

Face Saving and Conflicting Frames: An Analysis of Interaction between Native and Nonnative ESL Teachers

Antonieta Cal y Mayor Turnbull¹

INTRODUCTION

This study presents the analysis of a workplace interaction between two nonnative-English as a second language teachers and one native-English as a second language teacher. The aim of the study is to investigate how frames, alignment and footing are signaled in this work-related conversation and to analyze the role of face saving in the appearance of conflicting frames. In addition, this study aims to contribute to the research that has been conducted in both institutional and noninstitutional settings where professionals of different language and cultural backgrounds happen to interact.

Analysis of conversation between native and nonnative speakers of English seems to provide evidence that different use of contextualization cues can lead to misunderstanding (Gumperz, 1982; Gumperz, Jupp & Roberts, 1979; Roberts, Davies & Jupp, 1992). However, when conversation takes place between native and nonnative teachers of English as a second language (NES teachers and NNES teachers) other issues besides misunderstanding may arise. One of these issues can be the active involvement of the participants to save one's or the other's face, which can create conflicting frames during the interaction.

¹ Antonieta Cal y Mayor Turnbull completed her MA in Applied Linguistics at Teachers College and she is currently finishing her EdM at the same institution. She is a lecturer at the School of Languages of the Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas Campus I, Chiapas, México. Her research interests include face-saving and relations of power and dominance, developmental pragmatics, and codeswitching. She is also interested in education and training of second and foreign language teachers, particularly teachers of English, French, and Spanish. Correspondence should be sent to: Antonieta Cal y Mayor Turnbull. Escuela de Lenguas C-I, Universidad Autónoma de Chiapas, Boulevard Belisario Domínguez Km. 1081, Calzada a Rectoría S/N Tuxtla Gutiérrez, Chiapas; México. CP. 29020. E-mail: acymt@hotmail.com.

In the field of TESOL, nativeness is still much appreciated in spite of the severe critiques to the belief that a native speaker is a superior language teacher (“native speaker fallacy”, Phillipson, 1992, p. 195). NNES teachers still confront discriminating hiring procedures worldwide. In several countries native English speakers are sometimes preferred over NNES teachers, without taking into consideration the amount of experience or teaching expertise they may have, thus perpetuating the myth that in the TESOL profession what a native speaker says has “authenticity and authority” (Widdowson, 1994, p. 386). In the United States and Japan, for instance, prospective employers state upfront in newspaper ads that they require ‘native English speakers’, or simply have the tendency to hire primarily native speakers (Mahboob, Uhrig, Newman and Hartford, 2004; Norton, 1997; Simon-Maeda, 2004; Tang, 1997). In the case of Canada, Mawhinney and Xu (1997) report that foreign-trained teachers must get rid of their nonstandard accents in order to obtain teaching credentials.

In the academic and professional world, the benefits and drawbacks of being a NNES teacher and having a NNES as a teacher continue to be a source of debate which warrants further inquiry. The few studies conducted up to date have dealt mostly with NNES teachers and NNES teacher trainees’ self-image, beliefs, reflections and fears regarding their language proficiency as well as their position par rapport to their students (Amin, 1997; Duff & Uchida, 1997; Lee & Lew, 2001; Liu, 2001; Polio & Wilson-Duffy, 1998; Reves & Medyges, 2004; Simon-Maeda, 2004). Other studies have analyzed the impact and impression NNES teachers have on their students (Liu, 1999; Mahboob, 2004) or evaluated NNES teachers and NNES teacher trainees’ classroom performance, linguistic proficiency, and cultural awareness (Lazaraton, 2003; Nemtchinova, 2005) concluding that they have both strengths and weaknesses.

Given the still pervasive belief of some employers, students, and researchers that English native speakers make the best English as a second language teachers because NNES teachers are “linguistically handicapped” (Medyges, 1994, p. 103), it is not surprising that NNES teachers seem to be constantly confronted with the need to save their social standing by showing their language competency and teaching expertise to their employers and students. This need to save face may also be extended to NNES teachers’ colleagues, particularly NES teachers. No discourse analysis studies appear to have analyzed interaction between NES and NNES teachers from a frame theory perspective and with the goal of establishing whether the face saving needs NNES teachers experience in the classroom are also manifested outside the classroom when interacting with NES teachers. Using such an approach we could further enrich our understanding of NNES teachers use of contextualization cues to save face. We may also hope to increase NES teachers’ awareness of the need to use linguistic devices which will be less face threatening, not only for the nonnative ESL teacher, but for nonnative users of English in general.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Ever since the anthropologist Gregory Bateson introduced the concept of framing in 1955, frames have played an important role in the analysis of human interaction. Tannen (1993) provides an extensive historical account of the different fields that have visited, revisited, and modified the concept of frame. She mentions, among others, the fields of psychology, artificial intelligence, linguistics, anthropology, and sociology. This paper will only consider the anthropological-sociological orientation of Bateson, Hymes, Frake, and Goffman.

In *A Theory of Play and Fantasy* Bateson (1972) argues that communicative moves, verbal or nonverbal, cannot be understood without reference to what is actually happening. That

is, individuals exchange signals that allow them to agree upon the level of abstraction at which any message is intended. This level of abstraction is conveyed by the metamessage which allows them to identify what frame of interpretation they should apply to the communicative move. He provides a clear example with the reactions of monkeys to a hostile move from one of their own kind. A monkey interprets a bite as “this is play” because, due to its understanding of the metamessage, it *frames* the hostile move as play.

In his work on ethnography of speaking, Hymes (1974) categorizes frames as one of the *means of speaking*. By analyzing how language is used by people in specific cultures and settings, he arrives at the conclusion that in order to be capable of interpreting the utterances in the way they were intended by speakers, hearers must know on what frame they are operating. That is, hearers must know whether the activity in which they are engaging is joking, imitating, chatting, or lecturing.

Frake’s (1977) main contribution to the concept of framing is his opposition to a static notion of frames. He affirms that although participants have their heads full of *cognitive idiolects* or *schemas* these are not simply tapped or elicited but modified according to the circumstances. For him, frames are determined not only by the participants’ expectations on the interaction but by what they actually do when they interact. Using an extended metaphor, Frake sees people as mapmakers whose “culture does not provide a cognitive map, but rather a set of principles for mapmaking and navigation” resulting in “a whole chart case of rough, improvised, continually revised sketch maps” (p. 6-7). This metaphor allows the clear understanding that frames are constructed within the interaction, and that frames can overlap, be embedded or even conflicting.

Following Bateson, Goffman (1974) assumes that “definitions of a situation are built up in accordance with principles of organization which govern events – at least social ones—and

our subjective involvement in them” (p. 7) and it is in these terms that he uses the word *frame*. Goffman (1981) also introduces the concept of *footing*. For him footing is “another way of talking about a change in our frame for events”, and “a change in the alignment we take up to ourselves and the others present as expressed in the way we manage the production or reception of an utterance” (p. 128). Goffman asserts that the linguistic cues used by the participants help us to objectively recognize their footing and therefore provide us with the key elements to identify whether the participants are operating within the same frame and whether they are aligned or not.

Therefore, basic to the understanding and identification of frame, footing and alignment is Gumperz’s (1982, 1999, 2001) concept of contextualization cues. Gumperz (2001) defines contextualization cues as “any verbal sign that, when processed in co-occurrence with symbolic grammatical and lexical signs, serves to construct the contextual ground for situated interpretation and thereby affects how constituent messages are understood” (p. 221).

For Gumperz (1997), there are four different kinds of contextualization cues. The first one is prosody, which includes intonation, stress, accenting, and pitch shifts. The second one is paralinguistic signs, which include tempo, pausing and hesitation, and conversational synchrony. The third one is code choice, which includes code or style switching as well as the different phonetic, phonological, and morphosyntactic choices the speakers make. Finally, there is the choice of lexical forms and formulaic expressions, such as opening or closing routines.

Contextualization cues, besides helping to identify and create frames, are a useful instrument to preserve one’s face or as Goffman (1997) has put it: to present our self to others. According to Cameron (2001) “face is a kind of social standing or esteem which every individual claims for her or himself and wants to respect” (p. 79). Brown and Levinson (1978) distinguish between positive face and negative face. They argue that the positive face portrays the

individual's need to be liked, whereas the negative face portrays the individual's need to be left alone.

Contextualization cues such as modification of lexical and phonological items, pausing and use of certain formulaic expressions, help individuals to preserve both their negative and positive face, and, most of all, they usually help them to preserve their face as a whole, that is, their social role or standing.

Research in the area of Interactional Sociolinguistics has provided evidence that contextualization cues do play an important role in the establishment of frames and in signaling changes in alignment and footing. In institutional settings such as hospitals and mental health institutions, both personnel and patients have been found to use prosody and lexis to signal frames and change footing (Ribeiro, 1993; Tannen, 1986a; Tannen & Wallat, 1993). In noninstitutional settings and in talk among friends, contextualization cues have also been found to be important in the co-construction of frames and to occasionally have miscommunication effects if the hearer does not recognize the frame and misinterprets the footing. The latter has been found to be particularly the case in men-women, husband-wife and mother-daughter interactions (Maltz & Borker, 1982; Tannen, 1986b, 1990, 1994, 2006).

