recorder camera from Penn State Media and Technology Support Services. During the workshops, and given the ample whiteboard space available
in the classroom (Chemical and Bioengineering Building, room 113, see Figure 3-11), teams were encouraged to use the whiteboards to create the visualizations of their scientific concepts of interest. Pictures of these visualizations were also taken using the same equipment. Both the recordings of the C-BLI workshops and the pictures of teams’ visualizations were uploaded to Canvas as part of the course materials for teams to have access to. After data collection, these recordings and pictures were downloaded from Canvas and saved in a secure university server that only the teacher educator had access to.

Figure 3-11: Sketch of the chemical and bioengineering building, room 113.

The practice teach and actual teach sessions were also audio and video recorded using the same equipment used to record the C-BLI workshops. These videos were then uploaded to a secure university server that the teacher educators had access to and shared.
directly with each individual team. After the semester ended, these recordings were
moved to a secure university server that only the researcher/teacher educator had access
to and were transcribed using verbatim transcription.

The stimulated recalls that took place after the actual teach sessions were audio
and video recorded using Zoom. These recordings were then uploaded to the same folder
the actual teaching videos were stored and shared with each team. Both the actual teach
session and the stimulated recall recordings were accessible to each individual team and
the teacher educators only. These recordings have pedagogical value for the novice
teachers since they represent a recording of their actual teaching experience. After the
end of the semester, these recordings were saved in a secure university server that only
the teacher educators had access to.

The final teaching reflection papers were collected during weeks 13 and 14, two
weeks after students had completed all the EXTTP requirements and had met for a
stimulated recall session with the teacher educators. Students submitted these individual
reflection papers to a submission box on Canvas. After the end of the semester, these
reflections were downloaded and saved in a secure university server that only the teacher
educators had access to.

3.4.1. Analytical procedures

A microgenetic analysis (Lantolf and Thorne, 2006) of the data was conducted to
track the process of internalization of a) the target concepts within the novice teachers’
pedagogical context, and b) key concepts of C-BLI (looking both at understanding and
potential enactment during educational activity). Particular attention was paid to how
knowledge of C-BLI concepts mediated and facilitated the internalization of target concepts in teaching and mediated teaching activity.

The videorecorded data (lesson plan working sessions, practice teach, actual teach, and stimulated recalls) was transcribed using verbatim transcription. The written data (narratives, language learning and teaching narratives, and final EXTTP reflection) required no additional transcription. After the pedagogical intervention was completed and all the required assignments were turned in, the researcher/teacher educator reviewed data from all participants repeatedly “to develop a holistic, cross-participant horizon of developmental trajectories and experiences” (Casal, 2020, p. 85). This holistic perspective allowed for strategic selection of focal case studies that represented the range of individual experiences and mediational profiles. Importantly, throughout this analytical activity, the novice teachers’ evolving conceptual knowledge of their target concepts, as well as the potential understanding and enactment of the principles of C-BLI in educational activity, were understood within the contexts of the various sociocultural histories of the students and the mediational space created in the classroom by the teacher educators.

There was special attention paid to the following types of episodes: 1) novice teachers’ descriptions of the concepts they were expected to teach, 2) novice teachers’ applications of conceptual knowledge for planning, navigating, and/or reflecting on educational activity, and 3) the nature of responsive mediation that the teacher educators provided throughout the intervention.
Chapter 4

Results

Chapter 4 through 6 present a case-study analysis of three novice teachers’ conceptual developmental trajectories over the course of the 11-week pedagogical intervention. A microgenetic analysis was conducted on data drawn from students’ language learning and teaching narratives, recorded practice teach and actual teach activities, oral and written narratives about their evolving experience during the EXTTP, and the students’ final teaching reflection papers. The novice teachers in this course represented a diverse and complex group, with rich backgrounds and experiences that evolved uniquely throughout the course of the semester. The following novice teachers were chosen as a representative sample of the diversity of outcomes.

Jaime

Jaime (pseudonym) presented a history of multilingualism and extensive language learning, which acted as a prism through which he was able to effectively approach and engage with the intervention. As a student and a learner, Jaime was highly aware of his own conceptual development of the scientific concept assigned to him, but also of his development in terms of orienting to classroom activity. He was a highly reflective individual who sought chances for verbalization and externalization and was highly aware of the sources of the cognitive/emotional dissonance he experienced throughout the intervention. Importantly, Jaime was, from the beginning of the intervention, responsive to the type of mediation provided by the teacher educators, as well as able to discuss and materialize the ways in which he could address any cognitive/emotional
dissonance in his teaching activity. Another important (and reoccurring) salient point for Jaime’s development was the fact that his previous lived experience as a learner of Spanish functioned as a prism for Jaime to orient to and understand the concept of conditionality. His OBA of this scientific concept was deeply rooted in his Spanish understanding of conditionals, and he was able to use this knowledge throughout the intervention. A final salient point for Jaime’s development was the fact that he was able to use C-BLI to reorient to classroom activity, something he celebrated in his reflections.

### 4.1. Previous language learning and teaching experience

At the time of the pedagogical intervention, Jaime was a sophomore (first semester) double majoring in Spanish and Linguistics and completing a minor in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) and Korean. Outside of class, he was also an online language teacher to students of English, Korean, and Spanish. He took this course to satisfy one of the TESOL minor requirements and to expand his understanding of teaching with the goal of becoming a more well-rounded instructor.

Jaime had a notably multilingual background. He grew up in a household where both Standard and African American Vernacular English were spoken alongside Korean, and he learned Spanish as part of his schooling. Furthermore, he was a peer leader in his high school ESL program “mainly working with Spanish L1 speakers”, as well as a tutor for his Spanish class, which allowed him to interact with people from various linguistic backgrounds learning Spanish as a second or foreign language. Interestingly, Jaime utilized all the previously mentioned languages either in his everyday life and/or in natural settings, through travel to Spanish speaking countries and conversations with his
family in the US and Korea, which strongly influenced his understanding of language, as “these languages allowed me to connect to others and [I] utilize them as a tool in my everyday life”. Overall, and as it will be highlighted throughout the chapter, it is clear from Jaime’s writing (even in early submissions) that his previous experiences as a language learner and tutor have mediated his understanding of the social nature and communicative purpose of language, as well as mediated his understanding of his own emotions and ways to solve emerging cognitive/emotional dissonance throughout the intervention.

During the initial language learning and teaching narrative, Jaime discussed how his background and “linguistic landscape includes a lot of different languages”, and that this multilingual background had “sparked [his] passion for being a language learner” and has shaped his identity as a learner and as an individual (“by analyzing the languages of my heritage and the languages around me, it allowed me to understand and develop my identity and my culture”). Jaime also argued that this multilingual environment had guided his conceptualization of what a teacher should be, as “teachers give morsels that allows students to connect and understand the world around them”. Overall, Jaime stood out as one of the most active participants in the course, and his investment in learning about teaching was palpable throughout the semester. He was also a highly reflective student and regularly mentioned his plans of applying the knowledge from the course to improve his current teaching practices as a tutor, as well as in the future as an English teacher around the world. His highly reflective behavior, his upbringing and development in a multilingual background, and his current experiences as a tutor contributed to him
being an individual who was developmentally ready (ripe) for the pedagogical intervention.

**4.2. Preparing to teach the scientific concept of conditionals**

In Week 4, Jaime was grouped with one of his classmates and paired with a host instructor to teach a 55-minute lesson in an ESP/EAP course. Unlike the rest of his classmates in the course, who were assigned undergraduate ESP/EAP courses to teach their lessons in, Jaime was assigned a graduate level ESP/EAP class. This course was part of the International Teaching Assistants (ITA) program and focused on American Oral English for ITAs. The ITA program offers classes for international graduate students who are preparing to teach courses in their respective home programs. Therefore, the courses target advanced oral skills and their application in north American higher education settings. The student population in these courses consists of graduate students whose primary language is not English and who have either not successfully passed the American English Oral Communicative Test (henceforth AEOCPT; a required examination for all graduate teaching assistants at the university whose first language is not English) or who have taken the test but want to re-enroll voluntarily in the course to continue improving their oral English skills in anticipation to or during their teaching. The ITA program offers three levels of American Oral English courses based on the AEOCPT scores: 114G (for students who will require at least three semesters of ITA courses before they are recommended to teach), 117G (for students who will need at least two semesters of ITA courses before they are recommended to teach), and 118G (for students who need just one semester of ITA courses before being recommended to teach).
After students pass through these courses, they are required to take the Interactive Performance Test (IPT) before they can assume teaching duties in their respective departments.

Jaime was assigned the 118G course – therefore, he was assigned the highest-level course offered as part of the ITA program. As part of this pairing and the EXTTP, Jaime had to visit the class at least twice before teaching his lesson in order to understand the context in which he would engage in teaching activity, learn more about the students and their goals, and understand how his lesson would fit in the overall course. During week 5, Jaime met with his host instructor to discuss the course and students overall, as well as the topic of the lesson Jaime would teach. Jaime’s lesson focused on the use of conditionals during office hour interactions\(^1\). In general, across interactions in educational contexts, the use of conditionals is contextual and complex. Conditional tenses in English can be used to express the result of a specific condition, and there are four types of conditionals commonly taught in language classes. However, conditionals can also be used as a politeness strategy in English. In the particular setting of the ITA course, conditional tenses can also be used during office hours to build rapport with students.

Before knowing which course he was going to be teaching his class in, Jaime mentioned during class time that he was excited about the extended team-teaching project and about teaching in an ESP course. However, once he knew that he would be teaching a

\(^1\) The zero conditional is used to discuss the results of general truths (e.g., if you heat water to 100 degrees Celsius, it boils). The first conditional is generally used to express the results of a probably future situation (e.g., if you need assistance filling in the form, someone at the help desk will help you). The second conditional is often used to describe hypothetical situations (e.g., if I were you, I would write a little bit every day; if you finished your dissertation now, you would graduate in the Spring; If I liked writing, I would write more often). The third conditional is used to discuss hypothetical situations, but this time when both clauses are situated in the past tense (e.g., if it hadn’t been for the bad weather, I would have attended your defense; if it hadn’t been for my full-time job, I would have finished writing earlier).
class in the ITA program, clear expressions of emotion started to permeate every reflection he wrote. The fact that he would be teaching in this particular context caused cognitive/emotional dissonance that Jaime experienced throughout the intervention. As a sophomore, the fact that he would be teaching graduate students caused Jaime initial thoughts of insecurity regarding his expertise and legitimacy teaching a course in which all students were more advanced in their degrees than he was. In addition, these students were already proficient in English, but were taking this course to improve their oral proficiency when teaching university courses as part of their teaching assistantships. At first, knowing this, Jaime was apprehensive and highlighted in his writing that “this [educational setting] is very intimidating… Like, I am excited, but I am also very nervous”). These are strong themes of fear and anxiety over this new educational activity and context that Jaime will take part in that emerged in week 4 during classroom interactions, as well as during the early reflections of the intervention.

Excerpt 4-1: Reflection, week 5: (J = Jaime)

J: I was initially intimidated by my assigned course. [The students] are all at proficient levels of their English and are pretty much experts in their field, so it felt kind of scary to teach a group who already seems so knowledgeable.

As Jaime claimed, the prospect of him teaching this course was scary in part because he would be a novice teacher in a classroom full of graduate students who are already proficient in English. This is salient because he seemed to recognize the origin of his emotions (being a novice teacher in a classroom of proficient English speakers), which suggests that Jaime is at a higher level of awareness and higher level of ZPD than what was expected for a student in this EXTTP context. This level of awareness
continued to be salient in later reflections after being introduced to C-BLI during week 5 of the intervention.

**Excerpt 4-2: Reflection, week 5: (J = Jaime)**

*J: I also hold my own knowledge of expertise that I could use to instruct them. I think after this [CBLI session] reflection, I was able to conceptualize the process of teaching and became more comfortable with relaying the information. I think as I talk more with [his partner] and start to really hold the lesson, I should feel completely confident.*

In his reflection after being introduced to C-BLI in week 5, Jaime commented on the fact that, while it was true that these students were more knowledgeable in English, he also had knowledge himself about how to teach that he could apply to this context. In addition, he demonstrated once more that he recognized the source of his cognitive/emotional dissonance, and, importantly, highlighted that C-BLI helped him “conceptualize the process of teaching and [become] more comfortable with relaying the information” (the role of C-BLI will be discussed more in depth later in the chapter). This level of awareness of his own emotions and the source of them, as well as the realization and awareness of C-BLI as a tool to mediate such emotions, is quite possibly the result of his lived experiences as a language learner and user of various languages, as well as a result of his previous experience as a tutor. These lived experiences acted as a prism through which he understood and oriented towards language learning experiences, and this cognitive/emotional dissonance Jaime experienced acted as a catalyst for change, as it seemed to have also mediated Jaime’s orientation to future classroom activity. From the beginning of the intervention, Jaime was aware of how he was feeling about the EXTTP and about himself teaching in an advanced ESP context, as well as aware of why he was
feeling this way and what could make him change that emotional reaction moving forward. From a VSCT perspective, this heightened awareness could be interpreted as the result of Jaime’s engagement in narrative reflection.

Jaime’s reflection in both weeks 4 and 5 resonates with what Ding and Bruce (2017) and many others in the field of ESP/EAP have highlighted over the past decades. The fact that these students are seen as “experts in their fields”, as Jaime wrote in his reflection, impacted his feelings of legitimacy and expertise and made him feel like he was not knowledgeable enough to add or prepare a useful class for these students. Granted, Jaime was a novice teacher who had never taught in this educational context, and these graduate students were already proficient in English. Yet, they were also enrolled in the course precisely because they were not experts in Academic Oral English for instructors in North American university settings, which is what Jaime’s lesson targeted. Jaime was not teaching them English per se – he was teaching them how to use elements of the language in a particular context. Importantly, Jaime seemed to have resolved this cognitive/emotional dissonance through the process of writing about it and addressing the prompts provided by the teacher educator.

4.3 Understanding the scientific concept of conditionals

In terms of his understanding of the concept of conditionals, at first, Jaime displayed in his narrative reflections a superficial understanding.
Excerpt 4-3: Reflection, week 6: (J = Jaime)

J: I understand that the **conditional tense is a complex grammar technique** because it utilizes different tenses and modal or irregular verbs. I think my thoughts of this topic was **shaped by the mechanical learning from my Spanish classes**. However, the understanding and the learning I [have] should be understood to fit this specific [118G] material.”

This reflection illustrates Jaime’s starting point for conceptual understanding of conditionals. In it, Jaime displayed an awareness of how he understood the concept through the prism of his understanding of conditionality in Spanish, and how part of his goal was to understand the concept so that he could apply it or make it “fit this specific [118G] materials”. Therefore, there is a growing awareness of what the basis is for his thinking, as well as a growing awareness of the complexity and context-specificity required for conceptual language teaching. Specifically, Jaime started to think about what students would have to do with the conditionals rather than how Jaime himself used the conditional in his own language practices.

Another important (and reoccurring) point from this reflection was the fact that his previous lived experience as a learner of Spanish functioned as a prism for Jaime to orient to and understand the concept of conditionality. His everyday understanding and OBA of the concept of conditionality was mediated through his knowledge of Spanish. Initially, he was unable to verbalize how that concept was represented in English forms of functions, and when asked to delve more into what the conditional was and when it was used, he was only able to explain his understanding by providing examples of the conditional in Spanish.
Excerpt 4-4: Field notes, week 7: (J = Jaime, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: Okay, you say that the conditional is a complex grammar technique. What does that mean?
J: Like, for example, in Spanish when you say “si voy a Mexico, hablaré Español”.
TE: Okay.
J: Sorry, it’s easier to talk about it with Spanish examples.
TE: That’s fine, we are both good there.
J: Yeah.
TE: So, what does that mean, then? How is this a complex grammar technique? What do you mean by that?
J: Like… It just has different tenses…
TE: That sentence [you provided in Spanish] has different tenses, yes. You are right.
J: I don’t know.
TE: I’m curious, do you use sentences like that often, when you speak in Spanish?
J: Sometimes.
TE: When do you use them?
J: Oh! When I am talking about a hypothetical situation. Right. When I am talking about a hypothetical situation.

During this interaction, the teacher educator continued to present open-ended questions for Jaime to prompt him to externalize his thinking of conditionals. In his initial understanding of the concept, Jaime argued that the conditional was “a complex grammar technique”. The teacher educator opened the floor for him to verbalize and unpack this understanding (and for the teacher educator to understand what his orientation to the concept was), which he was only able to accomplish through examples in Spanish. Therefore, the teacher educator attempted to guide Jaime through a reasoning for conditionals use based on his own experience with Spanish conditionals (“Do you use sentences like that often, when you speak in Spanish?; When do you use them?) that would add to his emergent understanding of the concept. To what extent and in which ways the various languages that an individual speaks influence each other is one of the
main areas of research in Second Language Acquisition. In this case, Jaime’s orientation to the concept of conditionality was mediated through his second language learning in Spanish. Through Spanish, he had developed an understanding of this concept in the sense that he understood the grammatical form of the conditional in Spanish and general situations of use. Importantly, conditionality in Spanish is different from that in English, most notably formally. In English, conditionals are mostly modal constructions, whereas in Spanish, the conditional is part of the inflectional system. This is interesting because Jaime is a native speaker of English, but his understanding of the concept of conditionality is through his experience as a second language learner and speaker of Spanish, highlighting the importance of explicit knowledge of concepts as an orienting basis of activity. For Jaime, his explicit knowledge of Spanish was the orienting basis for conditionals, even when he was thinking about conditionality in English. This understanding through his second language also made him feel as if he was not targeting a concept that was completely novel to him (“my thoughts of this topic was shaped by the mechanical learning from my Spanish classes. However, the understanding and the learning I [have] should be understood to fit this specific [118G] material”).

Even though he lacked explicit understanding of the concept of conditionals in English, he could rely on what he had learned about this on a second language system and apply it to a novel context. Therefore, for Jaime, his previous experience as a learner of Spanish (plus the awareness of) and history as a language learner explained and formed the basis of his OBA. Slightly later in the intervention, Jaime’s reflections indicated that his thinking was pivoting towards more abstract conceptual approaches to conditionality.
**Excerpt 4-5: Reflection, week 7: (J = Jaime)**

J: A good orientation would be reviewing **what the previous class covered**. Reviewing the information would add meaningfulness to our lesson and help connect the material. I also think picking at the students’ minds about **what they already know about the topic [could be done]**. Many of them have already had an intensive grammar instruction in English, so **connecting it to [the] teach[ing] idea of office hours would be the bigger theme**. Also understanding why they would want to choose this grammar structure over a simpler structure and **show the pragmatic function of doing so** [would be important].

He also seemed to be pivoting away from specific constructions of Spanish (“si voy a Mexico, hablaré Español”), which were instantiations of conditionals, towards reflection on action that learners may accomplish through conditionals (“understanding **why they would want to choose this grammar structure** over a simpler structure”), as well as what knowledge might be necessary for students to think about conditionals in this way (“**show the pragmatic function** of doing so”). Also visible in his reflections was that at this early stage, Jaime did not know how he would theorize prior knowledge (“I also think **picking at the students’ minds about what they already know** about the topic [could be done]”), and he did not have concrete ideas of what conditionals allowed graduate students to do in office hours (“**connecting it to [the] teach[ing] idea of office hours would be the bigger theme**”). However, an emphasis on the students choosing this grammatical structure based on their pragmatic functions, rather than on simply producing grammatically correct structures, can be seen. Though subtle, there was a reorientation towards the concept of conditionality and how students might apply it to accomplish something through language in a specific context rather than as a grammatical resource they may be accumulating as part of some abstract proficiency.
The next week, during the last workshop before the practice teach, all groups were asked to have a draft of their lesson plan and power point ready to show another group from the course and teacher educator. Jaime and his partner were asked to explain their concept, the organization of their lesson, and their rationale for the activities chosen to their classmates. The classmates provided feedback on general clarity of the presentation (unfinished at this point) and explanation of the concept. Later on in the workshop, separately, the teacher educators discussed with Jaime his lesson plan and the slides he had started to create with his partner, which focused only on grammar. During this time, the teacher educator provided mediation targeted at Jaime and his partner on the pragmatic function of conditionality in the specific setting of office hours, prompting Jaime to think about the reasoning behind the use of hypotheticals in such a setting.

Excerpt 4-6: Field notes, week 8: (J = Jaime, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: This is a very good review of the grammatical aspect of the concept, and you seem comfortable talking about this part […]. But why is this relevant? Why would your students need to know this?
J: They are going to use it during office hours.
TE: Okay, but how can they use this during office hours? And why would they want to use it?
J: Right
TE: Based on what you know about the conditional up until this point, why do you think this could be a useful concept for students to know and use during office hours?

