ARTIGOS

FRAME ANALYSIS OF MICROTEACHING IN A COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS AN ADDITIONAL LANGUAGE IN SOUTHERN BRAZIL

ANÁLISE DE ENQUADRAMENTO DE MICROTEACHING EM UMA COMUNIDADE DE PRÁTICA DE PROFESSORES DE INGLÊS COMO LÍNGUA ADICIONAL NO SUL DO BRASIL

William Kirsch[1]
orcid.org/0000-0003-1349-8808
william_kirsch@yahoo.com.br

Simone Sarmento[2]
orcid.org/0000-0003-1405-3982
simone.sarmento@ufrgs.br

ABSTRACT: *The purpose of this study is to discuss the discourse practice of microteaching in a teaching community consisting mainly of students pursuing the teacher certification in English as an Additional Language in southern Brazil. The study relies on qualitative methods of data generation and analysis as well as on the framework of interactional sociolinguistics. Results suggest microteaching is a highly complex practice, with a recurring pattern. Additionally, they suggest that students who are considered successful in a microteaching session are those who produce such pattern in their micro-classes. We conclude by suggesting that informing participants about the expectations regarding the structure of microteaching before they engage in it is desirable.*

KEYWORDS: *English as an Additional Language; Teacher Development; Microteaching*

RESUMO: *O objetivo deste estudo é discutir a prática discursiva do microteaching em uma comunidade de professores do sul do Brasil, composta principalmente por estudantes de Letras Inglês ou Letras Inglês-Português. O estudo ampara-se em métodos qualitativos de geração e análise de dados, bem como em Sociolinguística Interacional. Os resultados apontam que o microteaching é uma prática discursiva que tem um padrão recorrente. Observar o referido padrão, inclusive, mostrou-se ser uma premissa para o sucesso das sessões de microteaching dos professores-alunos. Concluímos sugerindo que é desejável informar os participantes sobre as expectativas em relação à estrutura do microteaching previamente a seu engajamento.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Inglês como Língua Adicional; Formação de professores; Microaulas*

Introduction

Microteaching refers to a teacher development technique whereby a teacher or student teacher teaches a mock class in order to get feedback from peers, superiors or teacher educators about what has worked and what can help improve their teaching. Invented in the mid-1960s at Stanford University and subsequently used to develop educators of all areas (Ping, 2013), it is widely used in teacher preparation programs, methods courses, and supervised practicums, as well as in a variety of other formats (Slagoski, 2007). Microteaching is employed to (a) give pre-service teachers a glimpse of what real teaching looks like before they face it in the classroom, and (b) assess and develop teachers' performances,

[1]   Doutor em Letras pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul e professor de Língua Inglesa na Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre.
[2]   Doutora em Letras pela Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul e professora de Língua Inglesa do Instituto de Letras da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Docente do PPGLET da mesma universidade e bolsista de produtividade do CNPQ.

rationales, methodologies or skills (Cebeci, 2016). Research has found teachers and student teachers benefit from participating in microteaching (Amobi, 2005; Metcalf, Hammer & Kahlich, 1996). However, little work has explained the minutia of what goes on as teachers or student teachers microteach by analyzing their discourse while microteaching.

This paper had its origin in a larger research project that investigated the professional development of undergraduate student teachers of English as an Additional Language[3] in a Community of Practice (Wenger, 1998)[4] generated by a program named Languages Without Borders at a large university in southern Brazil[5]. The study was affiliated with the paradigm of Practice Theory (Young, 2009; 2010), relying on qualitative methods of data generation and analysis (Mason, 2002; Erickson, 1990) as well as on interactional sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 2005; Tannen, 2014). Although we did not originally set out to investigate microteaching, early in data generation it emerged as a central practice utilized by the community due to its pervasiveness in the teacher development meetings. This intrigued us to pursue a deeper understanding of how microteaching functioned in this community.

The purpose of this paper, thus, is to learn more about the discursive architecture of microteaching in the community investigated in this project. Inspired by Bell (2007), we drew initially on frame theory, using Goffman's (1974, p. 8) question – "What is it that's going on here?" – as a starting point for data analysis. This is the question participants in any sort of interaction must answer to make sense of a speech event. While there can always be multiple responses to this question, there is often enough agreement on the definition of a situation so people can manage interaction – both interpreting others' actions and regulating their own. The construction of a tacit response to this question makes it possible for people to interact successfully.

In a Google Scholar search for peer-reviewed papers containing the expression "microteaching" in the title and "discourse analysis OR conversation analysis OR interactional sociolinguistics" among the keywords, published in between 2010 and 2020, 140 entries come back. However, we discovered that only a very small portion of the entries indeed make use of interactional sociolinguistics, conversation analysis or discourse analysis (Bell, 2007; Kim, 2006; Ryoo, 2016). Unlike previous research, the present work provides a dense description of the discourse of microteaching in a community of practice. By presenting such description, this paper aims to help pre-service teachers and teacher educators to understand what they are doing when they microteach, for teachers find microteaching stressful when they do not know what is expected from them (Bell, 2007; Ryoo, 2016).

Theoretical framework

In this section, we address pertinent literature for the present research. First, we explain the terms that are essential for the discussion. Then, we review literature that has also addressed microteaching from the perspective of interactional sociolinguistics, conversation analysis or discourse analysis.

Interactional Sociolinguistics: setting the terms

Frame. The notion of framing comes from the work of Bateson (1972), who said that the meaning of an utterance or action cannot be correctly interpreted and responded to without the reference to a metamessage about the frame in which they were produced. For instance, an utterance may mean the opposite of what it says if it is "operating in a frame of play, irony, joking, or teasing" (Tannen, 2014, p.10).

