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Abstract
Films and TV series are commonly used in English Language Teaching because they are usually considered as a tool to improve students’ language level, a source of authentic language, a motivation enhancing activity and a way to explore culture in the classroom. However, in the context of the Bachelor of Education at Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, a study conducted by Cabrales and Rojas (2013) suggested that not many English teachers effectively used TV (particularly sitcoms), in class, contrary to the desire of 88% of the students surveyed, who said they would want their teachers to use TV in their classes. This apparent mismatch between teachers’ actions and students’ expectations regarding TV, as well as the absence of a general characterization of the beliefs held about TV as a way to explain said mismatch, justified this study. Therefore, the main objective of this research is to describe the current pedagogical beliefs about television of English teachers and students in the EFL context of the BEd Program at PUJ. To accomplish this objective, a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was chosen, consisting of two consecutive phases: quantitative followed by qualitative (quan → QUAL). During the quantitative phase, two different Likert-scale questionnaires were applied, one for students and one for teachers, while two focus groups were conducted with students and three teachers were interviewed during the qualitative phase. After using descriptive statistics and coding procedures (through the use of the software Atlas.Ti), methodological triangulation followed to analyze the data collected during both phases of this research. The analysis of the data suggests that most students and teachers believe that TV effectively helps to improve students’ English language level, particularly their listening skills and their vocabulary acquisition. Although students’ and teachers’ beliefs towards the use of TV, in general, seem to be alike, certain differences arise, particularly when it comes to the development of some skills, strategies for watching TV with educational purposes and the relationship between language
difficulty and the understanding of TV in English. In conclusion, the results of this research may become useful not only for a further characterization of students’ and teachers’ beliefs on TV in ELT in other contexts but also for the description of teachers’ and students’ practices regarding TV on the BEd program at PUJ.

**Key Words:**

Television, ELT, Beliefs, Teacher-training program.
# Table of Contents

1. **Introduction** .................................................................................................................. 10  
   1.1 *Problem Statement* .................................................................................................... 10  
   1.2 *Research Question:* .................................................................................................. 13  
   1.3 *Rationale* .................................................................................................................. 13  
   1.4 *Objectives* ............................................................................................................... 15  

2. **Literature Review** ......................................................................................................... 16  
   2.1 *Related Studies* ......................................................................................................... 16  
   2.2 *Conceptual Framework* ............................................................................................... 20  
      2.2.1 *Beliefs* .................................................................................................................. 21  
      2.2.1.1 *Teacher’s beliefs* .............................................................................................. 24  
      2.2.1.2 *Learner’s beliefs* ............................................................................................ 26  
   2.2.2 *Television* ................................................................................................................. 29  
      2.2.2.1 *Reasons for using TV inside the English classroom (Advantages)* ................. 36  
      2.2.2.1.1 *Reasons why using TV inside the English classroom is difficult (Challenges)* ... 40  

3. **Methodological Framework** ........................................................................................... 43  
   3.1 *Participants and Sample* ............................................................................................ 45  
   3.2 *Data collection methods* .............................................................................................. 46  
      3.2.1 *Questionnaire* ....................................................................................................... 46  
      3.2.2 *Interview* ............................................................................................................. 49  

4. **Results and Data analysis** ............................................................................................ 52  
   4.1 *Exploratory inquiry on television practices* ................................................................. 53  
   4.2 *Reasons for using or not using television (Advantages and Challenges)* .............. 59  
      4.2.1 *Efficacy* ................................................................................................................ 59  
      4.2.2 *Television as entertainment* .................................................................................. 61  
   4.2.3 *Television for autonomous learning* ...................................................................... 64  
   4.2.4 *Skill development* .................................................................................................. 67  
      4.2.4.1 *Reading improvement* .................................................................................... 70  
      4.2.4.2 *Listening improvement* ................................................................................... 73  
      4.2.4.3 *Writing improvement* ..................................................................................... 80
## Table of Figures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1</td>
<td>Mixed-method Sequential Explanatory Design</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>Hours students spend watching TV in English per week</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3</td>
<td>Devices students use to watch television</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4</td>
<td>Teachers’ reasons for using TV in the classroom</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Students’ reasons for watching television in English</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on the efficacy of TV in language learning</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7</td>
<td>Students’ belief on whether television is more a form of entertainment or a learning tool</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8</td>
<td>Teachers’ belief on whether TV is more appropriate for autonomous learning than classwork</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 9</td>
<td>Teachers’ beliefs on the effect of TV on skill development</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Students’ beliefs on the effect of TV on skill development</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve reading</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 12</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve listening</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 13</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve writing</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 14</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve speaking</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 15</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve grammar</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 16</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve vocabulary</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 17</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on improvement of student motivation when using TV in class</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 18</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether watching TV in English is the closest experience to living in an English speaking country</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 19</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English is a window to the English-speaking world</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 20</td>
<td>Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether it is possible to understand the majority of TV in English regardless of the language level</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 21</td>
<td>Teachers’ beliefs on the importance of certain TV selection criteria</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 22</td>
<td>Students’ beliefs on the importance of certain TV selection criteria</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 23</td>
<td>Summary of apparent beliefs identified in this research</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix List

Appendix A Students’ Questionnaire
Appendix B Teachers’ Questionnaire
Appendix C Transcription Focus Group 1
Appendix D: Transcription Focus Group 2
Appendix E: Questions from Individual Interview with Teachers
Appendix F: Transcription Interview 1
Appendix G: Transcription Interview 2
Appendix H: Transcription Interview 3
Appendix I: Atlas.Ti Project: Students
Appendix J: Atlas.Ti Project: Teachers
1. Introduction

1.1 Problem Statement

Television is now, perhaps more than before, a very important part of most people’s life. In the words of Perez Tornero (1997), television is “a medium that, in less than fifty years, has become hegemonic in planetary life”\(^1\) (p. 23). Additionally, Scolari (2008) argues that television “is the most impressive communicational experience of the 20\(^{th}\) century”\(^2\) (p. 2). No wonder then that educational settings have not been immune to the presence of this medium: the presence of TV in language classrooms can be traced back to the 1960s (Bouman, 1996, cited in Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013). The role it has played inside these classrooms has changed according to the dominant pedagogical approach to language teaching. For the last thirty years (since the 1980s), due to the Communicative Approach boom, the main purpose for using TV inside the classroom has been to improve student’s communicative competence, including grammar, speaking, listening and vocabulary, among other skills (Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013; Kines, 2012).

However, in the last ten years, there seems to have been a new wave of reflections concerning the use of TV in the classroom due to two different occurrences in diverse educational settings worldwide. The first one corresponds to a new development of language teaching: the proposal of a new, more complete, competence: Intercultural Communicative Competence (Byram, 1997 and 2009; Deardoff, 2009, both mentioned by Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013). Researchers like Rees (2005) and Hui Yang and Fleming (2013) have considered the possibilities a medium like television offers in fostering Intercultural Communicative Competence (ICC).

The second occurrence is related to the massive incorporation of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) in educational contexts, among which is considered not only traditional television but also the new possibilities a hypermedia (that is, a system in which different forms of information, such as data, text, graphics, video and audio are

\(^1\) “un medio que, en menos de cincuenta años, se ha convertido en hegemónico en la vida
\(^2\) “la experiencia comunicacional más impactante del siglo XX”. Id. Translation by the author of this document.
linked together) like the Internet (Soto, 2011) has to offer, such as streaming, cloud-storing, blogs, online magazines, forum discussions, videogames, spin-offs, etc. (Heram, 2012 and Tous Rovirosa, 2009). The problems and advantages underlying the integration of ICT in pedagogical contexts have received a lot of attention in academic circles in Colombia, (Benavides, Otálora and Hernández, 2013; Galvis, 2012) and worldwide (Peña Borrero, 1999; Fueyo Gutiérrez, 2004; and Magnuson, 2012, among many others.)

Despite all these somewhat recent developments related to the apparently renovated place of television in the classroom in general and, particularly, in the language classroom, the presence of this medium, both in theory and practice, inside English classes at the Bachelor of Education Program (BEd)³ at Pontificia Universidad Javeriana (PUJ), Bogotá, but also in the Colombian context, is yet to be explored and defined.

To this respect, the research project conducted by Cabrales and Rojas (2013) offers a budding inquiry into the subject. Both authors conducted a limited survey related to the use of situational comedies inside the English classroom of the BEd program. From a narrow sample of 8 English teachers from the program, only one admitted to have used a sitcom, occasionally, in his classes. This scene contrasts greatly with what was expressed by a small sample of students attending the courses offered by said teachers: 88% of the students would want television programs, more specifically situational comedies, to be used during their English classes. This does not happen as only 30% of the students stated that these types of materials had been present, albeit occasionally and not-systematically, in their English courses. This is also consistent with the syllabi (as of 2013, the year in which this research project started) of all the English courses: only one (Elementary English Level) mentions the use of television as an input resource; the other concentrated on listing written resources. This contradiction between the teachers’ practices and the students’ expectations and beliefs is a superficial sample of the contemporary struggle between the traditional school system and the new communicative ecosystem (Martín-Barbero, 2009), a

³ The Bachelor of Education program at PUJ, in Spanish “Licenciatura en Lenguas Modernas”, is a 5-year teacher training program with an emphasis on EFL (English as a Foreign Language) and FLE (Français Langue Étrangère). The program includes courses of EFL and FLE as well as courses on linguistics, pedagogy, research in Applied Linguistics and a practicum.
struggle that shows the emergence of other ways of watching, reading, writing and, above all, learning (Martín-Barbero, 2005).

Considering the multiple advantages the use of television in an EFL setting supposes (as already mentioned and proposed by studies such as those conducted by Kines, 2012; Katchen, 1992 and 1997 (the latter as cited by Kines, 2012); Bahrani & Shu Sim, 2011, as well as the numerous authors cited by Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013), and the necessity of critically approaching the de-centralization of knowledge brought on, among other reasons, by the new regimes of audiovisual languages (Martín-Barbero, 2005), it is important to consider why a medium like television appears to be underused in the EFL classrooms in the BEd Program but, more importantly, why it seems to be absent from reflections and research regarding the educational practice that takes place within this context.