When prompted to discuss the pragmatic elements of the concept of conditionality, his response was to highlight that students would be discussing “a hypothetical situation during office hours” and then continue to provide grammar examples. The teacher educator then pushed Jaime to give a rationale for his reasoning
("why do you think this could be a useful concept for students to know?") and to explain why the target students would need to use or care about conditionals during office hours ("why is this relevant?"). After this prompting, Jaime and his partner, alongside the teacher educators, discussed the social and pragmatic nature of the concept and how this may be significant and important during office hour interactions. After this workshop session, Jaime started to reflect concretely on the basis of his original orientation to conditionality as purely grammar.

**Excerpt 4-7: Reflection, week 8: (J = Jaime)**

J: I think I now have a more concrete understanding of my topic. Initially, I looked the grammatical concept purely as grammar and had the need to explain the minute details of the usage. However, with the help of [the teacher educator], I was able to see the function of the grammar as more social and come back to the idea of building rapport. Conditional tenses help build rapport with the student and guide the flow and tone of the office hour setting. The slideshow had a deep analysis of what the conditional was. However, it is important to be clear with the grammar structure, but in a way that is digestible. Many of the levels of conditional don't need to be explicitly stated, but a basic structure would be sufficient in review since they are proficient speakers.

In this reflection, Jaime recognized that his early approach was focused on teaching the grammatical structure of conditionals, which he called “the minute details of usage”. What Jaime meant by this was not what students could do with the language, or the schematic structure of the concept, but rather examples of the concept in context and little more.

**Excerpt 4-8: Reflection, week 8: (J = Jaime)**

J: Compared to last week, I have more confidence in my understanding of the concept. I think we figured out a good balance in making this lesson
impactful through the grammar and pragmatic function. For the visualization of the topic, we have decided to give them a flow chart of the different levels of conditionals in English. The image goes through simple conditional phrases and complex conditional phrases that imply hypotheticals. We would then break down each level and teach the grammar to the students. We would also explore how this usage could be seen in the real world and how it could be applied to phrases in office hours. We decided to orientate [sic] the students by having them reflect on the purpose of building rapport in the classroom. The idea is that the soon to be TA's [sic] will be able to recognize and use these grammar choices effectively in the office hour space. We would also explore the pragmatic function in using the more complicated conditional form instead of more simpler forms. For example, "Didn't you think to come to office hours for help?" vs "If you would've have come to office hours, I would be been able to help you more." Although these phrases imply similar ideas, the pragmatic function of respect and kindness isn't reflected.

At this point in the intervention, Jaime had an overall, general understanding of how the class should be structured and of how the concept fit the goal of the students enrolled in the course. However, after his second classroom visit, during which the target students discussed ways to build rapport with students in their classes, Jaime reflected on whether and how to incorporate and build on this to introduce the concept of conditionality in his lesson. During that time of the semester, Jaime was also reading and discussing articles for class that explored sociocultural approaches to language learning and the inherent social nature of language learning, language teaching, and language use. Jaime’s conceptualization of conditionals continued to evolve from being rooted in grammar to an understanding of conditionals as a concept that is inherently social and that helps, in this case, build rapport (“we decided to orientate [sic] the students by having them reflect on the purpose of building rapport in the classroom”). Up until this point, he has mentioned briefly and vaguely the fact that there is a social part of the concept of conditionals in his reflections and during classroom discussions. From this point forward, Jaime’s explanations and discussions of his own understanding of the
concept focused on how to organize and orient the lesson towards building rapport and around the pragmatic aspect of the concept during office hours (“the **pragmatic function of respect and kindness**”). In doing so, he reflected on ways in which he could illustrate the concept of the conditional to the students and argued that they “have decided to give them a flow chart of the different levels of conditionals in English [...]. **We would then break down each level and teach the grammar to the students**”. Similarly, he highlighted the fact that, in addition to the grammatical aspect of the concept, the lesson needed to cover how the concept of the conditional could be used in real life situations for the target students, (“the idea is that the soon to be TA's [sic] will be able to recognize and use these grammar choices effectively in the office hour space”), such as office hours, as well as ways in which he could explain the concept to an extent that ITA students would be able to apply it to novel, broader contexts of use (“we would also explore how **this usage could be seen in the real world and how it could be applied to phrases in office hours**”).

As Jaime’s understanding of the concept continued to evolve, he continued to be highly aware and reflective of where his current plan may not be as useful for the target students.

**Excerpt 4-9: Reflection, week 8: (J = Jaime)**

J: I honestly think that [partner’s] and my I’s ideas were a bit rudimentary in accomplishing the goals and needs of the students. I think we were more so thinking about the activities just to have them, but **not thinking about the specific details that would need them in place to make them effective**
As well as of how he needed to think about and implement activities so that they fit his goals for the class.

**Excerpt 4-10: Reflection, week 8: (J = Jaime)**

J: We initially had two ideas: a role play and a video piece. After talking and collaborating with [teacher educator], I think the role play idea would be the most effective for the needs of the students. **We want to make these concepts feel more useful and tangible for the students, so by allowing them to practice with their peers, [this activity] would be a great resource.**

Although these interactions with the teacher educator were not recorded (but documented as field notes), the teacher educator guided Jaime to give his reasoning for why the activities he had selected with his partner would or would not work for the target students, as well as if and how they would work with the information he was going to present on the PowerPoint slides. Throughout the intervention, the teacher educator constantly probed Jaime for the reasoning behind his answers and lesson choices as he continued to develop his understanding of the concept. This was intentional, as Jaime was coming into the intervention with a high level of understanding of what it meant to teach, and as his understanding of the concept developed, he continued to be responsive to the teacher educator probing for such reasoning. With this preparation, Jaime and his partner entered the practice teaching session.

### 4.4 Teaching conditionals

In week 9, Jaime engaged in the practice teaching session, where he and his partner entered a structured mediational space in which their instructional activities were co-constructed, analyzed, and adapted as Jaime and his partner were in the activity of
carrying them out. Throughout the session, he received feedback from his classmates on clarity of the presentation and activities, as well as responsive mediation from the teacher educators directed towards his presentation of the concept (“remember that the focus is office hours, and rapport - and conditionals is the concept you are covering to help them navigate office hours”), the activities they had selected for this class (“Here you want to very carefully engineer participation in this activity; Make your instructions for what you want them to do very clear – and put them on a slide), and his teaching persona. Jaime also received detailed written feedback afterwards. The mediation provided during the session still aimed at pushing Jaime to provide his reasoning for instructional choices/materials and guiding him as he would arrive at an answer. However, given the point in the intervention (week 9; one week before the actual teach), the mediation provided is also more explicit as to what to do in terms of materials and in terms of his own presentation as an instructor to the class. After the practice teach, Jaime reflected on the overall experience.

**Excerpt 4-11: Reflection, week 9: (J = Jaime)**

J: I think the practice teach, overall, went well. I feel like we captured some key points of the CBLI model […]. I think there was some cohesion between some parts of the presentation and some parts that needed a little extra work. I think a big part is **feeling comfortable** and being able to offer feedback to the people I am teaching. When I was **feeling nervous**, I felt **like I wasn’t conveying** the **information that [I] needed to convey effectively**. I think this will help the flow of the class and help in gaining participation […].

Overall, the lesson was well structured and organized, but it was apparent that Jaime was nervous, since this was the first time he was inhabiting a teacher persona with his classmates. Once more, Jaime’s reflections contained strong references to fear and
anxiety ("I think a big part is feeling comfortable") as he experienced cognitive/emotional dissonance between his expectation of how the lesson would evolve and the reality of it ("when I was feeling nervous, I felt like I wasn’t conveying the information that [I] needed to convey effectively").

Excerpt 4-12: Reflection, week 9: (J = Jaime)

J: We introduced the conditional in a way that was really rigid and didn't offer any student feedback. It felt like we were teaching at the student rather than teaching off them. I also need to position myself with a little more authority and have confidence in what I am saying. […] Since I wasn't completely comfortable with the information, I had a hard time elaborating and making the connections. So, I talked less and weakened my level of input. I think I have a way better understanding [now] and will definitely play my role better.

In addition, he felt like his understanding of the concept was at a lower level than he had hoped for ("I wasn’t completely comfortable with the information [yet], so I had a hard time elaborating and making the connections [for the classmates]")}, which also added to his anxiety. This feeling was also visible in his speech during the session, which was highly hedged when the questions from the students deviated from what he had presented in the slides, and in his embodiment in teaching, as he did not separate from the podium during the entire session. While his understanding of the concept of conditionality had evolved considerably up until this point, his embodiment, language use, and expressions of emotion seemed to indicate that he had a limited internalization of the concept, and as a result, did not have a basis or frame through which to act and orient to teaching activity. This lack of conceptual resources through which to orient to this particular teaching environment impacted the way Jaime was able to, or in this case, unable to self-regulate. At the same time, Jaime also indicated through his reflection that
he was internalizing other concepts presented during the course (e.g., teach off your students, not at them) and using them to guide his own thinking and frame the emergent conceptualization of himself in the classroom.

After the practice teach, Jaime brought up during conversation that this session was very useful, not only because of the run-through and the feedback received, but because he now realized how comprehensive his understanding of the concept needed to be in order to feel comfortable teaching it (“it’s just… I have a very good idea of what this concept is, and, like, I have a good understanding of the grammar and, like, the contexts to use it, but I feel like I need to think more about it. Like, I need a more comprehensive picture”). Jaime then continued working on his lesson and his understanding of conditionals until his actual teach two weeks later. The following was his representation of the concept during the actual teach (Figure 4-1).
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While the presentation and explanation of the concept was still rather grammatical in nature, a strong movement towards being schematic and functional can be seen in Jaime’s attempts to present the concept to the target students. Finally, in week 11, Jaime participated in the stimulated recall session, during which he and the teacher educators watched the recording of the actual teach session, reflected on, and analyzed teaching
moments together.

**Excerpt 4-13: Stimulated recall, week 11: (J = Jaime, TE = Teacher Educator)**

TE: How are you feeling about the actual teach?
J: I feel good! There were some moments where I'm like, I could, you know, like hindsight, I could have maybe done some things better or explain some things better, but I would say we had control. We had a good flow for it. Goodly energy.
TE: Do you think part of that control comes from your preparation?
J: Definitely. Like, I **know what I am doing.** There was a confusion moment [in the actual teach] with one of the students, but I think it kind of showed off our ability to work well together and just show that we knew and were confident **behind what we were saying.** Because I think in the first practice teach, we were using a lot of “I think” and all these “might mean”. But I think once that moment happened [in the actual teach], it kind of like solidified that it’s not “I think”, it’s “I know. I'm going to tell it to you. I know it”. I think that was a big moment.

Overall, Jaime was highly aware of his actions, emotions, and language use, as had been seen throughout his weekly reflections and classroom discussions. In this particular instance, expressions of emotion resurfaced in Jaime’s speech alongside the topic of preparation, and he was quick to mention the hedging displayed in his speech during the practice teach, salient enough that it impacted, at least in part, the way he presented his teaching persona and oriented to class activity. Jaime was bringing this up to contrast how he felt and behaved during the actual teach with the target students. He was understanding this novel experience through the prism of his practice teach, which had impacted and mediated his orientation to classroom activity in his actual teach. For his actual teach session, Jaime had implemented the feedback received during the practice teach and had worked on addressing the gaps in his understanding of the concept.
As a result, during the actual teach, he was noticeably more confident, which continued the trajectory of increasing levels of confidence that had emerged in the narratives and discussions throughout the intervention. When he was first told which class he was assigned to, Jaime expressed feelings of concern regarding his ability to teach the target students (“it felt kind of scary to teach a group who already seems so knowledgeable”), and even though he was also showing some sort of confidence in his ability to teach (“I also hold my own knowledge of expertise that I could use to instruct them”), this knowledge referred to existing pedagogical knowledge thanks to his experience as an online tutor, not content nor pedagogical content knowledge.

His lack of confidence in his teaching and in his understanding of the concept of conditionality became evident during the practice teach, when he was faced with questions from the audience and from the teacher educators that he could not answer. This highlighted his lack of understanding of the concept he was supposed to teach, as Jaime noted in his reflection after the practice teach session (“overall, the practice teach went well […] But I need to have confidence in what I am saying”), and helped him realize he needed to deepen his understanding of the concept and be ready for interactions that went beyond a superficial understanding of the conditionals. However, during his actual teach session, he demonstrated that he knew the concept well enough to be able to provide guidance and emergently recast, reconstruct, and dynamically adapt his explanation of the concept multiple times until students, who at first did not comprehend the concept of conditionals, were satisfied (“we knew and were confident behind what we were saying […] At that point, I knew the concept, so I was able to just keep thinking of different ways to explain that to him”). Specifically, Jaime discussed the
confidence that he felt on his knowledge of the concept of conditionals not based on a rehearsed script, or on a big list of examples, but in a deep understanding of how the concept itself functions.

4.5 Role of C-BLI

As the intervention advanced, it became clear that not only did Jaime exude and explicitly claim a level of confidence that sharply contrasted with his early explicit feelings of fear and anxiety, but he explicitly attributed this growth and confidence to a focus on concepts at the core of his pedagogy. The workshops Jaime participated in were designed based on the principles of VSCT’s conceptual development, and, as a result of that, they presented a recurring pattern: partners were asked to verbalize to each other and in written form their current understanding of the concept, how they would attempt to present it to the students, and the activities he would implement, as well as the rationales for those activities, to have students engage with the concept. Through each workshop, Jaime had dedicated time to research and form an understanding of the concept of conditionality, as well as to reason through that understanding when proposing his activities. In addition to this, Jaime referred often to C-BLI and its steps ever since he was introduced to it during the workshop in week 5.

Excerpt 4-14: Reflection, week 5: (J = Jaime)

J: I think this session was very informative and useful to see how these skill of relaying information come together. The Concept-based language instruction uses the key artifacts for learners to grasp and connect. I really enjoyed how this technique uses different concepts of knowledge and experiences to build upon one another and further facilitate learner. The idea of spontaneous concepts being used as a foundation of experience and knowledge enables the teacher to gauge
comfortability with the topic. Moreover, the scientific concepts are used as a formal background to place the pre-existing knowledge in a more meaningful way. I think it’s extremely beneficial that a student can experience the several levels of knowledge at different times to break apart the learning and piecing it together in a meaningful way. The two [concepts] come together to create learning and we can reflect and see if the process satisfies the 5 components of a telling lesson plan.

At this early stage, the reference to spontaneous and scientific concepts in the context of C-BLI that appear in Jaime’s reflections may be indicative of imitation. However, as the intervention progressed, during the workshops and classroom conversations, Jaime would regularly bring up the different steps of C-BLI to help him organize his lesson and to make sure that what he and his partner were thinking about including in the class would fit and be beneficial for the students. Throughout the intervention, there were also regular instances of imitation, as Jaime adopted language from the course readings, from the teacher educators’ discourse, and from the C-BLI model that was provided to him to talk about his evolving understanding of the concept, his understanding of his lesson, and his understanding of himself as a teacher in this context. This is highly relevant, as imitation is an important step in the internalization of concepts and suggests Jaime has a certain level of understanding of the significance of the actions of the teacher educators and of the meanings of the concepts he heard and worked with. Jaime was a highly reflective and aware individual, and in his excerpts, he presented a level of analysis that indicated he was able to see and feel his own developmental trajectory, which reinforces the initial claim of him being ripe for this type of intervention and project.

During the stimulated recall session, the teacher educator strategically asked Jaime questions that would push him to reflect on and trace his own development over
the course of the intervention. In doing so, Jaime identified the series of workshops that took place during the course, as well as having access to C-BLI, as tools that helped him get the preparation he needed to succeed in the task.

Excerpt 4-15: Stimulated recall, week 11: (J = Jaime, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: I mentioned preparation earlier and you guys both indicated that the planning and preparing was really important [for your success in the actual teach]. Can you talk a little bit about that whole process from the time that you learned what you were going to be teaching and where you were going to be teaching until the time you actually did the actual teach? Can you talk a little bit about maybe some points in that journey that were important points for you for understanding what you actually ended up doing?

J: Definitely. I think we there was a point, probably in the first workshop or the second workshop - I think in the first one - when we were trying to understand, like, what… like, what even are the conditionals? What is that concept? And so, the more we talked about it, the more we, I guess using our resources, looking into it, we had a firmer understanding of what the concept is. So, then we could apply it to their contexts of being TAs. Because I think, initially, we were so overwhelmed by like even understanding the concept for us that we couldn't even formulate a cohesive lesson plan because we didn't know what conditionals were at that time.

TE: Interesting. So, the different workshops and the chances to work together in class were helpful to have you verbalize your understanding to the others and to yourself.

J: Yeah. Exactly that.

He also brought C-BLI up in his final teaching reflection as a key element of his success in the extended team-teaching project overall, and a key element in how he understood and oriented to classroom activity.

Excerpt 4-16: Final teaching reflection, week 14: (J = Jaime)

J: The CBLI definitely helped in the planning and understanding of our lesson. It gave us a clear approach on how to present the topic in a meaningful way. Conditionals weren’t something that I was explicitly taught in my English class but from my Spanish classes. So, it allowed me to look at it in
a student’s perspective based on what I know about the topic in English, versus what I know about the topic in another language. This idea also shaped how we wanted to gear our participation within our classrooms […]. For example, a CBLI technique would have a teacher introduce a topic, solidify the topic, and expand further to allow the students to make connections. The concretization of the materials through this way allows the students to feel engaged with the lesson. Moreover, a teacher would have a good understanding [of the concept] and would also work with the responses that the students would give. Teachers would also have to account for smaller details that could assist the students to reach the grand idea or message. Moreover, I think the idea of knowing what the students need the language for is important. Understanding what the situation is for the student is important for the teacher. This will enable them to not only select the type of material or information to use, but also see how to convey the information. The teacher has the ability to recognize the class’s strengths and challenges. This would dictate how they would approach the topics and make it concurrent with the needs of the class.

Jaime attempted to do this through his lesson, and he prepared it in a way that allowed him to understand his target students’ current (everyday) understanding of the concept of conditionality, offered a rich representation of the concept, and then provided an environment for the target students to verbalize and apply the concept to various contexts through a series of role play activities. At this point of the intervention (week 14), such references and use of C-BLI and the concepts associated with it may be considered representative of internalization, as Jaime was discussing C-BLI and its application not just to his, by now, familiar context (ESP course), but also discussing it in hypothetical terms when applied to a novel context.

Overall, Jaime’s previous lived experiences as a multilingual learner and speaker functioned as a prism through which he was able to understand the scientific concept of conditionality quickly during the intervention. His previous knowledge of Spanish played a key role in forming an orienting basis for his developing understanding of the scientific concept. This was likely associated with Jaime’s study of Spanish explicitly. Because of
this and his willingness to reflect on his learning experiences throughout the intervention, he was able to quickly and easily develop his understanding of conditionals during office hour interactions with little mediation from the teacher educator. While there were moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance during the intervention, the mediation, intervention, and the tools made available during it guided Jaime when addressing those moments of struggle and when orienting to classroom activity. For Jaime, C-BLI appeared to be empowering, as a novice teacher, because of C-BLI’s clear pedagogical focus on concepts. Based on the data, C-BLI seemed to have created an infrastructure for Jaime to utilize for addressing moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance, as well as for easing negative emotions. Similarly, placing a clear focus on concepts facilitated Jaime’s lesson planning and orientation to teaching activity. In addition, towards the end of the intervention, there was evidence of Jaime’s conceptual development regarding the scientific concept of conditionality. Jaime was able to talk conceptually about conditionals and their use in target contexts, and, importantly, he was able to materialize this understanding in his lesson.
Chapter 5

Yíchén (逸尘)

This chapter presents the developmental trajectory of Yíchén, 逸尘, (pseudonym) throughout the pedagogical intervention. Yíchén’s development was marked by her willingness to engage in reflection, and by her quick adoption of C-BLI as a tool to mediate her own orientation to classroom activity and her own understanding of herself as an instructor and her teaching materials. Throughout the intervention, Yíchén relied on and utilized C-BLI as a tool to help her deal with cognitive/emotional dissonances that she experienced, as well as used it to build her confidence as a non-native English-speaking teacher and mediate her orientation to classroom activity.