Goffman (1974, p. 21) expanded this notion by proposing that "when an individual in a Western

---

[3]   EAL. Other acronyms that will appear henceforth: LwB (Languages without Borders) and LC (Language Center).

[4]   Also explained in session 2.

[5]   LwB was a program that fostered EAL in federal universities. Federal universities opened LCs, consisting of a coordination and student teachers (undergrad or grad students) who were responsible for teaching up to 16 hours of face-to-face classes for university community (Sarmento & Kirsch, 2015; Kirsch & Sarmento, 2018) as well as for attending pedagogical meetings and engaging on teacher development.

society recognizes a particular event, he tends […] to imply this response (and in fact employ) one or more frameworks or schemata of interpretation". Therefore, frames are structures of expectation (Tannen, 1979) which help participants navigate the practices in which they engage.

Goffman divided the frameworks into two categories: (1) primary frameworks and (2) keyed frameworks[6]. Primary frameworks may vary in degree of organization: some are so organized that they appear as a set of postulates or rules, whereas others do not appear to have any recognizable shape and only provide "a lure of understanding, an approach, a perspective" (Goffman, 1974, p. 21) regarding the event at hand. Primary frameworks allow people to "locate, perceive, identify, and label a seemingly infinite number of concrete occurrences defined in its terms" (p. 21). Thus, participants tend to apply primary frameworks to different situations, even when they cannot describe them. Consequently, primary frameworks are particularly important to provide an answer to Goffman's question, for several events fit within some primary framework.

Keying. The second category Goffman (1974) proposed is that of keyed frameworks, which is when primary frames are modified by signals that they should not be interpreted literally nor have their face-value meaning. Based on Bateson's (1972) account of an observation that he made in a zoo, in which he found that monkeys can play with one another, indicating awareness to metamessages that a certain action means *play* and not *fight*, Goffman (1974) described keying as the set of conventions by which a given activity, already meaningful in terms of some primary framework, is transformed into something patterned on this activity but seen by the participants to be something quite else (Goffman, 1974:43-44). This is what Goffman (1974) refers to as layering or lamination.

Layering/lamination. When no keying is involved, one interprets the activity in the light of the primary framework, and such activities are usually named real or literal activities. However, a keying of literal activities on a stage would provide us with something that is not literal or not real in primary framework terms, but it is real as a keyed one. For instance, in a staging of Becket's Waiting for Godot, if one asks "What are they doing?" the answer is likely to be "they are actors pretending they are waiting." Thus, they are not actually waiting; they are *pretending* to wait.

Footing and contextualization cues. Footing can be understood as:

> 1. Participants' alignment, or set, or stance, or posture or projected self is somehow at issue.

> 2. The projection can be held across a strip of behavior that is less long than a grammatical sentence, or longer, so sentence grammar won't help us all that much, although it seems clear that a cognitive unit of some kind is involved minimally, perhaps a "phonemic clause". Prosodic, not syntactic, segments are implied.

> 3. A continuum must be considered from gross changes to the instance to the most subtle shifts in tone that can be perceived.

> 4. For speaker, code switching is usually involved, and if not this then at least the sound markers that linguists study: pitch, volume, rhythm, stress, tonal quality.

> 5. The bracketing of a "higher level" phase or episode of interaction is commonly involved, the new footing having a liminal role, serving as a buffer between more substantially sustained episodes (Goffman, 1981, p.10).

Therefore, a change in footing implies a change in the alignment participants of an interaction take up in the way they manage the production and reception of an utterance. In other words, it is another way to talk about a change in frame, which may signal that participants are changing what they are doing or even that they are performing different identities.

Gumperz (2005) explained that the term contextualization cues refer to verbal signs which

---

[6]   I will henceforth refer to "secondary frameworks" for the sake of simplicity.

serve to construct the contextual ground for situated interpretation and, thus, affects how messages are understood. Contextualization cues represent speakers' ways of signaling and providing information to interlocutors and audiences about how they are using language at any point of an interaction. In this sense, they operate at various levels of speech production, including the aspects of grammar (phonology, morphology, lexicon, syntax) as well as (i) prosody (i.e., intonation, stress or accenting and pitch), (ii) paralinguistic signs (i.e. whispery, breathy, husky or creaky voice), (iii) markers of tempo, including pauses and hesitations; (iv) overlaps; (v), laughter; and (vi) formulaic expressions (Duranti, 1997).

Microteaching

In a study with 18 student teachers, Bell (2007, p.37) concluded microteaching is "a highly complex, layered (laminated) task for the participants. Within the same strip of activity their identities as students, classmates, and (future) teachers all compete for attention." In the recordings and questionnaires in which participants described their perceptions of the activity and explained how they approached the task, participants suggested they thought of microteaching in terms of performance or a classroom task more than properly teaching. The author indicated that several verbal and nonverbal cues are used to contextualize what is going on during the micro-classes. That is, participants signal to one another how they should interpret their actions at every moment, as the frames by which the strips of interaction should be interpreted can change at any time. For instance, a participant may shift from the microteaching frame to that of a student teacher talking to peers or trainer in an educational activity.