The need for academic consideration of the matter is, perhaps, more relevant in this setting due to two aggravating circumstances that are interrelated to each other. First, 100% of the students addressed by Cabrales and Rojas (2013) admitted they watch television in English on their spare time; 88% of those students say that they watch television series outside of the classroom for entertainment purposes and the other 12% consider that their watching sitcoms, for instance, is an educational experience. This brings forth very interesting questions regarding how both students and teachers consider the act of learning, the spaces and settings in which learning can effectively take place, the role of television in autonomous and incidental types of learning, among other very other relevant topics revolving around the configuration of education today.

This is indicative, perhaps, of what Peña Borrero (1999) and Martin-Barbero (1992) have categorized as a ‘mere presence’ and ‘instrumental façade’ of technology, its particular languages and the new ways of reading it entails inside the contemporary educational process. A true integration of all these aspects in an educational setting, as that constructed in the BEd Program, would require a shift in the agents’ habits, a re-definition of what are considered suitable reading practices in education, a re-consideration of the times and spaces available and appropriate for learning, and a questioning of the clear distinction currently established between entertainment and learning (Martín-Barbero, 2009).
The second aggravating circumstance pertains that both these students and teachers are part of a teacher-training program. As such, the beliefs teachers and students have regarding the use of technology, in general, and television, in particular, can ultimately shape their pedagogic strategies and performance. Teachers in training, as are the students at the BEd Program, may subconsciously copy attitudes, strategies and practices shown by their own teachers inside the language classroom (Magnuson, 2012). Furthermore, as Lortie (1975) pointed out (mentioned by Pajares, 1992), the thousands of hours a student spends in the classroom outweigh the effect of teacher training attempts, a phenomenon known as the apprenticeship of observation. This phenomenon alone gives credibility to the fact that studying beliefs in a setting like that of the BEd Program is not only relevant but also necessary as part of a reflexive educational practice.

1.2 Research Question:

Given the situation previously described, particularly the still understudied nature of the pedagogical role television plays inside the EFL context of the BEd Program as well as the beliefs associated said role, this project aims to answer the following research question: What are teachers’ and students’ current pedagogical beliefs about television in relation to their English language teaching and learning processes at the BEd Program at PUJ?

1.3 Rationale

The desire to propose and answer the previous research question issued from a personal wish to understand why Television seems to be underused and understudied in the English classrooms at the BEd Program. The curiosity arose from the fact that this type of TV shows has played a paramount role in my own English language learning experience. Furthermore, I have found that this idea, that television has many beneficial effects on language learning, is also present in other language students whose language level is similar to my own.

Cabrales and Rojas (2013) expressed an analogue curiosity and proposed, as a solution, a set of educational activities (materials) using two American sitcoms with the purpose of teaching non-standard language and slang. Despite their effort, and due to the limitations of their own survey, the problem does not seem to have been resolved with
these materials. Perhaps this is caused by the fact that a thorough characterization of the role of television in the English classrooms at the BEd Program, and within this role, a general characterization of the beliefs held about it, including a suggestion of the reasons why it seems to be underused, has not been undergone yet.

The main reason, then, behind the existence of this research project is that there seems to be a lack of information regarding TV in the EFL context of the BEd Program in general, despite the fact that the data collected by Cabrales and Rojas (2013) indicate the need for, at least, a preliminary academic consideration of this phenomenon. This project aims to contribute to the proposition of an initial characterization of the role TV plays within this context by identifying pedagogical beliefs about it. Certainly, a more comprehensive research would require the exploration of some of the other characteristics of the pedagogical role of television within this context, such as institutional policies and, above all, pedagogical practices, among other aspects.

It is important to highlight, then, that the selection of beliefs as the main category of this research has not been made by chance. This research, as carried out within the framework of a teacher-training program, presupposes that the identification of beliefs held by pre-service teachers is of the outmost importance because they determine the way in which pre-service teachers perform their teaching duties (Benavides et al., 2013). It follows, then, that this research in a way corresponds to a need particular to this kind of context, as stated by Pajares (1992):

(…) investigating the educational beliefs of teachers and teacher candidates should become a focus of current educational research, and it is also for these reasons that teacher preparation programs can ill afford to ignore the entering beliefs of preservice teachers. (p. 322)

The expected impact of this research, as responding to Pajares’ (1992) suggestion, is to contribute to a better understanding of the educational practices that take place in the teacher education EFL setting that is the BEd Program. More explicitly, shedding a new light on teacher’s and student’s beliefs about television would enable teachers and students alike to consider their own position regarding the education process in which they take part, in general, and their position towards television’s pedagogical role in particular. This could eventually lead to a reflection about the benefits this media presents in language learning,
an efficacy that has been proposed by various researches (Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013; Kines, 2012; Bahrani & Shu Sim, 2011; Ulusoy & Demirbilek, 2013, among others) and the potential role it could play in a pre-service teacher’s educational setting, such as the BEd program.

Likewise, an initial characterization of the pedagogical role television plays in this context would prove useful for further research projects, particularly ones that, like Cabrales and Rojas’ (2013) study, wish to approach material design, involving television, for the context of the BEd Program.

On a more institutional level, this project would also contribute to the research guideline established by the Facultad de Comunicación y Lenguaje (Faculty of Comunication and Language) that relates to Discourses and “Narratives”\(^4\) since, as it attempts to describe and analyze beliefs, it is concerned with different types of languages and narratives that configure social interactions within the classroom.

### 1.4 Objectives

**General Objective**

The general objective of this research project is, then, to describe the current pedagogical beliefs about television of English teachers and students in the EFL context of the BEd Program at PUJ.

**Specific Objectives**

The specific objectives of this research correspond to the stages necessary to accomplish the general objective.

- To describe the teachers’ beliefs about the pedagogical role of television in English in an EFL setting.
- To describe students’ beliefs about the pedagogical role of television in English in an EFL setting.
- To compare teachers’ and students’ beliefs.

---

\(^4\) “Discursos y Relatos”. Translation by the author of this document.
2. Literature Review

In this chapter, the reader will find the components of this research that pertain directly to its theoretical justification. The first section, titled “Related Studies”, briefly accounts for the research projects that, in way, made our own research possible. The second section, the “Conceptual Framework”, presents the conceptual categories and constructs that served as the theoretical foundation for this project.

2.1 Related Studies

Here, as mentioned before, a brief review of related studies is presented. In a way, all these research projects have opened a pathway so that a research as the one proposed here is possible. It must be mentioned, however, that a specific study regarding beliefs about television in an educational setting, local or international, was not found by the researcher by the time this project was concluded. Most of the studies presented in this review are related to this research in that they consider the beliefs held by both students and teachers regarding television in an ELT context. Therefore, all of the works mentioned in this review are pertinent to the current research in that they provide categories, methodological designs and, above all, results that, as they pertain to projects with questions and inquiries similar to the one currently driving our research, suggest important theoretical, methodological and analytical considerations.

Perhaps the most important previous study, in terms of context proximity, is the thesis written by Cabrales and Rojas (2013) titled “TV or Not TV: The Use of American Comedy Series and the Importance of Non-standard Language in EFL Classrooms”. In it, Cabrales and Rojas’ (2013) objective was to propose a series of sixteen communicative activities for teaching slang and non-standard English using four episodes from two American sitcoms. This material was meant to be used in English classes within the BEd Program at PUJ, Bogotá.

To create the communicative activities using television, Cabrales and Rojas (2013) followed Tomlinson’s (2011, cited by Cabrales and Rojas, 2013) framework for material design and its seven stages: need identification, need exploration, contextual realization of new materials, pedagogical realization of the materials, their physical production, student use and evaluation.
After the design process was over, Cabrales and Rojas (2013) found several advantages for language learning in their activities: they improve learners’ communicative competence, blend “classroom” language with “real world” language (an advantage that directly derives from the authenticity of the television materials used) and help learners realize how language is used by real speakers. However, it is necessary to mention that Cabrales and Rojas’ (2013) materials were not piloted or tested, since the use and evaluation stages of the design were not carried out, thus the benefits presented from their study are hypothetic.

However, the most relevant aspects of Cabrales and Rojas’ (2013) work for the present research can be found in the needs identification and exploration stages. During these two stages, the authors interviewed 8 teachers from the English Area at the BEd Program at PUJ, Bogotá. The interviews addressed the use of humor as a pedagogical strategy, the importance of teaching slang and the use of sitcoms inside the classroom. From the teachers interviewed, only 1 admitted to have prepared an activity with a sitcom.

Cabrales and Rojas (2013) also applied a questionnaire to students from the last four levels of English at the BEd Program. According to the data collected, 88% of the 42 students surveyed would like their English classes to include sitcoms. Only 30% admitted that comedy series have been used in their English classes but clarified that the use had been sporadic. 88% of all the students consulted watch this type of shows for entertainment while the other 12% watches it for educational purposes.

The data collected by Cabrales and Rojas (2013), which they interpreted as a reason for designing teaching material with sitcoms, present an apparent contradiction between teachers’ actions and students’ expectations regarding television, more specifically sitcoms. This brief description of practices and attitudes carried out and held by agents of the same context as the one object of this project is Cabrales and Rojas’ (2013) major contribution to the present study, particularly because the data collected by these authors offer a preliminary view into the research context of the present project. Furthermore, as was already mentioned on the rationale section of this document, Cabrales and Rojas’ work gives credence to the fact that more in depth inquiry regarding teachers’ and students’ beliefs about television in this specific teacher-training context is necessary.

Besides Cabrales and Rojas’ (2013) thesis, Wu Man-Fat’s (2012) study is, perhaps, the closest to the present study in that it approaches beliefs and television in English language
learning. Wu Man-Fat’s (2012) research, “Beliefs and Out-of-class Language Learning of Chinese-speaking ESL Learners in Hong Kong”, attempted to gather information on the relationship between the BALLs (Beliefs about Language Learning) and out-of-class language learning activities in the case of 324 ESL learners taking vocational education in Hong Kong.