In addition to this, over the course of the intervention, Yíchén regularly reflected on how she was taught and what was effective and ineffective in such pedagogy. She did not necessarily have a basis for making decisions, because she had not been trained as a teacher and had limited experience as a tutor, but rather than assuming that the way she was taught would work, or engaging in such practices subconsciously, Yíchén had an agentive, critical approach where she was consciously attempting to make principled decisions. She came into the intervention with an already existing understanding of the importance of having a complete understanding of what is supposed to be taught, rather than simply memorizing and applying that memorized knowledge in a particular setting or context.
5.1 Previous language learning and teaching experience

At the time of the pedagogical intervention, YiChen was a senior majoring in education and public policy and minoring in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). She enrolled in this course to satisfy one of the TESOL minor requirements, as well as one of the requirements in her major. Prior to enrolling in this course, YiChen had had experience in educational settings as a teaching assistant in an institution in China which prepared students for language tests, such as the TOEFL or the SAT. During this time, she “basically prepared course materials for students, and [she] checked their homework given by their teachers”, as well as “taught speaking and listening to beginner students”. Outside of educational settings, YiChen had worked for a youth activism and voter turnout organization, where she gathered information about relevant events and prepared and disseminated informational materials about such events to the community. YiChen’s plans after graduating with her BA were to pursue graduate school and become an elementary English teacher in her home country, as she “really want[s] to teach English back home”.

YiChen was a native speaker of Chinese, had studied English since she was in kindergarten, and had elementary knowledge of Korean. As YiChen recounted it in her language learning and teaching narrative, it was thanks to her mother that she started learning a second language and became interested in English. She started learning English at a very young age thanks to her mother, who started to teach her some words in English (“my mother taught me some simple words when I was young, and she found that I could quickly remember those words”); later enrolled her in a kindergarten that offered English classes (“my mother chose a great kindergarten for me, and that
kindergarten provided English courses for children”); and shortly after enrolled her in extracurricular classes so that Yichén could continue having exposure and learning the language outside of school hours (“I was really interested in learning English, so my teacher suggested my mother to enroll me in an interest class”).

During her initial language learning and teaching narrative, Yichén mentioned her first English teacher, whom she met during the extracurricular classes she was enrolled in, as a patient person who adapted to her shyness speaking English and helped her become comfortable using the language to express her ideas clearly (“I was afraid of talking to others, so she patiently chatted with me in English, [and] she encouraged me to talk to my peers”). She also encouraged her to try to use the language without worrying too much about making mistakes (“she encouraged me to talk to my peers without keeping thinking about grammar, and she would help me when I couldn’t choose the appropriate answers. She taught me how to use English to clearly express my ideas, and that is what I want to do as an effective teacher”). Yichén also remembers her fondly as the person who “helped [her] with my English name”, a name that she still uses to this day. This approach to English learning, however, changed drastically once she entered elementary school and continued to advance throughout the grades.

**Excerpt 5-1: Language learning and teaching narrative, week 3: (Y = Yichén)**

Y: I started to learn about simple grammar rules and sentence structures after entering elementary school, but [now, learning English] was not solely based on my interest. English is one of the required courses in the educational system in China, which means that we need to take exams every semester. My first grade and second grade teachers used traditional methods like in-class quizzes and dictations to help us memorize grammar rules and words, and they created in-class activities to make the classroom more interesting. They were professional teachers, and they knew how to help their students improve their English skills.
However, they didn’t focus on the practical skills. Some of my classmates could only read the words in the textbooks, and they were required to remember the sentence structures in the textbooks. Even though they could fluently read the content in the textbooks, they could not use these structures to communicate with others. That was similar to my experience in junior high school. I only focused on how to pass the exams and then only learned what the exams required. Even though I had the oral test, what I needed to do was to remember the given paragraphs. I didn’t spend much time thinking about how to use English, and I didn’t find the appropriate methods for learning English.

This meant that she was moving away from using the language to talk to her classmates without worrying much about mistakes (“they didn’t focus on the practical skills”) to focusing on memorizing what was required for a test (“I only focused on how to pass the exams and then only learned what the exams required”), including the speaking part of the exam (“what I needed to do was to remember the given paragraphs”), without practicing the language with others nor understanding the concepts behind what she was asked to memorize (“some of my classmates could only read the words in the textbooks”).

This approach to language learning continued while she prepared for the TOEFL exam in an immersion program after high school, during which time she started to realize that there was cognitive/emotional dissonance between the way she was being taught English and the application of the language in contexts other than standardized exams.

Excerpt 5-2: Language learning and teaching narrative, week 3: (Y = Yichén)

Y: I went to an English immersion in China […], and I started to learn about academic writing at that time. I remembered that I couldn’t get high scores in the writing section, and I was worried about my structures. Instead of helping me revise my paper, my writing teacher gave me a document with several writing structures. She asked me to remember those fixed structures, and these was suitable for the writing section. Moreover, she asked me to review the writing section based on topics. I got a good grade on the last TOEFL test, and I thought
that I found the appropriate methods for writing. After entering the university, I used those structures to finish my assignments without thinking. However, I was shocked by my grade because it is much lower than I think. The writing teacher told us that most of us used the same structure, and she didn’t understand why we chose that structure. I realized that those structures were not suitable for academic writing, and that was not the appropriate method for me.

From the beginning of the course, Yichén’s understanding of language learning, which was influenced by her lived experiences learning English both in China and in the US and the cognitive/emotional dissonances she experienced as a result of that learning, was that simply memorizing words and structures did not get students to an understanding of the language nor to an ability to use it in novel contexts. Importantly, this understanding had also helped Yichén create a representation of how language teachers should approach language teaching. She argued that her goal as a language teacher was not only to help her students be able to use the target language in goal-oriented activity (“It is important for teachers to encourage students to use the target language, and we don’t need to always correct their grammar”), but to also provide them with a conceptual understanding of the various elements of the target language (“instead of focusing on their assignments, I should focus on their understanding of academic writing”). For Yichén, her previous learning language history, as well as the cognitive/emotional dissonances she experienced during it led her to change the ideal of what language teaching should be.

Relatedly, she did not want to teach language the way she had been taught language in China, and she had started to identify in which ways instruction should differ from that which she had received. Rather than engaging in the same teaching practices she experienced during her language learning journey, as she moved through the
intervention, she attempted to make principled decisions. In her case, the teacher educators, throughout the pedagogical intervention, were not trying to raise her awareness of the complexity of teaching. Instead, their focus was on equipping her with resources to make principled decisions.

5.2 Understanding the concepts of tone and register in academic writing

In week 5 of the semester, and with this language learning history mediating her evolving understanding of language teaching and learning, Yichén was paired with a classmate and started to work on her extended team-teaching project. She was assigned an undergraduate ESP/EAP course, ESL 015, to teach a 55-minute lesson. ESL 015 is part of the English for Academic Purposes program, and it is a first-year composition course (FYC), which are common and required across institutions of higher education in the US. In these FYC courses, instructors help students develop reading and writing skills necessary to successfully participate in academic tasks. The content knowledge required for FYC courses is not just linguistic in nature, but also rhetorical, which may be difficult to manage for teachers entering these educational spaces for the first time. During week 5, Yichén and her partner met with the host instructor and were given the syllabus and encouraged to visit the class at least twice.

Yichén and her partner were assigned the topic of tone and register in academic writing. Tone and register in this context refer to the ways in which, depending on the audience, students use grammar, words, and expressions to convey meaning in their writing. At first, Yichén expressed concern in her discussion board reflections about teaching these concepts for two main reasons. First, even though she had heard of tone
and register before as a language learner herself, she did not remember what these concepts meant (“I had forgotten what tone and register were in academic writing. **I need to kinda relearn that**, which is not a good start”). And second, she felt uneasy teaching something about academic writing because she was a non-native English speaker (“I am a little bit** nervous about teaching academic writing because I am also a non-native speaker**, but that helps me review the key points of academic writing [for myself too]”).

In her week 6 workshop reflection, Yichén demonstrated a general understanding of the concepts of tone and register. However she was actively trying to find ways to make these concepts connect with students’ previous understandings.

**Excerpt 5-3: Reflection, week 6: (Y = Yichén)**

Y: We are going to teach tone and register, and it is related to how students select grammar and words based on what they write. **The style will be formal when students are finishing their assignments related to academic writing, and the style will be informal when they are sending messages to their friends.** Moreover, it is related to how students emphasize their topics by correctly using transitions or connections. Students replace the common-use words, and they use specific words to express an academic concept.

In this excerpt, Yichén indicated not only the definition that she found about tone and register, but also tried to come up with examples to illustrate what she meant by this definition of the concepts. She also provided examples of activities that, in her opinion, would help her make the connection between these concepts and the students’ everyday understanding of them.
Excerpt 5-4: Reflection, week 6: (Y = Yichén)

Y: I would like to ask students to find the chat history with their friends, and they are going to compare messages with their [class] assignments. They are going to discuss it as groups, and I would ask them to share what they have talked about [...]. I would ask them to use formal language to introduce one of their favorite topics, and they are going to briefly share their ideas with classmates. I am thinking about asking them to create a story together based on a chosen topic.

One week after, after discussing her ideas and understanding of the concepts with her partner and her classmates, her ideas and rationales for what activities to use and the rationale for them continued to evolve. It is important to remind the reader that this was a fundamental and intentional part of the pedagogical intervention: to create safe spaces for novice teachers’ verbalization of developing understandings in a way that would provoke and push their development.

Excerpt 5-5: Reflection, week 7: (Y = Yichén)

Y: Students [will be] required to find the chat history with their friends and emails which they have sent to their professors. They are going to compare that in class and discuss the differences in how they select styles based on who they are talking to.

Another week later, Yichén had a more comprehensive understanding of what she was going to do in the class and of how that connected to the students’ particular needs in the course and in the university. This was a critical point in her developing understanding of the concepts, because she was not only focusing on the grammatical rules of these concepts, but she was thinking about tone and register conceptually, as well as how they applied in the target context for ESL 015 students.
Excerpt 5-6: Reflection, week 8: (Y = Yichén)

Y: We are going to teach tone and register, which is related to how students select words and grammar based on what they need to write. This is one of the important topics for students to learn after entering the university, and this helps students prepare for writing articles academically. Students need to know how to express their ideas in a more formal way, and they need to understand the differences between different tones and register.”

As can be seen in the excerpt, Yichén was reflecting on how and why the concept may be useful for the target students, and how it was important to convey that information to the target students so that they also understood the difference. During week 8, Yichén found out that the host instructor had changed the order of the lessons in the syllabus. He had now introduced the topic of tone and register to the students, which meant that Yichén’s lesson would review the concepts rather than introduce them from scratch. While Yichén was nervous at first about this sudden change in the plan, she discussed her lesson and lesson plan in a proactive manner, highlighting in her week 8 reflection that this change would provide an opportunity for her to create a space where students could practice using the target concepts (“it’s okay about this change […]. What we need to do in our class is to review what students have learned about tone and register, and we need to help students use that concept practically”).

5.3 Teaching the concepts of tone and register in academic writing

The week before the practice teach session, Yichén and her partner met with the teacher educator to go over the lesson plan. At this point in the intervention (week 9), Yichén’s slides presented some gaps in the representation of the concepts, so the teacher educator mediation focused on making the concept of tone more concrete.
**Excerpt 5-7: Reflection, week 9:** (Y = Yichén, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: Let’s look at what you have here for tone. Okay, when you say: “your attitude towards the topic”, **what do you mean by that?**
Y: Hmm
TE: Let me ask that a little bit differently. How does a writer show an attitude towards a topic through language? **What’s an example?**
Y: Hmm
TE: Maybe that is what we need here. An example of a sentence that **shows a writer’s attitude towards a particular topic through some details** [in the language used].
Y: Yeah, I understand

Rather than asking Yichén a question about abstract social practices, the teacher educator was probing her to exemplify the concept or to talk about why people might use it. The teacher educator attempted to push Yichén to access her own understanding of literacy or her own experience as a speaker and writer. In other words, the teacher educator’s goal was to create a path for Yichén to access/use prior knowledge to reflect on and navigate this space in which they were thinking through together.

In the practice teach, Yichén had implemented all the feedback from the previous session and was able to present and discuss the concepts with her classmates. Therefore, during the practice teach, the teacher educator provided feedback oriented around the materials (e.g., please be sure that the grammar in your instructions is correct; double space the texts [in handout] so the students can easily mark/notate the texts with their ideas) and Yichén’s teaching persona (e.g., I would like to see you step away from the podium and into the center of the room when you are teaching. [your partner] can control the PPT when you are leading, and vice versa; Walk around the room as students are working in small groups. Talk with them, check in with them see how they are doing/what they are doing).
By the time of the actual teach session, Yìchén seemed confident in her ability to teach the target class. Other than her initial remarks about being nervous because she could not remember what the concepts meant, and because she was a non-native English-speaking teacher, the rest of the time, she inhabited this space where she seemed fairly calm and sure of herself (“this topic is not difficult for us to teach) and was mostly focused on the overall design of the lesson (“we only have 50 minutes for our practical [actual] teaching, which is quite short. I need to carefully think about how to effectively design the class”) and the activities that she would introduce (“we need to focus on designing activities that are innovative”). At the same time, she was also very much aware of her limitations in her understanding of the concept (“I feel like I just know a little bit more than just the surface, but not know enough”), and that understanding mediated her orientation to teaching activity. She discussed this during her stimulated recall session.

**Excerpt 5-8: Stimulated recall, week 11:** (Y = Yìchén, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: How do you feel about the actual teach? What are your overall thoughts on how the actual teach went?
Y: I think it’s pretty good. I was so nervous on my way to the classroom, but then I just arrived there, and I stood in front of the board, and I felt like “oh, I am a teacher now”, so I am not as nervous as I thought.
TE: What do you think made you feel like this? What made you feel like “I have this”?
Y: I told my partner I was so nervous, and I was still like “I don’t know what to do”. And she just told me “It’s okay, we have practiced that, we can do that”. And I started to calm down.
TE: So, talk about your level of preparation for your parts of the actual teach.
Y: Assume the total is 10, I think I am on 7 to 8. Because I know what I am going to teach, and I know how to control my time and also control the class, but I’m still not quite confident about the concept I am going to teach, because I am also an English learner.
TE: And how can you gain that competence that you wanted to have? What would you add to what you have done or do differently to get there?

Y: I think that **first, I need to clearly understand the definition of the concept.** Because I completely forgot about the concept. I needed to kind of relearn that, so it is not a good start. I need to at least have some understanding of the concept and then I can search for information I want based on that knowledge, so I probably need to review the concept in academic writing and also in other parts, like listening, speaking [...]. I need to clearly know what is the definition of that concept so I can be more competent when I introduce that concept next time.

During this interaction, the teacher educator prompted Yíchén to reflect on her overall feelings and thoughts regarding the actual teach. This was intentional, as part of the pedagogical intervention, as the teacher educator’s goal was to engage Yíchén in the activity of re-tracing her conceptual development over time. Yíchén quickly highlighted how her level of confidence while teaching was directly impacted by her perceived level of understanding of the concepts she was presenting to the students in the target class (“I know what I am going to teach, and I know how to control my time and also control the class, but I’m still not quite confident about the concept I am going to teach”).

Interestingly, in this case, there was a noticeable change over the course of the pedagogical intervention in the way Yíchén talked about her target concept, in that it was noticeable that her confidence had grown over time as her conceptual knowledge of tone and register evolved. Perhaps as a result of that deep understanding of what the goal of her preparation and orientation to activity was, she had identified gaps in her understanding, and she was already discussing how she had thought of ways to address those gaps for future teaching activity (“I probably need to review the concept in academic writing and also in other parts, like listening, speaking”). This is indicative of a remarkable level of conceptual understanding. Yíchén understood that she needed to
provide a more comprehensive representation of the concepts of tone and register to help
students understand and then be able to apply the concepts in contexts other than those
covered during class (academic writing).

An element of Yichén’s teaching persona that may have been slowing her
increase in confidence was the fact that she was a NNEST. She was not hesitant of her
pedagogical knowledge, in this case, but she was hesitant of her pedagogical content
knowledge and, at a more fundamental level, her English skills (“as an English learner, I
pay a lot of attention to my grammar. I am nervous when I need to teach grammar,
and I keep thinking about how to help students understand the topics that I teach”). At
times, she was able to gain strength from it (“I am also a non-native speaker, and I am
also a learner of English, so I know what [the students] have to go through”), but most of
the time, the fact that she was a non-native English-speaking teacher (NNEST) caused
her some degree of struggle.

Excerpt 5-9: Stimulated recall, week 11: (Y = Yichén)

Y: I am always doubting my word use, because I keep thinking that, and I think
that my word use is not that professional, and I think that maybe I can find other
words to replace that, so I keep revising words that I am not sure whether they are
professional or not, and I also try to make the instruction more clear, because I
know/understand what I am writing, but I don’t know if others understand what
I am writing. So, I try to make sure, because they are all English learners, I want
to use the simple words and simple sentences for them to clearly understand my
instruction without making them confused.

Yichén was aware of her perceived limitations as an English speaker, and of her
limitations on her conceptual understanding of the topics for her class. This mediated not
only her orientation to teaching activity in an ideal space prior to her actual teach, but
also while she was engaged in instructional activity during the actual teach. However, she was a highly agentive learner, and to address this (and continue completing her understanding of the concepts of tone and register), she actively sought opportunities for externalization and verbalization with the teacher educator, as well as sought responsive mediation from the teacher educator and feedback from peers during the class time allocated for workshops (and outside of class time via Zoom meetings with the teacher educator or meetings with friends and classmates). Quickly, reflections of insecurity in her narratives due to her status as a non-native speaker of English stopped emerging.

Yíchén understood the importance of expert- and peer-mediation (other-mediation), and she had been willing to engage in these spaces (intentionally created by the teacher educator) throughout the intervention. As the time to her actual teach got closer, in addition to discussing her concept with her peers as part of the workshop series, she started to ask for time outside of class to meet with the teacher educator(s) to discuss her plan and conceptual understanding, and she started to reach out to friends to provide her with feedback (as illustrated in excerpt 5.9). This, in itself, was yet another indicator of her willingness to engage in reflection and of her being ready for this pedagogical intervention.

**Excerpt 5-10: Stimulated recall, week 11:** (Y = Yíchén, TE = Teacher Educator)

Y: I talked to a lot of people before the actual teach. I asked all my friends to come to my home and they just stood there, and I wanted to make sure that our activities were effective and interesting. So, I kind of go through the whole PowerPoint for 3 times, talking to different people, and they can give me different points of view. And I start to revise [my slides and understanding] based on their suggestions, and your suggestions, and the suggestions of my peers.
TE: That’s amazing. Did that make you feel like you had a good grasp of the concept by the time you went to the actual teach?
Y: Yeah, [...] because I try to make sure, because they are all English learners, I want to use the simple words and simple sentences for them to clearly understand my instruction without making them confused.

During her stimulated recall, Yichén was quick to point out places where she realized she could have “done better” based on her teaching and her attunement to her students. One of the growth points appeared as she started to review the concepts. Based on the information she had received from the host instructor, the students had already been introduced to the concepts of tone and register. Therefore, Yichén and her partner proceeded to have a brief review of the concepts of tone and register.

Excerpt 5-11: Stimulated recall, week 11: (Y = Yichén)

Y: I think that the students are not as talkative as they usually perform in the classroom. I think it was because they don’t know us very well, so they are a little bit nervous. So, we only spent 2 minutes to share their understanding of tone. I think we could do more on that, but [my partner] thought that was enough, so we just moved on. But, **most of them had forgotten the concept of tone and register. Especially register. Because I had asked 3 of them, and they could not tell me the differences between formal and informal. [...]** I simply just read through the slide and just talked about what they needed to care about when they are writing their own academic essays, and I shared the worksheet.

Interestingly, even though Yichén had a slide presenting the concept of tone, this collision between her ideal understanding and expectations of where the students would be in terms of conceptual understanding of tone clashed with the reality of the students’ knowledge. As a result, she temporarily struggled in her resolution of the conflict, and ended up reading what she had on the slides, rather than engaging more with the students to address the gaps in their knowledge. However, she shared with the teacher educator
how, shortly after this resolution, she had thought of an alternative plan to engage the
students and continue the lesson in a way that was meaningful for them. Based on the few
responses that she received from students initially, when asked about the concept of tone
(which they mix with register), she was able to change the plan and address the gaps that
students had in their understanding of the concept of register. In other words, this
behavior indicates that she was being responsive to her students, which is not typical for
novice teachers.

Excerpt 5-12: Stimulated recall, week 11: (Y = Yichén, TE = Teacher Educator)

Y: They know that tone is attitude. But they also think that register is related to
attitude. But it kind of focuses more on the word use and the grammar of the
sentences. So, I focused more on this part.
TE: How did you focus more on that part versus the part on tone?
Y: I summarized what [the students] gave me, and I used their answers to help me
explain the three bullet points […]. But I think I can do better on this part,
because I think there should be more examples.
TE: How would you bring out those examples?
Y: I should have asked them [from the beginning] how much did they remember
about tone and register in academic writing, because I thought that they all
knew the concepts and they remembered them, but the fact was that they did not remember. So, I did not put examples, but I think there should be
did not remember. So, I did not put examples, but I think there should be examples to help them understand what I am talking about and to help them
understand the definition. And to clearly see the difference between formal and
informal.
TE: Did you think of that as you were teaching?
Y: Yeah! Because when they were doing the discussion part, I walked around and
asked them “do you still remember tone and register in academic writing?” and
they told me “no”. And then I started to think “oh, I should have put examples, I
didn’t do that”.