Ryoo (2017) conducted research in a pre-service teacher education course offered at a college in southern Korea for English Education Majors pursuing a certificate to teach in secondary schools. Microteaching happened during regular class sessions in a college classroom; eight 20 to 30-minute microteaching sessions were taught by 24 participants, recorded and transcribed. Then, the researcher did emic analysis of the transcriptions for the description and interpretation of different situational frames evoked by the participants. Like Bell (2007), the author found that microteaching is a complex activity in which participants shift frames multiple times during the same speech event and, thus, constantly use contextualization cues to demonstrate to one another how actions should be interpreted. However, the author found that the dominant situational frame was that of teaching, although participants also framed it as a learning and a performative event. Ryoo (2016) understands the changes in frame also represent the performance in contexts of different identities.

Therefore, there have been previous studies addressing microteaching from interactional perspectives. They have focused on the frames that participants use during a microteaching session (Bell, 2007) and own how the shift in such frames may indicate a different identity being performed in context (Ryoo, 2016).

Methodology

In the present study, data generated during microteaching sessions were analyzed pursuing the answer for the following question, inspired by Goffman (1974): "What is going on as participants microteach?" During microteaching observations, the first author generated field notes, took photographs, collected artifacts (e.g. lesson plans, handouts and classroom tasks), and produced audio recordings (Erickson, 1990; Mason, 2002). All data were organized in a database on MaxQda 12[7]. The audio material was then transcribed, amounting to about six and a half hours and 51 pages of transcription[8]. Then, we engaged in initial, focused, and theoretical coding (Saldaña, 2009)[9].

---

[7] MAXQDA is a software program designed for computer-assisted qualitative and mixed methods data, text and multimedia analysis in academic, scientific, and business institutions. It has been developed and distributed by VERBI Software based in Berlin, Germany. The emphasis on going beyond qualitative research can be observed in the extensive attributes function (called variables in the program itself) and the ability of the program to deal relatively quickly with larger numbers of interviews (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/MAXQDA).

[8] Times New Roman 12, single space.

[9] In this article, the original numbering of the lines have been kept as they appear in the original transcription in the database.

Participants consisted mainly of undergraduate or graduate students pursuing the teacher certification in EAL[10]. In pursuit of this certificate, they taught twelve hours a week (three classes) in addition to the lessons they still attended as students. They received a stipend funded by the federal government of Brazil and had to have at least a B2 level certificate of English language proficiency. The coordinator (a tenured professor from the English Department) was responsible for organizing the LCs administratively and, above all, for pedagogically supervising the student teachers. Additionally, one Fulbright English Teaching Assistant (ETA) also participated in the microteaching sessions. Below there is a table that sums up the participants that appear in the data.

TABLE 1 – *Participants: pseudonyms and background*

Pseudonym	Position	Education
Maria Estevam	Pedagogical coordinator	Ph.D.
Adam	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
Ana Ricarda	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
Antonia	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
Helena	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
Isabela	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
João	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
Kelly	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
Lucas	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
Mariane	Student teacher	Letras undergrad
Maria Julia	Former student teacher and researcher	Master's student in Applied Linguistics
Pedro	ETA	Bachelor of Arts, Political Science/ Latin American Studies

Findings and discussion

In this community, microteaching sessions took place in the pedagogical meetings during the first, third and fifth weeks of data generation. In each meeting, student teachers presented micro-classes of about 20 minutes[11]. In these meetings, the micro-classes started after about fifteen minutes of "announcements"[12] and pressing "bureaucratic issues" of the coordinator. Differently from previous work (Bell, 2007; Ryoo, 2016), in this community participants were still in college, pursuing a teacher certification in EAL, but they actually had full teaching responsibilities in the program, such as planning and teaching classes as well as evaluating students. In other words, although they were theoretically pre-service teachers, the development meetings, including microteaching, felt like in-service teacher development.

LwB teachers' task was to microteach a class they had prepared for the students in order to exchange ideas and to get feedback from both the coordinator and other "more experienced peers" selected by the coordinator. During each micro-class, the coordinator, Luisa (a grad student),

---

[10]　In Brazil, this major will give you a lifetime certification to teach Portuguese, Additional Languages and their respective Literatures; it is called Letras.

[11]　Not really enforced.

[12]　We will use quotation marks to indicate that we are quoting a participant directly (except when quoting literature) and italics to indicate that it is a term we coined to name something participants did not mention.

Maria Julia (a master's student volunteering at the community) and Pedro (ETA) took notes. At the end of each session, these participants "debriefed" their notes. Finally, Luisa, Maria Julia and Pedro sent Maria Estevam their assessment sheets and she compiled everything for the teachers' individual feedback sessions. There were three meetings devoted to these microteaching sessions, in which twelve pre-service teachers delivered micro-classes. Nevertheless, only eight (second and third sessions) will be considered here due to availability of audio recordings.

In this section, we first present a synoptic chart of the microteaching sessions in our data (see table below). Then, we present and discuss an excerpt of a prototypical microteaching session conducted by Kelly, for it contains most of the elements we encountered in the other micro-classes. Finally, we show two more segments to discuss less-common aspects of microteaching that do not appear in Kelly's class.

TABLE 2 – *Microteaching sessions and focus of each session*

1st week	Microteaching focus
Lucas	A listening and speaking class with a video.
Mariane	A listening, speaking and writing class with a video.
João	A reading, speaking and writing class about Geopolitics.
Helena	A class about Academic English with a short reading passage, extensive vocabulary work and a short written exercise.
3rd week	**Microteaching focus**
Nadia	A reading, speaking and writing class with two reading passages.
Mari	A speaking class about feminism.
5th week	**Microteaching focus**
Adam	A reading and speaking class about cosmetic surgery.
Isabela	A reading and writing class about postcards and letters.
Antonia	A reading and writing class about formal e-mails.
Kelly	A reading and writing class about research articles.
Roberta	A listening and speaking class about vacations.
Ana Ricarda	A reading and writing class about paragraph writing.

