HAL open science

The institutional and beyond: On L2 teachers' identity display in L2 classrooms

Jose Ignacio Aguilar Río

To cite this version:

Jose Ignacio Aguilar Río. The institutional and beyond: On L2 teachers' identity display in L2 classrooms. Damian J. Rivers et Stephanie Ann Houghton. Social Identities and Multiple Selves in Foreign Language Education, Bloomsbury Academic, pp.13-32, 2013, 9781441160645. hal-00761009

HAL Id: hal-00761009

https://hal.science/hal-00761009v1

Submitted on 5 Dec 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Jose AGUILAR
DILTEC – Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris III
jose.aguilarrio@univ-paris3.fr
(Manuscrit)

“The institutional and beyond: On L2 teachers' identity display in L2 classrooms”

0. Introduction

This paper analyses interactions between foreign language (L2) teachers and groups of L2 learners in teacher-fronted L2 classrooms (Richards, 2006). The focus is on the description of how the participants construct, interactively and collaboratively, a context where categorisation processes occur (Schegloff, 1992), namely on the complex identities that L2 teachers' display (Richards, ibid.). It is argued that the functions – pedagogical and other – of the observed materialized, local identities may not correlate with the institutional business traditionally expected of an allegedly institutional context such as that of the L2 classroom – e.g., to facilitate L2 learning (Richards, ibid.). The observations suggest that by virtue of their orientations, teachers may at times interrupt their “doing being teachers” within the L2 classroom context, and momentarily “doing being” someone else instead (Mondada, 1999). It is concluded that L2 teachers' observable, locally accomplished, situated ways to make sense of the L2 classroom context, may sometimes not correlate with the roles that the literature in applied linguistics and education describe as relevant in teacher-fronted L2 classrooms.

1. Identifying identity

The individual's identity, the contexts where he thrives as a social being within a given community, his personal past experiences and his future plans, are intricately related. So much so, that simple, linear, causal explanations of his complex self will most likely lead to inaccurate conclusions. An individual's identity is certainly the sum of his past experiences, those that he has lived, witnessed, and been told, but also those that he has dreamed, endured and refused. It is what he used to do, yet no longer does, and what he never could stand, and misses affectionately to a certain extent. It is that to which he hopefully will got round soon, but also all that for which he will never care – at least until he finally does.

Characterising the individual's identity is not like doing maths. One cannot give a certain value to what the individual has accomplished, lost or aims for, then add up all the variables and expect to get a result that means something remotely close to what the individual is. It is not only about what the individual has done or seen, the places where he has been, the people he has met. It is also about what he has thought, imagined, wished, loved, hated, regretted, felt, preferred, mistaken, remembered and forgotten about the places where he has been, the people whom he has met, the things that he has done. Ultimately, the individual's identity has to do with what he thinks and feels about himself, how he wishes that the others think and feel about him (Gergen, 1971), and the way he thinks that others may think and feel about him (Higgins, 1987; Marc, E., 2005). Identity is not just the result of a cumulative process, it does not equal determinism, yet it partially and dynamically determines what lays ahead of the individual.

1.1. Identity as a piece of luggage: events, time and awareness

Functionally, identity allows the individual to *act* within and upon the immediate, particular contexts where he exists socially, to develop a self-image (Gergen, ibid; Markus & Kunda, 1986), to foresee his social performance, to recognise, identify, and adapt to social circumstances, as well as to draw on specific roles, behaviours and expectations in order to co-construct social life and to

make sense out of it (Bucholtz & Hall, 2005; Riley, 2007; Zimmerman, 1998). This may need to be broken down a little.

Identity is permanently (re)constructed as the individual constantly chooses to deploy punctual aspects of his persona within local, specific, social contexts. Either when you are on your own, momentarily disconnected from other social human beings[1], or when you participate in a social situation with some of you social fellows, you carry images of yourself and others[2]. As such, the identity equates to a bank of experiences lived in particular contexts, along with, by virtue of, or in spite of the fellow participants. The individual's life-long absorption of such experiences, his recurrent participation in social contexts and systematic co-construction of action(s) with his fellows result in an ability to adapt to, identify and recognise social circumstances, as well as to have expectations about these (Edwards, 1994), which may nonetheless be nuanced and redrafted. The individual's social competence, developed within the realm of the social community(/ies) to which he claims to belong, grants him sound knowledge about what behaviour is acceptable, expected or legitimate in specific social settings, by the social fellow partners with whom he shares social competence, customs and etiquette, and constructs social reality.

1.2. Identity and space: contexts and boundaries

Not all social contexts are alike. Attending a funeral service clad in a pink, flashy, cocktail dress may be someone's version of elegance and respect. However, such a choice of outfit, for such a situation, would certainly be ruled out in most Western societies. Some human groups have come to recognise specific behaviour and actions as appropriate, or even suitable, for given social situations. This is what Edwards (ibid.: 212) calls “scripts”. Scripts give indications of what is possible and expectable in determined social contexts. Upon agreement on the norms that regulate particular social situations, members of particular regional, national, or other communities, may consider that there are specific roles that serve efficiently as vehicles to deploy determined actions.

Conversation analysis suggests that an individual's capacity to tailor his social performance, to draw on specific roles, may sometimes be constrained by his participation in so called institutional contexts where specialised practices are expected and required (Schegloff, 1992). These specialised contexts would function differently than other interactional genres, such as (informal, spontaneous) conversation. Yet, as some conversation analysts suggest (Heritage, 2005: 107; Schegloff, ibid: 117) institutional talk and ordinary conversation are not completely alien one to the other. What may be problematic – at least for an external analyst – is to determine what makes talk to be institutional or to resemble ordinary conversation. Is it the spatial context, the status that one perceives in the person to whom one speaks? Is it the matter of discussion that makes talk institutional? It is certainly all of these things. However, the value that is given to the context, the status, the matter being discussed, the extent to which they determine how institutional the talk, may change. Norms and scripts guide and guarantee cohesion and intersubjectivity, yet they may bend. As Heritage (ibid: 109) points out, since institutional talk “involves a reduction in the range of interactional practices deployed by the participants”, it is by looking closely at the participants' attitude that one can hopefully discern the institutional from the non-institutional (Schegloff, ibid: 116).

1.3. Looking at identity: what is it to be seen?

Conversation analysis is one approach to identity. Insofar as conversation analysis is a branch of ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1996), the object of study of hardcore conversationalists is not

---

[1] This is ever more difficult in nowadays hyper-technological societies, but as long as batteries empty, one may still imagine being *on his own* – for example, as I write these lines, before I leave to get my daughter at her nanny's.

[2] Whether you have made these or they have grown within you is irrelevant, the point is that they are part of who you are.

identity as such, but rather “shared” (Schegloff, 1991) or “situated cognition” (Mondada & Pekarek Doehler, 2004), which can be understood as limited, local, observable materializations of identity. However, some conversationalists do recognize “identity” as a construct that may fit within a conversation analysis approach (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). Zimmerman (ibid.: 90), for instance, suggests that *identity* be broken down into three sub-categories: the “discourse identities”, that depend on the “moment-by-moment organization of [an] interaction”, the “situated identities”, that “come into play within the precincts of particular types of situation”, and the “transportable identities”, which are “potentially relevant in and for any situation and in and for any spate of interaction”. By breaking down identity in such manner, the analysis of an individual's may behaviour be approached on different levels.The participants in a social situation where talk is prevalent orient to specific actions and behaviour, showing their preference for some (Pomerantz, 1994). These orientations are indications of how the participants understand the social episode that they co-construct. This alleged understanding may ultimately be linked with what is arguably most intimate and essential to the individuals, their *self* (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000; Goffman, ibid.; Markus & Nurius, 1986). An individual's orientation to a particular action, his display of a given behaviour, informs of the way the individual understands the social situation in which he participates, as well as his own place within that very situation – the things he can do and say, insofar as they would be acceptable or even expected.