During this interaction, evidence of instructional paraphrasing2 emerged (“I
summarized what [the students] gave me, and I used their answers to help me explain the

---

2 Instructional paraphrasing was not a concept introduced as part of the intervention, but it was part of her mediational environment.
three bullet points”) as well as evidence of Yichén adapting pedagogically in activity to the needs of her students. During this part of the actual teach, Yichén was reacting and adapting to her students’ understanding of the concepts as she was teaching in a situation that challenged the assumptions with which she had entered the educational space. She was able to adjust her instruction, at least in part, because of her deep conceptual understanding of the target concepts for the class. Despite the fact that Yichén felt like her understanding was not competent enough, she was reacting quickly to changes in her environment and adapting to what the students needed from her in order to understand the concepts she was teaching. The teacher educator intentionally asked her to provide a rationale for her actions, which she quickly provided, indicating that she had thought thoroughly about them. She was also thinking about these concepts and her lesson until the very last minute before the class started, and making informed changes that were mediated by the conceptual understanding she had gained.

**Excerpt 5-13: Stimulated recall, week 11:** (Y = Yichén, TE = Teacher Educator)

Y: I put these 3 questions 5 minutes before the class began
TE: Okay, and **why did you do that?**
Y: Because these questions came to my mind when I walked to the classroom, because I kept thinking “is there any other way for me to help them **understand how to choose the appropriate tone and register in academic writing?**”. So, I thought I should give them these three questions to help them understand, to help them choose the appropriate tone and register when they are writing their essays. So, first, the purpose. Why do I write this written text. Just think about why, think about why you have to write this […]. Then, think of who is going to be your audience […]. And then, what do I want them to know? […]

The questions Yichén referred to during the stimulated recall were the following:

1) Why do I write this written text?
2) Who is going to be my audience?

3) What do I want them to know?

The fact that Yíchén thought of these questions and felt they were critical to the students’ learning, and the fact that she was willing to put them in the slides at the last minute indicates how confident she felt about the concepts she was teaching, and how that understanding mediated her orientation to classroom activity. Not only was she able to think of these questions and how they may help the students, but she also placed them in the right location in the PowerPoint deck for the students to use as a tool to prepare for an activity in which they would need to use the concepts of tone and register.

5.4 Role of C-BLI

As part of the stimulated recall, Yíchén and the teacher educators discussed the workshops and introduction/use of C-BLI, which Yíchén highlighted as a tool that helped her understand not only the concept but how to organize a lesson plan around it.

Excerpt 5-14: Stimulated recall, week 11: (Y = Yíchén, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: Do you think working on your materials through the workshops, and on your own time, impacted the way you understood the concept itself?
Y: **It helped me understand how to explain that concept clearly**, because otherwise I would just use complex words or just simply remember the definition of the concept from one of my grammar books. But, when I am creating the PPT, I realize that some of my points are not that easy for a student to understand, so I **try to think about the concept in another perspective**.

In this reflection, it is important to highlight signs of developing expertise. Yíchén was engaging in reasoning from the perspective of the students, which suggests she had a deep understanding of the target concepts or a deeper understanding of what the students
needed. Through that understanding, in turn, she was able to focus less on herself and more on her students’ learning. Once more, she credited C-BLI and a specific focus on concepts and conceptual understanding for her ability and development as a novice teacher.

**Excerpt 5-15: Stimulated recall, week 11: (Y = Yichén)**

Y: I now understand how to use the concept that I learned into my classroom. I know how to use those [C-BLI] steps to help me design a course now. And I think that also helped me remember the concept better, because I also reviewed the concept when I was creating my course. So, I think it is quite useful for me to think about how to change my role from a student to a teacher now […]. I think it is very important for teachers to create a clear structure for students to understand what they need to learn […], and also that they need to care about, and also to keep reminding them the key points of the concept, so they can keep thinking about those when they are doing the other parts, the practice or activities.

During the stimulated recall, Yichén celebrated the understanding she had gained through the pedagogical intervention, as she was able to effectively use the tools that were at her disposal as part of it. She clearly stated that she had a better conceptual understanding of her lesson topic. But, importantly, she also highlighted how she now knew how to design future lessons due to her understanding of the core concepts of C-BLI.

By the time of the pedagogical intervention, Yichén had had no training as a teacher, although she had previous experience as a tutor. She did enter the pedagogical intervention, however, with a long history of experience as a second language learner (similar to the other participants). Because of her experiences as a non-native speaker, and because of her willingness to reflect, Yichén had an awareness and openness to
verbalization and critical thinking that allowed her to very rapidly self-regulate. This is salient because she was able to access and utilize C-BLI and the core concepts of C-BLI to *think about teaching*. Rather than falling back on her apprenticeships of observation, Yichén reflected on how she had been taught and what was effective and ineffective about it.

As a result, from the very beginning of the pedagogical intervention, she did not necessarily have a basis for making decisions, but she did not engage in practices that mimic those she had experienced before unconsciously. Instead, her goal was to be able to make principled decisions around her pedagogy and development as a teacher. Also, the fact that Yichén was a non-native speaker of English made her more conscious of the process and difficulties of learning a language. This element of her history acted also as motivation and criticality.

Yichén showed a clear development of her conceptual understanding of tone and register over the course of the intervention. She was a highly reflective, highly agentive student who took advantage of all spaces and opportunities the pedagogical intervention provided for her, by design: spaces for safe verbal thinking, regular reflections where she was asked to articulate her everyday and scientific understanding of the concept over time, the practice teach, the actual teach, the stimulated recalls, the access to the teacher educator for responsive mediation, and the introduction of C-BLI as a tool to mediate her understanding of target concepts and of teaching.

As her conceptual understanding evolved, her feelings of insecurity attached to her perceived status as a NNEST started to disappear from her narratives and discourse, and through her writings and discussions with the teacher educator, she was able to focus
on the way having a conceptual understanding and an understanding of the principles of C-BLI could mediate her teaching activity. She was also able to adjust her teaching plans effectively in activity, which is remarkable for a novice teacher, as well as able to recognizes the value in adjusting those plans. This behavior and orientation towards classroom activity suggests a clear understanding of the goal of teaching, which is not just to deliver content, but to help learners engage with that content and eventually internalize it. As she developed a deeper understanding of the concept, she saw language teaching as more than just ‘using’ the language but recognizing why and how to use the language (tone and register) to accomplish what the target students were trying to do rhetorically.

**Excerpt 5-16: Final teaching reflection, week 14: (Y = Yichén)**

Y: I appreciate that I have this opportunity to learn what I need to improve as an English teacher. I know how to bring teaching theories into the process of designing lesson plans, and I know how to **design appropriate lesson plans for my students**. I can use my learning experience to help students build the bases of learning English, and I would like to encourage my students to add their understanding on the top of that. I am looking forward to my next teaching opportunity, and I believe that I can do this better.

Throughout the intervention, Yichén was willing to engage with the narrative reflective activities and prompts, and was willing to engage in peer mediation, verbalization, and expert-other mediation with the teacher educator. In addition to this, she seemed to have understood the principles of C-BLI and was able to use them as a tool to mediate both her development of her target concepts and her orientation to classroom activity. The pedagogical intervention provided her with the necessary tools for her to make principled decisions in future teaching activity, which was Yichén’s goal at the start
of the pedagogical intervention. Overall, the data suggests she benefited from the pedagogical intervention.
Chapter 6

María

This chapter presents the developmental trajectory of María (pseudonym) throughout the pedagogical intervention. This development was marked by constant and intense cognitive/emotional dissonance throughout the various stages of the intervention, and this dissonance materialized from several sources. One source of dissonance evolved from the insufficient level of understanding María had throughout the intervention about the concept she was expected to teach (intonation). Similarly, there was dissonance between María’s self-assessment of her conceptual development and understanding of intonation over time. She discussed with the teacher educators the fact that she was mastering the concept and growing in her understanding of it, but, effectively, there was no evidence in her behavior and instructional activity to corroborate her claims. In addition to this, at various points of the intervention, her limited conceptual knowledge was challenged by either her peers, the teacher educators, and/or the target students, which caused her cognitive/emotional dissonance between not just her general ideal vs reality of educational activity, but also dissonance between her expectations and understandings of what it means to be a teacher.

6.1 Previous language learning and teaching experience

At the time of the pedagogical intervention, María was a Junior majoring in Political Science and minoring in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). She enrolled in this course because she was curious and passionate about learning and teaching languages, “because it seemed incredibly interesting, and [because]
it was recommended by others who have been in this course before”. In addition, she also thought that having this minor would help her in her application to Law School, which was her next step after graduation. Prior to enrolling in the course, María had a little bit of experience teaching English to speakers of other languages by assisting an ESL teacher for a semester, during which time she focused on helping students with grammar and “work on worksheets or complete homework”. During this time, she also “helped with developing conversational skills by being a partner for [students] to practice with”.

Other than that, María had extensive experience with delivering speeches, an activity she engaged in frequently as part of her major, and an activity in which she described herself as “really good”. Despite her limited experience teaching languages, she had extensive experience as a language learner. María grew up in an environment where her “entire dad’s family spoken Spanish”. She mentioned in her language learning and teaching narrative that, as a kid, Spanish “came very easily for me, and [she] understood a lot more than [she] does now”, and that to her, Spanish and English coexisted in a way that when she was spoken in both languages, she “never even knew there was a difference”.

However, at some point in her childhood, she moved from an area where Spanish was spoken by many members of her family and community to an area that presented a very different population. Perhaps as a result of this move, this atmosphere of being surrounded by two languages changed, and her family stopped using Spanish with her, which was something she often reflected on as she “think[s] back on my childhood and wish I would have kept up with my Spanish, and [she] wish my dad did as well”. To her, this was an emotionally charged inflection point in her journey as a language learner,
which took place rather early in that journey, that deeply impacted her and acted as a prism through which she understood future language learning/teaching situations. Notably, she wrote that “language loss is a hard thing for [her] to accept, because in a way it feels like a failure”. From that point on, language learning for María was understood through the prism of loss that impacted her as a young learner and person.

Years later, when María was in middle school, she started to take Spanish classes, which represented the “first taste of regaining the language I had lost”. She recounted that she was excited for Spanish classes, which were never boring, and truly enjoyed the way classes were organized and planned by her teacher (“I felt like the teacher showed so much excitement towards the idea of learning. She encouraged us to make mistakes and to be comfortable trying over and over again”). She also saw these classes as a space in which her “love for Spanish grew and [she] finally felt like [she] had a real chance at learning the language [she] so desperately wanted to know”.

However, as years passed, that feeling and situation changed quickly as she started to find herself engaging in rote learning and memorization of grammatical rules and barely interacting or using the language in goal-oriented activity (“The rest of the teachers I had were kin of harsh and showed little enthusiasm about the learning process… I found myself doing worksheet after worksheet with very little interaction”). This previous experience of her also mediated her understanding of what a teacher should be (“I do wish that [the teachers] would have had reflections on how their students were enjoying the class or absorbing material”), and how a class could be organized and conducted. Thinking ahead, María seemed to have a clear idea of how her classes would be if she were to become a teacher. Such idea, while it could be described as superficial,
seemed like a common initial conceptualization of educational activity based on her
previous apprenticeship of observation and her own personal language learning history.

**Excerpt 6-1: Language learning and teaching narrative, week 3:** (M = María)

M: I know **how hard learning can be**, and how everyone has a different way of
receiving information. I want to be seen as a flexible teacher that promotes the
overall wellness of my future students. When my students enter my classroom, I
want them to want **to learn while also having fun doing it**. I know that when I
am a teacher, I will provide a lot of interactive, collaborative, and brainstorming
activities.

Overall, María’s previous lived experiences regarding language learning and
teaching were rather negative. She had had negative experiences as a heritage speaker of
Spanish, and those experiences had acted as a prism through which she approached
classroom activity as a student. Such complex and negative relationship with language
learning also seemed to be mediating her understanding of what language was and how it
should be taught. She also highlighted in her narrative how she could relate to her future
students since she had been a language learner herself, and how she understood that
“language learning is difficult and often **comes with many doubts or emotions**”,
highlighting her the negative emotional nature of language learning.

She argued about the importance of reflection as a language teacher, as well as
about the importance of being there for the students not just as a source of knowledge. At
the same time, she saw the figure of the teacher as a source of “support system and
encouragement that [her] students need” and highlighted the importance of “constantly
question myself […] Am I making the right decisions for my students? Am I really
promoting their growth?”
It is with this understanding of and previous lived experiences regarding language learning and teaching that María started her extended team-teaching project (EXTTP) in week 5.

6.2 Understanding the scientific concepts of word stress and intonation

María and her EXTTP partner were assigned a graduate ESP/EAP course, APLNG 114G - American Oral English for Academic Purposes. This course is designed for non-native English speaking graduate students for them to develop and/or improve their oral skills in academic settings. Interestingly, María did not utter feelings of anxiety about the fact that she would be teaching graduate students (like Jaime did), but she did bring up from the beginning of the workshop series, in week 5, that she was “really excited about teaching my assigned course, even though [she was] a bit nervous” because she really wanted her lesson “to be helpful for [the students] and to create influential knowledge that they can continue to use”. The topic that María and her partner were assigned to teach was word stress and intonation, and so they started working on their understanding of the concepts and the development of their lesson plan and materials.

Initially, María’s everyday understanding of the concepts of word stress and intonation was highly superficial, and she had a hard time articulating her understanding.

Excerpt 6-2: Reflection, week 6: (M = María)

M: I believe that word stress and intonation is how we use our mouth to communicate orally and what it would look like, for example, how one’s mouth can affect speech and how one communicates using the mouth […]. Different mouths affect speech, and that is something I will be researching in the weeks to
come. I also think that word stress and intonation involve what is pronunciation and how can we use it for the benefit of communicating in languages. I think that word stress also uses emphasis on grammatical properties, and therefore it can help an individual know when word stress is applied.

In her reflection, it could be seen that María, at times, mixed ideas and confounded terms when trying to express herself (e.g., “different mouths” instead of “different intonation patterns”) and, overall, had a misunderstanding of what these concepts meant. Still, this was the first time she had to think about these concepts, and she was excited to continue researching and learning more about word stress and intonation.

In addition to this, María also received feedback from her classmates during the second workshop session, which focused specifically on María clarifying what she meant by this definition of word stress and intonation. At this point in the intervention, she used both terms interchangeably and conceptualized them as a single concept. She was also unable to verbalize an explanation for these concepts other than uttering the same sentence (“do you like ice cream?”) with rising and falling final intonation to clarify the difference to her classmates. As a result of this, one of her classmates provided her with an example to help her with her understanding of word stress (Figure 6-1).
María’s classmate explained to her that word stress can help the interlocutor differentiate between old and new information. In addition to this, the teacher educator provided an explanation of word stress in the context of the example María’s classmate had provided.

Excerpt 6-3: Field notes, week 7: (M = María, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: Okay, so, word stress can be understood as the emphasis that we place, as speakers, in specific syllables of a word or in the stress that we place in a particular word within a sentence – like this sentence that [classmate] wrote here. Let’s look at the first type, the stress that we put on specific syllables of words. So, for example, you have this word [writes RECORD on María’s notebook]. How do you pronounce that?
M: ‘re-cord
TE: Okay, yes. But you could also say re-‘cord, no?
M: Oh. Yeah. But. Yeah
TE: But what?
M: Yeah, yeah, I guess some people say it that way.
TE: Do they? ‘re-cord. Re-‘cord. What does that word [points to RECORD on María’s notebook] mean?
M: Yeah, like, keeping record of something
TE: and ‘re-cord?
M: Oh. Like, it is the record, like a ticket
TE: So, are they the same then? ‘re-cord and re-‘cord, are they the same?
M: No? Wait. No? Oh my God, I am so bad at this
TE: You are not, you are not. Take your time. ‘re-cord. re-‘cord [writes both
words on María’s notebook underlining the stressed syllable]. Are these the same? What do you think?

M: I don’t think so, no.

TE: One is a verb, and the other one is a noun, right? I am keeping a ‘re-cord of this conversation. I have to re-’cord this conversation. So, they end up being different words based on stress. They have different meanings depending on the syllable that you put the stress on. Does that make sense?

M: What’s a syllable?

During this interaction, the teacher educator engaged María to discuss her target concepts. Focusing first on word stress, the teacher educator started with implicit queries to create initial opportunities for María to externalize her understanding. This was done intentionally by the teacher educator in order for her to dynamically attune her mediation. The mediation increasingly grew more explicit, and the teacher educator offered more direct and material mediation to facilitate either verbalization of the concept or learning. The target concept is word stress and the focus during this interaction was how word stress distinguished between words that are orthographically identical in English. More specifically, the example of record (noun) and record (verb) was used, which illustrated in these pairs that the stress for the noun went in the first syllable, and on the second syllable for the verb. During the interaction, the teacher educator created a material artifact with the difference in stress marked visually for María. The teacher educator did this with the idea that written words with stress patterns would engage María’s literacy skills and point her towards the distinction in meaning at the core of the concept.

Specifically, as shown in the excerpt, the teacher educator wrote down the word [RECORD], and asked María to pronounce it out loud in order to assess if María would be aware of the difference in both pronunciation and meaning. The teacher educator then provided the alternative pronunciation María was missing. By uttering the word [RECORD] as both ‘re-cord and re-’cord repeatedly, the teacher educator opened the
floor for María to externalize her understanding of this newly presented concept and of how these two words might be different. However, part of the difficulty for María to externalize such understanding was the fact that her metalinguistic understanding of English was limited (e.g., what is a syllable?). After first opening the floor for María to externalize her understanding with open-ended questions (“are these the same? what do you think?”), the teacher educator’s mediation progressed towards more explicit discussions/explanation of what the concept of word stress meant, as well as for what syllables meant. The teacher educator did this in order to provoke learning after she came to the conclusion that María did not understand the concept or have a nascent understanding of it. María indicated she understood these concepts now. After this, the teacher educator proceeded to do the same with word stress within a sentence (‘Alba likes books vs Alba likes ‘books, field notes), which María also indicated had understood.

During her post-workshop reflection, María wrote that she found it to be “really refreshing to hear feedback from my peers and professor”, since she was still learning about the concept and “have been a bit confused on what the concepts actually meant”. Once more, there were expressions of emotion in her narratives, as María was still struggling to understand the scientific concepts of intonation and word stress. She also started to think of activities and how she could make students understand the importance and relevance of word stress and intonation in their speech, which she noted in her reflection after the second workshop.
Excerpt 6-4: Reflection, week 7: (M = María)

M: “I want the students to find their own purpose and have their own reasoning to why they find word stress and intonation important. I think by incorporating real life based activities, students will feel a stronger connection. They may also feel much more motivated to take the lesson seriously […] and can also see why they would want to use [these concepts] to their advantage.”

Just like she mentioned in her initial language learning and teaching narrative, María wanted to place emphasis on real world application of the language (in this case, of the concepts of word stress and intonation in the ITA classroom) and help her students in their communicative efforts, which was her ideal of a lesson. As weeks passed, she slowly continued to increase her understanding of word stress and intonation, although this understanding was not quite accurate.

Excerpt 6-5: Reflection, week 8: (M = María)

M: “This subject is extremely important for people learning an additional language. It can vastly improve a student’s communication skills when knowing when to stress their words and when to use different levels of pitch. It will also allow for people to be more intrigued to listen when a person is talking and not get lost in the sentences.”

María’s understanding continued to be rather general/everyday, but she started to identify the communicative value of this scientific concept. At the same time, she admitted that “word stress and intonation seem fairly simple on the cover, but underneath I found so many more in depth concepts”, which caused her “a bit of anxiety” (Week 8, field notes). It is important to note that, at this point in the pedagogical intervention, María’s partner effectively stopped working on the project, although was present enough that she could not be removed from the pair. This was a significant dramatic moment for
María and added considerably to her anxiety, as she was now, unofficially, the person in charge of moving the project forward. In addition to this, María no longer had the space to externalize and negotiate her evolving understanding of the target scientific concepts with her peer/partner. Nevertheless, she was willing to engage in reflective activity, and she continued to work on her lesson plan and materials and to seek times to meet with the teacher educator to externalize her thinking while working on those materials.

In the weeks leading up to the practice teach, she met with one of the teacher educators outside of class time to go over the slides she had prepared for the session, and she received explicit feedback addressing her understanding of the concept, as her slides only presented the everyday concept associated with word stress and intonation. During that session, María noted some of the information in the slides that had to do with intonation patterns were provided by the host instructor.