Below, the analysis refers to the full transcript of Kelly's micro-class. The whole transcript can be found in Appendix 1, for it was too long to be reproduced in the body of the text.

Kelly begins her presentation by contextualizing the micro-class. She explains three essential aspects for her peers to interpret the micro-class: (1) the course for which the class was planned, an EAP course; (2) the purpose of the class, which is to expand on a previous class and work with the structure of a research article; and (3) students' level of proficiency, B1 (lines 559-664). Similar contextualizations happened in most micro-classes and reveal something that is important throughout the event: different frames are constantly at negotiation. The primary frame is that of a *technical redoing* – "strips of what could have been ordinary activity can be performed, out of their usual context, for utilitarian purposes openly different from those of the original performance" (Goffman, 1974, p. 58).

In this case, it is an educational activity in which they pretend to teach to get feedback. Embedded in this primary framework, there is a keyed strip of interaction in which participants pretend to be in a class; the student teacher who is presenting the class pretends to be a teacher and the others pretend to be students.

After this introduction, Kelly indexes a change of frames from contextualizing the micro-class to teaching the micro-class by addressing her peers as students: "Okay, guys, so what is the idea today? Okay, we are going to follow up our class from last week [...]" (lines 564-572). In this way, Kelly provides participants with a verbal contextualization cue which signals contextualizing micro-class is over and actual micro-class has started. In other words, she shifts from addressing her audience as a peer to addressing them as a make-believe. The secondary frame, a class performance, is embedded in the primary one, a technical redoing.

The discourse marker "okay" is often employed by the student teachers to indicate they are transitioning to a teaching frame, which is visible in the collection of micro-classes. Moreover, addressing peers as "guys" or "people" is used for showing that the secondary framework of microteaching as a make-believe class has begun. Six out of eight micro-classes have similar introductions followed by contextualization cues signaling the transition from introduction to micro-class (primary to secondary framework), which worked as an invitation for peers to start participating as students.

Kelly's peers start acting as students right away and begin discussing what an abstract is. Everyone in the room (except for myself, Estevam, Maria Julia and Luisa, who are not expected to act as students) starts discussing[13] in pairs. After two minutes, Kelly mediates a whole-group discussion to define what an abstract is (lines 574-98), which her students define as "a summary" (line 576) and "an invitation to read your research" (line 580). Then, Pedro discusses the importance of an abstract for the research article (lines 589-96).

Next, Kelly asks participants to discuss the "parts of it, what constitutes [a research article]" (line 606-7), which they do in pairs and groups. After a couple of minutes, Kelly winds up again. Students come up with the parts of a research article and Kelly writes the words they come up with on the whiteboard (lines 618-34).

Subsequently, Kelly gives students "a minute to organize this [the parts of a research article]" (lines 635-38). When the minute has passed, they organize the parts of the research article in the sequence in which they expect the parts to appear (lines 642-671). Lucas changes the course of the segment by frowning and asking if they would have to number "all the parts [of a research article]" (line 672). In response to Lucas' turn, Kelly transitions from the secondary framework to the primary framework; she does so by using the modal verb "would" (line 673). This is a contextualization cue indicating she is no longer teaching – she is talking about what she "would do" in "a real class" (lines 676-78). This is what Kelly later refers to as "making a parenthesis" (line 729 and 736), which signals she is transitioning from secondary to primary framework for just a moment. These "parentheses" happen in most micro-classes and mean participants should change the frame by which they interpret the utterances and nonverbal actions of what is going on, shifting from secondary framework to primary framework. In the "parentheses," student teachers do not pretend teach; they talk to the audience as peers. Thus, there are clear verbal and nonverbal signals of when the parenthesis starts and when it finishes, often with the modal verb "would" associated with the noun phrase "real class."

These movements from microteaching framework to that of speaking as a peer underscores the interpretation that what is going on is a technical redoing, for it appears that everyone is are aware that the micro-class is a performance. For instance, as mentioned in the previous paragraph, Lucas frowns and asks Kelly if they will have to do "all" the activity (line 672), indexing some level of dissatisfaction; Kelly

---

[13]   At certain point, Maria Estevam, Maria Julia, and especially Pedro get carried away and participate as *students*, which is uncommon in the other micro-classes.

immediately recognizes that and moves on with the activity faster than she would in an actual class (line 673). Ryoo (2016) also found that temporal, spatial and class management issues push participants towards shifting frames during microteaching, especially to cover more class in less time. In this respect, Bell (2007) claims microteaching is a highly layered type of interaction in which frames may shift a lot in the same strip of interaction. Kelly's parenthetic utterances are a perfect example of that (line 729-32 and 736-45).

Moving on in this micro-class, Kelly has students fill in a chart in which they match questions with the parts of the research article where the information from the sentences could be found. After giving students a minute to discuss, she moves on to a whole-group discussion. This could, in a normal class context, be considered insufficient time. However, as it is a technical redoing, participants may agree to move faster or do the activity partially.

In the last step of Kelly's micro-class, students analyze a research article. She engages in a long explanation of what each group should do – analyze a different part of the research article (lines 702-21). This is followed by a concept-check question (line 720-1) which students answer almost in a puff (line 722-3). Kelly seems to interpret these answers as impatience from her peers, since, in her next turn, she begins to bring the micro-class to an ending (lines 733-64), by explaining what she would do in a "real class," which indexes that they are not going to do this in the micro-class. At the end of her last turn, she indicates the micro-class is over by saying "that's it" (line 763), immediately followed by applause. Clapping suggests that the performance frame is always at stake, which is also consistent with previous studies (Bell, 2007; Ryoo, 2016). Further, it marks a boundary for the primary framework.