Different approaches can be taken in order to look at identity. The boundaries between psychology and sociology are sometimes blurry. Research on identity is often legitimately carried out according to either psychological (Lipiansky, 1990, 1995; Marc, ibid), or sociological traditions (Goffman, ibid., 1968; Gumperz, 1997; Lahire, 1998). Both psychology and sociology deal with identity by proposing models and metaphors that may account for its genesis, architecture and development. These models may be built from scratch, or be the result of an individual's guided introspection. Notwithstanding the appropriateness of such approaches, the choice made in this paper in order to address identity fits within the conversation analysis tradition. It is particular instances of behaviour, rather than whole identities, which are addressed, analysed and dealt with. These behaviours are arguably local, observable manifestations of something much larger, on which it is undoubtedly way more difficult to put one's finger – certainly the analyst's. The object of this chapter is not quite *identity*, but rather the analysis of the “situated identities” (Zimmerman, ibid.: 90) of individual “performers” (Goffman, 1959: 56) in their capacity as L2 teachers, within the allegedly institutional context of teacher-fronted L2 classrooms. It is not the individual who speaks about himself, but his actions, as read by the analyst.

2. Identity and language

The question of language is central to the study of identity (Riley, ibid.: 39). Likewise, identity is central to the study of language and its acquisition (Block, 2007). Languages are tools for (inter)action and communication. As such, they allow the individuals to construct and act out their identity. The relationship between language and identity is similar to that between identity and context. It is virtually impossible to state which of the two comes first. According to scholars within a labovian, variationist sociolinguistic tradition, the analysis of identity construction, expression and negotiation practices, may help understand language choices made by the speakers, as well as their behaviour (Gumperz, ibid.; Lambert, 2009; Russell, 2005). For authors closer to the ethnomethodological tradition, identity is always a partial, local, observable phenomenon (Mondada, ibid.). Bucholtz & Hall (ibid.) argue that identity is not prior to interaction, but co-constructed locally as the interaction unfolds. It is the whole principle of Sacks' membership categorisation practices (Edwards, 1998): the participants in a social encounter give and take identities as they interact, and they mainly do this by using language(s), and meaning-conveying language-related devices.

2.1. Non-nativeness, learning and identity

Since the socio-cultural turn (Block, 2003; Firth & Wagner, 1997; Lantolf, 1994), part of the research made in second language acquisition (SLA) has taken an interest in the impact that learning a new language may have on the learners' identity (Norton, 1995, 1997; Norton & Toohey, 2011; Zuengler, 1989). Vasquez[3] (1990: 148-150) and Talburt & Stewart (1999), cited by Block (2003), show accounts of individuals whose experiences as expatriate-learners in foreign countries turned out to be incompatible with their self-images. Identity, understood as an implicit process within self and other-categorisation practices, is also addressed by Mondada (ibid.), however indirectly, who questions the status of "foreigner" that is often, and rather automatically, attributed to non-native speakers. According to Mondada (ibid.), a non-native speaker's foreignness is not a default identity applicable to those who happen to communicate in, learn, work with, or generally use a language different from their mother tongue. Last but certainly not least, Block (2007) gives a thorough account of the scope that identity has in SLA research.

Identity has also been a matter of interest for researchers who study "teacher-fronted situations" (Richards, ibid.). Cicurel (1991) characterises a group of learners' classroom actions as signs of their coming to terms with an identity that defines, as much as is defined by, an institutional context, that of the L2 classroom. As for Levine (2011), he suggests that the learners' identity may be enriched by teachers who foster multilingual practices within their classrooms. According to this author, getting learners to move from an only-code strategy to a multi-code choice one may have an impact on how they regard themselves and their interlocutors as users of other languages. Levine's standpoint is consistent with the multilingual and multicultural educational principles put forth by the Council of Europe (2001). Other questions, peripheral to identity, yet central to learning, such as the relationship between language learning and the emotions (Imai, 2010), also witness the broad scope of personality and identity aspects in contemporary SLA research.

2.1. Identity and professionalism: teaching as a cognitive state

Identity has also been a matter of interest as regards the L2 teachers' education, especially since the development of the "teachers' cognition" (Leinhardt & Greeno, 1986) and, more precisely, the "language teachers' cognition" (Borg, 2003; Woods, 1996). In effect, as Freeman (2002: 2) points out, the way L2 teachers are considered has profoundly changed in the last forty years – at least in Western societies. According to Freeman, language teachers' identity came to the fore of the research conducted within the field of the teachers' education since teaching ceased to be regarded as a purely behavioural matter. Language teaching is certainly a matter of technical knowledge, but also of assumptions and beliefs about how this knowledge may be brought about (Woods, ibid.). Language teaching can no longer be dissociated from what teachers think and feel (i) about teaching and learning (Aguilar Río, 2011; Cambra Giné, 2003: 203-204), (ii) about those with whom they work – either their teacher fellows or the learners – and ultimately (iii) about themselves. As Williams & Burden (1997: 51) put it, "[t]eaching, like learning, must be concerned with teachers making sense of, or meaning from, the situations in which they find themselves."

2.2. Language teachers' roles: breaking down identity

The ever increasing complexity of the learning process models that originate in the SLA research (De Bot, Lowie & Verspoor, 2007; Ellis, 2008; Larsen-Freeman, 2007; Larsen-Freeman & Cameron, 2008) has led to significantly more complex characterisations of the teaching processes, actions and conditions (Borg, 2009; Cachet, 2009; Coste, 2009; Narcy-Combes, Narcy-Combes & Starkey-Perret, 2009; Woods & Çakır, 2011). The L2 teachers' roles multiply as language teaching

[3] Not specifically an applied linguist, but a social researcher interested in the interplay between language and identity.

and learning environments diversify (Bertin & Narcy-Combes, 2007; Bertin, Gravé & Narcy-Combes, 2010; Compton, 2009). As far as teacher-fronted teaching contexts are concerned (Richards, ibid.), contemporary authors describe L2 teachers as communication and language experts, learning facilitators, contents designers and providers, interaction conductors, and cultural mediators (Germain, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 1995). As such, they are expected to orient to specific preferred actions such choosing topics, giving feedback to learners, correcting them, designing next speakers in group exchanges, preventing specific learners from taking over (Seedhouse, 2004):

```
  25    NB:                        [ça dépend du réseau + RÉACTION +
→ 26          alors on s'écoute-on s'écoute-ça dépend du réseau +
  27          réactions +
```

Excerpt 1. Noemi: “Listen to each other”[4]

As regards their role as communication conductors, the L2 teachers make use of the so called “IRF pattern” (Richards, ibid.; Seedhouse, 1996) – initiation, response, feedback. The IRF pattern is a discursive structure that is ubiquitous in L2 classrooms, and in any classroom for that matter (McHoul, 1978). It is the language teachers' prerogative to occupy the positions I and F as they interact with learners. The excerpt below is an archetypical example of the IRF pattern:

```
→ 53    R:     THEREFORE + WHY do we call IT (0.3) REM↑ or r·e·m SLEEP↑
  54           (0.3)
  55    AF:    XXX=
  56    R:     =what does + THAT mean↑
  57    {AM}:  [is it↑ + maybe↑
  58    AF1:   [XXX
  59    AM2:   rapid=
  60    R:     =RAPID↑
  61           (({board}, 1.1))
  62    AM1:   eye movement=
  63    AF1:   =eye movement=
  64    R:     =<EYE:> ((board, 0.6))
  65           MOVE:ment
  66    AM:    {°movement°}
→ 67    R:     WELL DONE (0.2) (.) <RApid EYE MOVEment> (0.5)
```

Excerpt 2. Richard: “REM and IRF”

Ultimately, L2 teachers are expected to perform these duties in ways that foster a certain rapport among participants in order to keep them active and motivated. As Dörnyei (2007: 726) puts it, “the motivational character of the classroom is largely a function of the teacher's motivational teaching practice, and is therefore within our explicit control.”