However, with regards to interaction between NES, NNES and speakers of nonstandard variations of English, in both institutional and noninstitutional settings, different use of contextualization cues have mostly been found to be the source of interethnic misunderstandings that have led to negative stereotypes (Akinnaso & Seabrook, 1982; Gumperz, 1982; Gumperz, Jupps, & Roberts, 1979; Hansell & Seabrook, 1982; Roberts, Davies, & Jupp, 1992).

Since the role contextualization cues play in creating misunderstandings and miscommunication among native and nonnative speakers of English has been thoroughly

studied, it seems relevant to analyze other phenomena that might occur when conflicting frames appear during the interaction of NNES and NES teachers, one of these being the need to preserve one's social standing and one's identity as a proficient English user and a competent language teacher.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The research questions addressed in this paper are the following:

1. How do the participants signal the different frames and changes in alignment and footing?
2. Are there any conflicting frames? If so, is there a relationship between conflicting frames and face saving?

METHOD

Participants

Participants were selected according to two criteria: profession and nativeness. Since the binary distinction between native and nonnative is still hotly debated in the literature, it was decided to use self identification as a basis to determine whether the participants were native or nonnative speakers. Since "to be a native speaker means not to be a nonnative speaker" (Davies, 2003, p.213), if participants stated they were native speakers it was assumed they were not nonnative speakers and vice versa.

There are three participants in this study: Mei Ling, Guadalupe and Ralph. Mei Ling is a twenty-two year old Hong-Kong born Cantonese native speaker. She has studied English since she was two years old and has lived in the United States for five years. She has taught English for one year. Mei-Ling sees herself as nonnative speaker of English, but having near native proficiency. Guadalupe is a thirty year old Mexican born Spanish native speaker. She has studied English since she was twelve years old and has lived in the United States for eight

months. She has taught English for almost nine years. She sees herself as a competent nonnative speaker of English. Ralph is a thirty-four year old American born English native speaker. He has taught English for almost three years. All three participants are enrolled in the MA in TESOL program in a North American University and they teach English at that University's ESL program.

Setting

The interaction which will be analyzed was held in the ESL program office, where the participants sometimes meet after they have taught their class and informally talk about their classes. During most of the conversation Mei Ling and Guadalupe were working at the main desk and close to the tape recorder, while Ralph changed location throughout the conversation. Towards the end of the interaction, the three participants went into the photocopy room walking away from the tape recorder, thus making it impossible to keep on recording without moving the tape recorder.

Materials and data collection procedures

A few days before this conversation, the participants had been asked if they self identified themselves as native or nonnative speakers of English. The day of the interaction, participants were asked if they could be tape recorded. They gave their formal consent and agreed to be tape recorded. A Panasonic cassette recorder was placed on the main desk and covered with a handkerchief to make the recording less imposing. The interaction lasted eighteen minutes and it has been wholly transcribed for analysis purposes.

Ralph asked Mei Ling and Guadalupe to perform an activity on idiomatic expressions that had been unsuccessful in his class. The discussion of this activity dominates throughout the interaction (see Appendix C). After the recording the participants were informally interviewed

regarding their language background, contact with English, and their feelings about nativeness and nonnativeness.

Data analysis procedures

The data were analyzed according to frame theory (Bateson, 1972; Goffman, 1981; Tannen, 1993) in order to identify the different frames and the conflicting frames, as well as the ways in which contextualization cues were used to signal a shift in frames, alignment and footing. The contextualization cues that were employed were stress, intonation, rate of delivery, pauses, hesitations, overlaps, and latching.

Once the different frames had been identified, the cross-cultural speech act realization project procedure (Blum-Kulka, House, & Kasper, 1989) was used to analyze the favor frame. The request within the favor frame was analyzed in terms of degree of directness and imposition, as well as by the supportive moves employed by the requester (e.g., attention getter, term of address, precommitment and grounder).

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Three continuing frames were found throughout the interaction: the “favor” frame, “the reflection-on-the-activity” frame, and the “photocopy request” frame. Inside the “favor” frame there were three embedded frames: the “teaching” frame, the “game/challenge” frame and the “teaching-learning” frame.

The “teaching” and the “game/challenge” frames appear separately but come often into conflict. “The teaching frame” turns into “the teaching-learning frame” once it has been accepted by the three participants and it is not conflicting anymore with the “game/challenge” frame. Inside the “teaching-learning” frame there are two embedded frames as well: the “song suggestion” frame and another “game/challenge” frame. Inside the “reflection-on-the-activity”

asking a favor which will impose on his colleagues the burden and risk of showing their knowledge of English.

Excerpt 1.

1 Ralph: Hey you guys um (0.2) *acc--could you do me a favor?--* I had this activity today
2 in my in my I-2 class. and the students thought it was really (0.2)really hard and
3 I was wondering if I could um have *acc--you guys to try it out and see?--* (0.2) see
4 how you feel about it.

A thorough analysis of excerpt 1 evidences that Ralph sees this request as a highly face-threatening act because he uses a great degree of politeness to ask for this favor. First, he uses an attention getter (“*hey*”) and a term of address (“*you guys*”). Both of them are informal and might suggest that Ralph wants to build rapport with the other two teachers. Then he employs a precommitment (“*could you do me a favor?*”) and provides a grounder (“*I had this activity today in my I-2 class and the students thought it was really hard*”). Finally, he delivers the head act proper, that is, he makes his request (“*I was wondering if I could have you guys to try it out*”). In both the precommitment and the head act, Ralph uses the conventionally indirect expression “*could*” and minimizes his imposition by introducing his request with the syntactical downgrader “*I was wondering if*”. This provides evidence that Ralph is playing the role of a polite requester who is at the same time protecting his positive face and the negative face of Mei Ling and Guadalupe.

Since his request is polite, and, although imposing, has been minimized, Guadalupe and Mei Ling cordially align and agree to help as can be seen in excerpt 2. However, their alignment is not as formal and elaborated as Ralph’s request. They agree with a simple “*sure*”.

Excerpt 2.

5 Guadalupe: Su[re]
6 Mei Ling: [Su]re

The “teaching” frame

The teaching frame appears several times throughout the interaction. It starts when Ralph provides the instructions for the activity as shown in excerpt 3. When giving the instructions, he changes his footing from being a favor requester to a teacher. He begins his teacher role by giving the instructions in an indirect manner (“*so there’s like one half and you know the parts*”) and then reinforcing it in a direct manner (“*you have to make*”), and also by speaking at a slower rate, perhaps to make sure his ‘students’ will understand (line 14).

Excerpt 3.

- 10 Ralph: that they would be able to sort of put them together *acc--so each /item/ is divided*
 11 *into two parts-- so there’s like one half and you know the parts because one half*
 12 *is written in like capital letters? and the pairs are all written in lower case letters=*
 13 Guadalupe: =wow=
 —→ 14 Ralph: =so you have to make a pair like *decc>one upper case and one lower case<.=*
 15 Guadalupe: =OK=

It seems that in his following turn Ralph attempts to assume a colleague role. He changes footing constantly in lines 16 through 19. In line 17 he says “*and I won’t tell you*”, however he changes his mind and goes into providing clues to the arrangement of the cards “*the beginnings of the phrases are all in lower cases*”. He then accelerates changing his footing and being once again the colleague giving a suggestion without imposing (“*can divide them up*”) but finally goes back to the teacher role decreasing his speech of delivery and repeating the instructions (“*try to match them up into sayings*”).

Excerpt 4.

- 16 Ralph: =So *acc-- here they are--* and I won’t tell you *acc--well actually OK--* ah the
 17 *decc>beginnings of the phrases are all in lower cases.< OK so you acc--can*
 —→ 18 *divide them up?-- right? and then try to decc>try to match them up into (0.2)*
 19 *sayings< there should be about ten in total.*

After these sudden changes in footing, Ralph finally adheres to his teaching role and continues in his teaching frame. It seems he wants to influence the participants’ action. This is shown in excerpt 5 where he intervenes while Mei Ling and Guadalupe have been silently

working. It appears as if he wants to double check if his instructions have been understood because he repeats that all the sayings are related to money (line 21).

Excerpt 5.

(6 seconds elapse between lines 19 and 20)

- 20 Mei Ling: (6.0) °° *Maybe we should.* °°
 21 Ralph: And they all relate to to money *acc--in some way--.*

The “game/challenge” frame

Mei Ling and Guadalupe are completely engaged in the activity as evidenced by the latching, mutual questioning, intonation and laughs present in excerpts 6, 7, 8 and 9. Once the instructions have been given and the cards displayed, Mei Ling and Guadalupe seem not to see this as a favor anymore. The data suggests they see it as a combination of “a game” and “a challenge”, because they are enjoying themselves doing the activity (i.e., they laugh), but they also want to complete it on their own (i.e., they do not want Ralph to intervene). It seems as if they want to preserve their positive face as nonnative English teachers, showing they know enough English to complete a supposedly intermediate level activity.