In general, during microteaching sessions, Estevam calls the participants to the front of the room and thanks them after they finish their microteaching. She is responsible for initiating and closing the event. Otherwise, she remains silent and takes notes for the duration of the micro-classes. However, in two micro-classes she

stepped in and acted to change the way student teachers were conducting things: Adam's and Mari's classes. In both cases, she wants them to change from the primary frame (i.e, technical redoing) to secondary frame (i.e, pretending to teach). Adam spends more time than usual contextualizing the class, and Estevam interrupts the event to tell him that the class should begin, as we can see in the segment below:

Excerpt 2: "And the class begins now'"

```
148 Adam: Hello everyone. I'm
teacher Adam. I'm going to be
149 your teacher this afternoon.
So the name of my microteaching
150 activity is "Four Corners".
For those who were here, like,
151 last week in Taiane's
lecture, it's very similar but I
152 didn't copy her. I have
references here, so, but, it's
153 pretty similar. So basically
I handed this class plan to
154 William and Professor Maria
Estevam. So if you want later
155 you can have here, I have all
the steps of this class, just
156 to let you know. This is going
to be EGP lesson. It's going
157 to take, like, ninety minutes
and my level here is B1, and
158 the material was very basic.
So if you are in a room that
159 has, like, no projector or
something like this, that's ok.
160 You just need something
printed if you want it, all right.
161 Because if you are out of
ideas, like, that you can use
162 markers and stuff. So it's a
very very simple activity. So
163 the material needed: copies
of the text. We have here the
164 text I gave you. Four
plates: one agree, another with
165 totally agree, disagree and
totally disagree. And one for
166 each corner in the classroom.
I've done this activity
167 before, not like this, not
with this topic, not like this,
168 but before students get inside
the classroom, I already put
169 the four plates here. So,
here I have printed like totally
```

```
170 agree, agree, disagree and
totally disagree. So, I think
171 it's going to stimulate them
using like ((inaudible)) like
172 this. So my warm up activity
it's going to be a fifteen
173 minutes activity for this
topic I chose was plastic surgery
174 among young people. So I, as
a warm up, I would start
175 talking about plastic
surgeries. All right? So I'll
ask you
176 very general questions about
plastic surgery…
177 Maria Estevam: And now the
class starts.
178 Adam: All right. So people
what do you know about plastic
179 surgeries here in Brazil?
Expensive, doctors are good,
180 surgeons or not, is it
common? How common it is, here
181 in Brazil?
```

Adam starts his micro-class by introducing himself as the teacher for the afternoon (line 148-9). He then goes on contextualizing the micro-class and talking to his audience as peers. For three minutes, Adam goes on and on explaining the micro-class. Perceiving that, Estevam jumps in and tells him to start (line 177), which he does immediately, in his following turn (line 177). He uses the discourse marker "all right" (line 178) and asks his audience a question, inviting them to participate. In our interpretation, participants not only negotiate the frames in which their actions should be interpreted, but also the identities that they are performing in these frames and through these actions, which was also claimed by Ryoo (2016). In these segments, Estevam invokes her identity of a coordinator and Adam of a pre-service teacher in a development activity, subordinated to the coordinator; however, only in two micro-classes does this happen.

Joking is another feature that Kelly's class does not encompass. At times, *students* say things that would sound unusual in a classroom or exaggerate the kinds of mistakes (linguistic or pragmatic) regular students would make. Usually, these segments are followed by laughter, indexing that there is a joke going on, as we can

see in the segment below.

Excerpt 3: The joke frame

```
141 Isabela: Can you give me an
example? [of a greeting]
142 Mari: Dear
143 Adam: hello
144 Isabela: Dear
145 Graziele: hey babe
((Laughter))
```

Isabela is teaching a class about writing formal correspondence and e-mails. When discussing greetings, she asks her audience for examples. Two volunteers come up with examples. First, Mari poses "Dear" as a possible greeting (line 142). While Isabela seems to be revoicing Mari (line 144), Adam comes up with another possible greeting, "hello" (line 143), perhaps less appropriate than Mari's. Right after that, Graziele comes up with "hey babe" (line 145), which is followed by laughter, suggesting others interpret it as a joke. This kind of joke also supports the interpretation that microteaching is a complex and laminated activity. There is a primary frame in which they are peers doing a technical redoing and a secondary frame in which they are engaged in a performance, consisting of a make-believe class. In the latter, occasionally, there is a third lamination; that is, playfulness.

To conclude the section, it is important to look back into Kelly's microteaching event, which, as mentioned before, is prototypical. Using this event as a prototype, after having analyzed all others, is a way to look at the more generic elements of microteaching in the community. The following discernible compositional features were identified in this practice:

1. student teacher goes to the front of the room;

2. contextualizes the class (level and course) addressing others as peers;

3. shifts footing to begin micro-teaching, and addresses peers as students;

4. makes "parentheses", that is, changes from the secondary to primary frame,

using contextualization cues to transition between frames;

5. brings micro-class to an end by transitioning back to the primary frame in order to explain to peers what would come next in a "real class";

6. peers clap.

Moreover, there are two components that may or may not appear: (a) coordinator steps in, invoking the coordinators' identity; (b) participants make jokes. The figure below summarizes which of these compositional features are integral to each micro-class. The first ones represent the six main components (dark gray) and the last two (light gray) represent the other less systematic ones.