This is roughly what an L2 teacher's performance amounts to, within the context of a teacher-fronted classroom situation, if we stick to a mainstream institutional discourse. In effect, these are roles and qualities that “effective teachers” (Walls, Nardo, von Minden & Hoffman, 2002) may be expected to have. However, since teaching is not only about possessing certain savoir-faire, but also about making sense of these – sometimes on a personal level – characterising an L2 teacher's performance is less straightforward and predictable than making a list of his linguistic, pedagogical and professional qualities, precisely because *the L2 teacher* is only a part of what lies within an individual's much larger identity. And this is all the more true in teacher-fronted L2 classroom interaction (Richards, ibid.), where the boundaries between “real” communication and communication “practice” are often blurry (Cicurel, 2002).

---

[4] 25 NB: it depends on the network, any reactions
26 now, listen, listen to each other, it depends on the network
27 any reactions

2.3. Teacher-fronted classroom interaction and identity attribution practices

All participants in the L2 classroom construct, interactively and collaboratively, discursive contexts where self and other categorisation processes occur (Cicurel, 1994, 2002; Pomerantz, 2008). Consequently, the teachers' contingent "situated" identities (Zimmerman, ibid.: 90) may sometimes not correlate with the a priori situated institutional business that they are expected to promote in the language classroom context – e.g., to facilitate the learning of a language (Bange, Carol & Griggs, 2005: 81; Richards, ibid.). Teachers may interrupt their "doing being teachers" within the L2 classroom context, and momentarily "doing being" someone else instead (Mondada, ibid.). Momentarily not quite being a teacher may be an occasional manner for a teacher to make sense of his precisely being what a teacher is expected to be – at least what *that very teacher* thinks that he is expected, or welcome, to be *in any given particular moment*, as he interacts with learners within the context of a teacher-fronted classroom. But it may also be a sort of trademark that allows the teacher to inform others about a certain way to come to terms with his roles as a teacher. In the following sections, attempts are made to illustrate this by relying on data obtained in L2 classrooms.

3. Data and methodology

The data presented show occurrences of L2 teachers and learners' interactions where the former oriented to self and other-derision, self-disclosed and legitimated laughter as a local, collective practice. Despite the fact that expectancies and participants' identities may be partially defined in advance in the L2 classroom context, the data suggest that participants may sometimes negotiate the L2 classroom institutional boundaries – that is, what business is done, by whom it is performed, and how it is achieved.

The data were produced as part of a Ph.D. dissertation completed in December 2010 (Aguilar Río, 2010). Between April 2007 and December 2008, fieldwork was conducted in four European university contexts where the local, native language was taught to young adult learners from Europe, Eastern Europe, the Middle-East, Asia, North, Central and South America. The data comprises roundabout 30 hours of teacher-fronted classroom observations, plus open-ended and recall interviews with seven teachers – three EFL teachers in Glasgow, Scotland, two French as a foreign language teachers in Paris, France, and two Spanish as a foreign language teachers in Andalusia, Spain. On average, each teacher was observed during six hours scattered in two to three sessions that took place in the same week, or from one week to the other. Classroom observations always preceded the open-ended interviews. Upon completion of the classroom observations transcriptions – this process ranged from two to twelve months – a recall interview was conducted with six of the seven teachers. The classroom transcripts were produced in the manner of the conversation analysis methodology (Ten Have, 1999): the sequentiality of the situations and the participants' orientations were the main guidelines for the analysis. Both the classroom observation transcripts and the original data – either audio or video recorded – were used during the recall interviews with the teachers (Pomerantz, 2005). The aim of the recall interviews was double: to confirm the validity of the contents transcribed and to figure out and co-construct with the teachers the principles and reasons behind some of their actions and orientations. In order to respect the space constraints, a selection of classroom excerpts is presented to illustrate of the sort of beyond-the-institutional identity-work observed.

3.1. Language teachers' self-categorisations: defining the self and its scope

All of the seven teachers displayed categorisation practices by means of which they oriented to aspects of their self. Some teachers' self-categorisation practices where explicitly stated:

```
→ 162    J:     pool + this size (.) AND: eh-hmm: (0.2) she's- + she's a teacher
```

```
  163          of English↑
  164    LR:   yeah
→ 165    J:    like me (0.3) but she: (0.7)
  166          <TRAVELS in her CAR↑ + to give LESSONS↑ + in a BANK↑ +
```

Excerpt 3. Janice: “Teacher friend”

```
  1      {TS}:  what's phobia
  2             (0.4)
  3      R:     AH [OK
  4      {AM}:     [XXX
  5      R:     XXX (0.8)
→ 6             FOR example + {I AM} a little-I don't like + HIGH (0.4)
  7             for example IN TOKYO I don't like <high buildings:>
  8             (0.4)
  9      {TS}:  °hm-mm°
  10     R:     yeah↑-I don't like going up [high buildings
```

Excerpt 4. Richard: “Phobia”

Excerpts 3 and 4 show Janice and Richard[5], English teachers in Glasgow, orienting to personal aspects in order to illustrate elements within their discourse, or to answer to questions asked by learners. They accomplish processes of self-categorisation by means of which they accept to be momentarily considered in a certain manner, or to be attributed a certain condition, which incidentally serves to maintain the intersubjectivity among the learners – who may likely recognize that Janice is a teacher herself who uses her own role as teacher to exemplify the account that she is giving, or that Richard's dislike of heights is one possible materialization of “phobia”.

Some teachers displayed categorisation practices by virtue of which they detached from contingent identities – “situated”, as Zimmerman would call them – set out for them by the very activity in which they participated. In some cases, the teacher explicitly treated these floating, contingent identities as non-appropriate:

```
→ 43     R:                                        [this is OUTSIDE of my
  44             KNOWLEDGE=
  45     AS:     =((laugh[ing))
  46     R:              [{has anyone been to India}↑
  47             (0.7)
```

Excerpt 5. Richard: “Outside of my knowledge”

In the excerpt above, as part of an exercise, Richard and the group of learners try to agree on a description of the symbol on the Indian national flag. By explicitly stating his ignorance (lines 43-44), Richard self-categorises as a non competent informant, thus as a resourceless participant for the current business – however, he remains the negotiation conductor (line 46).

Teachers' detachment from the contingent identities was at times implicit:

```
  10     NB:    ce que c'est-quelqu'un peut me MON-TRER + moi je préfère
  11            vous montrer [{ce que c'est qu'un} #briquet#
  12     AM:                 [{((soft laughter))}
  13            (0.8)
→ 14     NB:    j'peux pas [vous montrer parce que j'en ai pas
```

Excerpt 6. Noemi: “Lighter”[6]

Excerpt 6 presents French teacher Noemi momentarily “sliding” (Cicurel, 2005: 187-188) from a

[5] These are not the teachers' real names, but names that they have been given in order to preserve their anonymity.

[6] 10 NB: can anyone show me a lighter? I'd rather […]
11 show you what a lighter is. […]
14 I can't show you because I am not carrying one

communication conductor and comprehension facilitator role (line 10) to the denial of the implicit, situated role of “smoker” (line 14), which her own discourse has made contingent. Insofar as she self-categorises as “one who is not carrying a lighter”, she appears as “one who cannot satisfy the request that has just been made”, and implicitly as a “non-smoker”. Yet, she remains a comprehension facilitator.