To accomplish the research objective, Wu Man-Fat (2012) conducted a survey on the BALLs using a translated version of Horwitz’s (1987, cited by Wu Man-Fat, 2012) BALLI (Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory) and applied a Likert-scaled questionnaire on out-of-class language learning activities and their usefulness. Wu Man-Fat’s study, and its usage of Horwitz’s Likert-scale inventory, highlight that this type of items is methodologically associated to the study of beliefs in language learning. Additionally, results from Wu Man-Fat’s (2012) research show that naturalistic receptive and passive activities, such as watching TV and films, reading and listening, were most popular among students (about 60%), even if they were not deemed the most useful. One of the main contributions of Wu Man-Fat’s work to this research, therefore, is the consideration that the perceived usefulness of television is an important category when inquiring about students’ beliefs regarding television, especially because, as Wu Man-Fat (2012) also concluded, beliefs about language learning and the implementation of out-of-class language learning activities are positively related. For instance, according to Wu Man-Fat (2012), learners who implemented out-of-class language learning activities and regarded them as useful tended to have more positive beliefs about their English learning process, particularly in terms of the perceived value and nature of learning spoken English, self-efficacy and the expectation about learning the language.

Some of Wu Man-Fat’s (2012) findings are of great use to the present research project, particularly the ones pertaining to the out-of-class language learning activities regarding TV and films. Watching films, TV networks, news, drama and television series in English was the most popular activity reported by the students (28.8%). Furthermore, Wu Man-Fat (2012) found that learners who tended to implement this kind of activities were more confident in their language learning and would like to learn the language to make contact with native speakers. These learners also proved to have negative attitudes towards beliefs concerning timidity in speaking English with other people and translation as the most important part of learning English. These findings suggest, if only in the limited scope of a Hong Kong sample of students, that TV and films watching might be an important language learning activity for learners, an idea that greatly
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influences the present research in that, by researching students’ beliefs in the BEd context, we attempt to similarly describe how important they consider TV watching is for their language learning. Moreover, Wu Man-Fat’s (2012) study suggests that there may be a correlation between students’ belief about the usefulness of TV and their beliefs about language learning, particularly in terms of self-efficacy and motivation, an affective aspect of language learning that, as will become evident on the conceptual framework of this research, is highly associated to the use of television in language education.

For his part Kines (2012), in his research paper “The Viability of English Television Programs Inside of South Korean Classrooms”, describes the pedagogical practices around television in English in an attempt to determine if English television programs are a viable partner in South Korean EFL classrooms, considering that the Ministry of Education in that country wishes to reduce household spending on private English education while still maintaining a competitive language level. Kines’ (2012) purpose is, more explicitly, to determine whether English teachers from public schools are using television programs inside their classrooms.

To achieve this objective, Kines (2012) assumed a quantitative methodology by applying a short ten-question survey to fifty English teachers from public schools in the South Korean province of Gyeonggi-do and Seoul. Yes/no questions and multiple choice options composed the survey which, for the most part, approached topics such as time allotted to television viewing inside the classroom, pedagogical strategies regarding television, efficacy beliefs and, most importantly, reasons for implementing television in the English classroom. The fact that Kines (2012) has as one of his main concerns the reasons teachers have for introducing television in English suggests that, while inquiring about the pedagogical use of television, one of the main categories a researcher should consider are the reasons either teachers or students have for using this media, reasons that are intricately connected to efficacy beliefs.

Results from Kines’ (2012) research also show that 74% of respondents have incorporated television programs inside their classroom even though most of them did it sparingly (between 0 and 3 hours of television per month). Moreover, 35 of the 37 teachers that use television in their classes showed a positive attitude towards its use, and 28 among those stated television has positively impacted their students’ speaking performance. However, Kines’ (2012) survey does not include a question to discover how, exactly, these teachers came to that particular conclusion or belief. Kines (2012) states that most teachers have assimilated television into their classes and
show a positive attitude towards the strategy but a minimal routine usage of this medium has been made. The author explains this discrepancy between attitude and practice by highlighting contextual factors such as limited English class time and the exam-driven nature of Korean education.

Even though Kines’ (2012) study is limited in its sample and therefore does not represent a general trend within Korean public education, his work also proves useful for the present research in that it approaches teachers’ attitudes and practices regarding television and, thus, provides certain categories that will certainly prove to be useful in instrument design and result analysis, including viewing time and frequency, use of subtitles, additional viewing strategies and efficacy beliefs.

To conclude this brief literature review, three studies, of different nature and in different contexts, have provided conceptual and methodological guidelines for the present research. It is interesting to mention, then, that all three research designs employed quantitative and limited data collection methods, a characteristic perhaps indicative of exploratory works researching beliefs and language learning. Moreover, some of the results deriving from these studies may well serve as examples of what is to be expected from the present endeavor: Cabrales and Rojas’ (2013) conclusion about the mismatch between teachers’ and students’ ideas regarding television and sitcoms might be confirmed, denied or problematized by the present study. On their part, and given that the contexts are quite different and distant, Wu Man-Fat’s (2012) and Kines’ (2012) results prove equally useful to this study in that, by portraying the many complex relations television within an education setting has, particularly with affective variables such as motivation, efficacy and language learning beliefs, it seems that inquiring about the relationship between television and beliefs and attitudes will probably provide complex and intricate results.

2.2 Conceptual Framework

As was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, now follows the presentation of the theoretical foundations of this research. In compliance with the main objective of this research, the description of the pedagogical beliefs held by teachers and students about television within the EFL context present in the BEd Program at Universidad Javeriana, two main categories compose this section: beliefs and television. The first concept, belief, is subsequently defined and contextually situated within the domain of educational research, which is why two subsections,
teachers’ and students’ beliefs, are included. The concept of television is also defined, from a historical perspective, and is similarly contextually situated within the domain of education in the subsection that deals specifically with the uses of television in ELT. The reader will find that the key concepts of this research, those predominantly taken into account during the design of the data-collection methods and during the analysis, television, appear in bold in this section for easier identification and recollection.

2.2.1 Beliefs

The conceptual definition of beliefs seems like a difficult endeavor. Without a doubt, it is indicative that research papers regarding the study of beliefs propose inventories for characterizing beliefs and the results from the application of said instruments, but do not clearly define what is understood by “belief” (see Horwitz, 1988; Benavides, et al., 2010). This difficulty derives from the fact that beliefs have been theoretically constructed as messy and ethereal concepts, particularly because they are in close relation to other psychological terms such as knowledge, attitude and ideology (Galvis, 2012). And still, despite these academic inconveniences, authors like Pintrich (1990) suggest that beliefs are the most valuable psychological construct in teacher education (as mentioned by Pajares, 1992).

For researchers such as Albenson (1979), Nisbet and Ross (1980), Ernest (1989), among others (as mentioned by Pajares, 1992), any attempt to define beliefs should start in the differentiation of this concept from that of “knowledge”. The distinction is not easily made, although a specific differential characteristic seems to be present in various models: Nespor (1987), Nisbet and Ross (1980) and Ernest (1989) agree, albeit on different terms, that knowledge is a structure made of mainly of cognitive components, and beliefs, on the other hand, are related with affect, evaluation and judgment (Pajares, 1992). However, Pajares (1992) highlights that the idea of a purely objective knowledge, deprived from emotion, is imprecise. Rather, he proposes that beliefs influence the way people approach reality, including cognitive knowledge, thus this type of knowledge must have its own affective component.

Another difference between knowledge and belief, as proposed by Nespor (1987) and reviewed by Pajares (1992), is that knowledge systems, unlike belief systems, can be evaluated and critically examined. Furthermore, as this knowledge systems are more prone to logic and rational considerations, they are somewhat bounded to reality; beliefs, on the other hand, defy
logic. However, and this is the crux of the knowledge versus belief conundrum, Nespor (1987), Pintrich (1990), Goodman (1988) and Calderhead and Robson (1991) all conclude that beliefs are more influential and decisive when it comes to the determination of human behavior and some cognitive processes (such as problem representation and problem solution) than knowledge itself (Pajares, 1992). After going over several of the models, some of which have already been mentioned, Pajares (1992) closes the matter by concluding that the artificial distinction between knowledge and beliefs is resolved by most of these authors in saying that “Belief is based on evaluation and judgment; knowledge is based on objective fact” (p. 313).

After having made the distinction between belief and knowledge, it would presumably be possible now to define the former. The most comprehensive, and possibly useful, model regarding beliefs and their definition, even if it is somewhat outdated, is the one proposed by Rokeach (1968) (as mentioned by Galvis, 2012). This author defines belief as “any simple proposition, conscious or unconscious, inferred from what a person says or does, capable of being preceded by the phrase, 'I believe that . . . '” (p. 113, cited by Pajares, 1992). Rokeach’s (1968, as cited in Pajares, 1992) succinct but powerful definition was adopted in this research to guide all consideration of what constitutes a belief.

According to Pajares (1992), beliefs may be descriptive, evaluative or prescriptive in nature, although usually all three elements are somewhat present in most beliefs. This author also mentions that, for Rokeach (1968), all beliefs have three components: cognitive, related to knowledge; affective, that arouses emotion; and behavioral, related to action. However, beliefs cannot be directly observed or measured, which is why any study interested in understanding beliefs, such as the one proposed here, must consider making inferences from what people say, intend and do. Moreover, Brown and Cooney (1982) highlight that the manifestations of beliefs are time and context specific, implications that must be considered in any study (Pajares, 1992).

Rokeach (1968) proposes, then, that beliefs form a belief system, defined “as having represented within it, in some organized psychological but not necessarily logical form, each and every one of a person's countless beliefs about physical and social reality” (cited in Pajares, 1992, p. 318). Within a belief system, some beliefs are more important than others. Rokeach (1968) describes this importance as centrality or connectedness: the more connections a belief has with other beliefs, the more implications it has and, therefore, the more central it is. A more central belief, as it has consequences on many others, is more difficult to change.
Additionally, Rokeach (1968) also mentions, according to Pajares (1992), that a group of beliefs held about an object form attitudes which, in turn, become action agendas. The beliefs that constitute an attitude are connected with beliefs of other attitudes, which means that a person’s attitude towards a particular issue may be influenced by beliefs regarding other issues such as society, religion, race, etc.