Figure 1 – *Main features in microteaching*

	Nadia	Mari	Adam	Isabela	Antonia	Kelly	Roberta	Ana Ricarda
1	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
2	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	
3	■			■	■	■	■	
4			■	■	■	■	■	
5	■		■	■	■	■	■	
6	■		■	■	■	■		
Coordinator stepping in		░	░					
Jokes and laughter	░	░	░	░	░			

The eight micro-classes that encompassed these compositional features "worked." The two classes that "did not work" according to the debriefing and feedback produced by coordination (Mari's and Ana Ricarda's) were precisely the ones that lacked many of the components which characterize the practice's pattern in the community. Hence, peer participation was minimal and there was no applause after micro-classes were over. This pattern is intuitive: there is no such thing as a manual for microteaching, and yet people usually do it in a patterned way. Not attending to the pattern may mean little participation or being considered a failure by the coordinator – as happened with Mari and Ana Ricarda.

Final Remarks

In this article, we have described the discursive architecture of microteaching in the specific community investigated in this project from the perspective of interactional sociolinguistics. We found that microteaching is a laminated discourse practice, wherein participants align to and perform different identities throughout the activity while they point to one another how to interpret their actions by using contextualization cues. Additionally, we found that microteaching is a practice with recurrent features, which has been demonstrated over the analysis. When participants did not observe such features while micro-teaching, it caused peers to fail to identify what was going on. When it happened, peers did not understand what was going on and did not know how to respond during the micro-class. The teacher educator, on her turn, thought of the micro-classes as unsuccessful.

Microteaching is, as pointed out in earlier studies (e.g. Amobi, 2005; Metcalf, Hammer & Kahlich, 1996), an important teacher development technique. Nevertheless, it can be awkward for the participants when they do not know what to do. This is also in our data.

As we set out to understand the interaction architecture of microteaching in this specific community, it is possible now to draw some situated conclusions about some possible pedagogical implications of this study for teacher development. In this sense, we would like to end this text by delineating some recommendations based on our data, which do not have the intention of generalizing the findings obtained here for all contexts. Quite the reverse, the idea is to share some learning tokens we, as teacher educators, consider important take-aways.

Firstly, it is important for teacher educators to be able to communicate what they expect from microteaching – the more information about the expectations regarding the structure of the micro-class, the better. For this, it would be a good idea to show an example of microteaching – acting out, from video tape, or even by using the transcript provided here. Secondly, it is a good idea for the trainer to show teachers exactly the components that he or she considers essential in the micro-class; for this, Table 3 may prove useful. Furthermore, pinpointing to teachers the necessity of demonstrating how others should interpret their actions with contextualization cues is also desirable. As we navigate a new practice, sometimes explicit instruction of what we are expected to do, and how we are expected to do it can be lifesaving.

To conclude, we would like to state that we constructed the recommendations above by attending to the microteaching of a specific community. Therefore, they are not generalizable for all communities or to be taken in a prescriptive manner, though they may prove useful to other teacher trainers.

References

Amobi, A. (2005). Preservice Teachers' Reflectivity on the Sequence and Consequences of Teaching Actions in a Microteaching Experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly 32*(1), pp. 115–130. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ795309.pdf

Bateson, G. (1955). A theory of play and fantasy. *Psychiatric Research Reports, 2,* pp. 39–51. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/13297882/

Bell, N. D. (2007). Microteaching: What is it that is going on here? *Linguistics and Education,* 18(1), pp. 24–40. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2007.04.002

Duranti, A.. (1997). *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Erickson, F.. (1990). Qualitative Methods . In: R. Linn; F. Erickson. *Quantitative Methods Qualitative Methods* (pp. 0-77). London: Macmillan.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience*. New York: Harper.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gumperz, J. (2005). Interactional sociolinguistics: A personal perspective. In: D. Schiffrin; D. Tannen; H. E. Hamilton. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 215-228). Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kim, E..(2006). Comparison of discourse markers used by English teachers in the pre- and in-service teacher training program. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea,* 14(2), pp. 99-116. http://db.koreascholar.com/article?code=338022

Kirsch, W.; Sarmento, S. (2018) Workshops as an avenue of teacher development in a Language without Borders community in Southern Brazil *BRAZILIAN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING JOURNAL*, 9, pp. 115-132. http://dx.doi.org/10.15448/2178-3640.2018.1.30835

Ko, H. (2013). Overuse of the discourse filler "so" in micro-teaching talks by Koreans". *Language Research, 49*(1), pp. 25-44. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/0742051X9500037K

Mason, J. 2002. *Qualitative researching*. Second edition. London/Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.

Metcalf, K. K; Hammer, M.; Kahlich, P.(1996). Alternatives To Field-Based Experiences the Comparative Effects of Oncampus Laboratories. *Teacher Education*, 12(3), pp. 271–283. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(95)00037-K

Ping, W. (2013). Micro-teaching : a powerful tool to embedding the English teacher certification testing in the development of English teaching methodologies. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies, 2*(3), pp. 163–175. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(95)00037-K

Ryoo, H. (2017). Discourse Analysis of Microteaching: Dynamic Identities and Situational Frames. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*, 25(2), pp. 165-195. http://s-space.snu.ac.kr/bitstream/10371/86509/1/2.%202223381.pdf

Saldaña, J. (2009) *Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. London: Sage Publications.