Teachers' self-categorisation practices also bore on what they stated to be incapable of, or on what they did not know prior to the encounter with the group of learners:

```
  303   J:     ((chuckles)) ALWAYS + yeah↑ but not everybody here +
→ 304          {cause} I DON'T LIKE IT + °XXX the carpets°-I don't like
  305          {it}-and when and when <SOMEBODY COMES to my HOUSE> (0.7)
→ 306          it's very DIFFICULT for me [{you know} it's very DIFFICULT
  307   LR:                               [yeah
  308   J:     for me to-PLEA:SE take your shoes very DIFFICULT
```

Excerpt 7. Janice: “Take off your shoes”

```
  141   QN:    {se é[piler} les: + [les jambes↑
  142   AF:         [{°épiler°}
  143   MF:                        [ILS S::'É[PILENT
  144   QN:                                  [ils↑ s'épilent=
  145   MF:    =PILENT↑
  146          (0.3)
  147   QN:    les {jambes}
  148   MF:    les jambes
  149   QN:    °oui°=
  150   {IK}:  =c'est épilation↑ (0.2) c'est comme↑
  151          (1.5)
→ 152   MF:    AH + je savais pas + <LES CYCLISTES↑ + LES:-[eh:>
  153   QN:                                                [les cyclistes
```

Excerpt 8. Marie-Fabienne: “Waxing”[7]

In the two excerpts above, Janice and Marie-Fabienne self-categorise as those who “do not like”, “find it difficult to” and “did not know, but do know now”. In the case of Janice, she accepts to momentarily give an image of herself as someone who has preferences and may struggle to have things done her way. As regards Marie-Fabienne, she implicitly agrees to exchange roles with some of the learners, who become for a moment the experts who know whereas she does not (Arditty & Vasseur, 1999; Vasseur, 2000).

The excerpts shown so far suggest that the teachers may interactively accept a varying degree of self-disclosure, which may be more or less implicit. The elements to which the teachers orient bear on aspects of their self that seemingly belong to contexts outside of the institutional encounter with the group of learners. In this sense, it could be argued that they give an image of themselves that goes beyond the strict roles and functions that can be associated with an L2 teacher (§ 2.2). However, it is to be noted that in all the above excerpts, the teachers' orientations, either implicit or explicit, to aspects beyond their teacher-self function are coherent with a pedagogical rationale: they function as examples that must clarify language-related matters, as well as to maintain the group's

[7] 141 QN: to wax their legs
142 AF: wax
143 MF: they wax
144 QN: they wax […]
147 QN: their legs
148 MF: their legs
149 QN: yes
150 {IK}: it's waxing it's like […]
152 MF: I didn't know cyclists they
153 QN: cyclists

intersubjectivity. The data show that the pedagogical dimension of the teachers' self-presentation may sometimes be missing, or at least less definite.

3.2. When the self is the example: the teachers' orientation to self-derision

The data indicate occurrences of teachers who oriented to identity-construction discursive practices that comprised either self-derision or other-derision – addressed to the learners. Since the object of this paper is the teachers' identity display, only self-derision practices will be considered.

Some instances of the teacher's self-derision were produced as third position punchlines (Hetzron, 1991) in response to answers given by a learner in the second position:

```
  7      LC:    hmm::: + viernes + he ido: de fiesta:
  8      CD:    a-ha:
  9      LC:    eh:: ayer: + he ido #a la playa# ((lau[ghs))
→ 10     CD:                                          [((laughs)) porque yo-yo
  11             veo un poco COLOR↑ + [((laughs))
  12     {LD}:                        [((laughs))
  13     LC:                          [{CLARO}
→ 14     CD:    YO CADA DÍA MÁS BLANCO pe#ro# ((laughs)) (0.4) ((chuckles))
```

Excerpt 9. Cristóbal: “More pale every day”[8]

In this excerpt, Cristóbal, a teacher of Spanish in Malaga, legitimises laughter by producing a laughable self-categorisation that contrasts with the learners priori turn (lines 7-9). Such contrast leaves it to the hearer to decide on how miserable the teacher's condition may be. Cristóbal's feedback does not question the appropriateness of the topic displayed by the learner, yet departs from – or at least does not concentrate on – a concern for language accuracy.

The following excerpt presents an instance of self-derision that seems to support intersubjectivity maintenance among the group. As was the case with Cristóbal's example above, Richard's instance of self-derision below also occupies the third-position:

```
  26     R:     what does “ETERNAL” MEAN↑
  27            (0.8)
  28     AM:    for ever
→ 29     R:     for ever + yeah + like-sometimes like + my grammar lessons
  31            ((chuckles)) [{#ok#} (.) ok
  32     AM:                 [((laughs))
```

Excerpt 10. Richard: “Eternal grammar lessons”

Richard checks the comprehensibility of “eternal” (line 26), goes on to confirm his satisfaction with the learner's response, and finally suggests an example that is both a punchline to his own question and an instance of self-derision display, which serves to legitimise laughter.

Sometimes, the teachers' orientation to self-derision was implicit:

```
  6      R:     hmm XXX lots of absents yeah↑ + one two: + three: four:
  7             five: {°six: seven°} °XXX° (2.5)
  8             {>do you THINK< it's because of the sunny DAY↑}
```

[8] 7 LC: Friday I went partying
8 CD: hm-mm
9 LC: yesterday I went to the beach
10 CD: because I
11 CD: can see a bit of colour […]
13 LC: sure
14 CD: I'm more pale every day but

```
  9      {KR}:  eh #yeah#
  10     AM:    {((chuckles))}
→ 11     R:     YEAH {>they just probably said<} AH:: + Richard's lesson
  12            NAH::
  13     AS:    ((laugh))
```

Excerpt 11. Richard: "Sunny day"

```
  1      CD:    UN ejemplo (1.8)
  2             HOY (1.0)
  3             he: visto: (1.6)
  4             A CD:: (0.7)
  5             chicos:: + CD + una persona↑ (3.1)
→ 6             s:ábado por la noche no (0.5)
  7             pe#ro# [((laughs)) #normalmente#
  8      ED:           [((laughs))
```

Excerpt 12. Cristóbal: "Normal person"[9]

Both of the above excerpts illustrate instances of one teacher's orientation to implicit self-derision. Richard suggests that the reason for such a poor classroom turnout may be that the learners have not felt that Richard's English lesson could rival the (rather unexpected) good weather. As for Cristóbal, it is to be noted that his orientation to self-derision comes as a detour from a metalinguistic intervention for which he has chosen himself as an example. The implicit idea here is that Cristóbal, who is usually a person, stops being one on a Saturday night – where he could practice certain Saturday-night activities that would prevent him from qualifying as a person, such as drinking alcohol or letting himself go. In either case, the teacher's orientation to self-derision legitimises some of the learners' orientation to laughter.

Sometimes self-derision functioned as the highlights – or rather as a punchline of sorts – of one teacher's ongoing turn of a metalinguistic or cultural nature:

```
  71     J:     ((board)) SOUTH EAST (.) AND: + it was VERY NICE weather in
  72            Scotland + it was very nice in Scotland + like this
  73     {AF}:  hm-mm=
  74     J:     =and in SPAIN: ((board)) it was: RAINING + [it was: COLD
  75     {AF}:                                              [°XXX°
→ 76     J:     it was COLD + I had to WEAR {AT NIGHT a} VERY THICK PYJAMA
  77            ((board)) PYJA[MAS↑ VERY [THICK A HOT-WATER-BOTTLE +
  78     {LR}:               [{really↑}
  79     {CH}:                            [((laughs))
  80     J:     you know this RUBBER [BOTTLE + you put HOT WATER=[{that} you put
  81     {LR}:                       [{yeah}                    =[{hmm}
  82     J:     in the BED + keep you warm + I needed THAT
  83            (0.4)
  84     LR:    {real[ly↑}
  85     J:          [it was VE::RY COLD: and then it was raining and then there
  86            was a THUNDERSTORM BANG BANG BANG {in}the sky [(.)
  87     LR:                                                  [ouah: ((laughs))
→ 88     J:     {and I thought} THIS IS SPAIN and my mother said ((higher pitched
  89            voice)) IT'S LOVELY IN SCOTLAND=
  90     AS:    =((burst of [laughter))
```

Excerpt 13. Janice: "Holidays in Spain"

In the excerpt above Janice gives an account of her holidays in Spain, which she implicitly depicts

[9] 1 CD: an example
2 today
3 I have seen
4 CD
5 guys is CD a person
6 not on a Saturday night
7 but usually

as not having met her expectations (lines 88), due to the bad weather conditions (lines 74-76, 85-86). As Janice self-portraits as a victim of such bad weather, she accepts that her recounting legitimise laughter among the group (lines 79, 87). Further down, she self-portraits as a daughter (line 88), who has to endure her mother's apparent lack of sympathy (lines 88-89). Again, Janice's self-categorisation serves to legitimise laughter among learners (line 90). It is to be noted that Janice shifts from self-portraying in a number of ways, and acting as a comprehension facilitator (lines 72, 80-82, 86).