**Excerpt 6-6: Meeting with teacher educator, week 8: (M = María, TE = Teacher Educator)**

M: These are some of the things that [host instructor] included in her slides. We just did different sentences and stuff, and saw how to do that.
TE: This is from [host instructor], you mean?
M: No, no, she told us in the email this is the way she has done it [before], so we did something similar, but we did different sentences and stuff.
TE: Oh, okay, so how are you going to introduce this?
M: I will do the intonation part.
TE: Right, so, how are you going to explain this?
M: uh, that’s what I have to figure out. [For Rising-Falling Non-Final Intonation] I don’t know this… when there is more emphasis on the word
TE: What was that, sorry?
M: When there is more emphasis on the word, so, “when Emily left the GYM, it was snowing”. You know? Like, **when you are adding your emphasis to a word to get your point across**. Something along those lines, and more.
TE: Right, okay, yeah, so, think of the structure of a sentence.
M: Right.
TE: If you look at this sentence, if you only look at the first sentence, “when Emily left the gym, comma” is giving you an understanding that something is going to come after that statement […], you cannot have falling intonation here because the sentence does not end here. So, you need to indicate that in some way, and you do by rising intonation. Just like when you have a list of things, right? “We need apples, peppers, tomatoes, and cauliflower”. You keep going up to indicate that the sentence is not done until you bring the intonation down with the final item in the list.

M: Okay, I am writing that down in my footnotes.

At this point in the intervention, María continued to need explicit mediation and guidance about the concept itself. Throughout the interaction, the teacher educator asked questions to encourage María to externalize her understanding of the concepts (“how are you going to introduce this?”), and then provided more explicit, linguistic explanations of the concept to add to that current understanding (“think of the structure of a sentence”). While it is clear that María was working to gain an understanding of the scientific concepts she was going to teach, she did not have a conceptualization of many of the concepts associated with those of intonation and word stress either. She also lacked the metalinguistic knowledge of English to help her verbalize such understanding, which complicated things for her. Because of this, María relied on memorizing and reutilizing wording that had been provided either by the host instructor or copy-pasted from internet sources. However, this was empty verbalism, as she did not truly understand what she was uttering and was struggling to use her conceptual understanding of the scientific concepts of word stress and intonation to mediate herself in order to organize and advance on her lesson plan.

Overall, it was evident that the conceptual demands of the lesson she was going to teach were well beyond her current understanding and required a command of a horizon of interfacing concepts. Through these interactions, it became clear that she had an
extremely difficult time thinking about these concepts, let alone through them. Target concepts (e.g., word stress) relied on other undeveloped concepts (e.g., syllables) in a way that she found overwhelming.

6.3 Teaching word stress and intonation

Prior to their practice teach, María and her partner met with the teacher educator to discuss the slides they had prepared for the practice teach. During this session, based on the information that María and her partner had in the slides, as well as the overall understanding that María had of the concepts to teach, the mediation and feedback from the teacher educator was explicit, both in the content to include in the slides and in the way she should continue to conceptualize word stress and intonation.

Excerpt 6-7: Meeting with teacher educator, week 8: (M = María, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: You also need to make sure that you are making this relevant for them, right?
It is not just, in general, word stress and intonation, but you are talking about it in an academic context. In academic speech.
M: Right. I just added that on my notes, and then, we would ask them, “do you know what word stress and intonation mean?” and if someone says yes, we would ask them to explain
TE: Right, so, […] start little by little, “have you heard of word stress? – yes – okay, what does that mean? Can you give me an example?” . Try to get out [of the students] as much [information] as you can
M: If no one answers, do we explain this ourselves?
TE: Yes. If no one answers, you would jump into your next section, which should be your in-depth explanation of the concepts of intonation and word stress
M: Okay

In this interaction, the teacher educator explicitly brought to María’s attention that she was presenting the scientific concepts of word stress and intonation to be applied, in
part, in an academic context. Therefore, María should think of how to include
information and tailor her explanations to address this future context of use as she
continued to work on the materials on her own. In addition, María still had gaps in her
understanding of the concepts which were evident in the slides she had prepared. At this
point, the PowerPoint was barely started, and María seemed to have a hard time
understanding the flow and the type of information needed to include in them for their
practice and actual teach.

Excerpt 6-8: Meeting with teacher educator, week 8: (M = María, TE = Teacher Educator)

TE: I’ve noticed that you start [your explanation] with word stress but then you
end up with full sentence examples without explaining stress at a sentence level
first. You need to make that distinction and definition clear.
M: Okay.
TE: You would need to explain that in the phase during which you explain the
concept thoroughly.
M: So, have a slide that presents word stress and [another slides for] sentence stress?
TE: However you want to do it. That is up to you.

In the slides, María and her partner had started the explanation of the concept of
word stress focusing on syllable stress and then presented examples that contained full
sentences and that illustrated word stress at the sentence level, without having explained
this concept before in the slides. María seemed to mix word stress and sentence stress as
the same idea and did not seem to have the conceptual understanding necessary to go
through her materials and notice the gap. The teacher educator highlighted this
discrepancy explicitly and María proposed a possible solution, though she was unsure of
it. However, the teacher educator did not tell María how to address this point explicitly.
The teacher educator did this in an attempt to provide María with a decision that she could take easily on her own after having received very explicit feedback throughout the session. The rationale for this choice was emotional in nature. After an extended period of intense mediation, the teacher educator perceived this as an opportunity for the learner to exert and express her agency to complete a task that she was capable of.

In week 9, María engaged in the practice teach session with her partner and received ample feedback (both oral and written) from her classmates (“Include more clear explanations of word vs sentence stress – not clear on difference”; “Have students actually pronounce words to determine stress – they sound different in head than out loud!”) and the teacher educators (“put examples of word stress and intonation in your slides – these might be difficult concepts for your target students, and it will be beneficial if they can see what you are explaining with an example”), which she welcomed and took detailed notes on. At this point in the intervention, it was clear that María was not gaining conceptual understanding of the scientific concepts of intonation and word stress, and so the mediation that the teacher educators provided was explicit, mostly focusing on how to explain the concepts, and on ways to accomplish the desired task (as illustrated with the dialogue and the accompanying PowerPoint slides – Figure 6-2).
Word Stress in English

- The stress placed on syllables within words.
- In one word, we place emphasis on one syllable, while the other syllables are given less emphasis.
- English words only have one stressed syllable.
- Stressed Vs Unstressed Syllables in Words.

Word Stress

1. Definition of stress
   Stress may be defined as the degree of force or loudness with which a sound or syllable is articulated.
   Stress can be classified as word stress and sentence stress

2. Classification of English words in phonetics
   In phonetics, English words can be divided into three groups according to the number of syllables contained. They are:
   1) monosyllables, 2) disyllables, 3) polysyllables

3. Word stress
   In every English word of two or more syllables at least one syllable should be articulated with more force or loudness than the rest. We call this phenomenon word stress.

What do you think the difference is between stressed syllables and unstressed syllables in words?

Figure 6-2: Excerpts from practice teach PowerPoint.
**Excerpt 6-9: Practice teach session, week 9:** (M = María, TE = Teacher Educator)

M: Okay, so then a question for you is “what do you think the difference is between stressed syllables and unstressed syllables in words?”
S1: [unintelligible]
M: Okay, so, basically, they just convey more meaning whenever you are speaking.
TE: What does that mean? “It conveys more meaning when you are speaking” – what does that mean? How can you convey more meaning of a syllable?
M: Um, well, I would think it is through writing and then through pitch – your voice with words you are stressing – like when you say the whole word.
TE: Can you give me an example?
M: Right, so – fish and chips. You don’t say, I want FISH AND chips. You say FISH and chips.
TE: But what if I want to indicate that I want both?
M: Then that changes – then you change where the placement goes
TE: But that is not really a syllable example
M: That has more to do with intonation, but…

In this case, María attempted to rephase generic information to talk broadly about the concept, but there was no evidence of conceptual development. Rather, there was linguistic variation in how she discussed the concepts, and even then, the information she presented was incorrect and mixed (“I would think it is through writing and then through pitch”). During the interaction, the teacher educator offered her very explicit mediation trying to get insights into how she was orienting to the task. This implicit feedback took the form, at times, of open-ended questions (e.g., asking her to explain what she meant or expand on a point). At times, the mediation also took a slightly more explicit form by asking María to exemplify and instantiate (e.g., can you give me an example?; what if I want to indicate that I want both?). The same happened later on during the practice teach session, when discussing the nature and differences of stressed and unstressed syllables (Figure 6-3).
Figure 6-3: Slide from practice teach PowerPoint.

Excerpt 6-10: Practice teach session, week 9: (M = María, TE = Teacher Educator)

M: [Reading from screen]
TE: What does it mean for vowels to have peripheral quality?
M: Like, pronounce [sic] clearly. Is that right?
TE: What does centralized quality mean, then?
M: I don’t know. I should probably Google it.
TE: That’s okay. It is fine if you don’t know everything about the concept of stress – but you need to be careful to, at least, understand what you present on the slides instead of just reading off of them. Because you can get asked anything about that content – like I just asked you about it.
M: What I am trying to get across is that stressed syllables have more stress than unstressed syllables – but I don’t know if I should keep this then.
TE: What do you guys [rest of classmates] think?
S1: I feel like this slide should not be here. I feel like this has a lot of words that I don’t - that they [target students] may not understand. I would look at this and not understand much.
M: Okay

Once again, the teacher educator’s mediation was rather explicit, through open-ended questions that would prompt María to clarify and expand on her explanations (for
which María relied on the text in the slides). In addition to this, the teacher educator often engaged the students into the discussion to create a space for verbalization, peer mediation, and negotiation of meaning of these scientific concepts. In her reflection after the practice teach, María expressed her feelings associated with how the session went, her understanding of the concept, and her next steps.

**Excerpt 6-11: Reflection, week 9: (M = María)**

M: My practice teach gave me a run for my money. I felt pretty confident going in, and then I realized everything I had prepared wasn’t really directed towards learning. My slides were super confusing and didn’t have clear answers. I felt that the practice teach was really humbling and helped me realize that there is always room for improvement.

This realization of the cognitive/emotional dissonance experienced during the session was an important step in her developmental trajectory, as she now seemed to understand that something needed to change in order for her to be ready to engage in the actual teach. Something to note about María is that she was someone who genuinely welcomed feedback. Even though, in her narrative, she highlighted the emotional experience of this practice teach, and even though she received many comments from many of her classmates and from the teacher educators, she did not let this bring her down. She might have been “surprised about how much advise I received for my practice teach”, but she “felt that the advice aspect was really important, because [she] learned that as [she] was teaching, a lot of [her] peers didn’t really understand what was going on at all. Plus, the feedback that I received from my instructors really helped a lot.”

This, in turn, highlighted the importance of quality responsive mediation and of the intentional creation of spaces for verbalization and inter-thinking. Overall, in the
reflection, Maria identified clear cognitive/emotional dissonances during her practice teach session. One source of cognitive/emotional dissonance was the fact that “going into the practice teach, [she] felt like [she] knew the concept pretty well”. However, through the questions of her classmates and teacher educators, it became clear to her that her understanding of the scientific concepts was superficial. As a result, she could not effectively address any of the questions that deviated from what was written in the materials she had prepared. At this point, she was still dealing with a complex understanding of a scientific concept (Smagorinsky et al., 2003), with superficial understandings of some of the elements that are part of the scientific concepts of word stress and intonation and how those interact together.

Another source of cognitive/emotional dissonance had to do with the fact that she was not able to express herself when presenting the concept (“I soon realized I didn’t actually know how to deliver my concept”). She argued that this difficulty was not necessarily related to her understanding of the concept, but rather to her simply not knowing how to explain it (“I knew what I wanted to say in my head, but actually speaking it out loud gave me a lot of trouble”). An argument could be made, from a different theoretical perspective, that she could understand the concept but, for example, lacked metalinguistic resources to explain it.

However, from a VSCT perspective, an inability to verbalize or externalize conceptual understanding through any available means complicates the suggestion that you can separate internal understanding from verbalization/externalization. Knowing her level of understanding of the concepts of word stress and intonation at this point in the intervention, it could be argued that this difficulty verbalizing such understanding in a
new setting stemmed from the fact that her everyday understanding of the concept was in itself very superficial. María corroborated this later in the same reflection by adding that “now, all [she has] to do is make sure [she knows] the topic […] so we can deliver a good lesson”. At this point in the intervention, María continued to rely heavily on the materials she had created for her lesson, as well as on online materials (object-regulated), rather than being able to self-regulate.

After the practice teach session, María had to reduce her lesson to fit the 75-minute session she had for the actual teach. The week after the practice teach session, María and her partner also learned that the host instructor was going to cover the first concept (word stress) in the class prior to María’s actual teach. With this in mind, and after discussing this change with the teacher educators, María and her partner reorganized the lesson so that they would only focus on the scientific concept of intonation.

María continued to work on the materials and slides, and implemented all of the feedback from the previous meeting sessions pertaining to her explanation and presentation of the concept, as well as the rest of the slides in which she established a connection to the students’ existing everyday understanding of the concept and the activities they were to engage in. The next step for her was the actual teach.

This was the last step in the EXTTP and represented the culmination of all of María’s work throughout the pedagogical intervention. It also represented a scenario in which María experienced a great deal of cognitive and emotional dissonance, which she was highly aware of throughout the class. María went into the classroom already feeling “very nervous before [the actual teach]”, and during it, she experienced various instances of cognitive/emotional dissonance that she struggled through while engaged in teaching
activity, as her expectations of the actual teach and the reality of the class clashed on several occasions.

María had quickly identified the root of the cause for these dramatic collisions as the lack of a comprehensive understanding of her concept prior to engaging in the actual teach. She wrote that she “felt like [she] had the basic understanding [of the concept of intonation] to give the lesson”. As she mentioned in her final narrative reflection, when students started to ask her questions either to clarify what she had just presented or to explain the concept further (or apply it in an example), she felt like she did not have “the understanding to necessarily answer [students’] questions”. This caused an emotional response in which she felt anxious and was in a state where “[she] tried her best, but even when [she] was answering the students, [she] was like ‘I don’t think that is right, but I don’t know what else to say’ […], so [she] carried through the class, but [she] also felt like were a lot of holes [in her understanding] that could be filled”.

María did not have a deep understanding of the concept of intonation, and so what was mediating her pedagogy up until this point was not a conceptual understanding of the concept, but rather the materials she had put together for the lesson itself. During the moments of dissonance between her understanding of examples/rehearsed script/and teaching materials and the reality that that she experienced with the target students, she was unable to go beyond any of these artifacts to overcome such dramatic moments.

Interestingly, María thought that the students understood what she was trying to say (“I think they have a good understanding of what I was trying to teach, and I hope they did”), mostly thanks to the activities she had prepared (“I don’t necessarily think they didn’t understand because of all the examples I had”), although she highlighted
that there was still room for improvement (“I probably could have done a little bit more foundational work”).

Another instance of a dramatic collision took place when one of the students asked María to elaborate more on the concept’s definition, and she was unable to do so. The host instructor helped by providing an answer to that student’s question, but the host instructor was sitting over the back of the room, and it was likely that, at least, some of the students did not hear this explanation. María quickly noticed this and tried to paraphrase what the host instructor had said to the students to make sure they all heard the answer. However, she was not able to do so. María recounted that she “knew in that moment that [she] was struggling, because [she is] learning intonation herself, [she] was kind of, in a way, absorbing what the host instructor was saying and then [she] just didn’t have that time to spit it back out”. The (unsuccessful) attempt to mimic what the host instructor uttered in the classroom regarding the concept of intonation indicates a lack of internalization or conceptual understanding. María was not able to paraphrase the information given by the host instructor because her understanding of the concept of intonation was superficial and mediated by what was written in her slides.

When María’s classroom activity required anything other than a presentation of her materials, she was unable to think through the concept. As a result, she had no basis for making decisions during the lesson. The result was a very emotional experience, such that emotions mediated and shaped all future class activity in increasingly negative ways.
6.4 Role of C-BLI and overall understanding of the scientific concept of intonation

Overall, María’s journey to understanding the scientific concept of intonation started with feelings of anxiety as she felt overwhelmed about teaching a concept she had not been aware of, or consciously thought about, until this point. She was a determined student and continued working on the project despite the setbacks she experienced with her partner, although feelings of inadequacy were salient in her narratives throughout the intervention.

Excerpt 6-12: Stimulated recall, week 11: (M = María)

M: I felt really overwhelmed at first when I was learning about [the concept]. Because I knew nothing about it, I was like “How am I supposed to teach something so someone?” and I felt a little bit intimidated because I almost felt like I shouldn’t teach this to them. Because [the host instructor] has years of experience, and maybe [the students] would actually remember the lesson better if she does teach it. So, I kind of found I was doing a disservice [to the students], like, I know that’s like almost a doubt. But I feel like that is what made me work really hard on the project, as you say numerous times. I kept trying and trying, and because I was trying, I was also learning.

Interestingly, María, who identified as a native speaker of English, also brings up the fact that she is a native English speaker as an element which made the learning of the concept somewhat harder, because she seemed to have this understanding that she should know this concept already because she was a native speaker, which reveals insights of her orientation to concepts of language knowledge. Explicit knowledge/metalanguage was not a part of it if she thought that nativeness necessarily entailed understanding of concepts in the language. A big part of her learning throughout the intervention involved her finding and comprehending her own everyday conceptual understanding of intonation.
Excerpt 6-13: Stimulated recall, week 11: (M = María)

M: I also think it was even harder that [this was a concept] in English, which is my first language, because when I was learning about [intonation], I was like “I don’t even know where to start”, because I am already doing it. I’m already using [intonation] but I don’t even realize when I am doing it. I actually started thinking about, like, “what am I saying? What does it mean? What am I doing?”, and I think that was kind of interesting because it made me really reflect on something I had no idea about and that I am doing 24/7.

As María explained in this excerpt, this realization of her not having a deep conceptual understanding of the concept of intonation, even though it was a concept that exists in her first language and that she already used, prompted her to reflect on her everyday conceptual understanding. She then mentioned that having access to C-BLI did make an impact on her own developing conceptual understanding, in part because “it made me have a lot of personal reflection, and I think that made the lesson plan better”. At the very end of the intervention, even though she still had considerable gaps in her conceptual understanding of intonation, there was evidence of a more complete understanding when compared to her initial reflections. Still, this understanding seemed to be surface-level and not conceptual.

Excerpt 6-14: Final teaching reflection, week 14: (M = María)

M: I taught the concept of intonation and how intonation can benefit a student. Intonation is basically the way we use our voice and how it creates music through speech. Intonation is the rise and falls of one’s voice during speaking. Intonation is vital for people to know about because intonation is used in speaking on a daily basis.”

As this excerpt illustrates, María was unable to articulate her understanding of the linguistic concept of intonation in a scientific, comprehensive way. However, when
discussing the concept, she was able to discuss it in a way that shows conceptual
development (e.g., she identified the fact that there was a communicative value, but she
was unable to articulate why or in which way that was significant) from her starting
point. She moved from an (intuitive and rather inaccurate) everyday understanding of the
scientific concept of intonation into a complex of the scientific concept, but she did not
get to a point where she had a fully formed scientific conceptual understanding of
intonation. Therefore, María seemed to have developed a more comprehensive
understanding of the complex of the scientific concept of intonation.

During the final teaching reflection, María brought up the usefulness of C-BLI in
helping her evolving conceptual understanding and orientation to classroom activity,
despite initial doubts and concerns.

**Excerpt 6-15: Final teaching reflection, week 14: (M = María)**

*M: The CBLI workshops that happened in the weeks 5-9 really helped me. Admittedly, I really wasn’t sure how CBLI was going to help me in the beginning. In fact, I didn’t even realize what the initial purpose served. However, through time, I realized that the CBLI was actually one of the most important things I would ever learn. I felt that before CBLI, I only ever viewed the big picture, but with CBLI, I realized that I need to start seeing all of the integral parts that go into a lesson planning. The details really matter, and they are crucial to making a lesson comprehensible and actually worthwhile. I felt very challenged, and I feel like that made my lesson plan all the better. Without CBLI, I think I would have seriously missed some crucial steps. I feel that my lesson plan was much more rounded with using CBLI, and it could have been a lot better if I had known CBLI longer.”*

María brought up her understanding and access to C-BLI as a key tool that helped
her guide her lesson planning, although there was not much evidence in her narratives
and in her orientation to classroom activity to necessarily support that claim. In the end,
as she argued in her stimulated recall, she tried her best, was still able to provide useful information to the students, and learned from the experience, so she was comforted by that knowledge.

**Excerpt 6-16: Stimulated recall, week 11: (M = María)**

M: I feel like CBLI really helps a lot, especially because I had no idea of what I was doing, and I felt like the CBLI really made me think about things that I wouldn’t have thought about. Personally, I was constantly thinking back to ‘we have to have this step first, and then we build upon it, and we have to constantly reflect’. And, you know, I think all the CBLI stuff we did really, really helped me. I feel like the lesson planning was a struggle, but if I didn’t have the component of CBLI, it would have been really, really hard.