The problem of belief change is one of the main reasons beliefs are a relevant field of study, particularly in educational research. To this respect, Pajares (1992), drawing on Nisbett and Ross (1980), proposed that early experiences, which later on may become beliefs, are harder to change than new experiences, mainly because they have been affecting perception and the processing of information for some time.

Furthermore, when beliefs do change, these changes are not always logical or necessary. Posner et al. (1982) describe two processes by which beliefs may be changed, in terms of Piaget’s concepts of assimilation and accommodation (Pajares, 1992). When assimilation occurs, new information is harmonically incorporated into the belief system. On the other hand, accommodation takes place when the new information cannot be assimilated and, as a result, previous beliefs must be changed, replaced or reorganized. Since accommodation constitutes a more radical change (and possibly affect more central beliefs), assimilation is more likely to happen. Additionally, new beliefs must be consistent with the belief system for any of these processes to take place or, in Rokeach’s (1968) terms, the new belief must establish a functional connection with other beliefs in the system for this to happen. This, however, is not enough to cause changes in a person’s belief system. Guskey (1986), as mentioned by Pajares (1992), argues that new beliefs must be tested and found effective for them to be permanently incorporated into the system. This means that belief change is a result, rather than only a cause, of changes in behavior.

All the previous reflections regarding belief change need to be considered, particularly in a study, such as the present, in which belief description is the main goal. Describing an individual’s or a population’s set of beliefs, while informative in it own right, is an undertaking that aims at achieving individual or societal change by providing a better understanding of the phenomenon. Therefore, Pajares’ (1992) above-mentioned assertion about the necessity of studying beliefs, particularly within educational settings, is intrinsically connected to the possibility of accommodation and assimilation, in other words, to the possibility of changing
beliefs and challenging the perpetuation of stagnant and antiquated pedagogical models and practices. Ultimately, defining and describing pedagogical beliefs is part of a reflective educational practice.

After having defined beliefs and belief systems in general, it is now necessary to approach the domain of beliefs within the specific context of this research, i.e. an educational setting. To successfully insert the concept of belief in education, it seems necessary to consider the two main agents whose beliefs are of interest to this research: teachers and students.

2.2.1.1 Teacher’s beliefs

Considering specifically teacher’s beliefs within a reflective teaching practice, Richards and Lockhart (1994) comment that, traditionally, the focus on language teaching has been what teachers actually do but that it is now necessary to pay attention to the beliefs and thinking processes underlying these actions. These authors also propose that teacher’s belief systems are based on the goals, values and beliefs teachers have in regards to teaching as well as their understanding of their teaching environment. These systems are constructed gradually and incorporate subjective and objective dimensions that may express simple or complex beliefs (an idea very similar to that proposed by Rokeach, 1968, in Pajares, 1992). Kindsvatter, Willen and Ishler (1988), as mentioned by Richards and Lockhart (1994), suggest that teachers’ beliefs derive from a variety of sources, although they explicitly mention six.

The first source is the teachers’ own experience as a language learner. This experience greatly shapes teachers’ beliefs and are often a reflection of they way in which they were taught. Lortie (1975), mentioned by both Richards and Lockhart (1994) and Pajares (1992), further describes this phenomenon as “apprenticeship of observation” and he concludes that the thousands of hours teachers spend in the classroom as students are more significant in shaping their beliefs and practices than the considerably less amount of hours they spend on teacher education. Pajares (1992) notes that this is consistent with Rokeach’s (1968) model in that all that classroom time is a fertile ground for belief development.

The second source is the experience of what works best in the classroom. For some teachers, this is the main source of the beliefs that affect their teaching. This is consistent with Guskey’s (1986) idea that beliefs need to be found effective in order to be held (Pajares, 1992). The next source corresponds to the established practice within the school or institution where the
teachers’ practice takes place. This means that, within a specific educational context, some teaching styles and practices may be more valued than others.

Personality factors constitute the fourth source of beliefs and relates to very specific personal preferences and characteristics. The fifth and sixth sources are both connected with theoretical considerations. The fifth source are educationally based or research-based principles which correspond to the understanding teachers may have about learning principles in psychology, SLA, education, etc. Finally, the sixth source are principles derived from an approach or method, the idea a teacher may have about the effectiveness of a particular method or approach.

Richards and Lockhart (1994) also mention five topics related to beliefs that must be taken into account when reflecting about language teaching: beliefs about English, about learning, about teaching, about the program and the curriculum, and about language teaching as a profession.

Regarding beliefs about English, these authors mention that the ideas people have about a language are influenced by the contact they have had with it and its speakers. Furthermore, it is important to analyze teachers’ beliefs related to the importance of English, its difficulty, a preferred language variety, the importance or unimportance of having a native-like pronunciation, etc. These beliefs may influence attitudes towards the teaching of English and express realities that may, likewise, have an impact on teaching.

Teachers and students come to the language classroom with certain expectations about the learning process. They also bring experiences that shape their perception, including their idea of what constitutes learning. Teachers’ beliefs about learning, according to Richards and Lockhart (1994) may be based on their training, their teaching experience or their experience as language learners. These authors mention that it is important to consider, when studying teachers’ beliefs, that which is understood by learning, the best way this is accomplished, what teachers believe to be the best students, encouraged and discouraged learning styles as well as the students’ role in the classroom.

Logically, it is likewise important to consider the other side of education: teaching. Teachers have different beliefs about what constitutes effective teaching, their own role in the classroom, the methods and resources pertinent, and the best classroom management strategies and approaches. Richards and Lockhart (1994) mention that Johnson (1992) found that classroom
Practices are usually linked with teachers’ views about teaching since teachers tend to teach in accordance with their theoretical beliefs.

The next topic, beliefs about the program and curriculum, is relevant because teaching language programs reflect the institutional culture and the collective decisions and personal beliefs of teachers that are part of that program. Furthermore, each teacher has a specific take on the program they work in, including their beliefs about lesson planning, the use of instructional objectives, relevant materials and text-books, content to be taught, assessment, etc. These beliefs also include ideas about problems and things to be improved within the program.

Finally, Richards and Lockhart (1994) propose that it is also important to consider teachers’ beliefs about language teaching as a profession in that, depending on the context, the working conditions and career prospects may influence the way in which teachers consider their own responsibilities and accountability. Additionally, it is necessary to consider what teachers think about the changes that need to take place in their profession, the characteristics of their own training process and the rewarding aspects of their everyday working practice.

Even though this particular research revolves around pedagogical beliefs regarding television (and not general educational beliefs), the five topics brought forth by Richards and Lockhart (1994) should be taken into account when studying teachers’ pedagogical beliefs, regardless of the content of the belief. As is apparent from Rokeach’s (1968, in Pajares, 1992) model, beliefs are interconnected in unpredictable ways and, consequently, form systems. It is only logical, then, that a teacher’s beliefs about television in an ELT context might be related to his or her beliefs about English, learning, teaching, the curriculum and the other topics mentioned by Richards and Lockhart (1994). The same might be said about a student’s set of beliefs, although, according to the two aforementioned authors, considering learners’ beliefs may need the inclusion of some additional topics, as presented on the following section, dedicated to the specificity of students’ beliefs.

2.2.1.2 Learner’s beliefs

Regarding learners’ beliefs, it is clear that they way learner’s approach learning, just as teachers approach teaching, is also influenced by students’ beliefs, goals, attitudes and decisions. Richards and Lockhart (1994) propose that learners’ beliefs are subjected to the influence of the
social context in which learning takes place. Beliefs also influence students’ attitude toward both the language and language learning.

These authors propose eight main topics to be considered when studying learner belief systems: the nature of English, the speakers of that language, the four language skills, teaching, language learning, classroom behavior, beliefs about self and, finally, students’ goals. The first beliefs mentioned by Richards and Lockhart (1994), those pertaining the nature of English (or, in the case of contexts other than EFL, the language to be learned), are related to both the status the learner perceives English has in comparison to other languages as well as the aspects of the language they find most difficult to master. Even though some of these beliefs may be characterized as linguistic folklore, they can influence how students approach learning the language and which methodology, for instance, they may favor in order to overcome the perceived difficulties.

The second topic is beliefs about the speakers of English. Learners usually have particular views about native speakers of the language they want to learn. These views are based on previous contact they have had with native speakers or are derived from other sources such as television and the media in general. These attitudes are also influenced by cross-cultural differences and, although they may be described as mere stereotyping, have an impact on the learners’ desire to interact with native speakers. This topic is particularly relevant to our project because the relationship between beliefs about television and about English speakers is explicitly mentioned by Richards and Lockhart (1994).

The next topic corresponds to beliefs about the four language skills. According to Richards and Lockhart (1994), this type of beliefs can be reflected in students’ specific assumptions about the listening, writing, reading and speaking skills. These may include, for instance, ideas about the best ways to improve a skill in particular or the importance of certain grammar structures in the development of a certain skill.

Beliefs about teaching is the fourth topic. As has already been mentioned, due to the large amount of time learners have spent being exposed to teaching, they may have constructed fixed views about what effective or ineffective teaching practices are like. These could include specific expectations regarding the types of activities a teacher should propose, his or her role and responsibilities, among others. The beliefs that relate to this topic are particularly influenced by cultural values related to teaching.
The next topic is associated to beliefs about language learning which, in short, contemplate the assumptions learners have about how to learn a language and the best activities, strategies and approaches that are useful to achieve this goal. These too are particularly influenced by cultural values.

Richards and Lockhart (1994) mention, as the sixth topic, the one pertaining appropriate classroom behavior and interaction (such as classroom rules, asking patterns, what constitutes cheating, etc.). The next topic is beliefs about self, which can be briefly described as the student’s view about his or her abilities, strengths and weaknesses as language learners. These beliefs might have an impact on the priorities learners set for themselves. The last topic is beliefs about goals and what students wish to accomplish in their language learning experience (i.e. a native-like pronunciation, being able to convey meaning, developing oral skills exclusively, etc.).