3.3. Constructing identity impromptu: the teacher's apologetic self

In some rare cases, the teachers oriented, not quite to self-derision, but to the questioning of a certain self of theirs. This questioning may have been the teacher's reaction to an aspect of the L2 whose sense was made salient. As such, the teacher's questioning seems to have functioned as an example, or rather as a counter-example:

```
  198    J:     =<S:ensitive> + <thinking about the other students>
  199    {AM}:  u-[hu
  200    AF:      [{yes}=
  201    J:     ={think} about the student °not about me° (0.6)
→ 202           [°yeah↑° + sometimes I am NOT sensitive I know I'm very bad
  203    {LR}:  [yeah
  204    CH:    ((chu[ckles))
  205    LR:         [(lau[gh))
→ 206    J:              [{sometimes} I am not so good at that +
  207           it's a problem +
  208           yeah↑ I think you are more sensitive than me
  209    LR:    ((lau[ghs))
```

Excerpt 14. Janice: “Sensitiveness”

Janice and the group negotiate the meaning of “sensitive”. Janice suggests a definition, and then goes on to illustrate the meaning by self-categorising as “not sensitive” and “bad”. Further on she nuances her previous self-categorisation (line 206), acknowledges the risk of her insensitivity, yet does not precise who or what is at risk. Finally, Janice insists on her lack of, or insufficient, sensitivity, as she compares it with the learners' sensitivity. It is to be noted that the only response given by learners is laughter (lines 204, 205, 209), whose meaning remains rather obscure.

The teacher's questioning of a certain self may also have followed a prior instance of implicit self-derision, seemingly gone unnoticed:

```
  72     R:     a CONFERENCE {as} + in ACADEMIC world + what's a
  73            CONFERENCE↑
  74            (0.8)
  75     AF:    meetings=
  76     AF:    ={scien[ce}
  77     AM:           [XX[X
  78     AM:              [{meet for} [XXX
  79     R:                           [meeting↑
  80            (0.6)
  81     AF:    of science
  82     AM:    lecture
  83     R:     SCIENTISTS for example=
  84     AF:    ={yeah}=
  85     R:     =academics + and what do they do↑
  86            (0.7)
  87     AF:    they speak about-eh: specific-eh:=
  88     {AF}:  =°hmm°
  89            (0.2)
  90     AM:    {°yes°}=
→ 91     R:     =well do[ne + so + for example in MY subject we have (0.2)
  92     AF:            [{yeah})
```

```
  93     R:     CO-eh (0.3) CONferences about lin:-GUIStics or
  94            SOCIOlinguistics-SOCIOlinguistics conferences I go to (.)
  95            sometimes + when I need to sleep
  96     AM:    ((chuckles))
→ 97     R:     #ok↑# ((chuckles)) (.) #you'll know what I mean in a few
  98            years if you continue to study# (0.2)
  99            hmm + sometimes inTERESting +
  100           sometimes not °so interesting° (0.5)
  101           (.) OK ((chuckles)) + I shouldn't say this-you'll be good
  102           academics + m-much more motivated than me
```

Excerpt 15. Richard: “Conferences and motivation”

Richard and the group negotiate the meaning of “conference”. Richard's orientation to the roles of communication conductor and facilitator are clear enough (lines 72-91). Once certain keywords have been elicited, Richard exemplifies by drawing on his own experience. He implicitly self-categorises as an unmotivated conference attendant (lines 93-95). Further down, his self-derision going unnoticed, Richard self-categorises, slightly less implicitly, as a unmotivated conference attendant again, which contrasts with his prospective categorisation of learners (line 102).

4. Data discussion and limits

The data presented show several L2 teachers as they interact with groups of language learners in teacher-fronted language classrooms. The language teachers are seen to orient to institutional practices, sometimes of a pedagogic nature, such as correcting, giving feedback, encouraging, selecting the next speaker (McHoul, ibid.), or maintaining the group's intersubjectivity by focusing on particular language items, checking the learners' comprehension, asking for or giving definitions and explanations. Exemplifying has also been identified as a strategy by means of which the teachers maintained the intersubjectivity among the group. The data have shown that some teachers oriented to exemplification as a teaching practice by drawing on their own personal experiences, from which they selected specific episodes, opinions and stories. By defining such items as elements around which to define local exemplifying actions, the teachers consequently oriented to self-categorisation practices, which means that they momentarily agreed to – or chose to – show themselves in a particular manner, and possibly be seen by learners in this very manner – or in another particular one, which would entirely depend on the learners. The data have shown that self-derision and self-disclosure were embodiments of the teachers' self-categorisation practices.

4.1. Self-categorisation practices and pedagogical functions

A primary pedagogical function has been identified in the teachers' self-categorisation practices. In order to illustrate or clarify a potentially problematic L2 item, some teachers made use of whatever language contents were at their reach – namely their own, personal experiences. It has been suggested that it may be easy for the learners to relate the language awareness activities and processes with the reality of those who inhabit the context of the language classroom – namely the teachers. Relating more or less abstract, metalinguistic aspects of the L2 to be learned, with more concrete, real, situated elements of these very language aspects, may certainly be acquisitionally appropriate and efficient. The data have revealed a secondary function of the teachers' orientation to self-categorisation practices. This has been associated with instances of the teachers' self-categorisation practices where the language contents used to exemplify a pedagogical function was somewhat less clear, or simply missing. Such secondary self-categorisation practices would seem to work as local, situated identity-construction strategies deployed by the teachers. Self-derision and self-categorisation, taken as instances of the teachers' discursive practices seem to have opened new interactive sequences that departed from those opened by the language awareness activities in course. In both cases, the learners reacted to the teachers' actions by orienting to laughter, which indicates the momentary prevalence of an emotional dimension over strictly cognitive processes.

Learning an L2 – and teaching it, for that matter – are far from being purely cognitive business (§ 2.1). Emotions are very much present in any and every L2 teaching and learning situation (Dörnyei, 2003; Imai, ibid.; Williams & Burden, ibid.). Catering for and addressing the emotional aspects at work in teacher-fronted L2 classrooms are also part of the teacher's roles (Bogaards, 1988; Dörnyei, 2007). Our analysis suggest that the teachers' departure from a strictly institutional discursive order is a way for them to come to terms with their role as emotion regulators. By orienting to self-disclosure and self-derision, the L2 teachers seem to work towards the creation of discursive and identity comfort zones for themselves and for the learners. This idea was confirmed by some of the observed teachers during their open-ended interviews:

> "I suppose at the back of my mind, as well, you know, is this lesson going to be OK for me, too, yeah, obviously, I think about myself too […]"
>
> "I often find, that if I, am not in a very good mood, and I teach, I can be in a better mood afterwards, and I think that's because, I can take on a role, I can take on a role of, hiding my, eh, negativity, so it's not, sometimes teaching can be good for that XXX or, and sometimes it can energise me as well, sometimes it {can have this effect} it can energise me as well, if I'm tired, just the sheer act of, of putting some thought and energy into something can, energise me"

Excerpt 16. Richard, open-ended interview

Richard and Cristóbal were among the teachers who affirmed to use their personal experiences as fuel for their exchanges with the learners. As they showed during their open-ended interview, for these two teachers, their self-presentation was something that they consciously worked during the encounter with the learners:

> "I think it's important, not to reveal, your, all of your self, but to reveal as much of yourself as it's, desirable, for both yourself and the students, so yeah, I try to be who I am, but not all the time"