After María was introduced to C-BLI, she did write down its steps in her notebook and would refer to them often. Therefore, it can be understood that this is the type of knowledge that helped her mediate her understanding of the lesson plan, in that she was aware of the “different steps” she would need to follow in her lesson planning (“we have to have this step first, and then we build upon it”, meaning first she would need to orient students to the concept and then move from there to provide an in-depth explanation, etc.). However, there was no evidence to suggest that she had an understanding of C-BLI’s pedagogical focus on teaching concepts. She did not seem to understand the principles behind C-BLI at this point.

María also mentioned time as a variable that could have influenced her development. Time was, indeed, a constraining variable given that the intervention targeted a single semester. It is important to remember that even though she had some experience as the assistant to an ESL instructor, this experience represented her first time
teaching or engaging in classroom activity. María concluded that, while this experience “felt very strange, it was one of the most satisfying things [she] has ever done in her life”. In addition, María differed from the other two case studies in that she did not show as much progress in understanding the scientific concept of intonation, and she experienced much emotional dissonance throughout the pedagogical intervention.

One source of dissonance was that her understanding of the concept was insufficient for her to teach the concept itself. María seemed to think about her scientific concept as if she was talking about a word in itself and delivering facts about it. At the same time, she admitted, sometimes, that she really did not know what she was teaching. A second source of dissonance was the often-discussed gap that novice educators experience between their ideals and their expectations and classroom reality. This dissonance emerged from María being challenged as a teacher, as well as the knowledge she brought into the classroom. This was not just a gap in terms of general outcomes in the classroom, but her expectations and understanding of who she was and what it meant to be a teacher vs who she actually was in the classroom and how things were developing in that context.

Expanding on this role of expertise, the third source of dissonance was visible in her self-assessment of development and understanding. María believed that she was mastering things and growing in her conceptual understanding of the scientific concept of intonation. This was true in that she did develop her understanding of her concept (as a series of complexes). However, the dissonance comes from the fact that this was not the necessary level of understanding needed for the target course. Similarly, she was self-identifying her understanding of C-BLI as a regulator, but in this case, there was no
evidence to support self-regulation with the concept. Because María was not consciously aware of the origins of her cognitive/emotional dissonance, as time progressed, her experience of these dissonance moments was primarily and increasingly emotional. Her experience of classroom activity was that she was not really thinking through a fully developed, or even emerging, understanding of concepts.

She did not seem to have an understanding of C-BLI’s focus on teaching a concept, such that learners could take up the concept as a psychological tool and think through it. While she materialized the C-BLI steps and seemed to refer to them regularly (which might be evidence of María’s attempting to re-create C-BLI in her lesson planning and the lesson itself), she also had a clear surface-level understanding of C-BLI, in that she did experience it and see it as a set of procedures, but she did not understand the principles behind it nor the idea to teach through concepts. Therefore, because María did not have a comprehensive conceptual understanding of her scientific concept nor of C-BLI, she had nothing to fall back on when dramatic moments appeared throughout the intervention.

Further, María’s case is salient because she did not have teaching experience, as well as the metacognitive knowledge of how intonation works in English. With all of this in mind, it is not surprising that she experienced intense cognitive/emotional dissonance throughout the intervention. Similarly, the fact that her partner stopped working on the project but was still part of the pair contributed significantly to the stress of the situation. Therefore, it is unsurprising that, while María developed, she remained material-oriented throughout the intervention, despite the responsive mediation and feedback received from the teacher educators and her classmates.
Chapter 7

Implications (Discussion)

7.1 Summary of study aim and findings

This dissertation employed Vygotskian Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978, 1986) and Concept-Based Language Instruction (Gal’perin, 1970, 1992; Arievitch & Haenan, 2005; Arievitch, 2008) to promote and trace the conceptual development of target scientific concepts for novice language teachers, as well as to promote their development as language teachers over the course of the semester. To accomplish this, an 11-week long pedagogical intervention targeting the Extended Team-Teaching Project (EXTTP) was designed and implemented to introduce the novice teachers to the principles of Concept-Based Language Instruction. This pedagogical intervention had also the goal to create a space for participants to work through their emerging conceptual understanding of their target concepts and their developing teaching personas with the help and mediation of the teacher educators. The data gathered and analyzed consisted of participants’ language learning and teaching narratives, weekly narrative reflections during the course of the pedagogical intervention, audio and video recordings of the practice and actual teach session, audio and/or video recordings of additional sessions to discuss students lesson plans, stimulated recalls that took place after the actual teach sessions, lesson plan materials, and final teaching reflections. Further, this study was shaped by the following research questions:

1. To what extent can C-BLI as a set of pedagogical principles serve as a mediational tool for orienting novice teachers to content knowledge and pedagogical decisions within their particular educational contexts?
2. To what extent can the engagement in narrative activity as a form of verbalization be leveraged as a means of orienting novice teachers to better meet the particularized demands of their specific pedagogical contexts and reflect on the nature of their content knowledge, their pedagogical decisions, and their relationship with learner knowledge?

Three participants were selected for case studies and closely analyzed from a Vygotskian developmental microgenetic perspective over the course of a semester. Unsurprising for case studies, participant experiences were rich, diverse, and individual. The case study approach allowed for a look at the individual nature of the participants’ experiences as they embarked in their language teaching journey, which will be discussed in section 7.2. Similarly, it highlighted, as will be discussed later in this chapter, the power of a Vygotskian mediational approach that offered responsive, dynamically attuned, individualized support, mediation, and feedback to individuals. While the case studies were diverse, analysis of these case studies together resulted in the emergence of three important themes that will serve as discussion points:

**Theme 1**: The introduction of C-BLI facilitated participants’ developing understandings of the scientific concepts they were expected to teach in their target classes.

**Theme 2**: The internalization of the key concepts of C-BLI led to a more positive emotional orientation to language teaching, including more resilience when dealing with struggling setbacks and a more principled and critical engagement with teaching concepts and teaching activity.
Theme 3: Novice teachers who were more willing to engage in reflective activity, in general, displayed an increased ability to internalize/adopt C-BLI more readily, which underscores the importance of reflection in Vygotskian SCT pedagogies and highlights that learners’ reflective capacities are individual and dynamic.

These themes and the theoretical implications associated with them are discussed in depth in section 7.3.

Overall, these themes underscore the importance for teacher educators to design and implement pedagogical interventions in teacher education programs that are designed to help novice teachers gain a deep conceptual understanding of the content they are expected to teach. In addition, they highlight the importance of interventions that are designed to responsively mediate novice teachers as they experience the emotional nature of teaching and potential cognitive/emotional dissonances. Similarly, these results highlight the importance of providing novice teachers with safe mediational spaces they can inhabit to externalize their evolving understandings regarding their conceptual knowledge and their orientation to classroom activity.

7.2 Summary of case studies

This section serves as a concise summary of the major elements presented for each case study/focal participant in chapters 4 through 6.

Jaime was a highly motivated and agentive student who came into the pedagogical intervention with limited teaching experience but with an extensive, complex multilingual history of language learning and language use. He was also willing to engage in reflective activities and sought mediation from the teacher educator regularly
(during and outside of class hours) to externalize his evolving understanding of his assigned scientific concept and of his engagement with the principles of C-BLI. Similarly, he actively sought to access the space the teacher educator co-created for verbalization and responsive mediation to navigate his emerging struggles. Initially, Jaime struggled with the idea that his expertise as instructor for the target class would be difficult to justify given that he was going to be teaching graduate students in an ESP/EAP course. As an undergraduate student, this caused strong emotional reactions, which highlight the impacts of feelings of legitimacy and expertise for teachers in ESP/EAP courses, and how these are often difficult to overcome given the lack of support and/or training instructors in this field experience (Ding & Bruce, 2017). Yet, as Jaime grew familiar with and began to take up the concepts of C-BLI, he regularly referred to them for guidance and used them as tools as he was planning and discussing his lesson and the validity of his knowledge in this educational context.

As the intervention advanced, Jaime’s understanding of the scientific concept of conditionality became more comprehensive, and in his reflections, he started to imitate and adopt the language of C-BLI to discuss his rationale for his lesson materials and organization. By the end of the intervention, Jaime was not only able to externalize his understanding of the scientific concept of conditionality, but also to dynamically reframe and reconstruct an explanation for his target student and apply that understanding to novel contexts of use (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014), as well as externalize his rationale behind the use of conditionals in novel contexts. (Lantolf, 2011). Importantly, Jaime was able to also discuss lesson planning and his own orientation to classroom activity in hypothetical contexts, which was indicative of his early internalization of C-BLI as a set
of pedagogical principles. As part of the intervention, the teacher educator provided responsive mediation to guide Jaime throughout his conceptual development. To do this, the teacher educator created spaces to elicit Jaime’s understanding of and orientation to the target concept, and to prompt him to provide his rationale for pedagogical decisions. Jaime took up the mediation, found it useful, and sought additional mediation throughout the intervention, as he recognized its role in his development. This highlights the importance of the responsive mediation provided by the teacher educator, as well as the importance of the access to spaces for safe verbalization of developing understandings, a crucial element of the intervention.

The second case study, Yichén, understood the EXTTP, pedagogical intervention, and her role as a teacher through the prism of her instructional history. She entered the pedagogical intervention with an understanding of the importance of conceptual knowledge rather than relying on memorization and repetition of information and its application in a specific context. This, as was evident from her language learning and teaching narrative, was the result of her previous experiences as a language learner in her home country, where she prepared for language tests (e.g., school testing, Gāokǎo or University Entry Exam, TOEFL, IELTS) by memorizing grammar rules and syntactical structures rather than understanding linguistic concepts. She experienced first-hand how limiting and incomplete this approach to language learning was and indicated in her narratives how she wanted to avoid teaching students in this way by keeping the communicative purpose of the language elements present. Throughout the intervention, it was clear in her discourse and orientation to classroom activity that she wanted to make
principled decisions about her teaching, an action that was in part informed by her reflection on her apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975).

Yichén was quick to adopt C-BLI as a psychological tool to help mediate her understanding of the scientific concepts she was going to teach in the target course. Her evolving understanding of the target scientific concepts also helped her in building confidence to teach this particular course as a NNEST, and her understanding and adoption of C-BLI as a pedagogical tool mediated the way she approached teaching activity regardless of the context. For instance, one important element of this case study was that Yichén, late in the term, recognized her ability to think through the scientific concept and through the principles of C-BLI when engaging in teaching activity. She was also able to adapt and change materials in activity based on the tailored needs of her students and based on her understanding of the concept itself. Jaime and Yichén were two of the highest achieving students in the course, seemed to have progressed towards internalizing C-BLI, were aware of their use of C-BLI as a psychological tool to mediate their orientation to classroom activity, and drew confidence from that internalization and ability to utilize/discuss such knowledge in novel contexts.

The third focal participant, María, had a different developmental trajectory from that of the previous two novice teachers. María entered the pedagogical intervention with the least teaching experience of the focal participants, as well as with a notable lack of metalinguistic awareness of English to help her externalize her evolving understanding of the target scientific concept. She was also a Political Science major, which was an outlier in a classroom filled with education or language major students. Further, María
experienced intense cognitive/emotional dissonance and drama throughout the intervention from various sources.

María relied on her apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) to form her understanding of what educational activity should entail, and she imitated it to some degree throughout the intervention. Importantly, María had extremely negative experiences as a language learner, and she approached and understood such learning through the prism of language loss, as she was a heritage speaker of Spanish who did not know the language anymore. Therefore, María had very strong negative emotions (feelings of loss and inadequacy) attached to language learning that she carried through her schooling years and brought into the pedagogical intervention.

María’s conceptual development was visible and understood as an evolving understanding of complexes (Smagorinsky et al., 2003). That is to say, María’s understanding of her target scientific concept was an inconsistent and relatively incoherent set of elements that she had started to understand over the course of the intervention. This conceptual development progressed over the course of the intervention with the help of the mediation provided by the teacher educator, peers, and spaces for verbalization that were part of the pedagogical intervention. While María’s conceptual understanding did not get to a point, even at the end of the intervention, where she was able to exhibit a full conceptual understanding of the concept of intonation in which the different elements are unified and coherent, she still demonstrated development. At the end of the intervention, she was still in a stage where she was object-regulated (e.g., mediated by the materials she had created for her class), and this caused María intense moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance during her practice and actual teach sessions.
In dialogue, María was positive about C-BLI as a set of concepts for thinking about language teaching activity. In particular, she said that it helped her organize her thoughts and have a clearer idea of the structure of the lesson. As is often the case with novice teachers, there was an evident gap between the ideal she described and the pedagogical practice, because the understanding that she explained she had – outside of class – did not come through in activity.

7.3 Theoretical implications

7.3.1 C-BLI to mediate conceptual development

The first theme that emerges from the data relates to the benefit in using C-BLI to develop an understanding of scientific concepts. For all three case studies, the introduction of C-BLI contributed to the development of an understanding of the scientific concepts they were expected to teach in their target classes, corroborating previous arguments in the literature regarding the beneficial application of C-BLI to teach and/or develop conceptual understanding of scientific concepts (e.g., Buescher, 2015; Casal, 2020; Doyle, 2021; Kim, 2013; Kurtz, 2017; Lai, 2012; Negueruela, 2003; Van Compernolle, 2012; Yanez-Prieto, 2008; Zhang & Lantolf, 2015). This process of development began with the series of workshops that were part of the 11-week long pedagogical intervention, during which participants were engaged in externalization and discussion of their evolving understandings of their target concepts with peers and expert others (teacher educators), as well as in written form. By engaging with the different steps of C-BLI in order to prepare their lessons, the students worked in pairs and with the teacher educator to gain a conceptual understanding of the target scientific concepts.
All participants addressed in their narratives or reflections that engaging in these workshops did push them to think about their topic beyond the superficial information they could borrow from the internet or from textbooks. That is to say, they were encouraged to think of the target students’ existing understanding of the concepts they were going to cover during the lesson, think of a way to materialize the target concepts, think of ways to engage the target students to verbalize and apply the target concepts in social activity (Lantolf & Poehner, 2014), and think of the types of activities the concepts related to in social and cognitive life.

This has implications for LTE. For instance, utilizing C-BLI to mediate conceptual understanding of target concepts provides a way for novice teachers to gain abstract knowledge of those concepts and the ability to apply them in novel activity. In addition to this, in many cases novice teachers are not teaching entire courses by themselves, or they are not developing the curriculum or syllabus, which is to say that, with the curriculum in place, an understanding of the concepts they are teaching from a more local perspective provides a more feasible entry point for novices.

### 7.3.2 C-BLI to mediate novice language teachers’ development

Related to the use of C-BLI as a pedagogical tool to gain conceptual understanding of target concepts, the second theme that emerges from the data of all case studies is that of the relationship between the internalization of the concepts of C-BLI and orientation to classroom activity. This theme addresses the first research question of this project. The data strongly suggests that the internalization of the key concepts of C-BLI leads to a more positive emotional orientation to language teaching. That is to say, the
focal participants indicated that they felt less intimidated to engage in their actual teaching sessions than they felt at the beginning of the intervention because of their understanding of C-BLI. They argued that such knowledge mediated them, at least in part, when preparing for and orienting to educational activity. The understanding of C-BLI across the focal participants differed (naturally). The data from the participants who had a more comprehensive understanding of the key concepts of C-BLI showed more resilience when dealing with setbacks during the course of the intervention (particularly during the actual teach sessions), as well as a more principled and critical engagement with teaching concepts, materials, and teaching activity.

### 7.3.2.1 Reshaping previous educational orientation

From a Vygostkian SCT perspective, teacher cognition is conceptualized as both originating in and being directly shaped by the various educational contexts and social activities in which teachers engage (Johnson, 2009). All case studies entered the pedagogical intervention with a pre-existing understanding of what teaching entailed, mostly understood through the prism of their previous lived experiences as language learners, and to a minor degree as language tutors. These understandings based on their apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) and previous lived experiences, however, did not necessarily reflect a principled way of teaching (as argued in Borg, 2006; Freeman, 2002; Johnson, 2009, among others) but simply their understanding of how individuals perceived having been taught. Unsurprisingly, participants differed in their assessment of the validity of their previous experiences. For example, both Jaime and Yichén reflected on their previous experiences and identified how these could be
improved to help future language learners communicate using the language rather than simply studying to pass tests. María reflected back on her previous experiences and relied on those which had been positive (e.g., her teachers during middle-school making her Spanish class fun), because she believed this would lead to student language learning.

To address this, C-BLI was introduced by the teacher educator as a means to mediate and reconceptualize participants’ teaching cognition (Lantolf & Esteve, 2019). This reconceptualization can reduce a possible reliance on textbooks and memorized rules (material-oriented), as well as on beliefs surrounding teaching activity. Instead, the emphasis is placed on conceptual understanding and principled ways to approach educational activity.

As argued in chapter 2, C-BLI can address all different elements of teacher knowledge in pedagogical activity, given that it offers a balance of content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and knowledge of context into a single pedagogical approach. In this study, two of the focal participants were able to combine their evolving understanding of the target concepts (content knowledge) with their evolving understanding of pedagogical knowledge (through classroom activity and readings), plus their knowledge of context (after their classroom visits) to make their lesson appropriate for their target class (pedagogical content knowledge) through their understanding of C-BLI. One of the focal participants did not get to this level of understanding of C-BLI by the end of the intervention, but even a superficial understanding of it prompted her to reconsider and rethink the way she was preparing her materials.
Specifically, this orientation to classroom activity with an emphasis on conceptual understanding was visible in some of the focal participants’ teaching materials. For example, Jaime was able to create a flow chart for the target students to select the appropriate conditional depending on the context (similar to Negueruela’s (2003) charts developed for his L2 Spanish students in order to enable them to make agentive choices regarding verbal aspect), as well as reframe his explanations of the concept of conditionality to render them understandable by the target students.

Similarly, Yichén was able to adapt and change in activity her teaching to better orient the target students to the concept based on their response to her teaching materials (teaching off her students). Importantly, she was also able to reflect afterwards on her teaching activity and on ways in which her teaching could have changed to better present the concept and engage target students with it. By the time both Jaime and Yichén engaged in their actual teach sessions, they were at a point in their development that suggested internalization of their target concepts, and, as a result, were able to dynamically adapt their pedagogy to the emergent needs of the target students, reason through them, and focus on their conceptual understanding. At the very least, they have developed personal conceptual understandings that they can dynamically apply in teaching activity.

María also developed an understanding of her scientific concept (as a series of complexes) and of C-BLI to a different degree. While she remained object-mediated, she explicitly credited having access to C-BLI as a means to push her to think more carefully about the way she prepared her materials and mediated her understanding of the organization of her lesson.
Overall, this study reinforced the range of experiences that can be labeled as *novice*. This has considerable implication for LTE programs, where assumptions or understandings of what novice means, whether arbitrary or based on previous students, can have a powerful influence on the way the pedagogies are shaped. In the current study, all students’ needs were unique, but one of the student’s needs were, from a linguistics perspective, considerably more extensive than those of the others. Importantly, the pedagogy allowed room for adaptive, responsive mediation and dynamic attunement to each individual participant’s needs, because it included regular interactions with groups and individuals *by design*. This, however, is time consuming and not characteristic of LTE programs, where for reasons of resources or efficiency, 1:1 interactions are likely more limited. In this case, *all* students developed. The development that was witnessed by María is an example of the transformational power of a Vygostkian pedagogy, or in this case, a C-BLI informed pedagogy to LTE, through which no student is “not ready” for development.

Crucially, this does not mean that all novice teachers can be expected to attain the same “endpoint”. This has significant implications for the way that novice language teachers are assessed in LTE programs. This dissertation has captured the development of the three focal participants, but in a threshold or benchmark approach that looked comparatively at where the students would be at the end of the semester/program, not all three focal participants would be deemed successful. For instance, from a traditional approach, María would most likely be left behind. Implementing this type of approach in LTE programs, where VSCT and C-BLI informs novice language teacher pedagogy,
allows the teacher educator to *see* novices’ needs and to mediate them and work together towards a goal.

### 7.3.2.2 Emotional mediation during/for teaching activity

Data from participants’ narratives indicated that participants’ work through and reliance on C-BLI impacted their confidence and emotional responses to educational activity. A common theme in the SCT informed literature on second language teaching and teacher knowledge is the strong negative emotions of novice teachers surrounding gaps between their ideals and the reality of their teaching contexts, and the struggles and cognitive/emotional dissonance they experience as a result of that (e.g., Golombek, 1998; Golombek & Doran, 2014; Johnson & Worden, 2014; Reis, 2015).