It is also important, in addition to those learners’ belief systems mentioned by Richards and Lockhart (1994), to consider the beliefs held by a particular set of language learners: pre-service language teachers. According to Pajares (1992), pre-service teachers are different from other high education students in that they are insiders within the educational process. That is to say the people and practices they find in the classroom are not very different from the ones they previously knew and, thus, their beliefs may remain unaffected.

This familiarity that pre-service teachers have with the ongoing practices on the language classroom may have a role in the political process of reproducing society (Ginsburg and Newman, 1985; Lortie, 1975; both mentioned by Pajares, 1992). Most students who choose a career in pedagogy do so because they have had a positive identification with current teaching practices, a situation that leads to the continuity of traditional practices rather than innovation. Edmundson (1990), as referenced by Pajares (1992), states that most pre-service teachers are not aware that one of their future tasks as teachers should be to affect a system in need of reform by being agents of societal change.

Pajares (1992) also comments on some of the findings of other researchers regarding pre-service teachers’ beliefs and their relationship with the educational hopes that teacher educator have for them. The author mentions that most pre-service teachers have an unrealistic optimism and are biased in that they believe that the most important characteristics in a successful teacher are the ones they perceive they already have. They also believe that problems they will face in the classroom will differ considerably from the ones teachers usually face and the vast majority
predicts they will be better teachers than their peers. Also, pre-service teachers tend to overvalue the affective variables and undervalue cognitive and academic variables (according to Porter & Freeman, 1986; Weinstein, 1988; in Pajares, 1992). Furthermore, Pajares (1992) adds that, at the beginning of their training process, pre-service teachers view teaching as a process of transmitting knowledge and of dispensing information (as taken from Brookhart & Freeman, 1992). This author concludes that, even though teacher education researchers have been aware of the power early experiences in the classroom have in developing pre-service teachers’ educational beliefs, they have failed to explore it.

At this point, having defined what is understood by belief and the general characteristics of the beliefs held by the two main agents in the language learning process, it is necessary now to consider the theoretical definition of television as the other main concept orienting this research. The next section, then, presents a brief historical review of the way in which television has been academically considered to this date and constructs the definition of television that guided this research.

2.2.2 Television

Television is, as Scolari (2008) sums up, the mass media *par excellence*, the audiovisual channel that reaches the most consumers and, without a doubt, the most important communicational experience of the past century. Furthermore, television has been the media that most radically shakes culture, its separation between reality and fiction, between work and leisure (Martín-Barbero, 2005). However, and even though the first television programs date back to the 1940s, television studies and serious academic considerations regarding this media did not appear until the late 1970s (Creeber, 2006). It is in this context that the main text defining the historical changes that had, until that point, characterized television appeared: in his chapter “TV: The Lost Transparency”5, written in 1983, Umberto Eco (1999) defines the first moment of television, paleotelevision, and the transition towards the second moment, neotelevision, that was currently taking place.

The main characteristic of paleotelevision, according to Eco (1999), is that it speaks about the outside world. Additionally, it thrives on the separation of the two basic types of television

---

5 TV: La transparencia perdida. Id.
shows: information shows and fantasy or fiction shows. The first type, information shows, offer statements about facts that can be empirically verified (Eco, 1999). The second type of shows, such as soap operas, sitcoms, movies, etc., operate under the audience’s willingness to activate their suspension of disbelief and accept to take seriously something they know is fictional (Eco, 1999).

On paleotelevision, in general, people looking at the camera are avoided since television itself seems to want to disappear as an agent on the enunciation process. Also, technical devices (such as cameras, microphones, lights, etc.) that make production and broadcasting possible are hidden in an attempt to show events as though they are happening regardless of the presence of television (Eco, 1999). Additionally, paleotelevision, as it is conceived for a general public, presents cult and refined speech. Tous Rovirosa (2009) summarizes the three main objectives of paleotelevision: to inform, to educate and to entertain, in that order, all within the sphere of institutional discourse.

Neotelevision, on the other hand, speaks about itself and the contact it tries to establish with the audience (who is now capable of deciding when and how to let it speak). Due to the proliferation of private channels and a diversification of the offer, audiences of neotelevision are in control of what they watch (Eco, 1999). According to Campillo Lorenzo (2006-2007), neotelevision also cancels out the difference between information (reality) and entertainment (fiction). Neotelevision, then, becomes a producer of reality rather than it’s mere mirror: the presence of television cameras influence the development of a certain event.

Additionally, since neotelevision’s focus is on itself (Eco, 1999), it no longer worries about hiding the technology that makes enunciation possible: it purposefully shows the artifice (microphones, cameras, etc.) and invites the audience to be a part of it (through hotlines, for instance) in an attempt to connect more deeply with it, to speak the audience’s language, to be like life itself. Tous Rovirosa (2009) states that neotelevision seeks to entertain, to involve and to coexist.

Both concepts, paleo and neotelevision, were widely popular within the academic circles interested on semiotic analyses since the 1980s, as Scolari (2008) points out. This is a fact that can be exemplified by mentioning the works by Abril (1995), Imbert (1999), Farré (2004) and Carlón (2004) and the later works by Malmberg (1996) and Piscitelli (1995), corresponding to critical theory applied to television (all of them also mentioned by Scolari, 2008). Tous Rovirosa
(2009), moreover, points out that it is with the appearance of neotelevision in the mid 1980s, when genres start to mix, that television as a medium becomes mature.

Albeit the usefulness of the categories proposed by Eco (1999), academics such as Scolari (2008), Verón (2001, cited in Scolari, 2008) and Campillo Lorenzo (2006-2007) agree on the fact that television has not had an homogenous and lineal development and, as such, characteristics of both paleo and neotelevision coexist on television today. By the mid 1990s, however, Semprini (1994) and Cavicchioli and Pezzini (1993), as told by Scolari (2008), noted that the category of neotelevision was no longer appropriate to describe the changes happening on television: the showcase of people’s privacy, the creation of sociopolitical talkshows, infoshows, docushows, among others, information being diluted into fiction and the real world becoming a reality show.

Additional to the television phenomena highlighted by academics in the 1990s, the appearance of new digital technologies, such as the internet, made it impossible for television and communication researchers to ignore that a new moment of television was starting. Heram (2012) states:

Several authors, from different perspectives, have announced the death of television – Pérez de Silva (2000), Piscitelli (1998), Carlón (2009), Verón (2009)– as well as the president of Microsoft, Bill Gates, during the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, in 2007, when he stated that the Internet will revolutionize the way in which we watch television thanks to the proliferation of new technologies and diverse screens.  

(p. 261)

These authors, according to Heram (2012), seem to agree on the fact that these new technological developments will result in new ways of producing and consuming television, which in turn will make this medium, as mass media, disappear. Carlón (2009) (in Harem, 2012), for instance, argues that television, as language, will not die, which is why he proposes to differentiate between television as a language and as a medium. Scolari (2009), states that “we

6 “Son varios los autores que desde diversas perspectivas han anunciado la muerte de la televisión –Pérez de Silva (2000), Piscitelli (1998), Carlón (2009), Verón (2009)– así como también lo ha realizado el presidente de Microsoft, Bill Gates, en el foro Económico Mundial de Davos, Suiza, en el 2007, cuando afirmó que Internet revolucionará la forma de ver televisión y anunció su muerte. Todos coinciden en que lo que se modifica es la forma de ver televisión a partir del auge de las nuevas tecnologías y las diversas pantallas”. Id. Translation by the author of this document.
are entering a new phase in the evolution of this medium but we have not yet agreed upon how to call it” (p. 197, cited in Heram, 2012).

Scolari (2008) points out that academics that refrain from semiotic studies have used the term “Post-television” to talk about this new moment; that is the case of Piscitelli (1998), Ramonet (2002), Missika (2006) and Imbert (2007, 2008), as mentioned by Scolari (2008) and Tous Rovirosa (2009).

This last author prefers to use “Metatelevision”, following the conceptualizations proposed by Olson Scott (1987, 1990) and Carlón (2005). Metatelevision, according to Tous Rovirosa (2009), corresponds to television characteristic of the turn of the millennium, format televisions and “realities” as well as the mixing of genres that results from the contamination between fiction and non-fiction. Metatelevision is also characterized by the fact that the industry offers, additional to the public and private networks also present on the previous moments, cable, premium channels and digital platforms. To conclude, metalevision’s objectives are to entertain, to fragment and to recycle.

Scolari (2008), on his part, proposes what appears to be the most adequate term to label the television we experience today: “hypertelevision”. By pointing out that new and traditional textualities coexist within the same media ecology, he argues that we are now assisting to the birth of bastard species, mediums that adopt or emulate grammars and narratives from other media. As such, the hypertextual experiences that take place today (surfing the web, living on Second Life or videogaming) have an influence in shaping contemporary audience’s expectations and practices towards television. The hypertextual proliferation has created a reader accustomed to interactivity, a user expert on fragmented textualities, capable of adapting to new ways of interaction.

Martín-Barbero (2009) complements this idea by stating that technological mediation today, as it has stopped being limited to devices and has become structural in its influence, entails new ways of perception and language, new sensibilities and forms of writing. This new hypertextual experiences Scolari (2008) speaks of, form a new generation “whose subjects are not constituted through the identification with figures, styles and practices from old traditions, that to this day define what culture is, but through the connection / disconnection (from interface games) to devices” (Ramírez, 1995). We are before a generation that has learned English from television captured by a
satellite dish rather than in school, that experiments a strong empathy with the language of digital technologies, and that feels more and more comfortable writing on the computer than on paper.7 (Martín-Barbero, 2005, p. 69).

Hypertelevision then, according to Scolari (2008), caters to these generation and condenses much more than the mere deepening of the distinctive characteristics of neotelevision: the combination of media into what is called the transmedia and the appearance of new formats and logics have redesigned television today.