Excerpt 6 exemplifies that Mei Ling and Guadalupe are involved and aligned working on the activity. Guadalupe shows her enthusiasm by stressing the key word that completes the saying: “*jackpot*”. Mei Ling latches on Guadalupe’s answer giving her approval and showing her involvement.

Excerpt 6.

- 22 Guadalupe: Hit the jackpot I say jackpot so=
 23 Mei Ling: =Yes

There are also several consecutive turns in which Mei Ling and Guadalupe are aligned and cooperating completing the activity. In excerpt 7 their involvement and alignment are evidenced by their latching utterances, rising intonation and the emphasis they put on they key words “*go, go broke*”.

Excerpt 7.

- 33 Mei Ling: Or (0.2) to go?=
- 34 Guadalupe: =Where's go?=
- 35 Mei Ling: =Yeah here to go broke I think because to be can be
- 36 many things=
- 37 Guadalupe: =Yes

The data suggest that Mei Ling and Guadalupe seem to be enjoying themselves and are actively involved as evidenced by their laughter and raising intonation. Excerpts 8 and 9 show how they stress the key words and laugh. They ask each other's approval on their guesses. This is evidenced in the following two excerpts in the way the key words "*bacon, bank, loaded*" are stressed. The use of raising intonation in lines 38, 40 and 113 shows uncertainty and search for the other's opinion.

Excerpt 8.

- 38 Mei Ling: To be the bacon? ((laughs))
- 39 Guadalupe: I have no idea. ((laughs))
- 40 Mei Ling: To be the bank? ((laughs))
- 41 Guadalupe: ((laughs))

In excerpts 8 and 9 Guadalupe and Mei Ling laugh at their responses. It seems that in spite of the challenge and the risk of losing face, they see the activity as a game. Furthermore, excerpt 9 shows how even after accepting the "teaching-learning" frame in line 94 (see excerpt 17 below), Mei Ling and Guadalupe sometimes still go back to the "game/challenge" frame, because they keep on trying to complete the activity on their own.

Excerpt 9.

- (Mei Ling and Guadalupe continue working silently with the pieces. Mei Ling attempts to make a saying and laughs at the results) (3 seconds elapse between lines 114 and 115)
- 115 Mei Ling: (3.0) ((laughs))=
- 116 Guadalupe: =((laughs))
- 117 Mei Ling: =/??/?/ ((laughs))
- 118 Guadalupe: Oh God °°*To be*°° To be loaded?
- 119 Mei Ling: Yes, yes to be loaded.. with money:

Although they have not yet mentioned that they see the activity as face threatening, it seems that they may have perceived it as such, because they externalize those feelings towards the end of the "game/challenge" frame as evidenced in excerpts 10 and 11. In line 71 Mei Ling

provides a reason for not being able to complete the activity, apparently trying to take out the blame from herself.

Excerpt 10.

- 71 Mei Ling: Because we don't really learn any of these in our ESL classes so:=
 72 Ralph: =Yeah=
 73 Mei Ling: =I
 74 really don't (0.2) know any of these ((laughs)) [I mean I know like]=
 75 Ralph: [OK interesting]
 76 Mei Ling: = [two or three]

However, in excerpt 11 Mei Ling takes the blame and responsibility as she states that it is “*embarrassing*”, and although Ralph tries to save her face by saying “*it shouldn't be embarrassing*”, Guadalupe aligns with Mei Ling saying “*sort of*”, apparently showing that this is embarrassing for her as well and that she has also lost face.

Excerpt 11.

- 87 Ralph: =This just confirms my experience which was
 88 that they thought it was quite hard so:=
 —→ 89 Mei Ling: =This is so embarrassing ((nervous laugh))
 90 Ralph: It shouldn't be embarrassing=
 —→ 91 Guadalupe: =Well: sort of

Conflicting frames

The “teaching” and the “game/challenge” frames have been analyzed simply as embedded frames within the “favor” frame. However, these frames conflict several times as illustrated in the excerpts presented in this section. In excerpt 12 the two frames conflict for the first time when Ralph tries to provide help but he is stopped shortly by Guadalupe who overlaps and asks him to “*hold on*”. When Ralph insists on taking his turn back Guadalupe continues to ask him to “*hold on*” and she raises her voice trying to stop him. However, Ralph insists on showing himself as a supportive teacher. The data suggest that while Guadalupe is trying to save her face by asking to have enough time to complete the activity, Ralph is trying to save both Guadalupe and Mei Ling's face by saying that the activity is in fact hard and by wanting to help them.

Excerpt 12.

26 Guadalupe: (3.0) See might not be=
 27 Ralph: =OK see[is]
 →28 Guadalupe: [OK]we will hold [on HOLD ON]
 →29 Ralph: [I'm thinking it]might be kind
 30 of hard=

In excerpt 13 the frames conflict again. Ralph tries to intervene as a supportive teacher when Mei Ling shows her disappointment saying “*I don’t know*”. He wants to stop the activity but Guadalupe pays no attention to him. She overlaps with him while thinking out loud. Since her guess is not the appropriate one, instead of saying “*that’s wrong*”, Ralph seems to disguise his disapproval of the guess by conveying the same meaning in an indirect manner, possibly to save Guadalupe’s face. He simply says in lines 45 and 46 “*somebody actually said cheap the bacon*”.

Excerpt 13.

42 Mei Ling: I don’t know.
 43 Ralph: Oh OK all [right so I’m just going to]
 →44 Guadalupe: [°°cheap bacon? °° Cheap the]bacon? Cheap the=
 →45 Ralph: =Somebody actually
 46 said cheap the ba[con but that’s not]
 47 Guadalupe: [Yea but that’s not] I keep thinking like=

In excerpt 14, Ralph tries to intervene in the activity by approaching the desk and seeing what Mei Ling and Guadalupe are doing. Although he does not speak, the data suggest that Mei Ling sees this as an attempt to impose a teaching frame and stop the activity, so she asks him to let them try. Guadalupe does not react to Ralph’s physical movement but she does react to Ralph’s attempt to steal the floor from her in line 58. This is evidenced by how she overlaps with him and tells him to “*hold on*” and then once again raises her voice repeating “*hold on*” in order to stop him shortly as she had previously done (see line 28 in excerpt 12 above).

Excerpt 14.

→55 Mei Ling: =Let me let us try=
 56 Guadalupe: =to bring home the bacon that’s it
 57 that’s it that’s the one=
 →58 Ralph: =I think [I think]

59 Guadalupe: [hold on] HOLD ON let us try=
 60 Mei Ling: =(laughs))

The conflicting frames reach their climax in excerpt 15. Ralph insists on providing help but both Mei Ling and Guadalupe emphatically refuse his help by raising their voices when saying “no” and by elongating the vowels. However, both of them laugh after refusing which seems to imply that Ralph should understand that this is a game and that the refusal should not be taken as part of the game.

Excerpt 15.

→ 61 Ralph: If you want me to tell you when=
 → 62 Mei Ling: =[NO:: (laughs)]=
 → 63 Guadalupe: =[NO::(laughs)]=

Up to this point Guadalupe and Mei Ling appear to have been aligned ‘against’ Ralph, thus being ‘we’ against ‘you’. Their footing has been constant, since they see each other as two nonnative teachers who need to prove to the native teacher colleague they can do the activity.

However, in excerpt 16, there seems to be a change in footing on Guadalupe’s part. In spite of Mei Ling and Guadalupe’s refusal of help, Ralph insists on providing help, though not by giving the answers, but only by telling them when they are wrong. Guadalupe aligns with him in line 66 by saying “OK” apparently accepting the teaching frame and the help, but Mei Ling rejects his proposal emphatically by repeating “no” four times, to make it clear his help is not needed, and therefore misaligns with Ralph and Guadalupe in an attempt to remain in the game/challenge frame and save face. As shown in line 70, Guadalupe goes on in attempting to perform the activity on her own by taking a guess and then asking for Mei Ling’s approval on her guess with a tag question (“*cold hard cash, isn’t it?*”). This follow-up line challenges the earlier idea of Guadalupe accepting the “teaching frame” in line 66. We can speculate whether she was using “OK” as a back channeling cue or as an acceptance of the “teaching frame”.

Excerpt 16.

- 64 Ralph: =I can tell you when you are
 65 wrong=
 → 66 Guadalupe: =[OK]
 → 67 Mei Ling: =[No] no no no=
 68 Ralph: =acc-Otherwise /?/-- but I was so surprised because it was
 69 like
 → 70 Guadalupe: Cold had cash, isn't it?

The data seem to show that the conflicting frames have three implications. First, they appear to reinforce the notion that for Mei Ling and Guadalupe the task is not a favor, it is a combination of a game and challenge. Second, they give the impression that Mei Ling and Guadalupe are trying to save face by not giving up and trying to perform the task on their own. It seems that they feel that since they are English teachers, they should be able to do the activity, and, that if they are not, they lose face as language professionals. Third, the data appear to demonstrate that Ralph tries to impose his teaching frame, but not in a threatening manner; on the contrary, he wants to impose a “friendly teacher” frame trying to save his students’ (in this case his colleagues’) face in several ways: by trying to stop the activity, by trying to provide help, and by commenting on how difficult the activity actually is.