Sarmento, S.; Kirsch, W. (2015) Inglês sem fronteiras: Uma mirada ao contexto de

prática pelo prisma da formação de professores. *Ilha Do Desterro* 68(3), pp. 47-59. https://doi.org/10.5007/2175-8026.2015v68n1p47

Slagoski, J.. D. (2007). Practicum: Microteaching for Non-
-Native Speaking Teacher Trainees. *English Teacher Fo-
rum, 45*(4), pp. 32–37. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1099409

Tannen, D.. (1979). What is in a Frame for Underlying
Expectations. In: R. Freedle. (Ed.). *New Direction in Dis-
course Processing* (pp. 137-181). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Tannen, D. (2014). Socioloinguistics: Interactional Socio-
linguistic. In W. J Frawley (Ed.). *Oxford International Ency-
clopedia of Linguistics (pp. 8-13).* Oxford University Press.

Torga, M. (1986). L'universal, c'est le local moins les
murs: Trás-os-Montes. Bordeaux: William Blake and Co.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice : learning,
meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, U.K./New York, N.Y.:
Cambridge University Press.

Young, R. F. (2009). *Discursive practice in language
learning and teaching*. Chichester ; Malden, Mass.:
Wiley-Blackwell, 2009.

Young, R. F. (2010). Discursive Practice in Langua-
ge Learning and Teaching. *The Modern Language
Journal, 94*(4), pp. 683–684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.
system.2009.08.006

APPENDIX 1: Excerpt 1, Kelly's micro-class

```
559 Kelly: Okay, so before I start, just let you know, this
560 would be a follow up class from the EAP course. So in the
561 previous class I worked with abstract structure and what
562 parts are there. And today as a follow-up we would work
563 with research article structure. So like a study skill
564 class for the EAP 'coz, level B1. Okay. So guys what is the
565 idea today? Okay, we are going to follow up our class from
566 last week, okay? And to start just to get you to
567 review something that we discussed last week I want you to
568 talk in pairs, very quickly and come up with definition of
569 what an abstract is and what we use it for. Okay? So, what
570 is it? The definition of an abstract and why we use an
571 abstract, okay? So two minutes to discuss that with your
572 pairs. Go. Okay? ((To microteaching mock students))
573 ((People discuss in pairs))
574 Kelly: Okay. So let's check. What were some of the ideas
575 that came up? What is an abstract?
576 Nadia: A summary?
577 Kelly: Of what?
578 Nadia: The text
579 Kelly: Okay. A summary. Any other ideas?
580 Maria Estevam: An invitation to read your research.
581 Kelly: Okay. What else? Okay. And why do we use it for?
Why do 582 we summarize? And why do we invite?
583 Lucas: So other people can read it and see if it's worth it
to 584 read the whole article.
585 Kelly: Uhum, uhum. Why would you like to invite someone to
586 read your article?
587((Inaudible talk))
588 Kelly: You wanna say something?
589 Pedro: Yeah. Going from that. When you're writing a
590 research article, or a master's thesis or a doctoral
591 dissertation, you have to read forty, thirty, fifty
592 articles. You don't have the time to read all of them. The
593 abstract is kind of the preview from the movie that is the
594 article. So you read it very quickly and you decide if
595 that's relevant to your research or not. So it's really
596 important that they actually sum up the article.
597 Kelly: Does anybody disagree with these ideas? No? Okay.
598 Then considering the abstract as summary of an article,
599 okay? Let's think as the article being an expansion of the
600 abstract. Can we think like that? Okay. What parts? If the
601 answer is gives the summary, is because something is
602 larger, okay? So the abstract is the short version and the
603 article is the long version. Okay? So considering now, the
604 research article, okay? What do you, what type of
605 information do you put there? What type of information do
606 you write? In a research article. Think about the parts of
607 it, what constitutes. Something like Fernanda did. Like
```

608 greetings, introduction. Think about that but for a
609 research article. Three more minutes for you to discuss
610 with your peers.
611 ((People discuss with their pairs. Inaudible
612 conversations.))
613 Kelly: Okay, can we check? For the real class I would give
614 a couple more minutes for the purpose of the activity.
615 Okay. So. Collectively what parts are there in a research
616 article? ((Kelly writes the words they brainstorm on the
617 board)) ((Addressed to all audience in the room))
618 Lucas: Introduction
619 Adam: Literature review
620 Maria Brum: Methodology
621 Maria Julia: Results
622 Isabela: Maybe analysis first
623 Fulana: Further studies
624 Ana Ricarda: Conclusion
625 Pedro: Results
626 Kelly: Results is here
627 Pedro: OK
628 Fulana: Discussion
629 Ana Ricarda: References
630 Pedro: I was going to say objective, but I hear that they
631 don't say objective.
632 Kelly: Aim
633 Lucas: Goal
634 Pedro: Purpose
635 Kelly: Anything else? No? Okay and then do you think they
636 are presented in this order. Okay. I'm gonna give you one
637 minute to you organize this. Okay? In pairs as well. Okay.
638 So do it.
639 ((They talk in pairs for about a minute))
640 Kelly: Ok. If you could go on on the class... So let's
641 check. How would you start your article?
642 Lucas: Introduction
643 Kelly: Introduction. Okay, the second step. Introduction
644 and objectives as one. The first thing. Do you agree, do
645 you disagree? ((Kelly numbers the article parts in the
646 order agreed by participants))
647 Pedro: Objective