Excerpt 17. Richard, open-ended interview

> "Yo creo que hay una cosa que no {debemos} olvidar, y es intentar ser divertido, no […] porque hombre, soltar el rollo es lo más fácil, ser, ser un tocho es lo más fácil"

Excerpt 18. Cristóbal, open-ended interview[10]

The teachers' orientation to particular discursive practices implies their vision on how they conduct the interaction with learners:

> "I try not to be, domineering to the students, I try no to be, I try not to, eh, emphasize any power, really, particular relationships, although of course, I try to maintain the atmosphere of the class, I think it's XXX, perhaps, maybe because my background is in psychology, I'm quite aware that, anxiety, or, nervousness, can interfere with, language learning, in, in, my experiences of learning languages at school would kind of, confirm this, to me, so, eh, that's why I kind of try to take {a kind of an easier approach} with the students, I try to make classroom not, I don't mean a fun place, but a non threatening place"

Excerpt 19. Richard, open-ended interview

As teachers reflected on their self-presentation during the encounter with learners, they confirmed the idea that they self-categorise themselves in a number of manners:

---

[10] I think there is one thing we must not forget, you have to try to be amusing, right […] being a bore is the easiest thing to do".

“En realidad, tú eres su, su amigo, novio, padre, tú eres una mezcla”

Excerpt 20. Cristóbal, open-ended interview[11]

Some of the teachers claimed that their orientation to personal matters must be obliterated during the encounter with the learners, as was the case with Naomi, who argued that the role(s) of an L2 teacher do not match those of a mother-tongue teacher:

“Le professeur, la mission d’un professeur de français langue étrangère, c’est d’essayer de s’effacer au maximum, c’est-à-dire c’est de, provoquer, l’envie de communiquer chez l’apprenant, évidemment, il est, animateur, avant d’être, c’est pas, je pense pas que ça soit la même fonction […] dans un cours de français langue étrangère, on a beaucoup plus un rôle d’animateur, c’est-à-dire qu’on va essayer de créer des situations, pour favoriser, eh, le désir de, de communication chez l’apprenant, parce que, ce qu’on veut c’est qu’il soit autonome, qu’il puisse communiquer”

Excerpt 21. Naomi, open-ended interview[12]

According to Naomi, an L2 teacher must serve the learners' needs, and that to the extent of ignoring the teacher's own wishes, expectations and desires. This does not mean that the teacher's emotions are not involved in the practice of teaching, bur rather, that the teacher's self-presentation will adopt a certain behaviour, which Naomi described as mothering:

“Moi, personnellement, je pense que j’ai un style très maternel, c’est-à-dire, je suis une, un professeur maternel, j’aime bien, materner mes apprenants, parce que j’ai toujours peur qu’ils ne comprennent, qu’ils n’aient pas compris quelque chose, etcétéra, et c’est là, en fait, ma difficulté, enfin, la difficulté d’un enseignant, c’est comment trouver, justement, un compromis, entre, la fonction d’animateur et cette fonction, ehm, d’encadrement, ehm, {ce rôle}, maternel, presque maternel, ehm, qu’on peut être amené à jouer”

Excerpt 22. Noemi, open-ended interview[13]

The teachers' actions as the interact with learners in teacher-fronted classroom situations are the result of the formers' pedagogical views on teaching, but they may also respond to contingent circumstances that all the participants co-construct. Some of the teachers' actions may not match their principles.

4.2. The limitedness of the data presented

Characterising identity is a cumbersome enterprise. Identity is a hardly observable phenomenon[14], its dynamic nature is best characterised along time, within an array of different contexts, as the individual interacts with various interlocutors in a number of situations. Identity may change over time. The local, more or less tangible roles to which an individual's identity may give way sometimes differ within contexts that would seem to be alike – as may be the case of teacher-

[11] In fact, you are their friend, boyfriend, father, you are a mixture.

[12] The teacher, a French as a foreign language teacher's mision is to have a presence that is as discrete as possible, that is, to provoke the learners' desire to communicate, the teacher is obviously an MC of sorts, but I don't think that role applies in the case of a French mother-tongue class, our role as an MC is more important, insofar as we will try to create situations that favour the learners' desire to communicate, because we want them to be autonomous, so they can communicate.

[13] I think that I have a very mothering style, that is, I am a mothering teacher, I like mothering my learners, because I am always worried that they do not understand something, my problem, actually, any teacher's problem, is to find the balance between his role as a MC and his role as a conductor, this almost mothering role, that we sometimes have to play.

[14] It is difficult to guaranty that the analyst-researcher will not over-interpret whatever data are made available.

fronted L2 classrooms. One obvious shortcoming of this paper is the limited scope of the data presented. Plus, the teachers were always observed as they taught the same group. This means that all conclusions concerning the teaching practices are necessarily limited. In order to account for the teachers' identity materialisation and change, it would be necessary to set up much longer fieldwork, as well as to observe the same teachers as they teach different groups of learners.

5. Conclusion and perspectives

The participants in the language classroom, the teacher and the learners, show by means of their actions their local understanding of the current situation as they check and adjust to that of their fellow participants'. It is by virtue of this constant, mutual checking, which is accomplished in the situated acts of identity display, that the participants negotiate and co-define what is possible and impossible, appropriate and inappropriate in a given context – namely the L2 classroom –, and ultimately confirm or review their goals, as well as the means available to achieve these.

The excerpts that have been shown indicate that teachers may sometimes orient to actions that do not seem to correspond to the roles and functions that they have been assigned by the institution in order to facilitate learning. Either these institutional roles and functions are too narrow, or the means to characterise them are not sufficiently adequate (Richards, ibid.: 56) to take into account the subtleties of the interactive business and the self and other-categorisation processes that can be observed among the participants in a language classroom. In effect, the data indicate that the language classroom may be the space where the participants, namely the teachers, negotiate and try to validate (a) particular self(s), or aspects of their identity, with the rest of participants. This suggests that, for some teachers, the institutional context of the classroom may also be a place where they orient to activities other than the strict learning facilitation, group conduction, intersubjectivity maintenance, and classroom dynamics management. As it has been stated above (§ 4.2) the span of the fieldwork that was conducted is rather limited. As regards the effect that time – taken as a vector of experience – may have on an L2 teacher's teaching practice, it may certainly be worth observing a group of teachers during an extended amount of time in order to determine whether changes have operated. The underlying hypothesis here is that the longer a teacher has taught the more different his teaching practice. This hypothesis is at the core of previous research such as Gatbonton's (2008), as she compares novice and experimented L2 teachers' sets of practices.

One may wonder, what may be the consequences of such observed self-categorisation and identity negotiation practices in terms of L2 learning? A non compromising answer might be that learning is too complicated a matter to be only – or mainly – catered for by strictly implementing the teaching practices that have come to be recognized – by L2 teaching theorists and teachers – as the most apt to foster learning. One may argue that L2 learning can thus be facilitated in a number of ways that go beyond those recognised/acknowledged/accepted/suggested by the institution, that learning may have ways unknown to L2 teaching scholars or practitioners – or to SLA scholars, for that matter –, or be the result of actions other than those specifically designed as “teaching acts”, and consequently embodied within a “teaching self”.

A subsidiary question remains: what is it to be learned in a L2 classroom? Is it only, or mainly, a language, a code? Is L2 learning also, or especially, about learning alternative ways to look at the world, and to inhabit it, which would be partly expressed by a given language, within a particular community? The obvious answer to the question is, that will depend on the learners' needs. However, it may also be argued that expecting L2 teachers to exploit only their technical competences as language and communication experts may be somewhat limiting both for the learners and the teachers themselves. Voices coming from Europe (Council of Europe, ibid.; Dupuis et al., 2003) suggest that L2 teachers are also expected to act as educators and mediators among cultures and individuals. It may be the case that in order to accomplish such roles, the L2 teachers'

performance calls for more important self-disclosure, for a certain "investment of the self" (Richards, ibid.: 72). In such a case, looking at L2 teachers only as L2 teachers, or expecting them to only act as such, would certainly be limiting and insufficient.