However, the specificity of hypertelevision resides not on the lineal extension of its stories but on its expansion to different media. Hypertelevision is characterized by the integration of its stories into transmedia narratives (Jenkins, 2006).8 (Scolari, 2008, p. 6)

The television of the 21st century, then, has complex structures with a multiplicity of recurring characters, expanding stories and the multiplication of narratives. Screen fragmentation is a common recurrence, a result from hybridization with visual forms from digital interfaces, also described as “Windows aesthetics” by Vered (2002), mentioned by Scolari (2008). Hypertelevision is obsessed with live television and it’s most emblematic form is the reality show.

The previous historical considerations about paleo and neotelevision were necessary to comprehensively understanding how, even today, these two forms of television coexist with the more complex and contemporary hypertelevision. Based on these time-specific definitions and considering that the students, and perhaps also some of the teachers, that constituted the sample of this research were most likely part of this new hypermedia generation, as proposed by Martín-Barbero (2005), that is, that they were accustomed to fragmentation, multimodality, hybrid narratives and the omnipresence of multiple screens in daily life, the following definition of television was constructed for this research:

7 “una nueva generación «cuyos sujetos no se constituyen a partir de identificaciones con figuras, estilos y prácticas de añejas tradiciones, que definen aún hoy lo que es cultura, sino a partir de la conexión/desconexión (del juego de interfaz) con aparatos». Estamos ante una generación que más que en la escuela es en una televisión captada por antena parabólica donde ha aprendido a hablar inglés, que experimenta una fuerte empatía con el idioma de las tecnologías digitales, y que crecientemente se siente más a gusto escribiendo en el computador que en el papel”. Id. Translation by the author of this document.

8 “Pero la especificidad de la hipertelevision no se encuentra tanto en la extensión lineal de las historias como en su expansión en diferentes medios. La hipertelevision se caracteriza por integrar sus relatos dentro de narraciones transmediáticas (Jenkins, 2006)”. Id. Translation by the author of this document.
Television is audiovisual material such as movies, dramas, sitcoms, soap operas, dramatic or comedic shorts, news broadcasts, interview shows, talk-shows, sports or game shows, realities and advertisement, regardless of the device on which it is watched (television set, computer, cellphone, tablet, etc.) or if it is watched partially or in its entirety.\(^9\)

However, and as can be concluded from Scolari’s (2008) mention of the audience and it current transmedia generation, television should not be defined solely by its intrinsic characteristics but also by the dialogical relations it establishes, particularly in the case of hypertelevision. This dialogue television initiates with other media can be further explained by Fiske’s (1989) characterization of television’s meaning-making potential as “textuality”. Even though Fiske’s theorization well precedes the time of hypermedia, his explorations about the way in which television, not reducible to either the audience or the screen seen as text, has the potential to provoke both manifold meanings and pleasures, can be extrapolated to explain the transmedia interactions we experience today.

Fiske (1989) starts describing textuality by pointing out that television does not deliver programs but a semiotic experience characterized by its polysemy and heteroglossia since the viewer has the freedom to make sociable pertinent meanings and pleasures out of it as well as the opportunity to produce a counter-text. This openness of television is related to its intertextuality. To explain this, Fiske (1989) brings forth Barthes’ (1975) idea that culture is a web of intertextuality in the sense that all texts refer only to other texts and do not have an anchor in a final reality. This means that represented events and characters can be understood only in terms of their relations with other texts. Intertextuality, then, is the meaning potential that exists in the spaces between texts and has four dimensions that, according to Fiske (1989), need to be considered: primary relations, secondary relations, oral culture and the subject and the social formation.

\(^9\)“Televisión: material audiovisual como películas, dramatizados, comedias, telenovelas, cortometrajes dramáticos o cómicos, documentales, noticieros, entrevistas, talk-shows, programas deportivos o de concurso, realities y comerciales, sin importar el dispositivo en que se mire (tevisor, computador, teléfono celular, tableta, etc.), ni si se mira de manera total o parcial”. The original definition was constructed in Spanish in order to share with the participants of the study and, thus, avoid bias due to misunderstanding of such as key concept.
The first dimension, corresponding to primary relations, refers to the most basic and seemingly obvious intertextual relations that surpass allusion, denying genre and medium boundaries (Fiske, 1989). Secondary relations include the intertextual relations that form (and give form) to secondary texts that aim to advertise, promote, criticize and respond to the primary texts (television, in this case). These secondary texts, intertextual enablers, include ads about television shows, spin-offs, critical articles, behind-the-scenes clips, biographies of the actors, wikis about actors, characters or the production process, etc. These texts are an important part of the viewing experience since they “increase the viewer’s sense of power over the meanings and pleasures offered by the primary texts because they grant him or her access to, and thus allow him or her to participate in, the mode of representation” (p. 66).

The third dimension, oral culture, relates to the unmistakable fact that people talk about what they watch on television. This intertextuality form is important because the opinions expressed by others regarding a television show may affect the interlocutors’ viewing experience and meaning making process. Fiske (1989) mentions a secondary form of this intertextuality, that is, the written renditions of these opinions in the form of newsletters, fanclub publications and fanzines. Blogs, weblogs, fanfictions, forums and discussion boards may be some also present today. The last dimension is related to the configuration of subjectivity and social experience since reading a text and deriving pleasure from it entails an awareness of the boundaries between the representation and real world. For Fiske (1989), then, the subject is an interdiscursive potential that, activating certain meanings or others at different moments, exercises a cultural authority over a given text.

Fiske’s (1989) definition of the four dimensions that come into play when considering television as (inter)textualities helps to better understand the way in which hypertelevision establishes intertextual relations with itself (the reflexivity mentioned by the advocates of metatelevision such as Tous Rovirosa, 2009) and with other media. Consequently, what truly defines hypertelevision is its dialogue with other media. This is evident on the increasing appearance of collaborative narratives (audiences participate on the creation of content), new forms of asynchronic consumption (Scolari, 2008), participation of the audiences on webpages, blogs, online magazines, forum discussions (Heram, 2012) and other interaction strategies orchestrated by the producers of television shows (Tous Rovirosa, 2009) that need to be considered as part of the meaning production process fostered by television viewing experiences.
What can be concluded from the application of Fiske’s (1989) notion of textuality to the contemporary form of television, hypertelevision, is that TV watching cannot be considered a passive activity, even less so today that the viewer has a more predominant role in the consumption, promotion and creation of transmedia narratives through the many interactional possibilities the internet offers (Heram, 2012; Tous Rovirosa, 2009). The implications of regarding the act of watching television as a dynamic, meaning-constructing activity are particularly relevant for the use of TV on which the current research concentrates, that is, teaching and learning English. By accepting Fiske’s (1989) intertextuality within an English teaching or learning context, television can surpass the traditional notion of being regarded as mostly relevant for developing aural receptive skills and become, as Kines’ (2012) study proposed, a wide-ranging language teaching and learning companion in that its usage can encompass complex and significant creative endeavors. The next section of this chapter focuses, precisely, on the ways in which television has been used within the domain of ELT.

2.2.2.1 Uses of television in English Language Teaching (ELT)

Since the general concept of television has already been defined, it is now paramount to consider its presence in the specific context of interest for this research, ELT classrooms. As was mentioned in the problem statement of this research, television has been part of ELT since the 1960s (Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013). However, as Kiely (2005) points out, it has not had such a widespread use as other technological tools such as the tape-recorder or, more recently, the computer. Some of the reasons for this lack of systematic popularity are, according to the same author, that video (in general) has not been associated with a specific approach to language teaching, that it requires specific electronic devices which are not always available and that it is seen as a form of popular culture, mainly as entertainment, as opposed to the traditional high-culture art forms involved in language teaching, mainly literature.

Additionally, Kiely (2005) also mentions that TV has been historically linked to language learning without a teacher, in contexts outside the classroom or in forms of autonomous learning, situations in which learners study entirely on their own while exercising their responsibility and their right to determine the direction of their own learning (Thanasoulas, 2000). Nonetheless, recent studies as those conducted by Hui Yang and Fleming (2013), Bahrani and Shu Sim (2011), Kines (2012), Ulusoy and Demirbilek (2013), Gómez, Larrea and Raigón
(2012), Rees (2005) and Song (2011) (among many others, see reference list of this research), show that the use of television in English language teaching and learning is a reality worth studying and considering.

To this respect, there are many ways in which television can be used inside the ELT classroom. Kiely (2005) proposes that activities designed to exploit television may focus on three aspects: on language use, on language forms or on television as social practice. The focus on language use aims to develop listening comprehension skills while the focus on language forms highlights the phonological, lexical and grammar (morphology and syntax) elements of the language. A focus on television as a social practice intends to exploit televisual literacy and the understanding of the purpose and context of television programs.

On her part, regarding ways of using videos in language teaching, Sherman (2003) identifies several types of videos as well as six uses of this media in language teaching. This author divides television shows into two main categories depending on the reality of the events portrayed in them: video drama (fiction) and non-fiction video. Video drama includes full-length feature films, drama series, sitcoms, soap operas, drama clips and comedy sketches. Non-fiction videos include documentaries, TV news, interviews and talkshows, sports programs, game shows, non-fiction clips and TV commercials. Additionally, the six uses of television of this media, depending on the purpose, identified by Sherman (2003) are the following: using television for its own sake, for comprehension of the spoken language, as a language model, for culture, as a stimulus or input and as a moving picture book. In a way, Sherman’s (2003) uses are related, as could be expected, with skill development, that is, the use of television to improve a student’s specific or multiple language skills.

The first use proposed by Sherman (2003), using television for its own sake derives from the fact that learners, just like any other English speaker, want access to the world of English-language media and use cultural audiovisual products like any other consumer would. The second use, for comprehension of the spoken language, aims to take advantage of the fact that television, with its visual dimension, provides a comprehensive contextualization, particularly in terms of pragmatics, as well as a wide variety of genres. This particular use is, therefore, associated with the development of listening skills. The next use, as a language model, exploits television’s authenticity and its realistic linguistic resources, such as different accents, vocabulary, grammar, syntax, discursive genres and interactive language, some of these usually absent from the
language classroom. The fourth use, which corresponds to the emphasis on culture, finds its rationale on the fact that television shows how English-speaking people act, think, live and behave, and it offers access to global-cultural products. The use as stimulus or input, the fifth use, seeks to use television as a starting point for productive skills, such as writing and speaking, in the form of discussions, writing assignments and project work. The final use, as a moving picture book, seeks to take advantage of television as thousands of picture dictionaries and magazines, given its wide range of things, places, people, events and behaviors, a use specific for vocabulary acquisition.