As evidenced in the data presented above and in the complete transcript, it seems that although both parties are trying to save face, they look at the issue from different perspectives. On the one hand, Ralph sees the face saving situation as his responsibility, since he is the one who asked Guadalupe and Mei Ling to do him a favor and who placed them in this embarrassing situation of not being able to perform the task. On the other hand, Mei Ling and Guadalupe see the face saving as their own responsibility: they have to show they are capable of doing the task, and they do not want to rely on Ralph’s help.

The “teaching-learning” frame

The “teaching” and the “game/challenge” frames are often in conflict. However, after Mei Ling and Guadalupe realize they cannot cope with the challenge on their own, they accept “the teaching frame” thus changing it into a “teaching-learning frame”, because it is no longer being imposed on them and they actively participate in the construction of this new frame.

In excerpt 17, the data show that Ralph and Guadalupe are aligned. In line 94, Ralph offers his help in an unobtrusive manner. He offers his help as if it were a request thus trying to save Guadalupe and Mei Ling’s face. Moreover, he uses a conventionally indirect word “*can*” and points out the accomplishment of his nonnative colleagues by choosing to tell them which words are “*right*” instead of which items are “*wrong*”, as he had done before (see line 65, on excerpt 16). His help is not rejected by Mei Ling and is accepted by Guadalupe who aligns with him by using the expressions “*yeah*” and “*OK*”. Although it can be argued that these can be acting as back channeling cues, the latching and repetition of the utterances seems to provide evidence that this time Guadalupe is truly aligned and has accepted the “teaching frame”, co-constructing the “teaching-learning” frame.

Excerpt 17.

→	94	Ralph:	=Can I tell you the ones that are right?= =Yeah= =OK this is
→	95	Guadalupe:	
	96	Ralph:	
	97	right. this is right. this is (0.2)not right. =	
→	98	Guadalupe:	=OK=

In excerpt 18 the data show that Mei Ling has also accepted the teaching-learning frame. This is evidenced by the latching utterances of Ralph and Mei Ling, and by Mei Ling’s acceptance of the suggestion that “*dead*” goes with one of the short ones.

Excerpt 18.

	145	Mei Ling:	=Dead skate?
	146	Ralph: (0.5)To what?= =I’m saying= =Dead no.. dead.. acc--but it goes with ayy?--=	
→	147	Mei Ling:	
→	148	Ralph:	

- 149 Mei Ling: = no?=
 150 Ralph: it goes with one of the short ones=
 → 151 Mei Ling: =OK ((laughs))

The data suggest that Guadalupe and Mei Ling have clearly accepted Ralph's position as their teacher. In excerpt 19 Guadalupe asks for Ralph's help. This is marked in line 164 by her raising intonation waiting for a reply. Ralph provides a clear response to which Guadalupe asks for confirmation in line 167. Then, once again in line 169, Guadalupe asks him to repeat the word as she would do with a teacher.

Excerpt 19.

- 163 Mei Ling: Skate?
 → 164 Guadalupe: What does that mean?
 165 Ralph: OK a cheapskate is a person like a *decc>stingy person<* a person who would not
 166 spend money.=
 → 167 Guadalupe: =OK like Scrooge=
 168 Ralph: =Scrooge=
 → 169 Guadalupe: =OK (0.5) How did you say the word?

In excerpt 20, Mei Ling once again relies on Ralph to find an answer to her questions. She seeks confirmation for the expression "*you are known as a deadbeat*" in line 193.

Excerpt 20.

- 188 Ralph: you're a deadbeat
 → 189 Mei Ling: If *decc you don't pay?* [Your debts?]
 → 190 Ralph: [If you don't]pay like the money that you owe yeah
 → 191 Mei Li: Then you are in=
 192 Ralph: =You are known as a deadbeat=
 → 193 Mei Ling: =You are known as a?=
 =

As was mentioned at the beginning of the analysis, the "teaching-learning" frame permeates throughout the interaction. The "reflection-on-the-activity" frame begins in line 229 (see excerpt 23 below), but Mei Ling and Guadalupe still ask Ralph questions about the content of the activity, thus seeming to bring again a "teaching-learning" frame within the "reflection-on-the-activity" frame as evidenced in excerpt 21. In this excerpt Mei Ling and Guadalupe still acknowledge Ralph as the native speaker who knows the answers and who can teach them

something new. In fact, both nonnative teachers keep on asking him questions about sayings they do not understand, as can be seen in lines 319, 321 and 329.

Excerpt 21.

- 319 Mei ling: [What] does that mean? to
 320 feel like the bank. (0.2) [acc--Like that you have a lot of money?--]
 → 321 Guadalupe: [decc> do you use it too?< In English or not?
 322 Ralph: Well it's there's something related but I don't we don't I don't say it that way
 323 like acc--I would say something like--=
 324 Guadalupe: =like if someone comes and asks [you]
 326 Ralph: [right]
 327 Guadalupe: =for [money]
 328 Ralph: [acc--for money] all the time--=
 → 329 Guadalupe: =How would you decc>ever say?<=

The “song suggestion” frame.

Embedded within the “teaching-learning” frame, we find the “song suggestion” frame. As shown in excerpt 22, Guadalupe signals a change of frame by singing and changing the topic. She also signals a change of footing. She is not longer a participant trying to match the sayings, nor a student learning from her teacher, but a teacher who can give suggestions to her colleague.

Guadalupe seems to carefully introduce her suggestion by asking Ralph if he has planned to bring other songs, instead of stating her suggestion up front. When Guadalupe sees that Ralph is not really interested in her suggestion when he says “*there's a lot of money songs*” (line 130), she takes on his idea to use Madonna's “Material Girl” emphasizing that it is a very nice song but yet again gives another suggestion. This time Ralph seems to accept the suggestion by saying “*that's a good idea, I should look for the video*”. Mei Ling brings them back into the “teaching-learning” frame by trying to continue with the activity, as can be seen in line 137. Guadalupe and Ralph align with her, thus leaving the “song suggestion” frame.

Excerpt 22.

(Guadalupe turns away from the desk and the activity and while making the “song” suggestion she faces Ralph)

- 120 Guadalupe: *sing Money money money is so funny* Are you bringing any other songs?
 121 Ralph: We're going to do Material Girl on=
 122 Mei Ling: =Ouh=

- 123 Ralph: =Monday=
 124 Guadalupe: =Oh good 'cause there's this
 → 125 I was thinking I listened to the ABBA song *sing money money money*=
 126 Ralph: =That's
 127 a good one too.=
 128 Mei Ling: =Yeah=
 129 Guadalupe: =And I thought about it=
 → 130 Ralph: =--acc/??/?/-- there's a lot of money
 131 songs=
 132 Mei Ling: =Yeah=
 133 Ralph: =And I was trying to pick a good one.
 → 134 Guadalupe: Material Girl is very nice and if you can get hold of the video it's so funny,
 135 very eighties like
 → 136 Ralph: *acc--that's a good idea--* I should look for the video.
 → 137 Mei Ling: To break=
 138 Guadalupe: =To break the (0.2) to break the bank to break the /?/=
 139 Ralph: =Wait wait wait

The “reflection-on-the-activity” frame

Once the favor has been completed, that is, once Mei Ling and Guadalupe have tried to complete the activity, first without and then with Ralph's help, the three of them change from the “teaching-learning” frame to the “reflection-on-the-activity” frame. In this last frame, the three participants are once again in equal roles as they were in the overarching favor frame: they are language teachers.

Excerpt 23 is the beginning of “the reflection-on-the-activity” frame. The data evidences that all three participants share their feelings towards the activity, and that they do it as teachers. Ralph is not afraid of sharing that “*he felt bad*” during his class (line 229). Mei Ling appears to feel free to point out to him that the idioms seemed easy for him because he is a native speaker, but that for nonnative speakers, including teachers and students, they are not so easy.

Excerpt 23.

- 229 Ralph: [I felt bad] because I thought I though they were more strongly like (0.2)
 230 collocated? [like]
 231 Guadalupe: [The] problem is that if [we have not]
 → 232 Mei Ling: [They are to]native speakers=
 233 Guadalupe: =[Yeah]

In excerpt 24, the involvement of the three participants in the discussion is evidenced by their latching and overlapping. Once Ralph has shared his feelings towards the activity both Mei Ling and Guadalupe appear to feel ratified to express their opinions. In lines 246 and 247 Mei Ling and Guadalupe agree that using fewer expressions would be better. Guadalupe even stresses the word “*five*”.

Excerpt 24.

242 Ralph: I think maybe giving fewer I think I should just give [like]
 243 Mei Ling: [fewer] would be [good]
 244 Ralph: [four]
 245 five=
 → 246 Mei Ling: =five maybe=
 → 247 Guadalupe: =five

Excerpt 25 shows the high involvement of the participants while reflecting on the activity, evidenced primarily by the constant latching. It also shows that Ralph acknowledges his colleagues by asking their opinion about how to make the activity easier.