Data indicated that all three focal participants experienced similar feelings of anxiety and doubt regarding their teaching capabilities and understanding of content knowledge. However, the core concepts of C-BLI can serve as mediational tools for orienting learner decisions around language teaching activity in ways that render the uncertainty of early language teaching manageable, given that C-BLI provides a clear basis for and goal of language teaching activity. In this case, all focal participants indicated that knowing (to varying degrees) and having access to C-BLI did make them feel more confident about the materials and organization of their lessons overtime, as well as impact their feelings of legitimacy to be teaching the target students.

This was salient as they were all assigned an ESP/EAP course. It is also particularly important in Language for Specific Purposes contexts, where educators are unlikely to receive context-specific training (Ding and Bruce, 2017), and are likely to
teach in contexts where the absence of traditional hierarchies of expertise in the classroom can create unique tensions and doubts about teaching personas. That is to say, the context-specific and dynamic nature of specific-purposes pedagogical contexts complicates traditional assumptions regarding teacher knowledge, raising important questions of teacher expertise and, subsequently, teacher development.

Typically, in an LSP course, language educators enter classrooms with linguistic content knowledge but not necessarily developed knowledge of the subject domain or teaching experience. They also teach a course for students who, in some cases, have high levels of subject domain knowledge or investment in it, and in many cases have large amounts of experience or even advanced degrees, titles, and standing (Ding & Bruce, 2017). In these cases, the expertise of the educator can be questioned, as these instructors are not members of the communities to which pedagogical activity is directed. For novice language instructors, this dissonance can create extreme identity conflicts (Garcia-Alonso, 2022). Particularly in these contexts, an emphasis on linguistic *concepts*, which can be taken up and applied across communicative domains, not only reinforces the language teacher expertise in the classroom (which may be important interpersonally and in terms of teacher self-efficacy), but also helps frame a pedagogy of discovery that very much aligns with LSP theory (Swales, 1990).

One concrete implication for LTE programs within specific purposes pedagogies is to draw on C-BLI as a tool for educating novice teachers and for supporting them through challenging early experiences. This is particularly important in the US, where many ESP/EAP courses (e.g., English in particular subjects, general L2 writing, or even freshman composition for international and/or domestic students) at institutions of higher
education are taught by graduate students who may receive general support in language education but are unlikely to receive targeted support in teaching within their disciplinary context (Ding & Bruce, 2017).

Results from this study support this claim. For example, having a deep understanding of the target concept, as well as an understanding of the principles of C-BLI boosted Jaime’s confidence in the classroom and allowed him to adapt his explanation of the concept repeatedly when needed to better fit the context of the students. In addition to this, he reported feeling more confident when dealing with unexpected situations during the actual teach. Further, his data showed a change in his feelings around his own legitimacy as the teacher in the room, in this case an undergraduate instructor in a graduate EAP course. As Jaime understood the principles of C-BLI better, his confidence in his persona as a teacher and in the legitimacy of his knowledge increased, as well as his feelings surrounding his teaching activity.

On a similar trajectory, Yichên’s understanding of the core concepts of C-BLI mediated her feelings surrounding her non-native speaker teaching persona. Yichên relied on her NNEST status at times to establish rapport with her students and relate to their learning experiences (corroborating arguments by Lipovsky & Mahboob, 2010, as well as Mullock, 2010, among others), as she had gone through and understood the difficulty of learning these concepts in English. However, her status as a NNEST was also a source of drama for her, as she doubted herself when explaining her target concept in English in ways she thought could be understood by the target students (Manara, 2018; Shin & Kim, 2011) and would give her credibility in front of them (Reis, 2011). Yet, the results from the intervention indicated that, as Yichên continued to develop her conceptual
understanding, the concerns about NNEST stop surfacing in her narratives. Her growing conceptual understanding of her target concept and of C-BLI as a pedagogical tool allowed her to move away from discussions around nativeness. Her confidence in her teaching ability increased as she shifted her focus on how well she understood the concept and the organization of her lesson, as well as her understanding of what the goal of her pedagogy was (conceptual understanding of the target concept).

For these two focal participants, being introduced to and working through C-BLI pushed them to gain a conceptual understanding of their target concepts, as well as helped them reconceptualize their instructional approaches and understanding of what teaching is and entails to a focus on concepts, meaning and communication (Lantolf & Esteve, 2019). Therefore, they are able to remove emphasis from other variables of their teaching personas (e.g., year/rank and nativeness status) that were attached to negative emotions.

This was not as salient with María, whose understanding of the core concepts of C-BLI was not at the same point of development as Jaime’s and Yichén’s by the time of the actual teach. She still relied heavily on her materials, and because of her lack of deep conceptual understanding of her concept and of the core concepts of C-BLI, when moments of cognitive/emotional dissonance appeared, she did not have the tools to regulate them. From a VSCT perspective, such emotional dissonance is conceptualized as a catalyst for change, if given appropriate mediation. Therefore, an implication for LTE programs is to anticipate and take advantage of the dissonance and provide attuned, responsive mediation to provoking development. This topic is discussed more in depth in the following section.
7.3.3 Reflection and expert-other mediation in Language Teacher Education for novice language teacher development

The third and final theme that emerged from the case studies data highlights the importance of reflection and mediation to foment and guide novice language teachers’ development. This theme addresses the second research question of this project. This pedagogical intervention included, by design, multiple spaces and instances for participants to reflect on their own developing understandings of their target concepts (and anything else related to classroom activity and the project overall), and multiple instances of engagement in dialogic, responsive mediation with the teacher educators (expert-others) as they worked through their developing understandings of the target concepts and pedagogical intervention overall. As Johnson and Golombek (2016) stated, “simply placing new teachers in classrooms as observers, tutors, or even instructors may do little to support the development of teacher/teaching expertise” (p. 90).

In this study, it is also argued that simply providing novice language teachers with C-BLI without providing them with safe spaces for them to externalize their evolving understandings and receive mediation by an expert other targeting their individual, emerging needs would also do little to promote language teacher development. As a result, verbalization/externalization and responsive mediation (Johnson & Golombek, 2016) were fundamental components of the pedagogical intervention. Through these reflections, the teacher educator was able to understand and document, as well as mediate, the participants’ evolving understandings of their target concepts and their orientation to teaching activity.
Over the course of 11 weeks, the teacher educator engaged in explicit, goal-directed, and intentional responsive mediation with all three case studies, both during and outside of class time, to facilitate the development of schematic, high quality explicit knowledge of concepts, and the ultimate internalization and development of conceptual resources relevant to course goals and desired outcomes. By engaging in this type of mediation, the teacher educator was able to simultaneously see and promote novice language teacher development.

Some of the ways the teacher educator materialized this responsive mediation were by prompting participants to externalize their current understandings and to prompt them to reason through their thinking when creating materials, as well as their reasoning through the relevance of the target concepts for the target students. In addition to this, the teacher educator provided expert understandings of elements of the target concepts when needed, and suggestions on materials and orientation to classroom activity. This was done by carefully and responsively offering a range of highly explicit to more implicit feedback, depending on the needs of the participants (Lantolf & Aljaafreh, 1995).

Similarly, the teacher educator engaged in responsive mediation to guide and reshape participants’ feelings of own expertise and legitimacy by recognizing the emotional nature of teaching (Johnson & Worden, 2014; Zoshak, 2016) and highlighting the power of a focus on conceptual knowledge to understand expertise and teaching activity.

From a non-Vygotskian perspective to language teacher development, both Jaime and Yichén would have been described or identified as individuals who developed throughout the course of the semester. Yet, for María, the understanding would be that
she was not ready. That is an exclusive pedagogy where students who aren’t ready for the type of activity or goal are deemed ‘unhelpable’ and are, often, abandoned. From a VSCT perspective, engagement in mediation from the instructor, from peers, and from artifacts and materials provide an alternative means of navigating this situation. This has implications for LTE programs and the expert-others within them. On the one hand, the courses have to be structured in flexible ways where there is time to prepare novice teachers. On the other hand, teacher educators/expert-others need to be prepared for novice teachers entering these educational programs with less than expected in terms of knowledge, and dynamically and responsively adapt to where they currently are, as well as to provide enough spaces for such mediation to occur.

Jaime’s and Yichén’s successes were connected to rapid conceptual development of both their target concepts and of the core concepts of C-BLI, as reflected in their narratives, their discussions with the teacher educator, and their orientation to classroom activity. In María’s case, her development looked different, but it was development, nonetheless. The direct role of mediation and the essential nature of the dynamic attunement to learners’ needs meant that the teacher educator was able to find the novice teachers’ differing developmental points at the beginning of the pedagogical intervention and mediate them responsively (rather than relying on holistic or start of term diagnostics of learners needs, which are common in LTE programs). In the case of María, the curriculum (and María’s own schedule) did not necessarily allow a lot of additional time for the teacher educators to mediating María to master concepts that were necessarily assumed by the pedagogy, but weren’t targeted by them (e.g., knowledge of syllables in
order to discuss word stress). This is a limitation of the current study – the fact that previous knowledge was assumed.

Overall, a VSCT-informed pedagogy is transformative. An emphasis on conceptual knowledge is transformative for everyone individually, in that those concepts are adopted by novice teachers as psychological tools. It is also transformative in that it is transformative for everyone. It includes individuals who are typically excluded because their previous education, previous lived experience, prior access to mediators, etc. mean that they enter the pedagogy in a different place than others/than expected. This does not mean that non-VSCT-informed LTE programs/pedagogies place students in a hierarchy, but they are not necessarily designed to support students who come into the programs at different than expected starting places.

This highlights the importance of flexibility from a curricular perspective in LTE programs and from the teacher educators that form them. As part of a VSCT-informed pedagogy, it is essential to have room and space for the teacher educator to adapt to the novice teachers’ needs and provide spaces for such mediation to occur, as it is the mediational needs of the individual learner/novice teachers that dictates pedagogy.

7.4 Limitations and future research

While this study has offered insights into the potential role that C-BLI can play as an approach to language teacher education itself, it is not without its limitations. First, the intervention placed the researcher and participants in contact with each other for 11 weeks. This was enough time to provoke and assess transformative development. However, future research can adopt a longer-term intervention structure where novice
teachers receive more, ongoing instruction in C-BLI principles, have additional opportunities to teach, reflect, and adapt, and, importantly, receive more opportunities for adaptive, responsive mediation from an expert-other.

Related to this, a second limitation of this study lies in the fact that it did not focus on assessing target students’ learning outcomes. In other words, from the results of this pedagogical intervention, it cannot be assumed which of the three focal participants was the most effective instructor. The pedagogical intervention and focus of the teacher educator were oriented towards the novice teachers, not target students’ learning activity. A significant future direction can be to integrate learner perspectives and learning outcomes into the pedagogical intervention and analysis (similar to Lantolf & Esteve, 2019).

Another limitation of this study, related to the first point, is infrastructural in nature. The courses novice teachers were paired with were ‘high stakes’ courses, which added tension for everyone involved in the pedagogical intervention. That is to say, when preparing novice teachers to teach students in other instructors’ classrooms, there is additional tension to ensure that novice teachers’ lessons go well. This can be a limiting factor during a pedagogical intervention, in that there is a responsibility for the teacher educator to, at some point in the intervention, get things up to speed and make sure the lessons are appropriate for the context.

Moving on from limitations, while there has been considerable research on the unique challenges and experiences that non-native speaking language educators encounter and face in second and foreign language teaching, the findings of this study suggest that C-BLI has potential for supporting and mediating non-native teachers
through these spaces. In particular, the focus on conceptual knowledge, in terms of the teachers’ goal, classroom activity, and learner assessment from a C-BLI perspective clearly orient teacher expertise around explicit scientific concepts rather than vague notions of nativism. In this study, there is early evidence that such a clear focus for educators is empowering and helps mediate potential negative emotions associated with teaching. Further research into this relationship is warranted, as is the potential benefits of C-BLI for reorienting learner conceptions of language teacher expertise around concepts, thus shifting attention away from broad nativists preferences in society.

Lastly, and most importantly, the findings of this study point towards strong potential benefits of C-BLI not only as a way to teach language effectively but also as a way to educate teachers. That is to say, the core concepts of C-BLI appear to serve as mediational tools for orienting learner decisions around language teaching activity in ways that render the uncertainty of early language teaching manageable by providing a clear basis for and goal of language teaching activity. At the same time, scientific concepts appear to be an essential component of these benefits, at least on early stages, as an emphasis on concepts provides a clear means of conceptualizing language teacher subject knowledge, object of pedagogical activity, and goal for learners.
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Appendix A
Guidelines for the Extended Team-Teaching Project

Overview
You and your partner(s) will prepare and teach one lesson in a university-level ESL course offered by the Department of Applied Linguistics.

Requirements include:

1) At least two visits to your assigned ESL class (BEFORE you teach)
2) Development and approval of a detailed lesson plan and all teaching materials
3) ‘Practice Teach’ in our APLNG 493 class and revision of your lesson plan
4) ‘Actual Teach’ in your assigned ESL class
5) Reflection Meeting with me following your ‘Actual Teach’
6) Individual Final Reflection Paper

*********************

Classroom Visits:

You and your partner(s) will visit your assigned ESL class at least two times before you teach your lesson. Please contact your host instructor well in advance to plan your visits.

During your visit, please position yourself as a learner of teaching, not as an evaluator of the students or the instructor.

Take notes during your visit that can guide your own planning. Focus on the following:

1. What are the goals of the lesson?
2. What key concepts/skills are taught and/or practiced?
3. What teaching strategies and activities does the teacher use?
4. Describe the teacher/student and student/student interactions.
5. What did you learn about teaching English language learners that you did not know or consider before your visit?

**Topic and Detailed Lesson Plan:**

With your host instructor’s guidance, you will identify a key concept or skill that you will be expected to teach. With your partner(s), you will design a lesson plan using the format provided in CANVAS. You will also design all teaching materials.

When you have completed your lesson plan and teaching materials, you will email everything to your host instructor for feedback. You will make revisions based on the feedback and prepare to ‘Practice Teach’ your lesson to our class.

**‘Practice Teach’/Revision of Lesson Plan:**

Before you actually teach your lesson, you will ‘Practice Teach’ your lesson in our APLNG 493 class. The ‘Practice Teach’ is a teaching simulation that gives you an opportunity to ‘test’ your lesson plan design, activities, and materials. We will provide feedback during and after your ‘Practice Teach’, and you will revise your lesson plan with your own ideas and the feedback you receive.

After revising your lesson plan and at least one week in advance of your ‘Actual Teach’, you will send everything to your host instructor and me for final approval.

**‘Actual Teach’:**

You and your partner(s) will teach your lesson in your assigned ESL class. Your host instructor and I will be there to support you, and I will videorecord your class.

**Reflection Meeting with Me:**

Immediately following your teaching, I will meet with you and your partner(s) to reflect on your experience.

**Individual Final Reflection Paper:**
You will write your own Final Reflection Paper in which you consider all aspects of this experience (initial class visits, lesson planning process, practice teach, actual teach, reflection meeting, team partnership). Your paper should be double-spaced and 3-4 pages.
Appendix B

Guidelines for Language Learning and Teaching Narratives

A language learning and teaching narrative is an opportunity for you to explore what has shaped and continues to shape who you are as a language learner and teacher. Your narrative will be a combination of reflections on your prior language learning and teaching experiences, a critical analysis of those experiences, and the application of insights you have gained from them to your current and future language study and language teaching. Please note that ‘teaching’ can refer to any type of teaching/tutoring experiences, not just those related to language.

Specifics:

a) write your narrative in first-person, use double-space, 12-point font, 2-3 pages

b) upload to Narrative drop box in CANVAS

Consider the following as you construct your language learning and teaching narrative, and feel free to take your narrative in your own direction.

A. Reflection

1. Memories and impressions of yourself as a user/learner of other languages and as a teacher. These may be based on experiences with your family and/or friends, living in another country or culture, and/or more formal classroom language learning experiences.

2. Beliefs and assumptions about how languages are learned and taught at the time you had those experiences.
3. Beliefs and assumptions about the role of the teacher and students in learning another language when you had those experiences.

4. Your motivations for becoming an English language teacher and how your decision reflects your identity.

B. Critical Analysis

1. Consider how your prior experiences and beliefs shaped the kind of language user/learner and teacher you are today.

2. What do you believe are your greatest strengths as a language user/learner and as a language teacher?

3. What challenges have you had to manage? How did you manage them?

C. Application

1. Describe one or two critical incidents that encapsulate you as a user/learner of other languages and as a teacher.

2. How did you understand these incidents? How did you respond to them?

3. How does your understanding of and response to these incidents reflect your conceptions of yourself as a user/learner of other languages and as a teacher?

4. Now that you have written this narrative, how would you describe who you are today as a language user/learner and as a teacher?
Appendix C
Lesson Plan Format

Names:

GENERAL COURSE INFORMATION
1. Provide name of course AND brief description of course.
2. Describe your students
   - Proficiency level:
   - Age range:
   - L1s:
     - Why are they taking the class?
3. How long is the class?

GENERAL LESSON INFORMATION
1. TITLE of Your Lesson Plan:
   - Why does this topic matter to your students?
   - How does it connect to the previous class
   - How does it prepare your students for the next class?
2. Overall Instructional Goal:
3. Learning Objectives & How You Will Measure Each (Content & Language)
4. Materials Needed – List all materials, websites, handouts, etc. you need to teach this lesson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>THE PLAN</strong></th>
<th><strong>WHY?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(describe the activities &amp; student arrangement)</td>
<td>(give justification for activities &amp; student arrangement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orientation and Discussion of Learners’ Pre-Understanding</strong> (Time in min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘Connection’: Write exactly what you will say to your students to link the previous activity/concepts with the next activity/concepts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Presentation and Explanation of Concept</strong> (Time in min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Time in min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visualization and Materialization of Concept (Engagement)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘Connection’: Write exactly what you will say to your students to link the previous activity/concepts with the next activity/concepts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verbalization/Evaluation</strong> (Time in min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ‘Connection’: Write exactly what you will say to your students, review the lesson and help them ‘make sense of’ what they learned.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Application of Concept to a Novel Context</strong> (Time in min)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D
Prompts for C-BLI Workshops

Workshop 1:
Please provide a brief explanation of your understanding of Cohesion after today's session, as well as a general reflection on the session (e.g., the structure of the PPT, the idea of concepts, etc.).

Workshop 2:
Please provide detailed answers to your responses (350 words minimum, but feel free to write more!). Try to make connections to the content of the class we have seen so far.

Following our C-BLI lesson plan:

1. Please provide your current understanding of the concept you will be teaching (explain the concept). It is okay if you don't know how to explain this concept thoroughly yet! Just write what you can and what makes sense to you as of now.
   
   You can also think of how you would explain the concept to your students.

2. What would be a possible visualization of this concept? (This is an initial visualization - it may change as you keep working on your lesson)

3. What are possible orienting activities to explore students/ pre-existing understanding of the concept?

4. How might you engage students with this concept?

Further questions:

1. How do you feel about teaching in your assigned course? Why?

2. How do you feel about teaching this concept? Why?
Workshop 3:

1. After having discussed your concept with your classmates last and this week, and after having received feedback from your peers, how do you currently understand your concept? Please provide a visualization as well.

2. After presenting your concept to your classmates, please discuss possible orienting activities to explore students’ pre-existing understanding of your concept. What is the reasoning behind these activities?

3. After working on your lesson plans during today’s session, please discuss the activities you are planning for the engagement of students with your concept. What is the reasoning behind your activities?

Please feel free to add/discuss anything that you feel is relevant in this discussion.

Workshop 4:

After working on your lesson plan during today’s session:

1. How do you currently understand your concept? Please elaborate.

2. What do you think the importance of teaching this concept is?

Regarding the activities you are thinking about for your lesson plan:

1. Please elaborate on your reasoning for choosing these activities. Also, please discuss **what you are trying to accomplish with these activities**.

Please feel free to add/discuss anything that you feel is relevant in this discussion.

Practice Teach Reflection:

Before answering these questions, please review the feedback from your peers, instructors, and the recording of your practice teach

1. How do you feel about your practice teach?
2. In what ways has your understanding of the teaching of your concept changed after experiencing your practice teach? What about your understanding of yourself as the instructor?

3. In your opinion, what aspects of the practice teach went the way you had expected, and what others went in an unexpected way?

4. What are you planning on changing from your practice teach for your actual teach session? How? (e.g., activities, the way you position yourself, etc.). Please elaborate.

5. Please focus on the feedback that you have received from your classmates: what are some salient comments that you would like to address? Is this feedback useful? How or how not?

6. Please focus on the feedback that you received from your instructors - what are some salient comments that you would like to address? Is this feedback useful? How or how not?