Behind each of the uses Sherman (2003) proposes, a particular language learning objective and a particular reason for using TV to accomplish that objective. The next section presents some reasons why television is or, at least, should be used in ELT.

2.2.2.1.1 Reasons for using TV inside the English classroom (Advantages)

As mentioned before, the use of television in ELT is not fortuitous but, rather, responds to the acknowledgement of certain advantages that derive from it, the most obvious of all, as can be deduced by Sherman’s (2003) six proposed uses of TV in ELT, is its efficacy, the fact that its use can effectively improve a student’s English language level.

As Kines (2012) highlighted in his research, there are some other positive reasons why teachers and students decide to use TV for English learning or teaching. For instance, the most commonly mentioned value of television for language teaching is its authenticity (Ulusoy & Demirbilek, 2013; Katchen, 2002; Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013) which, by definition, entails that TV is produced by and for native speakers without the specific purpose of being used in language education. It involves, as Ulusoy and Demirbilek (2013) summarize it, “real language, real native speakers and a real message for real listeners” (p. 352). This characteristic of television entails that a wide variety of language, with different linguistic, paralinguistic and paragrammatic levels, accents, vocabulary, grammar and syntax becomes available to students in the classroom (Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013).

Sherman (2003) highlights two main reasons why authentic video, including television, should be incorporated into language teaching. The first, accessibility, is quite pragmatic: the current availability of authentic materials, fostered by communication technologies, makes television a media and a resource that is part of students’ lives and, as such, should not be
ignored in the classroom. The second reason, also mentioned by Ulusoy and Demirbilek (2013), is the increase in student motivation. **Motivation**, Thanasoulas (2000) proposes, is a hard concept to define, although he states that there is general consensus around the fact that motivation is one of the key affective factors that influence the rate and success of second or foreign language learning and that it provides the initial impetus to start learning a L2 as well as the driving force needed later on to sustain the long and often tedious learning **process**. According to Sherman (2003), the increase in motivation that television accomplishes derives from the contemporary fascination with audio-visual media and from the fact that students feel excitement in understanding and enjoying something authentic.

Drawing from research made by Ryan (1998), Yamanaka (2003), Hart (1992) and Henessy (1995) among others, Ulusoy and Demirbilek (2013) present other advantages of using television to teach languages: it triggers students’ cognitive domains and allows students to see language as a whole rather than as isolated structures. However, and besides these more linguistically focused reasons, the most compelling argument for using television in ELT is, perhaps, that it is a window to English culture. Certainly, defining culture is a difficult endeavor, so much so that, among the numerous authors that highlight the relationship between television and culture, only Gómez et al. (2012) bring forth a definition, taken from Cheney (2001). **Culture**, then, is “the collective experience of a group of people that includes their thoughts, feelings, values, behaviours, communication, and their interpretation of sensory stimuli” (Cheney, 2001, cited by Gómez et al., 2012, p.143).

The previous definition of culture, given its general and holistic nature, may well comprise most of the aspects that authors like Sherman (2003) mention when discussing television and culture. This author underscores that TV, particularly drama, may reflect major cultural movements, period settings, the minutiae of daily life and, most importantly, that it shapes popular knowledge shared by English speakers. For Sherman (2003), then, television not only is representation of cultural values and though patterns but also creates culture. Kiely (2005), on his part, notes that students are able to read the cultural contexts present in these materials, particularly in terms of the characters’ (participants’) social and economic status, as well as the purposes and motivations of their interactions. To this respect, Hui Yang and Fleming (2013), based on Aiex (1988) and McDonald and McDonald (1991), mention that authentic video, including television, is the closest experience to living in an English-speaking context
because it brings that world closer to the learner and provides examples of behaviors, conflicts and lifestyles, all cultural aspects. Gómez et al. (2012) conclude that, in using television, “the main advantage for the teacher is still the opportunity to identify and understand social patterns and cultural beliefs” (p. 149).

Despite these considerable advantages, the increase in student motivation, the exposure to authentic materials and language use and the possibility of introducing cultural aspects in the classroom, implementing television watching in an ELT setting isn’t always easy. The following section explores the challenges teachers and students face when using television for English learning purposes.

2.2.2.1.2 Reasons why using TV inside the English classroom is difficult (Challenges)

The most immediate difficulty teachers face when using TV in class, already hinted at by Kiely (2005), corresponds to the availability of devices needed to play video. Sherman (2003) points out that these resources must be ready to use whenever the need arises and that the teacher should be able to operate them easily (this includes a basic knowledge on how these devices work, how to set them up, troubleshooting, etc.). The increasing availability of videos on the Internet, as mentioned by Hui Yang and Fleming (2013), has made it possible for teachers to rely on less specific devices (such as VCRs or DVDs). Nevertheless, depending on a machine is not risk-free and, as Sherman (2003) suggests, a back-up lesson should be prepared. This may translate into more potential work for the teacher.

The second challenge teachers face relates to material selection, an issue that is related to language difficulty. Authentic videos, particularly television, are perceived by teachers as too difficult for students, therefore considering the adequacy of the material in relation to the students language level, their ability to understand what is being said, done and implied, is paramount for successful TV implementation (Sherman, 2003). Correct material selection is crucial in overcoming this particular difficulty (Kiely, 2005). Criteria for a good material selection may include interest, attractiveness, adequacy of language difficulty to language level (Sherman, 2003), content schemata, context proximity, acoustic and syntactic difficulty, text type and the relationship between the images and the audio (Bahrani & Shu Sim, 2011).

Another important aspect to consider when using television inside the classroom, and that may become a challenge, is time. As Sherman (2003) points out, lack of sufficient class time and
surplus in preparation time can be some of the problems of using videos in the ELT classroom. Kines (2012), drawing on Katchen (1997), suggests the use of television shows, particularly sitcoms, over films because they are shorter, humorous and can be discussed in class.

On the matter of time, Sherman (2003) suggests finding a balance between the underuse and overuse of videos. The “Friday afternoon” approach (major underuse) corresponds to the presentation of an entire video that takes up all the time of the lesson, with little to no preparation and no follow-up activities. This approach, according to Sherman (2003), may be advantageous as extensive exposure, but does not integrate the material to the program and ignores its teaching potential. Furthermore, as can be concluded from the works done by Bahrani and Shu Sim (2011), Hui Yang and Fleming (2013), Kiely (2005) and, particularly, by Kines (2012), the use of television in a systematic, routine way, as opposed to the sporadic presentation of television programs, is a major contributing factor to the learning process fostered by these materials. The other extreme, overuse, is described as the extensive use of worksheets on vocabulary, content and structure as part of the viewing experience. Sherman (2003) notes that this approach, albeit thorough, does not suit most students, may hinder learning and enjoyment, and is very time consuming for the teacher.

The last challenging aspect to consider is the use of subtitles. Kines (2012), following Ovando (2006), mentions that subtitles offer students a confirmation of the words and expressions that may not otherwise be understood; however, this author also points out that other researchers such as Katchen (1992) suggest discouraging the reliance on subtitles as the students’ confidence in their second-language skills progresses. Sherman (2003) stresses, about the use of subtitles, that viewers will tend to read rather than listen when given the option of both. Additionally, this author also presents four possibilities for using subtitled television in the ELT classroom (but these may be subject to the availability of the necessary subtitles): the first option is the use of the English program dubbed into the learners’ native language and with subtitles in that same language, a viewing experience that, in itself, does not help English language learning; the second option is a show in the students’ native language and subtitled in English, which does not constitute a listening comprehension experience but, as Sherman (2003) points out, does appear to have great efficacy in vocabulary extension and is recognized as an effective learning technique by many language learners; the third alternative, probably the most accessible, is the use of a show in English with subtitles in the students’ native language which, according to
Sherman (2003), may not be a very significant English learning experience because students tend to focus on the written language; and the last option is shows in English with subtitles in that language, an alternative that may improve students’ reading comprehension rather than their listening skill.
3. Methodological Framework

This chapter presents relevant information regarding this research’s methodology. First, a brief characterization of the approach and study type is made as well as a description of the methodological design. A concise report on the participants (number and characteristics) and the sampling techniques ensued, followed by a definition and exhaustive description of the data collection tools employed. Finally, we offer a graphic summary of the most significant information of the chapter.

Firstly, it is necessary to point out that this research belongs, given its topic and purpose, to the field of Applied Linguistics since “It focuses on language in use, connecting our knowledge about languages within an understanding of how they are used in the real world” (Croker, 2009, p. 4). Furthermore, within the field of Applied Linguistics and the domain of language and education (Cook, 2003), this research can be categorized as a mixed-methodology case study.

According to Ivankova, Creswell and Stick (2006), mixed methods is a procedure for collecting, analyzing, and ‘mixing’ or integrating both quantitative and qualitative data at some stage of the research process within a single study for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of the research problem (p.3).

A combination of both quantitative and qualitative methods, as proposed in this research, allows for a more robust analysis since it aims at taking advantage of the strengths of each method. Among the many mixed methods existing today, a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was chosen. This design consists of two consecutive phases: quantitative followed by qualitative (quan → QUAL) (Ivankova et al., 2006; McMillan, 2012). Both phases were connected in the intermediate phase of the study as well as in the integration of both quantitative and qualitative data during the analysis.

During the first, quantitative phase, two Likert-scale questionnaires, based on the categories highlighted on the theoretical framework, were created and given to participants (teachers and students respectively). This phase aimed at describing the students’ and teachers’ beliefs in the form of statistics, a valuable research method as a first approach to the phenomenon (McMillan, 2012). The rationale behind this design is based on the fact that data collected during this quantitative phase, and its analysis, provides a general understanding of the phenomenon.
studied since the nature of the data collected does not allow for a particularly in-depth description. Furthermore, the first statistical analysis derived from this quantitative data proved useful for the purposeful selection of participants for the next phase as well as input for the interview protocols that were subsequently elaborated during the next stage.