All teachers have been learners. Teachers teach the way they do partly because they have so been taught during their training, but also because they have either become reassured by the teaching ways they have been exposed to, or questioned them, and found new, more appropriate ones – either for themselves or for the learners. If we accept that there is a "teaching practice", and if such practice may come close to the notion of "professionalism" (Heyworth, 2003: 95), the training for the future L2 teaching professionals should not ignore matters that have to do with the discursive space that teachers occupy within the teacher-fronted L2 classroom context – however peripheral some authors seem to find such matters (Kasper, 1997). The future L2 teachers' training programs should thus spare – and more than that, *devote* – some time to reflect on the facet(s) that teachers construct as pre-service teachers, how these may fit within the teachers' larger identity, as well as how certain facets, not necessarily L2 teaching-related, may develop over time, or be put to the service of the L2 teaching-practice. The process of teacher identity construction should not be left unaccompanied, it deserves scaffolding, as is the case of training programs such as the DELTA (Borg, 2011).

Teachers may thus develop a certain "style" (Cicurel, 2005: 187-188; Dörnyei, 2007: 724-726) that learners can identify, relate to, expect, or even appreciate. One can affirm without much reservation, that the learners' appreciation or a teacher's "style" may well contribute to facilitate the learning processes. As it has been suggested language classrooms are contexts where it is expected that learning processes be encouraged and facilitated (§ 2.3). As van Lier (1988: 179) puts it, the L2 classroom is a short-cut to learning. In order for L2 classrooms to function as such, L2 teachers are (usually) trained to become aware of (i) whatever complex cognitive and social processes that come into play in teacher-fronted learning situations, (ii) learners' differences and needs, (iii) as well as specific teaching techniques that will hopefully foster learning. Teachers are also *persons* (Williams & Burden, ibid.: 63), which means that they bring to the institutional teacher-fronted classroom context their hopes, fears, wishes and preferences – all of which goes beyond the strictly institutional business within the L2 classroom. The practice of teaching entails the endorsement and renewal of a certain institutional order. This order transpires as participants, namely the teacher, orient to specific functions and roles. Beyond the institutional nature of teaching, the multiplicity and the complexity of the individual-L2 teacher's identity remain. According to Matei & Medgyes (2003: 72) "students expect teachers to be powerful figures, not only in terms of professional qualifications, abilities and knowledge, but also in terms of personality: students wish to be impressed and entertained, and they appreciate teachers with strong, if not charismatic, personalities." The data that have been analysed suggest that for teachers to "play the personality card" may imply for them to assume and exploit aspects of their self(s) that go beyond the teachers' institutional identity work, as much as they complete it. The teachers who exploit their personality within the context of the L2 classroom accept to self-disclose, to show aspects of themselves, and consequently to be perceived by learners in a certain manner, which may be a way to cater for all the participants' motivation (Dörnyei, 2007), to detour from being a communication conductor or comprehension facilitator, to become a rapport manager, to live the space of the classroom in a certain way. Eventually, it is up to every single language teacher to negotiate with the learners what is legitimate, possible, impossible, appropriate and inappropriate within the context of the language classroom. Beyond the institutional expectancies, there will always remain the participants' personality and much more complex identities.

6. Transcription convention

R, CD, N, J, MF: teacher	/fragment/: phonetic transcription

EM, FT, AF1, AF2: learners (0.2): silence measured in tenth of seconds +: silence shorter than (0.2) seconds :, :, ::: : syllable progressively lengthened ↑: rising intonation (.): breath intake ((fragment)): analyst's commentary, additional information [Fragment] [Fragment]: overlapping turns	(fragment): analyst's commentaries, additional information FRAGMENT: loud utterance Frag-ment: self-correction, hesitation, {fragment}: analyst is uncertain °fragment°: whispering #fragment#: laughter while speaking XXX: incomprehensible =: two turns linked without a pause 22: line number →: observed phenomenon

7. References

Aguilar Río, J. I. (2011). L'étude de la cognition enseignante à travers l'auto-confrontation : problématiques de recherche et précautions méthodologiques. In V. Bigot & L. Cadet (Eds.), *Discours d'enseignants sur leur action In classe : Enjeux théoriques et enjeux de formation*, Actes académiques (pp. 61–73). Paris: Riveneuve éditions.

Aguilar Río, J. I. (2010). Pour une analyse de la «présentation de soi» de l'enseignant de L2 : Style revendiqué, aspects relationnels, décisions interactionnelles. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. Paris.

Antaki, C. & S. Widdicombe (Ed.). (1998). *Identities in Talk*. London: SAGE.

Arditty, J. & Vasseur, M.-T. (1999). Interaction et langue étrangère : présentation. *Langages*, *134*, 3–19.

Bange, P., Carol, R., & Griggs, P. (2005). *L'apprentissage d'une langue étrangère : Cognition et interaction*. L'Harmattan.

Bertin, J.-C. & Narcy-Combes, J.-P. (2007). Monitoring the Learner–Who, Why and What For? *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *20*(5), 443–457.

Bertin, J.-C., P. Gravé et J.-P. Narcy-Combes. (2010). *Second Language Distance Learning and Teaching: Theoretical Perspectives and Didactic Ergonomics*. Hershey: IGI Global.

Block, D. (2007). The Rise of Identity in SLA Research, Post Firth and Wagner (1997). *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*, 863–876.

Block, D. (2003). *The Social Turn in Second Language Acquisition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Bogaards, P. (1988). *Aptitude et affectivité dans l'apprentissage des langues étrangères*. Paris:

Crédif-Didier.

Borg, S. (2011). Teacher learning on the Delta. *Research notes*, *45*, 19–25.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*, 81–109.

Borg, S. (2009). Language teacher cognition. In J. C. Richards et A. Burns (Ed.), *The Cambridge Guide to Second Language Teacher Education* (pp. 163–171). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bucholtz, M., & Hall, K. (2005). Identity and interaction: a sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*, *7*(4-5), 585 –614.

Cachet, O. (2009). Professionnalisme des enseignants et complexité :vers une conception dynamique de l'agir. *Lidil*, *39*, 133–150.

Cambra Giné, M. (2003). *Une approche ethnographique de la classe de langue*. Paris: Crédif-Didier.

Cicurel, F. (1991). L'identité discursive d'un apprenant In langue. *Interactions In langue étrangère* (pp. 259–269). Aix-In-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence.

Cicurel, F. (1994). Marques et traces de la position de l'autre dans les discours d'enseignement des langues. *Les carnets du Cediscor*, *2*, 93–107.

Cicurel, F. (2002). La classe de langue : un lieu ordinaire, une interaction complexe. *AILE*, *16*, 145–163.

Cicurel, F. (2005). La flexibilité communicative : un atout pour la construction de l'agir enseignant. *Le français dans le monde : Recherches et applications*, *167*, 145–164.

Compton, L.K.L. (2009). Preparing language teachers to teach language online: a look at skills, roles, and responsibilities. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, *22*(1), 73–99.

Conseil de l'Europe. (2001). *Un Cadre Européen de Référence pour les Langues: Apprendre, Enseigner, Évaluer*. Strsbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.

Coste, D. (2009). Postface : Médiation et altérité. *Lidil*, *39*, 163–170.

De Bot, K., Lowie, W. & Verspoor, M. (2007). A Dynamic Systems Theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *10*(1), 7–21.

Dörnyei, Z. (2003). Attitudes, Orientations and Motivations in Languague Learning: Advances in Theory, Research, and Applications. *Language Learning*, *53*(1), 3–32.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). Creating a motivational classroom environment. In J. Cummins & C. Davidson (Ed.), *International Handbook of English Language Teaching* (pp. 719–731). New York: Springer.