Excerpt 25.

295 Ralph: = acc--I wonder if I should have given an entire
 → 296 sentence-- like ilus you know using the idiom, you think that would make it
 297 easier to match?
 → 298 Mei Ling: no=
 299 Ralph: =more text=
 300 Guadalupe: =no=
 301 Ralph: =less cut=
 302 Guadalupe: =no I think this is fine just to help them make wild
 303 guesses and maybe after giving them this then give them the sentence=

Finally, it seems important to point out that within this frame it appears that the face saving now relies on the nonnative speakers. As can be inferred from the data, Ralph’s activity was unsuccessful and he does not hesitate to recognize this failure to his colleagues. In fact, Guadalupe repeatedly tries to save Ralph’s face by making positive comments about this activity and about him as a teacher. However, as evidenced in excerpts 26 and 27, Ralph does not acknowledge Guadalupe’s positive comments. On the contrary, he goes on stating how bad designed the activity was for his students and how frustrated he felt.

In excerpt 26 below, Guadalupe tries twice to save Ralph's face. First, she states that the activity is really good (line 257), then she latches her utterance with Ralph's and emphasizes that she liked the activity very much and that Ralph is very creative, emphasizing the words "liked", "very much" and "creative", and saying the sentence "you are so creative" in an enthusiastic manner. However, the data shows that Ralph does not acknowledge Guadalupe's comments as he continues saying that the activity was too challenging for his students (line 263).

Excerpt 26.

- 257 Guadalupe: [but this is] really good I mean is °°idioms and they are using collocations. °°
 258 what verb goes with what.
 259 Ralph: I mean I liked=
 → 260 Guadalupe: =I liked the activity [very much]=
 261 Ralph: [but it was not]
 → 262 Guadalupe: =you're so creative!
 → 263 Ralph: No acc--I don't know about that-- but it proved to be very challenging I was I
 264 was sad because I spent so much time planning (0.2) my lesson today and then
 265 it was like sort of falling apart during this because acc--I had to give provide so
 266 much in terms of /?/-- of stimulation

As evidenced in excerpt 27 which concludes the "reflection-on-the-activity" frame, Guadalupe once again makes positive comments in order to save Ralph's face and acknowledges him as a good teacher. Ralph seems to show his frustration by saying "a lot of planning doesn't always result in a good class". Guadalupe does not react immediately, in fact, there is a half second pause before she makes a positive comment and repeats that Ralph is very creative, emphasizing the words *always* and *creative* in line 380. Then, in line 382, Guadalupe steals the floor from Ralph and says "I wish I was your student" in an enthusiastic manner. Ralph, however, does not acknowledge Guadalupe's comments, he simply states that "it is actually a good activity" but that it needs to be "shorter or pre-taught".

Excerpt 27.

- 376 Ralph: =acc---that's interesting but-- I just want to
 → 377 show that like [acc--a lot of planning] doesn't always result in --°°a good=
 378 Guadalupe: [that's a nice]
 379 Ralph: =class so I'm going to take these slips back but
 → 380 Guadalupe: (0.5) °° that was so nice°° you are always so creative!

- 381 Ralph: I don't know I was [trying]
 → 382 Guadalupe: [I wish] I was your student!=
 383 Ralph: =I was trying to do something
 384 good today but (0.2) I mean I think it's really it's actually a good activity it's
 385 just more of a it just needs to be graded a little bit that's all, like shorter (0.2) or
 386 *decc>pre-taught<* or something

The “photocopy request” frame

The “photocopy request” frame ends the “reflection-on-the-activity” frame, and also puts an end to the recorded interaction as the three participants go into the photocopy room beyond the reach of the tape recorder. The beginning of the “photocopy request” frame is signaled when Ralph walks towards the photocopy request basket and leaves materials to be copied. Guadalupe verbally aligns with him asking if he needs those copies for Wednesday. With this statement, Guadalupe is also changing footing presenting herself now as an ESL program office staffer in charge of making copies, and not as an ESL teacher. This is evidenced in excerpt 28 below.

Excerpt 28.

(As Ralph says lines 383-386 he walks towards the request-copy basket place on top of the teachers' table leaves some handouts to be photocopied. As Guadalupe sees that she goes also towards the request-copy basket)

- 387 Guadalupe: (3.0) Do you need those copies for Wednesday? Or?=
 388 Ralph: =for Wednesday=
 389 Guadalupe: =or for
 → 390 tomorrow or for Monday=
 391 Ralph: =Well It'll be great if I can get them for tomorrow but
 392 but (0.2) but is that possible? Maybe tonight=
 → (After line 399, Ralph, Mei Ling and Guadalupe enter the photocopy room beyond the reach of the tape recorder, thus making the rest of the recording unintelligible, if heard at all)

CONCLUSION

This study provides evidence that frames, alignments and footing occur in work-related conversations between NNES and NES teachers. Furthermore, it illustrates that a great variety of contextualization cues are used by the interactants in order to signal their changes in frame, alignment, and footing. However, most importantly, it supports the idea that in conversations between native and nonnative ESL teachers, conflicting frames can occur as a strategy to save

face. It also shows that although all parties might be willing to work towards the same goal (saving face), their contextualization cues can be ignored or misinterpreted. Furthermore, it seems to evidence that NNES teachers are more eager to preserve their social standing than NES teachers are. It may be ascribed to an overarching threat to one's professional position - a linguistic shortcoming cannot be immediately fixed, while an unsuccessful lesson or activity can be easily improved.

The analyses provide evidence that native teachers need to be sensitive towards nonnative teachers when asking them to perform face threatening activities and that nonnative teachers need to be more aware of the contextualization cues their native speaking colleagues use to help them preserve face. Although much research has been conducted on misunderstandings between native and nonnative speakers in institutional settings, few of them have considered the issue of face saving strategies. Therefore, the approach used in this paper might be helpful in understanding how conflicting frames operate in the work place, in academic environments, in the classroom and in casual conversation when native and nonnative speakers interact. The awareness of the need to use linguistic strategies which will minimize the face threat is likely to foster better communication between native speakers of English and nonnative speakers of English, and also between nonnative speakers who are communicating with each other in English.

Limitations of the Study

One significant limitation of this study is the inability to categorically generalize the results. In this paper, the evidence suggested that face saving was the cause of conflicting frames, however, this might not be the only cause of conflicting frames when native and nonnative teachers of English interact. Since there seems not to be extensive research on face

saving interaction and conflicting frames between native and nonnative teachers of English, there is a great need for the expansion of such work. The results found in those studies might shed light on the importance of face saving strategies in the interaction between native and nonnative language professionals, not only in the teaching environment, but also in other work settings.

REFERENCES

- Akinnaso F. N., & Seabrook C. (1982). Performance and ethnic style in job interviews. In J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 119-144). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Amin, N. (1997). Race and the identity of the nonnative ESL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 580-583.
- Bateson, G. (1972). A theory of play and fantasy. Reprinted in *Steps to an ecology of mind* (pp. 117-193). New York: Ballantine Books.
- Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & G. Kasper. (1989). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Brown P. & Levinson, S. (1978). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*. London: SAGE.
- Davies, A. (2003). *The native speaker: myth and reality*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Duff, P. A., & Uchida, Y. (1997). The negotiation of teachers' sociocultural identities and practices in postsecondary EFL classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 451-486.
- Frake, C. O. (1977). Playing frames can be dangerous: Some reflections on methodology in cognitive anthropology. *The Quarterly Newsletter of the Institute for Comparative Human Development*, 1, 1-7.

- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Goffman, E. (1997). Self-Presentation: The presentation of self in everyday life. In C. Lemert & A. Branaman (Eds.), *The Goffman reader* (pp. 21-25). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1997). Contextualization and understanding. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon* (pp. 229-252). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gumperz, J. (1999). On interactional sociolinguistic method. In S. Sarangi & C. Roberts (Eds.), *Talk, walk and institutional order* (pp. 453-471). New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gumperz, J. (2001). Interactional sociolinguistics: A personal perspective. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis*. (pp. 215-228). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Gumperz, J., Jupp, T., & C. Roberts. (1979). *Crosstalk*. Southall, UK: National Centre for Industrial Language Training.
- Hansell, M., & Seabrook, C. (1982). Negotiating interpretations in interethnic settings. In J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 85-94). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes, D. (1974). Ways of speaking. In R. Bauman & J. Sherzer. (Eds.) *Exploration in the ethnography of speaking* (pp. 433-51). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lazaraton, A. (2003). Incidental displays of cultural knowledge in the nonnative-English-speaking teacher's classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 213-243.