_350 words minimum._
Appendix E

Guidelines for Final Reflection of the Extended Team-Teaching Project

In a narrative format, please respond to the following questions:

**Part 1:**

1. Explain the concept that you taught in your own words.
   a. Then describe how you decided to teach it and why you taught it that way.
   b. Finally, describe how the C-BLI workshop series (weeks 5-9) helped you understand your concept and your approach to teaching it.

2. What did you learn about yourself as a new teacher of English?

3. If you were to teach this lesson again, what might you do differently and why?

4. What did you learn about each of the following?
   - Teaching as connecting
   - Collaborative teaching and planning
   - Building rapport with your students
   - Emotions and teaching (frustrations and celebrations)
   - Lesson planning, activity design, and materials development
   - Engineering participation
   - Teaching off, not at your students

5. If you have any suggestions for making this assignment more meaningful, please feel free to share them with me.

**Part 2:**
Please review what you wrote for Part 1 of your language learning and teaching narrative and briefly write your responses to each of the following prompts:

1. Did writing your language learning and teaching narrative at the start of the semester in any way shape your experiences throughout our class, raise your awareness of how you came to choose language teaching, and/or help you think differently about your identity as a language teacher?
   a. If so, why do you think that was so? If not, why do you think that was so?

2. Now that we are at the end of the semester, what would you change about what you wrote in Part 1 of your narrative?
   a. Why would you make those changes?

3. What might you add to your initial narrative, and why?

4. What is your motivational level/your investment now for being a language teacher? Why do you believe that is so?

5. If you are still interested in becoming a language teacher, what will you do/continue to do to grow?
Appendix F
Course Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Date &amp; Guests</th>
<th>Topic &amp; Readings</th>
<th>Reaction Papers</th>
<th>Major Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1: Common Notions of Methodology, Language, &amp; Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1 8/24</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>History of ELT Methods</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read assigned chapter: Larsen-Freeman (2000) Chapter 2 - GTM Chapter 4 - ALM Chapter 9 – CLT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Paper #1: History of ELT Methods Submit to CANVAS before class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 1: Reading Response</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After you have read your assigned Larsen-Freeman chapter, prepare a summary of the following to share with our class:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) the goal of the teaching method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) the role of teacher/learner using this method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) the benefits/challenges of the teaching method</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 2: Visual Depictions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create/find a visual representation of each of the following types of teachers, and prepare to share your visual in class:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) an image of the type of language teacher you have had and a 2-3 sentence explanation of your image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) an image of the type of language teacher you aspire to be and a 2-3 sentence explanation of your image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extended Team-Teach Project (ETTP)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upload semester schedule to ETTP Module in CANVAS.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2 8/31</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ELT Post-Method</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Paper #2: ELT Post-Method Submit to CANVAS before class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Briefly explain what your author means by post-method pedagogy (Hall), language as situated and social (Gee), emotions and learning (Pekrun), OR reasoning teaching (Johnson).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Why does your author believe the approach/concept(s) is important for EL teaching? Provide two examples that illustrate the approach/concept from your article.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What would your author say about the approaches we discussed last week and why?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETTP (in-class)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review Guidelines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conversation Partners (CP) (in-class)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intro email to partner &amp; set up Meeting #1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Complete Meeting #1 on or before Wed., 9/14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class Date &amp; Guests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Topic &amp; Readings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaction Papers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Assignments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part 2: The Teacher as a Learner of Teaching</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Week 3 9/7

**Guest:** Dr. Karen Johnson, Kirby Professor in Language Learning and Applied Linguistics  
**IRB for Research Study**

#### Teacher Professional Knowledge

**Everyone reads:** Johnson (1999) Chapters 2, 3 & 4  
**Please read all three chapters. Prepare your RP for ONLY your assigned chapter.**

#### Reaction Paper #3: Teacher Professional Knowledge

**Submit to CANVAS before class.**

**Chapter 2:**
1. What is the ‘apprenticeship of observation’ (Lortie, 1975)?
2. Why is it considered powerful yet limited?
3. What comprises EL teacher professional knowledge?

**Chapter 3:**
1. What are three beliefs about language learning/teaching shared by Ken, Anne & Elizabeth? How do your beliefs align/not align with theirs?
2. What are ‘intuitive screens’? Why do they matter for teaching?
3. What are ‘epistemic beliefs’? Why should we be aware of ours?

**Chapter 4**
1. Do you relate more closely to the learning-to-teach experiences of Richard or Kate (or both)? Why?
2. What are ‘developmental models’ of learning to teach? Why can they be problematic?
3. Why does Johnson note that learning to teach is not a “singular event, with a start and a finish” (p. 54)?

### ETTP
- Meet with team in our class.  
- Together, write email of introduction to Host Instructor.  
- Set up Visit 1 by end of Wk5.

### CP
- In class, set up Google Doc for reflection.  
- Complete Meeting #1 before our class on 9/14.

### Week 4 9/14

**Guests:** ETTP Host Instructor(s)

**Creating Productive Learning Environments**  
**NO READINGS for this week.**

#### Reaction Paper #4: Conversation Partner: Meeting #1 Reflections

**Submit to CANVAS before class.**

1. On your Google Doc, respond to the questions in the Reflections column for Meeting 1 (see CP Guidelines).
2. Upload your Google Doc link to RP #4 in CANVAS.

#### ETTP: Host Instructors
- Lesson Planning & Materials  
- Pedagogical Concepts  
- Teaching as Dialogic Mediation

#### CP
- Discuss Meeting #1 in class.  
- Complete Meeting #2 before our class on 9/21.
WEEK 5
9/21

Reasoning
Teaching

Everyone reads:
Johnson (1999)
Chapter 9

Choose one:
Chapter 6 (Ken),
Chapter 7 (Anne),
OR
Chapter 8 (Elizabeth)

Reaction Paper #5: Reasoning Teaching
Submit to CANVAS before class.

Part 1:
1) What is ‘robust reasoning’? How is it the
same as/different from ‘teacher reasoning’?
2) Johnson believes in the power of reflection
and participation in a professional community
for teacher professional development. Why
does she advocate for both? Do you
agree/disagree with her perspective? Why?

Part 2:
1) Create a visual representation that illustrates
what shapes the reasoning of Ken, Anne, or
Elizabeth. Include two sentences explaining
your representation.

Part 3: The Context of Schools &
Schooling

Week 6
9/28

Guest:
Carly
Colavecchi
ESL
Teacher,
SCASD
Easterly
Parkway
6:00 p.m.

Learners and
Institutions

Everyone reads:
Norton (2018)
and
Sharkey & Layzer
(2000)

Reaction Paper #6: Learners and Institutions
Submit to CANVAS before class.

Norton (2018)

1) According to Norton, what is ‘investment’?
How does it differ from ‘motivation’?
2) How does investment help us understand our
students?
3) Describe an experience you had as a language
learner in which you were motivated but not
invested, OR motivated AND invested. How
can your experience help you understand your
students?

Sharkey & Layzer (2000)

1) Define ‘benevolent conspiracy’.
2) Provide two examples of how teachers and
administrators facilitated ELs’ access to
academic resources and the result.
3) Provide two examples of how they hindered
ELs’ access to academic resources and the
result.

Class
Date &
Guests
Topic &
Readings
Reaction Papers
Major
Assignments

Week 7
10/5

Culture and
Learning

Reaction Paper #7: Culture and Learning
Submit to CANVAS before class.

ETTP:
• Workshop #1: Concept-Based
  Instruction (CBI) & Sociocultural
  Theory (SCT)
• Lesson Plan Format
• Language Learning and Teaching
  Narrative

CP
• Discuss Meeting #2.
• Complete Meeting #3
  before our class on 9/28.

ETTP
• Workshop #2: CBI/SCT

CP
• Discuss Meeting #3.
• Complete Meeting #4
  before our class on 10/5.
| Week 8 10/12 | **Guest:** Jaime Ellenberger  
PSU Graduate/  
EFL Teacher in Sweden | **Everyone reads:**  
Nieto (2017)  
Nieto (2020) - Interview | **Nieto (2017, 2020)**  
1) What does Nieto mean by “sociocultural mediators”?  
2) Why does she believe that seeing ourselves as sociocultural mediators can change the way we work with our students?  
3) What are three connections you see between what Nieto shares in her interview and our previous course readings and in-class discussions? | **CP**  
- Discuss Meeting #4.  
- Complete Meeting #5 before our class on 10/12. | **Week 8 10/12** | **Curriculum Design and CDP**  
**Everyone reads:**  
Graves (1996) Chapters 1 and 2  
Additional resource chapters by Graves in CANVAS. | **Reaction Paper #8: Curriculum Design and CDP Submit to CANVAS before class.**  
**Part 1 - Readings**  
Graves  
1) What is ‘problematizing’ in course design? Why is it important?  
2) Choose three factors presented in the chapters that matter when designing a new course. Tell why each factor is important.  
**Part 2 - Course Development Project (CDP)**  
Review the CDP Guidelines in CANVAS. Brainstorm initial ideas for your CDP:  
1) Explain the type of course, the students, and the organization/institution in which you will teach it.  
2) Tell why you think your course matters and why you want to design it. | **ETTP**  
- Workshop #4: CBI/SCT  
**CP**  
- Discuss Meeting #5.  
- Closure Activity | **Week 9 10/19** | **ETTP ‘Practice Teach’** | **TEAM ____: Practice Teach**  
**TEAM ____: Practice Teach**  
**TEAM ____: Practice Teach** | **NO READINGS THIS WEEK. RP #9 points earned by providing feedback to teams. These RP points cannot be made up if you are absent.** | **Class Date & Guests**  
Week 10 10/26 | **ETTP ‘Practice Teach’** | **TEAM ____: Practice Teach**  
**TEAM ____: Practice Teach**  
**TEAM ____: Practice Teach** | **ETTP**  
If your Actual Teach is this week, Final Reflection is due.  
**NO READINGS THIS WEEK. RP #10 points earned by providing feedback to teams. These RP points cannot be made up if you are absent.** |
### Part 4: The Activity and Content of Language Teaching

#### Week 11 11/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Everyone reads:</th>
<th>Reaction Paper #11: L2 Instructional Materials, Media &amp; Technology</th>
<th>ETTP</th>
<th>CDP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Naji Meidani & Pishghadam (2013) and Richards (2015) | Submit to CANVAS before class. Naji Meidani & Pishghadam 1) How can we be sure to select the most appropriate text and materials for our students/context? Why should we care? 2) What do the authors suggest we can do to minimize potential biases (country, ethnic, cultural, socioeconomic, gender, and so on) when selecting textbooks and other materials? Richards 1) Choose three forms of technology that might be helpful for your Conversation Partner and/or for you as a language learner. 2) Explain why you have chosen each. | If your Actual Teach is this week, *Final Reflection is due.* | Elevator Speech.  
Course Description. |

#### Class Date & Guests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic &amp; Readings</th>
<th>Reaction Papers</th>
<th>Major Assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 12 11/9</strong></td>
<td><strong>CBI, TBLT, ESP</strong></td>
<td><strong>ETTP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Guests:** ESL 118 Oral English for ITAs | CHOOSE ONE:  
Content-Based Instruction (CBI) Hauschild, Poltavchenko, Stoller (2012) – Environment  
Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT) Van den Branden (2016)  
English for Specific Purposes (ESP) | **You are now the instructor:**  
For your reading, develop three discussion questions as follows: 1) two questions about the key points you want your students to discuss for your reading 2) one question that asks your students to synthesize what they have learned with their own experiences 3) and, provide your responses for each of your three questions | **Discussion Groups**  
6:00 p.m.  
Upload drafts to CANVAS before class:  
• Course Description  
• Needs Assessment  
• Program Goals & Learning Objectives **LAD**  
• Activity-leading begins next week. |
### Week 13
**11/16**

**L2 Oral Skills and Assessment**

**Readings (& LAD):**
- Listening – Goh (2014)
- Fluency – Bohlke (2014)
- Pronunciation – Darcy (2018)
- Assessment – Katz (2014)

**Reaction Paper #13: L2 Oral Skills and Assessment**

Submit to CANVAS before class.

1. Consider your language learning in relation to the content of your reading. Briefly explain what you identify with in the reading and why.
2. Share something that surprised you and why it surprised you.
3. What can you use from the reading in your CDP?
4. How will you adapt the concept or activity to your CDP context?

---

### Week 14
**11/30**

**L2 Reading, Writing & Grammar**

**Readings (& LAD):**
- Reading - Anderson (2014)
- Writing - Cushing Weigle (2014)
- Grammar - Larsen-Freeman (2014)

**Reaction Paper #14: L2 Reading, Writing, and Grammar**

Submit to CANVAS before class.

1. Consider your language learning in relation to the content of your reading. Briefly explain what you identify with in the reading and why.
2. Share something that surprised you and why it surprised you.
3. What can you use from the reading in your CDP?
4. How will you adapt the concept or activity to your CDP context?

---

### Week 15
**12/7**

**Closure Activities**

**CDP Flyer Pedagogical Concepts Professional Development**

**Reaction Paper #15: CDP Advertising Flyer (electronic version)**

Submit to CANVAS before class.

1. Design a flyer to advertise your course.
2. Consider your target group of students, your context.

---

**ETTP**
If your Actual Teach is this week, Final Reflection is due ???

**CDP**
Upload drafts to CANVAS:
- Materials/Activities
- Assessment/Evaluation
- 10-Week Calendar

**LAD**
- Lead your activity this evening if related to any of these readings.

---

**THANKSGIVING BREAK**

---

**Major Assignments**

---

**FINAL CDP:**
Email to Sharon as PDF by midnight on Sunday, December 11, 2022.
|   |   | 3) Prepare to present your flyer to our class. |   |
Appendix G

Course Syllabus

APLNG 493: Teaching English as a Second Language (ESL)

Course Syllabus – FALL 2022

Department of Applied Linguistics, The Pennsylvania State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor:</th>
<th>Sharon Childs &amp; Alba Garcia Alonso</th>
<th>Office:</th>
<th>304D Sparks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section:</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>Office Hours:</td>
<td>Tuesdays, 12:00-2 p.m. &amp; by appt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days/Time:</td>
<td>Wednesday, 6:00-9:00 p.m.</td>
<td>Email:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ssc5@psu.edu">ssc5@psu.edu</a>, <a href="mailto:axg484@psu.edu">axg484@psu.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location:</td>
<td>Engineering Unit B, Rm. 107</td>
<td>Office Number:</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Description & Objectives

This course focuses on the teaching of English to speakers of other languages. Specifically, the course explores the multidimensional nature of the teacher as a learner of teaching, the contexts within which teaching occurs, and the activities and content of second language teaching and learning.

Course Objectives

Throughout the semester, you will engage in a range of theoretical, reflective, and pedagogical activities that will enable you:

1) to understand your own beliefs and knowledge about language learning and language teaching and become aware of the impact of such knowledge and beliefs on your classroom practices;
2) to recognize the highly situated and interpretative processes involved in language teaching, and be able to reflect on, critically analyze, and evaluate your own teaching practices;
3) to become sensitive to the complex social, cultural, political, and institutional factors that affect language teaching and students' language learning;
4) to come to recognize students' strengths and development as learners and language learners;
5) to understand subject matter content from an instructional perspective and learn to anticipate areas that may require additional instructional support;
6) to use your knowledge of theory to inform your instructional practices; and
7) to participate in professional collaborations with other learners of teaching as
you learn together about second language teachers, second language teaching, and second language learning.

**Course Materials**

Readings and course materials are available in CANVAS.

**Course Topics**

- **Part 1:** Common Notions of Methodology, Language, & Teaching
- **Part 2:** The Teacher as a Learner of Teaching
- **Part 3:** The Context of Schools & Schooling
- **Part 4:** The Activities & Content of Language Teaching

For a complete course schedule, including weekly topics, assigned readings, and weekly assignments, see CANVAS and the Course Calendar.

**Course Assignments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSIGNMENTS</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction Papers (RP)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conversation Partners (CP)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Discussion Leaders (RDL)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Team-Teach Project (ETTP)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Development Project (CDP)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL POINTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Scale**

- **A**   95 – 100%  (190-200 pts.)
- **A-**  90 – 94%   (180-189 pts.)
- **B+**  87 – 89%   (174-179 pts.)
- **B**   83 – 86%   (166-173 pts.)
- **B-**  80 – 82%   (160-165 pts.)
- **C+**  76 – 79%   (152-159 pts.)
- **C**   70 – 75%   (140-151 pts.)
- **D**   60 – 69%   (120-139 pts.)
- **F**   59% & below (< 120 pts.)

As a reminder, check the following website regularly for University updates: [https://keeplearning.psu.edu/](https://keeplearning.psu.edu/).

**Course Requirements**

**Attendance**

This is a discussion/activity-based class which means much of our learning happens through interacting with one another in the classroom. As such, attendance is necessary. After two (2) absences, excused or unexcused, one letter grade will be deducted from your final grade for each additional absence. Please notify Alba and me by email in advance if you will miss a class.
Reaction Papers (45 pts.)
Throughout the semester, you will be required to read a range of research articles, book chapters, and other published materials and complete 1-2-page Reaction Papers (RPs) based on the readings. The RPs are intended to help you relate to the weekly topics and prepare you to lead and/or participate in in-class discussions and activities.
Weekly RP questions/tasks are in the weekly Modules and Announcements. RPs must be submitted to CANVAS prior to our class meeting (by 5:59 p.m. the night of class). Late papers will not be accepted.
Rubric: Reaction papers
3 fully addresses the RP questions/tasks, provides clear evidence that you completed the reading (i.e., references concepts, quotes, and examples from the reading), makes connections to previous in-class discussions/readings, and includes personal experiences and examples.
2 partially addresses the RP questions/tasks and/or limited evidence that you completed the reading or tried to connect to personal experiences and examples.
1 failed to address the RP questions/tasks and/or lack of evidence that you completed the reading.
0 no or late submission.
Conversation Partners (30 pts.)
The Conversation Partner activity provides you with the opportunity to interact with an adult English language learner and reflect on English language learning and teaching, culture, and identity. You will be paired with an international student from our Intensive English Communication Program (IECP). You and your partner will meet several times throughout the semester. Specific discussion points for each meeting will be provided for you and your partner, and you are welcome to include other topics of interest to both of you. You will be asked to prepare to share your experiences with our class throughout the semester and develop a final presentation with your partner(s). Guidelines are in CANVAS.
Reading Discussion Leaders (15 pts.)
You and your partner(s) will choose a reading from Part IV of our course, The Activities and Content of Language Teaching. Based on your selected reading, you will prepare and lead a 45-minute discussion of your reading with our class. Guidelines are in CANVAS.
Extended Team-Teach Project (60 pts.)
The Extended Team-Teach Project (ETTP) is a, as it states, a team-activity designed to provide you with classroom teaching experience. The project involves several assignments completed both in and out of class and culminates with you and your team teaching one class in an ESL course offered by the Department of Applied Linguistics (APLNG). Guidelines are in CANVAS.
Course Development Project (50 pts.)
The final assignment for this course is a Course Development Project (CDP). For the CDP, you will choose a particular instructional context (real or imagined) and develop a detailed framework and rationale for a course that would be appropriate to teach in that context. You will then develop several lesson plans and all necessary teaching materials for that course. To help you situate your CDP, you may consider a context in which you are currently teaching, a prior teaching context, or a teaching context in which you hope to teach. Guidelines are in CANVAS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exam Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are no exams in this course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Policies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


VITA
Alba García Alonso, PhD

Education:
PhD in Applied Linguistics, Penn State University, Conferred May 2024
Dissertation: Concept-Based Language Instruction as the mediational means of novice language teacher development. Advisor: Karen E. Johnson
MA in Spanish, Penn State University, 2018
BA in Linguistics and Spanish, Ohio University, 2016
Conservatory Degree in Music Theory and Piano Performance, Official Conservatory of Music Hermanos Berzosa, 2012

Selected Positions:
User Experience Researcher
First American Financial Company, 2022-Present
Academic Writing and Spanish Instructor (GA) (Graduate/Undergraduate)
Co-Instructor of Teaching ESL (Graduate/Undergraduate)
Applied Linguistics & Philosophy Departments, Penn State University, 2019-2022
Linguistics and Spanish Lecturer
Department of Spanish, Italian, & Portuguese, Penn State University, 2018-2019
Graduate Research Assistant
Brain Tracking Lab (PI: Dr. Paola Dussias), Penn State University, 2017-2018

Selected Publications and Presentations:

Grants and Awards:
Spanish Basic Language Program Teaching Excellence Award, 2018
Department of Spanish, Italian, & Portuguese, Penn State University
Graduate Student Award for Master’s Degree, 2018
Department of Spanish, Italian, & Portuguese, Penn State University
NSF PIRE Fellowship Grant to Beijing Normal University, 北京师范大学, 2017 ($9,200), Center for Language Science, Penn State University
The National Collegiate Chinese Honor Society, 2016
Chinese Language Teachers Association, USA (CLTA)