648 Lucas: Literature review
649 Kelly: Introduction and then objective as one. The first
650 thing. Do you agree? Do you disagree?
651 Lucas: I'd say objective and literature review.
652 Pedro: Introduction. Then literature review, 'coz it's a
653 part of introduction. You see other studies about it and
654 then you go for purpose, objective, goal.
655 Maria Estevam: I'd actually put after the methodology
656 Pedro: I'd put it before
657 Mari: ((Inaudible))
658 Kelly: Okay, I want to check 'coz... Does it mention the
659 literature review and somebody said the objective. Just
661((inaudible)) objective first?
662((Writing on the board))
663 Kelly: Objective first?
664 Mari: So the reader can understand why you reviewing that
665 in the literature review.
666 Kelly: Okay, and then, the third thing, the literature
667 review. Okay. Then, as number four? ((Still writing on the
668 board))
669 Lucas: Methodology
670 Kelly: Do you agree? Yeah? Okay.
671 Maria Julia: Analysis
672 Lucas: We'll have to number all of them? ((Frowning))
673 Kelly: Analysis. I would go on numbering all. Okay. Not
674 you, but just to modeling.
675 Lucas: ((Inaudible))
676 Kelly: In the real class, yes. So go. It depends a lot on
677 what they tell you. Then you would organize the thing. So
678 we checked the order of the thing. And now what I want you
679 to do, okay, you're going to do that individually first,
680 and then after you're going to compare with your pair.
681 What I have here? Type of information we include in a
682 research article and the parts. So you're going to find a
683 sentence here describing the type of information and I

684 want you to write here in the column the part where you
685 would find this information. Okay, by purposes you have
686 like kinda divided in six bigger parts but if you don't
687 want to use them then you use divided here in the board.
688 You can use it, so you can write here where would you find
689 this information in the text.
690 ((People chat in pairs and write on the handout))
691 Kelly: Okay. Now that you have finished, compare to your
692 pair and see if you decided on the same thing. If it's
693 different you can discuss why you chose a different one.
694 ((People chat in pairs))
695 Kelly: Okay, let's check together. Don't worry if you
696 didn't finish. Together we check the answers. Okay, for the
697 first one as a result of completing the above
698 procedure, what did you learn? What did you invent? What
699 did you create? Where would you find this kind of
700 information?
701 Students: Results
702 Kelly: Result? Okay, then you go on for all the questions.
703 Okay? Okay. So this, knowing this is good because you can
704 be prepared for the next. When you are reading an article
705 you are prepared for the reading activity. So you know
706 what to expect from the article, maybe you can expect to
707 find all of them, maybe not necessarily. Okay, then it's
708 good to know what could be coming from the article. Okay?
709 So, what you're going to do now, we are going to analyze an
710 article. A research article okay? And try to find the
711 answers for these questions, okay? In the text. But you're
712 not going to for the whole article, okay? I'm going to
713 divide you in groups and then one of the groups are going
714 to look just for the introduction, okay? And the other

715 group just methodology. Then group number three just the
716 discussion and then, so on. Okay? You're going to work
717 only with this part of the article for now. Okay. And then
718 according to what we have corrected you're going to find
719 the answers in the article. Okay? So each group is going to do
720 one thing, okay? Are you going to read the whole
721 article, yes or no?
722 Overlapping voices: No ((a very low energy and aspired
723 'no'; almost puffing))
724 Kelly: Okay, not today. Okay. Can you read the same part as
725 different group?
726 Overlapping voices: No ((a very low energy and aspired
727 'no'; almost puffing))
728 Kelly: Okay, so you understood. I would have ((inaudible))
729 Just a parenthesis here. For the purpose of the activity
730 you can choose one of the section to start reading. Don't
731 matter if somebody is doing the same. Just because of the
732 microteaching.
733 ((They discuss in pairs for a few seconds))
734 Kelly: Okay, now that you have found all the answers,
735 right? We have all the answers. Let's check. And then
736 another parenthesis, okay? Then I would go not like, one
737 group answers all the questions, but I'll do okay,
738 introduction. One of the questions. Then methodology. One
739 of the questions, discussion. ((Kelly does a circular
740 motion with on hand, suggesting it goes on)) Then I would
741 go rounds, so everybody. You would be like, ten minutes
742 waiting for your turn, okay? So you'll do kind of dynamic.
743 And then you check or identify the parts. I would bring to
744 class like color pencils or like pens, 'coz people
745 sometimes like underline it,

coloring, okay? I'd do that.
746 Okay, so now that you have all the answers for your
747 questions, okay. You're going to write the abstract that is
748 missing in this article. Okay? And then you can see you
749 don't have the article in the beginning. Now that we
750 analyzed the whole article you're going to write the
751 abstract. Okay, the way you want to do it. What do you
752 consider that is important to mention in the article it's
753 your abstract, okay? And then students would do that,
754 okay? I would collect and take a look but they wouldn't
755 correct their text yet. I would just mark. Why? 'Coz then
756 I'm going to give you the real abstract from the text and
757 then now you're going to compare your version with the one
758 from the article, okay? And then you, they would discuss
759 the differences, like Nadia and Lucas's version they would
760 compare to the real one. Okay? Actually, for the real
761 class I did like a reading activity as well, like
762 discussion the topic of the text, not only for the
763 structure, but today we wouldn't have time. That's it.
764 ((Applause))

William Kirsch

Professor adjunto de língua inglesa da Universidade Federal de Ciências da Saúde de Porto Alegre (UFCSPA) em Porto Alegre, RS. Brasil

Simone Sarmento

Professora associada da Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul (UFRGS) em Porto Alegre, RS. Brasil

Endereço profissional

William Kirsch

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande, Instituo de Letras e Artes.

Fundação Universidade do Rio Grande

Carreiros

96203900 - Rio Grande, RS - Brasil

Simone Sarmento

Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Instituto de Letras.

Av. Bento Gonçalves, 9500

Agronomia

91540000 - Porto Alegre, RS - Brasil