- Lee, E., & Lew, L. (2001). Diary studies: the voices of nonnative English speakers in a master of arts program in teaching English to speakers of other languages. *CATESOL Journal*, *13*, 135-149.
- Liu, J. (1999) From their own perspectives: The impact of non-native ESL professionals on their students. In G. Braine (Ed.), *Non-native educators in English language teaching* (pp. 159-176). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Liu, J. (2001). Confessions of a non-native English-speaking professional. *CATESOL Journal*, *13*, 53-67.
- Maltz, D.N., & Borker, R.A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and Social Identity* (pp. 195-216). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mahboob, A. (2004). Native or non-native: What do the students think? In L. Kahmhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 121-147). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press
- Mahboob, A., Uhrig, K., Newman, K., & Hartford, B. (2004). Children of a lesser English: Nonnative English speakers as ESL teachers in English language programs in the United States. In L. Kamhi-Stein (Ed.), *Learning and teaching from experience: Perspectives on nonnative English-speaking professionals* (pp. 100-120). Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan University Press.
- Mawhinney, H.B., & Xu, F. (1997). Reconstructing the professional identity of foreign-trained teachers in Ontario schools. *TESOL Quarterly*, *31*, 632-639.
- Medyges, P. (1994). *The non-native teacher*. London: Macmillan.
- Nemtchinova, E. (2005) Host teachers' evaluations of nonnative-English-speaking teacher

- trainees. A perspective from the classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 39, 235-261.
- Norton, B. (1997). Identity and the ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 409-429.
- Phillipson, R. (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Polio, C., & Wilson-Duffy, C. (1998) Teaching ESL in an unfamiliar context: International students in a North American MA TESOL practicum. *TESOL Journal*, 7, 24-29.
- Reves, T., & Medgyes, P. (1994). The non-native English speaking EFL/ESL teacher's self-image: An international survey. *System*, 22, 353-367.
- Ribeiro, B.T. (1993). Framing in psychotic discourse. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Framing in Discourse* (pp. 77-112). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, C., Davies, E., & T. Jupp. (1992). *Language and discrimination: A study of multiethnic workplaces*. London: Longman.
- Simon-Maeda, A. (2004). The complex construction of professional identities: Female EFL educators in Japan speak out. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 405-436.
- Tang, C. (1997). The identity of the nonnative ESL teacher: On the power and status of nonnative ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 577-580
- Tannen, D. (1986a). Medical professionals and parents: A Linguistic analysis of communication across contexts. *Language in Society*, 15, 295-312.
- Tannen, D. (1986b). *That's not what I meant! How conversational style makes or breaks your relations with others*. New York: William Morrow.
- Tannen, D. (1990) *You just don't understand*. New York: William Morrow.
- Tannen, D. (1993). *Framing in discourse*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (1994) *Gender and discourse*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Tannen, D. (2006) *You're wearing that?: Understanding mothers and daughters in*

conversation. New York: Random House.

Tannen, D., & Wallat, C. (1993). Interactive frames and knowledge schemas in interaction:

Examples from a medical examination/interview. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Framing in discourse* (pp. 57-76). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 377-388.

APPENDIX A Transcription Conventions

Overlaps

[overlap begins
[
] overlap ends
]

= No interval between two speakers' utterances. Also links different parts of one speaker's continuous utterance when the speech goes onto another line due to an intervening line by a different speaker.

Intervals

(0.0) timed pause

Delivery

/?/ unintelligible word

/???/ unintelligible segment (more than one word)

/word/ doubt in the word

: sound extension (the more, the longer the extension)

. stopping fall in tone

? rising inflection

! animated tone

((laughs)) laughter

ABC increased volume

underline emphasis

°° *abc* °° encloses speech at a decreased volume

acc--abc-- encloses speech with an increase in speed delivery

decc>abc< encloses speech with a decrease in speed of delivery

singingabc encloses speech that is sung

→ focus of attention

APPENDIX B

Transcript

Transcript of the conversation between Mei Ling (M), Guadalupe (G) and Ralph (R).

- 1 R: Hey you guys um (0.2) *acc--could you do me a favor?--* I had this activity today
 2 in my in my I-2 class. and the students thought it was really (0.2)really hard and
 3 I was wondering if I could um have *acc--you guys to try it out and see?--* (0.2) see
 4 how you feel about it.
- 5 G: Su[re]
- 6 M: [Su]re
- 7 R: OK All right so it's like eh we were working on on idioms related to money? OK
 8 and: so I was I had not /pretty/ taught these expressions so so this was this was
 9 like their first look at some of these sayings and I thought that they would (0.2)
 10 that they would be able to sort of put them together *acc--so each /item/ is divided*
 11 *into two parts--* so there's like one half and you know the parts because one half
 12 is written in like capital letters? and the pairs are all written in lower case letters=
 13 G: =wow=
 14 R: =so you have to make a pair like *decc--one upper case and one lower case.--*
 15 G: =OK=
 16 R: =So *acc-- here they are--* and I won't tell you *acc--well actually OK--* ah the
 17 *deccc>beginnings of the phrases are all in lower cases.<* OK so you *acc --can*
 18 *divide them up?--* right? and then try to *decc>try to match them up into* (0.2)
 19 *sayings<* there should be about ten in total.

(While saying lines 16-19 Ralph displays on the desk the cards of that contain the sayings, pointing to the cards that have lower cases) (After Ralph has stopped speaking Mei Ling and Guadalupe start working silently on the activity by making two columns: one with the papers with capital letters and one with the papers with lower case) (6 seconds elapse between lines 19 and 20)

- 20 M: (6.0) °° *Maybe we should.* °°
- 21 R: And they all relate to to money *acc--in some way--*.
- 22 G: Hit the jackpot I say jackpot so=
 23 M: =Yes

(Mei Ling and Guadalupe work with the pieces of paper trying to make guesses. They try to match the beginning with the possible ending of the saying) (3.5 seconds elapse between lines 23 and 24)

- 24 G: (3.5) To go to the bank?=
 25 M: =Yes mm

(Mei Ling and Guadalupe work with the pieces of paper trying to make guesses. They try to match the beginning with the possible ending of the saying) (3 seconds elapse between lines 25 and 26)

- 26 G: (3.0) see might not be=
 27 R: =OK see[is]
 28 G: [OK]we will hold[on HOLD on]
 29 R: [I'm thinking it] might be kind

30 of hard=
 31 G: =Well let's let's get (0.2) be broke?.. to be broke
 32 R: (0.5) °°OK°°
 33 M: Or (0.2) to go?≡
 34 G: =Where's go?≡
 35 M: =Yeah here to go broke I think because to be can be
 36 many things=
 37 G: =Yes
 38 M: To be the bacon? ((laughs))
 39 G: I have no idea ((laughs))
 40 M: To be the bank? ((laughs))
 41 G: ((laughs))
 42 M: I don't know.
 43 R: Oh OK all [right so I'm just going to]
 44 G: [°°cheap bacon? °° Cheap the] bacon? Cheap the=
 45 R: =Somebody actually
 46 said cheap the ba[con but that's not]
 47 G: [Yea but that's not] I keep thinking like=
 48 R: =Yeah (0.2) that's really
 49 [interesting]
 50 M: [°°Cheap? Cheap? °°]

(Ralph approaches the desk to check how Mei Ling and Guadalupe are placing the cards)

51 R: OK so these are pretty high level (0.2) yeah=
 52 G: =I mean if we (0.2) to get?
 53 M: A million?
 54 G: To bring home a million=
 55 M: =Let me let us try=
 56 G: =to bring home the bacon that's it
 57 that's it that's the one=
 58 R: =I think [I think]
 59 G: [Hold on] HOLD ON let us try=
 60 M: =((laughs))
 61 R: If you want me to tell you when=
 62 M: =[NO::((laughs))]=
 63 G: =[NO:: ((laughs))]=
 64 R: =I can tell you when you are
 65 wrong=
 66 G: =[Ok]
 67 M: =[No] no no no=
 68 R: =acc--*Otherwise* /?/-- but I was so surprised because it was
 69 like
 70 G: Cold hard cash, isn't it?
 71 M: Because we don't really learn any of these in our ESL classes so:=
 72 R: =Yeah=
 73 M: =I

- 74 really don't (0.2) know any of these ((laughs)) [I mean I know like]=
75 R: [OK interesting]
76 M: = [two or three]
77 G: [^oto go break? ^oI'm broke]=
78 R: =but I mean=
79 G: =You say I went broke? Or you say I
80 am [broke]
81 M: [Well] (0.2) they are two different (0.2) I mean=
82 R: =OK=
83 G: =You can take not that
84 this is=
85 R: =No no it's very good=
86 G: =Yeah=
87 R: =This just confirms my experience which was
88 that they thought it was quite hard so:=
89 M: =This is so embarrassing ((laughs))
90 R: It shouldn't be embarrassing=
91 G: =Well: sort of

(Mei Ling and Guadalupe continue working in the activity trying to match the pieces of paper) (2.5 seconds elapse between lines 91 and 92)

- 92 M: (2.5) ^oTo feel like? To feel like? ^o
93 G: like the bank? OK let's=
94 R: =Can I tell you the ones that are right?=
95 G: =Yeah=

(Ralph approaches the desk and points out at the pairs Mei Ling and Guadalupe have put together)

- 96 R: =OK this is
97 right. this is right. this is (0.2)not right. =
98 G: =OK=
99 R: =this is not right=
100 G: =OK
101 R: Although you could use that phrase but that's not this is right=
102 G: =OK=
103 R: =OK
104 G: To feel like the bank?=
105 M: =No I don't=
106 G: =Maybe [maybe I'm using Spanish] that's=
107 R: [You have have these too]
108 M: [Yeah Yeah so /?????????/?]
109 G: =what we use that maybe with idioms I have problems because I usually tend
110 to calque them from Spanish to translate them=
111 R: =Oh I should write and then of
112 course=
113 G: = I feel like the bank because everyone is asking me for money.