Dupuis, V., Heyworth, F., Leban, K., Szesztay, M., & Tinsley, T. (2003). *Face à l'avenir : Les enseignants In langues étrangères à travers l'Europe*. Strasbourg: Editions du Conseil de l'Europe.

Edwards, D. (1994). Script Formulations: An Analysis of Event Descriptions in Conversation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *13*(3), 211–247.

Edwards, D. (1998). The relevant thing about her: social identity categories in use. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Eds.), *Identities in Talk* (pp. 15–33). London: Sage.

Ellis, N. C. (2008). The Dynamics of Second Language Emergence: Cycles of Language Use, Language Change, and Language Acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(2), 232–249.

Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997). On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 285–300.

Freeman, D. (2002). The hidden side of the work: Teacher knowledge and learning to teach. A perspective from north American educational research on teacher education in English language teaching. *Language Teaching*, *35*(1), 1–13.

Gangestad, S. W. & Snyder, M. (2000). Self-Monitoring: Appraisal and Reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(4), 530–555.

Garfinkel, H. (1996). Ethnomethodology's Program. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *59*(1), 5–21.

Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behaviour: Novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, *12*(2), 161–182.

Gergen, K. J. (1971). *The concept of self*. New York: Holt, Rineheart and Winston, Inc.

Germain, C. (2001). *Évolution de l'enseignement des langues : 5000 ans d'histoire*. Paris: CLE International.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Double Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. (1968). *Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New Jersey: Pelican Books.

Gumperz, J. J. (1997). *Language and social identity*. Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. (2005). Conversation Analysis and Institutional Talk. In Fitch, K. & Sanders, R. (Ed.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction* (pp. 103–147). Mahwah: Routledge.

Hetzron, R. (1991). On the structure of punchlines. *Humor - International Journal of Humor Research*, *4*(1), 61–108.

Heyworth, F. (2003). Language educators as agents of change: new developments in language pedagogy and their influence on the status of language education. In P. Rádai (Ed.), *The status of language educators* (pp. 95–100). Graz: Council of Europe Publishing.

Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self-Discrepancy: A Theory Relating Self and Affect. *Psychological Review*, *94*(3), 319–340.

Imai, Y. (2010). Emotions in SLA: New Insights From Collaborative Learning for an EFL Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *94*(2), 278–292.

Kasper, G. (1997). A Stands for Acquisition: A Response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, *81*(3), 307–312.

Lahire, B. (1998). *L'homme pluriel : Les ressorts de l'action*. Paris: Nathan.

Lambert, P. (2009). (Dé)construction de clôtures identitaires dans un espace scolaire : un regard sociolinguistique impliqué. *Lidil*, *39*, 43–56.

Lantolf, J. P. (Ed.). (1994). *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research*. Second Language Learnin. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2007). On the complementarity of Chaos/Complexity Theory and Dynamic Systems Theory in understanding the second language acquisition process. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *10*(1), 35–37.

Larsen-Freeman, D. et Cameron, L. (2008). Research Methodology on Language Development from a Complex Systems Perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, *92*(2), 200–213.

Leinhardt, G. & Greeno, J. (1986). The cognitive skill of teaching. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *78*(2), 75–95.

Levine, G. S. (2011). *Code Choice in the Language Classroom*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

Lipiansky, E. M. (1990). Identité subjective et interaction. In C. Camilleri (Ed.), *Stratégies identitaires*, Psychologie d'aujourd'hui (pp. 173–211). Paris: PUF.

Lipiansky, E. M. (1995). Théories de la communication et conceptions du sujet. *Modèles d'interaction verbale* (pp. 187–198). Aix-In-Provence: Publications de l'université de

Provence.

Marc, E. (2005). *Psychologie de l'identité : Soi et le groupe*. Paris: Dunod.

Markus, H. & Kunda, Z. (1986). Stability and Malleability of the Self-Concept. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*(4), 858–866.

Markus, H. & Nurius, P. (1986). Possible Selves. *American Psychologist*, *41*(9), 954–969.

Matei, G. S., & Medgyes, P. (2003). Teaching English is a political act: A non-p.c. dialogue. In P. Rádai (Ed.), *The status of language educators* (pp. 69–77). Graz: Council of Europe Publishing.

McHoul, A. (1978). The organization of turns at formal talk in the classroom. *Language in Society*, *7*(2), 183–213.

Mondada, L. (1999). L'accomplissement de l' « étrangéité » dans et par l'interaction : procédures de catégorisation des locuteurs. *Langages*, *134*, 20–34.

Mondada, L. & Pekarek Doehler, S. (2004). Second Language Acquisition as Situated Practice: Task Accomplishment in the French Second Language Classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, *88*(4), 501–518.

Narcy-Combes, J.-P., Narcy-Combes, M.-F., & Starkey-Perret, R. (2009). Discours des enseignants sur leur formation et leur métier : quel lien avec la motivation des élèves ? Résultats d'une enquête préliminaire. (F. RABY & J.-P. Narcy-Combes, Eds.)*Lidil*, La motivation pour l'apprentissage d'une langue seconde, (40), 139–157.

Norton, B., & Toohey, K. (2011). Identity, Language Learning, and Social Change. *Language Teaching*, *44*(04), 412–446.

Norton, B. (1997). Language, Identity, and the Ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*(3), 409–428.

Pomerantz, A. (2008). «Tú Necesitas Preguntar In Español»: Negotiating Good Language Learner Identity in a Spanish Classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *7*, 253–271.

Pomerantz, A. (2005). Using participants' video stimulated comments to complement analyses of interactional practices. In H. T. Molder & J. Potter (Ed.), *Conversation and Cognition* (pp. 93–113). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pomerantz, A. (1994). Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (Ed.), *Structures of*

Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis, Studies in Emotion and Social Interaction (pp. 57–101). Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres.

Richards, K. (2006). 'Being the Teacher': Identity and Classroom Conversation. *Applied Linguistics*, *27*(1), 51–77.

Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1995). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A description and analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Riley, P. (2007). *Language, culture and identity: an ethnolinguistic perspective*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Russell, L. (2005). It's a question of trust: balancing the relationship between students and teachers in ethnographic fieldwork. *Qualitative Research*, *5*(2), 181–199.

Schegloff, E. (1991). Conversation Analysis and Socially Shared Cognition. In L. B. Resnick, J. M. Levine, & S. D. Teasley (Eds.), *Perspectives on socially shared cognition* (pp. 150–171). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Schegloff, E. (1992). On talk and its institutional occasions. In P. Drew & J. Heritage (Eds.), *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings* (pp. 101–134). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seedhouse, P. (1996). Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities. *ELT Journal*, *50*(1), 16–24.

Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Talburt, S., & Stewart, M. A. (1999). What's the Subject of Study Abroad?: Race, Gender, and «Living Culture». *The Modern Language Journal*, *83*(2), 163–175.

Ten Have, P. (1999). *Doing Conversational Analysis: A Practical Guide*. London: Sage.

Vasquez, A. (1990). Les mécanismes des stratégies identitaires : une perspective diachronique. *Stratégies identitaires*, Psychologie aujourd'hui (pp. 143–171). Paris: PUF.

Vasseur, M.-T. (2000). De l'usage de l'inégalité dans l'interaction-acquisition In langue étrangère. *Acquisition et interaction In langue étrangère*, *12*, 51–76.

Walls, R. T., Nardo, A. H., von Minden, A. M. & Hoffman, N. (2002). The characteristics of effective and ineffective teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *29*(1), 39–48.

Williams, M. & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for Language Teachers: A social constructivist*

approach. Cambridge: CUP.

Woods, D., & Çakır, H. (2011). Two dimensions of teacher knowledge: The case of communicative language teaching. *System*, *39*(3), 381–390.

Woods, D. (1996). *Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: Beliefs, decision-making and classroom practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Identity, Context and Interaction. In C. Antaki & S. Widdicombe (Ed.), *Identities in Talk* (pp. 87–106). London: SAGE.

Zuengler, J. (1989). Identity and IL development and use. *Applied Linguistics*, *10*(1), 80–96.