114 R: (0.5) That's really interesting.

(Mei Ling and Guadalupe continue working silently with the pieces. Mei Ling attempts to make a saying and laughs at the results) (3 seconds elapse between lines 114 and 115)

115 M: (3.0) ((laughs))=

116 G: =((laughs))=

117 M: =/????/ ((laughs))

118 G: Oh God (0.3) °°To be°° (0.2) To be loaded.

119 M: Yes, yes to be loaded (0.2) with money:

(Guadalupe turns away from the desk and the activity and while making the "song" suggestion and faces Ralph)

120 G: *singing* **Money money money is so funny** Are you bringing any other songs?

121 R: We're going to do Material Girl on=

122 M: =Ouh=

123 R: =Monday=

124 G: =Oh good 'cause there's this

125 I was thinking I listened to the ABBA song *singing money money money*=

126 R: =That's

127 a good one too.=

128 M: =Yeah=

129 G: =And I thought about it=

130 R: =decc>/??/?/< there's a lot of money

131 songs=

132 M: =Yeah=

133 R: =And I was trying to pick a good one.

134 G: Material Girl is very nice and if you can get hold of the video it's so funny, very

135 eighties like

136 R: *acc--that's a good idea--* I should look for the video.

137 M: To break=

138 G: =To break the (0.2) to break the bank to break the /?/=

139 R: =Wait wait wait to

140 break the what?=

141 G: =decc>Cold hard cash?< It's like (0.2) that's all they care

142 for.=

143 M: =((laughs))

144 G: (0.5) To feel like a million bucks? Oh wow=

145 M: =Dead skate?

146 R: (0.5)To what?=
147 M: =I'm saying=

148 R: =Dead no.. dead.. *acc--but it goes with ayy?--*=

149 M: = no?=
150 R: it goes with one of the short ones=

151 M: =OK ((laughs))

152 G: Cheap skate? (0.2) I don't know *acc--I'm just making a wild guess.--*

- 153 R: I was trying to encourage you.=
 154 M: =[((laughs))]=
 155 G: =[((laughs))]=
 156 M: =To be [good skate] to break skate=
 157 R: [That was my]
 158 M: =oh DAMN IT ((laughs))
 159 G: It's so hard I mean if *acc--we cannot even do* [it-- how can you expect your]=
 160 R: [that's really that's really hard Ok]
 161 G: =students. OK but help us (0.2) cheap?
 162 R: Cheap
 163 M: Skate?
 164 G: What does that mean?
 165 R: OK a cheapskate is a person like a *decc>stingy person<* a person who would not
 166 spend money.=
 167 G: =OK like Scrooge=
 168 R: =Scrooge=
 169 G: =OK (0.5) How did you say the word?
 170 Stingy?
 171 M: Sting=
 172 R: =Oh yes stingy=
 173 M: =Stingy=
 174 R: =Stingy and (0.5) let's see (1.0) *acc-- what else*
 175 [do we have?--]
 176 M: [°°cheap stake°°]
 177 R: Let's take a look we had mm (0.5) to be loaded is good: *acc--What about to feel*
 178 *like.*—When when you feel really good.

(Guadalupe and Mei Ling put together the saying “to feel like a million bucks” and Ralph nods in approval)

- 179 G: (1) And do people actually use it? very much?
 180 R: Yeah (nods)
 181 M: Wow=
 182 R: =OK, and then=
 183 G: =I guess I'm with the wrong people ((laughs))=
 184 M: =*acc --I didn't*
 185 *know it either--* ((laughs))
 186 R: If you, these are hard but if you refuse to pay,if you don't pay your debts=
 187 G: =uhu
 188 R: you're a deadbeat
 189 M: If *decc> you don't pay?<*[Your debts?]
 190 R: [If you don't] pay like the money that you owe yeah
 191 M: Then you are in=
 192 R: =You are known as a deadbeat=
 193 M: =You are known as a=
 194 G: =It's like a
 195 noun=
 196 R: =Yeah

- 197 G: And to be /?/ the bank?
 198 R: Oh wait we have to look acc--/???/ *wrong--* ah (0.2) to break for it OK these are
 199 very hard because=
 200 G: =You can be good for it=
 201 R: =Yeah to be good for it and:
 202 M: What do you mean by to break the bank?
 203 G: Is it like to hit the jackpot?=
 204 R: =Ah OK= (Ralph gives them hand out with answers)
 205 G: =Ah you have them here=
 206 M: =/????/

(Mei Ling and Guadalupe start looking at the handout and they make comments about the sayings)
 (2.5 seconds elapse between lines 207 and line 208)

- 207 G: (2.5) OH wow it's the opposite.
 208 R: (0.5) You guys have the bacon right?=
 209 G: =Yeah
 210 G: (3.0)It's it's so funny you use like the bacon in English and we use the bread in
 211 Spanish
 212 R: But we also used bread=
 213 G: =Yeah what do you say? To bring home the bread?
 214 R: More often bacon=
 215 G: =Yeah that's it=
 216 R: =I think [that]
 217 G: [I think] but that's interesting how just
 218 two three words change
 219 R: We could say acc--*he earns a lot of bread--*
 220 G: (3.0) Wow
 221 M: Well I should teach my students more (0.2)of these=
 222 R: =Well that that confirms
 223 what my students were experiencing which was that this is a pretty hard
 224 exercise=
 225 G: =Yeah ((laughs))=
 226 R: =Okay all right [yeah]
 227 M: [It's just]pure guessing I mean is not
 228 [((laughs))]
 229 R: [I felt bad] because I thought I though they were more strongly like (0.2)
 230 collocated? [like]
 231 G: [The] problem is that if [we have not]
 232 M: [They are to]native speakers=
 233 G: =[Yeah]
 234 R: =[acc--*They*]are
 235 *to native speakers--*
 236 G: If we have never heard them=
 237 R: =Yeah=
 238 G: =Like yeah (0.2) like deadbeat=
 239 R: =Right

- 240 G: Hit the jackpot I knew because I taught that unit (0.2)[the jackpot]
 241 R: [they hit the]jackpot (0.2)
 242 I think maybe giving fewer I think I should just give [like]
 243 M: [fewer] would be [good]
 244 R: [four]
 245 five=
 246 M: =five maybe=
 247 G: =five
 248 R: 'cause certainly that is=
 249 G: =And then maybe ask [them what they mean]=
 250 M: [five would be much:]=
 251 R: =That
 252 amount turned out to be *acc--just way to hard--*=
 253 G: =Yes=
 254 R: ='Cause I've done similar
 255 activities but I did them with more advanced learners and maybe shorter
 256 [things like]
 257 G: [but this is] really good I mean is °*idioms and they are using collocations.* °
 258 what verb goes with what.
 259 R: I mean I liked=
 260 G: =I liked the activity [very much]=
 261 R: [but it was not]
 262 G: =you're so creative!
 263 R: No *acc--I don't know about that--* but it proved to be very challenging I was I
 264 was sad because I spent so much time planning (0.2) my lesson today and then
 265 it was like sort of falling apart during this because *acc--I had to give provide so*
 266 *much in terms of /?/--* of stimulation of what because most of the time students
 267 really like the puzzle activities?=
 268 G: =uhum=
 269 R: =because they can like figure it out and
 270 they are like *acc--oh yeah I'm matching--* you know it's it's very fun to do it in
 271 groups but this one was so hard they were just looking at me like I was crazy
 272 ((laughs)) [((laughs))]=
 273 M: [((laughs))]
 274 G: [((laughs))]
 275 R: =And I was like (0.5) I'm sorry. (0.2) *acc--but anyway--*
 276 if you want to copy that
 277 G: Yeah that will be good for us=
 278 R: =This stuff only (0.2) ah (1.5) interesting (0.5) I'm
 279 glad I didn't give them twenty=
 280 M: =[OH NO: ((laughs))]=
 281 G: =[OH NO: ((laughs))]=
 282 R: =I though about giving them
 283 even more=
 284 M: =No that'll be too hard=
 285 G: =And then to memorize them and /?/=

- 286 R: =They
 287 don't have to memorize them=
 288 G: =No but=
 289 R: =I wanted them to [learn them] at some
 290 G: [to learn them]
 291 R: =level like to be familiar to feel like these are:=
 292 M: =Yeah (0.2) now that I mean when
 293 I'm looking at the answers I feel that yeah they should go together but when I'm
 294 trying to match them it was hard=
 295 R: = *acc--I wonder if I should have given an entire*
 296 *sentence--* like ilus you know using the idiom, you think that would make it
 297 easier to match?
 298 M: no=
 299 R: =more text=
 300 G: =no=
 301 R: =less cut=
 302 G: =no I think this is fine just to help them make wild
 303 guesses and maybe after giving them this then give them the sentence=
 304 M: =did you
 305 give them this?=
 306 R: =Yeah I mean first we tried to do? I thought that I would see
 307 how much they knew *acc--it turned out not very much --* so [like a couple] of=
 308 M: [(laughs)]
 309 R: =those=
 310 G: =yeah=
 311 R: =And then then I like gave them this and then we went over this like
 312 (0.2) usually in the groups it was like too hard maybe about usually about two
 313 (0.2) I think they got (0.5) somebody got bacon and think like maybe (0.2) a
 314 million bucks (0.2) some of the longer ones but *acc--I think the shorter ones are*
 315 *very hard right?--* because it's like many possibilities (1.8) and I think that to
 316 eliminate confusion next time I would I would try to take out (0.2) any
 317 *decc>potential crossmatches<* where you could be like to feel like the bank
 318 *acc--you know--* like that could also work so I would [try]
 319 M: [What] does that mean? to
 320 feel like the bank. (0.2) [*acc--Like that you have a lot of money?--*]
 321 G: [*decc> do you use it too?<*] In English or not?
 322 R: Well it's there's something related but I don't we don't I don't say it that way
 323 like *acc--I would say something like--*
 324 G: =like if someone comes and asks [you]=
 326 R: [right]
 327 G: =for [money]
 328 R: [*acc--for money*] all the time--=
 329 G: =How would you *decc>ever say<?* =
 330 R: =*acc--how*
 331 *would I respond?--* =
 332 G: =You would say I'm not the bank. =

- 333 R: =I'm not a bank=
 334 G: =Yeah=
 335 R: =Or what do I look like? An ATM machine?=
 336 G: =Yeah=
 337 R: = Right? Who do I look like?
 338 Donald Trump?=
 339 M: =[((laughs))]=
 340 G: =[((laughs))]=
 341 R: =Like those like I was going to teach those too but
 342 mm *acc--forget it*—mm but you know because *acc--every culture has*
 343 [*slightly*] *different phrasings--* [for the] *decc>I can't loan you money<=*
 344 G: [Yeah]
 345 M: [Yeah]
 346 G: =Yeah=
 347 R: =thing=
 348 M: =Yes=
 349 G: =Yeah like the bank one=
 350 R: =Yeah ha=
 351 G: =I'm not the bank, yeah, that's
 352 what we use in Spanish
 353 R: Right. I'm not the bank very interesting *acc--anyway--* but it was one of those
 354 days where it was kind of like 'cause I think I have them also that I gave them the
 355 gold poem? to read at the beginning?=
 356 G: =Oh yeah=
 357 R: =and the gold poem has all these
 358 like anti[quoted] vocabulary=
 359 G: [Yes] =Yeah that's what I told you a little bit=
 360 R: =and
 361 they were like °° *this is really hard*°° and basically I think that (0.2) *acc--it sorts*
 362 *of breaks their spirit a little bit when I give them days that are--* like over their
 363 level because they kind of like °°>*what is the purpose of this class so:<°°* but
 364 the end was easy=
 365 G: =Yeah=
 366 R: =it was like just like *acc--a watching describing*
 367 *activity?--[and they]*
 368 G: [Yeah It's always] the most important thing is to end with=
 369 M: [/????/ easy]
 370 G: =something nice=
 371 M: =Yeah=
 372 G: =to cheer them up even if the class doesn't start so
 373 well=
 374 R: =Yeah=
 375 G: =and they go happy=
 376 R: =*acc--that's interesting but--* I just want to
 377 show that like [*acc--a lot of planning*] *doesn't always result in --°°a good*=
 378 G: [that's a nice]

379 R: =class so I'm going to take these slips back but
380 G: (0.5) °° that was so nice°° you are always so creative!
381 R: I don't know I was [trying]
382 G: [I wish] I was your student!=
383 R: =I was trying to do something
384 good today but (0.2) I mean I think it's really it's actually a good activity it's
385 just more of a it just needs to be graded a little bit that's all, like shorter (0.2) or
386 *decc>pre-taught<* or something

(As Ralph says lines 383-386 he walks towards the request-copy basket place on top of the teachers' table leaves some handouts to be photocopied. As Guadalupe sees that she goes also towards the request-copy basket)

387 G: (3.0) Do you need those copies for Wednesday? Or?=
388 R: =for Wednesday=
389 G: =or for
390 tomorrow or for Monday=
391 R: =Well It'll be great if I can get them for tomorrow but
392 but (0.2) but is that possible? Maybe tonight=
393 G: =Maybe /?/
394 R: I don't know
395 G: Write tomorrow and see
(Mei Ling points at the "money idiom handout")

396 G: (1.0) Yes, I'll make them for us. It doesn't matter if it has the line right?=
397 R: =You guys
398 want the second sheet?
399 M: Oh sure if you have the second sheet.

(Ralph, Mei Ling and Guadalupe enter the photocopy room beyond the reach of the tape recorder, thus making the rest of the recording unintelligible, if heard at all)

APPENDIX C Money Idioms Activity

The cards are cut and scrambled. Students then try to reassemble them

To break	THE BANK
To bring home	THE BACON
To go	BROKE
Cheap	SKATE
Cold hard	CASH
To be good	FOR IT
Dead	BEAT
To feel like	A MILLION BUCKS
To hit	THE JACKPOT
To be	LOADED

APPENDIX D

Money Idioms Handout

Money idioms

To break the bank

To spend so much money you go bankrupt.

We can afford to go on vacation. It won't break the bank.

To bring home the bacon

To be the money-earner in a family.

In their family, the wife brings home the bacon. The dad stays at home with the kids.

Cheapskate (noun)

A person who hates to spend any money; a stingy person.

My friend is such a cheapskate that when we go out he always "forgets" to bring his wallet.

Cold hard cash

Cash money (no checks, no credit cards). Used for emphasis (even though cash is made of paper).

At this store we accept only cold hard cash.

Deadbeat (noun)

A person who never pays his or her debts (the money he owes)

"Deadbeat dads" are fathers who don't pay to support their children.

To feel like a million bucks.

To feel great (bucks = dollars).

I just got back from a long vacation. I feel like a million bucks.

* to look like a million bucks = to look great.

To go broke

Lose all your money, have no money.

My uncle started a company to sell candied cockroaches. He quickly went broke.

To be good for it

To have the money to pay back a loan.

Can you loan me \$100? I'm good for it. I promise.

To be hard up

To not have much money.

His brother is hard up for money all the time because he never works.

To hit the jackpot

To make a lot of money suddenly (often through gambling).

We hit the jackpot at the casino and then went on a shopping spree.

To be loaded

To have lots of money.

My uncle is loaded; he lives in a huge mansion up in Westchester County.

To lose your shirt

To lose a lot of (or all) your money quickly.

I invested in a lot of dot-com stocks five years ago and lost my shirt.

To make a killing

To make a large amount of money.

My sister made a killing when she worked in the oil industry.

To make ends meet

To have just enough money to pay your bills.

In New York City, many people have trouble making ends meet.

Material world (noun)

The world of things, commodities and products (stuff people buy). Contrast to the “spiritual world”.

I hate to work at my stupid job, but I’ve got to pay the bills. After all, we live in a material world.

Money talks

Those who have money also have power and influence.

Millionaires get what they want because money talks.

To pay an arm and a leg for something

Pay a very high price for something.

I paid an arm and a leg for my new Mercedes-Benz. Isn’t it cool?

A penny saved is a penny earned

Being careful with even small amounts of money is important. (A penny = \$0.01). This is old-fashioned advice that can be annoying.

Do you really need to buy that new Prada jacket? A penny saved is a penny earned.

To pick up the tab

To pay the bill for something.

I picked up the tab for my sister and her three children at the restaurant.

To be rolling in dough

To be very rich (informal). Dough = money.

The guy works on Wall Street; he’s rolling in dough.

To shell out

To pay for, spend money on.

My father shelled out a lot of money to buy a new condo.

APPENDIX E

Gold poem

From “Miss Kilmansegg and Her Precious Leg.” II. Her Moral
Thomas Hood (1799 – 1845)

GOLD! Gold! Gold! Gold!
Bright and yellow, hard and cold,
Molten, graven, hammer'd, and roll'd;
Heavy to get, and light to hold;
Hoarded, barter'd, bought, and sold, 5
Stolen, borrow'd, squander'd, doled:
Spurn'd by the young, but hugg'd by the old
To the very verge of the churchyard mould;
Price of many a crime untold;
Gold! Gold! Gold! Gold! 10
Good or bad a thousand-fold!
How widely its agencies vary:
To save – to ruin – to curse – to bless –
As even its minted coins express,
Now stamp'd with the image of Good Queen Bess, 15
And now of a bloody Mary.