After this first phase, a qualitative phase followed. During this phase, an interview protocol, for both group and individual interviews, was created and successfully applied. This qualitative stage of the research aimed at deepening the findings from the quantitative phase by collecting participant perspectives (direct and narrative in nature, with no restriction regarding possible answers, unlike the data collected during the first phase) to further describe students’ and teachers’ beliefs. The rationale behind this phase resides in that the qualitative data collected in it, as well as its analysis, refines and elaborates on the numeric data by taking into account the participants’ views in a more comprehensive way.

Priority was given to the qualitative phase of the study, despite the fact that it was the second phase, due to the purpose of the study. Since its main objective was to describe the current pedagogical beliefs about television of English teachers and students in the EFL context of the BEd Program at PUJ, it explicitly partakes of the main characteristics of qualitative research as mentioned by Vasilachis de Gialdino (2006, who, in turn, quotes Mason, 1996):

qualitative research is: a) founded on a widely interpretive philosophical position in that it is interested in the ways in which the social world is interpreted, understood, experimented and produced, b) based on methods that generate flexible data that is also sensitive to the context in which it is produced, c) sustained by analysis and explanation methods that include the understanding of complexity, detail and context (p. 25)\(^{10}\).

The present research can also be described as a case study since, by definition, it is an intensive description, analysis and understanding of a single entity or bounded system (Merriam, 1998), such as one event, setting, program, social group, community or individual (McMillan, 2012), in this particular case, the description of students’ and teachers’ beliefs within the context

\[\text{10 "la investigación cualitativa está: a) fundada en una posición filosófica que es ampliamente interpretativa en el sentido de que se interesa en las formas en las que el mundo social es interpretado, comprendido, experimentado y producido, b) basada en métodos de generación de datos flexibles y sensibles al contexto social en el que se producen, y c) sostenida por métodos de análisis y explicación que abarcan la comprensión de la complejidad, el detalle y el contexto". Id. Translation by the author of this document.}\]
of a specific EFL educational setting. As McMillan (2012) notes, case studies are generally associated with qualitative research but, as in the present study, often both data collection methods (qualitative and quantitative) are used in one case study.

3.1 Participants and Sample

This research took place within the context of the BEd Program at PUJ, an undergraduate program corresponding to a teacher-training program in that it educates future English and French language teachers. Considering the mixed-methodological nature of this research, a concurrent sampling procedure, defined as the use of different sampling procedures for each phase, was employed (McMillan, 2012). During the quantitative phase, two different sampling techniques were employed, one for each of the two groups of participants: teachers and students.

The first group, who answered a belief inventory questionnaire, included 12 English teachers, equivalent to 70.5% from a total population of 17 teachers in charge of at least one English course within the BEd Program during the second semester of 2015. The English courses available were (ranging from non-speaker to C1 proficiency level according to the CEFR): Elementary, Basic, Pre-Intermediate, Low-Intermediate, Intermediate, High Intermediate and Low-Advanced. All courses have from 8 to 10 hours of class per week during 18 weeks each semester and are taught by two teachers simultaneously, one in charge of reading and writing and the other responsible for listening, speaking and language use. Given the small number of teachers that composed the entire population of the first group (n=17), no specific sampling technique was defined and all teachers were invited to answer the questionnaire. However, only 70.5% of the population effectively answered (12 teachers).

The student group, on the other hand, was very numerous (n=342), thus a probability cluster sampling technique, defined as the use naturally occurring groups of students (for our case, in the form of English courses) was employed (McMillan, 2012). From the 20 groups taking English courses, 18 (90%) were asked to answer the questionnaire, including at least one for every English level. 199 out of the 342 students coursed at least one English course during the second semester of 2015, 58.18% of the student population from all English courses, answered the belief inventory questionnaire.

During the qualitative phase two other sampling techniques were used, again one for each group of participants. Based on the results from the quantitative phase, 3 teachers from the 12 that had answered the questionnaire, were selected to participate in individual interviews.
according to a criteria sampling technique, a selection method in which participants are chosen depending on their previous answers and their ability to represent the major trends and typical cases already apparent from the quantitative instrument (McMillan, 2012).

Still during the qualitative phase of this research and using a convenience sampling technique (which, as McMillan, 2012, explains, implies benefitting from participants that are easily accessible), a total of 14 students were selected, 7 from each of the two English courses (one High Intermediate, the other Low-Advanced) that had not been asked to participate during the quantitative phase, to take part in two Focus Groups, one for each English course. These 14 students, who had not answered the first questionnaire, represented an additional 4% of students participation which, added to the 58.18% that did answer the questionnaire, provides a total of 62.18% of student population participation.

3.2 Data collection methods

The selection of the instruments used for data collection was in direct relation to the achievement of the objectives of this research. The use of two main data collection techniques, as already explicit on the research design, was proposed: Questionnaire and Interview. Two beliefs questionnaires were created, one to be used with teachers and another with students. On the basis of responses gathered with these questionnaires, questions were created for individual interviews with teachers and group interviews (Focus groups) with students. A further characterization of these methods and instruments now follows.

3.2.1 Questionnaire

A questionnaire, according to McMillan (2012), “is a written document containing statements or questions that are used to obtain subject perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, values, perspectives and other traits.” (p. 154). Considering that one of the main objectives of the present research was to describe teachers’ and students’ beliefs, generally conceived as non-cognitive traits, two questionnaires were deemed an appropriate data collection tool.

The three main types of items used in questionnaires measuring non-cognitive traits are checklists, ranked items and scales (McMillan, 2012). A check-list gives the respondent a series of options to choose from, particularly yes/no questions, while ranked items ask the respondent to place a limited number of categories in sequential order according to a pre-determined degree of
preference, importance, etc. (McMillan, 2012). Scales, on their part, offer respondents a series of gradations so that they can indicate their values or attitudes by choosing the scale that best reflects their preference (McMillan, 2012). The type of item chosen for the questionnaire applied during the quantitative phase of the research was Likert scales, whose purpose is, according to Bertram (2007), “to obtain participant’s preferences or degree of agreement with a statement or set of statements”. This type of scale is also used in Horwitz’ (1998) BALLI, a paradigmatic example of beliefs inventories which, according to Cohen and Fass (2001), has been extensively used in the identification of beliefs in cross-cultural settings and, later on, in the comparison of beliefs expressed by both learners and teachers.

The benefits of a questionnaire without open-ended questions (such as one consisting of Likert scales) reside in that they are quick to complete and straightforward to analyze. However, they do not allow for respondents to add explanations and there is the risk that the categories might not be exhaustive (Cohen, Lawrence & Morrison, 2000). Considering both these aspects, and the fact that the mixed-method nature of this research would help overcome these limitations, it was concluded that the use of two beliefs inventories was appropriate as an initial approach to the phenomenon.

The two questionnaires, one for students and one for teachers, were constructed as Internet-Based surveys on the Google Forms platform and delivered to participants via e-mail. This form of electronic questionnaire was selected given some of its many advantages, as highlighted by McMillan (2012), among them: cost-efficiency, fast-response rate, easier distribution and immediate database construction. To overcome some of the disadvantages inherent to the application of web-based surveys, such as low response rate and difficulty to inform participants of their ethical rights (McMillan, 2012), the researcher visited each English course before sending the questionnaire, gave instructions, informed participants of their rights and prompted them to answer the survey at that specific time.

Even though both questionnaires had the same categories, so that a comparison across sample groups was possible, the statements/questions related to each category were written differently for each questionnaire, given the fact that the students’ instrument sought to inquire about students’ beliefs regarding television and their learning, whereas in teachers’ case, the focus was on television and their teaching. The macro-categories present in both questionnaires were, as already presented on the chapter that corresponds to the conceptual framework, reasons
for using or not using television for language learning. Within these macro-categories (advantages and challenges) it is possible to find: the **efficacy** of television in language level improvement, the effect of television on **skill development** (reading, listening, writing, speaking, vocabulary and grammar), the effect of using television in class on student **motivation**, the relationship between television and **culture**, the challenge that is **material selection**, the confinement of television as a form of **entertainment** or as mostly suitable for **autonomous learning** and the relationship between **television difficulty and language level**.

Regarding final layout, the students’ questionnaire was divided into four parts, each one corresponding to a page on the Google Forms survey format: participant’s overall information and general television practices, broad pedagogical beliefs regarding television and English learning, beliefs about what happens inside the context of the English class and, finally, beliefs about television and free-time, independent watching. This questionnaire was piloted twice, once in paper and once on web form, by a total of 5 BEd students that did not belong to the population surveyed, before the final version was constructed and ultimately applied. See Appendix A for a paper rendition of this survey.

On the other hand, the teachers’ inventory had only three parts, divided in three Google Forms pages: participant’s general information and television practices, overall pedagogical beliefs regarding television and beliefs related to the occurrences inside the context of the English classroom. The teachers’ questionnaire was piloted twice, once in paper and once on web form, by a total of 3 language teachers that did not belong to the population surveyed, before the final version was concluded. Refer to Appendix B for a paper version of the teachers’ survey.

Finally, it is important to clarify that both questionnaires used two sets of Likert-scale options: “Completely Agree”, “Agree”, “Neither Agree nor Disagree”, “Disagree” and “Completely Disagree”, on the one hand, and “A Great Deal”, “A Lot”, “Neither A Lot nor Very Little”, “Very Little” and “Not at all” on the other. Besides name completion, all questions followed a Likert-scale format, except for one open-ended question regarding the reasons for watching/using television in English. All questions were mandatory for completing the survey. Furthermore, both questionnaires were written in Spanish to avoid possible bias or error deriving from misunderstanding of statements on the part of students, particularly those belonging to the elementary and basic levels. Additionally, both questionnaires provided an ever-present
definition of what is considered to be included in the term “Television” as proposed by the present research.

3.2.2 Interview

An interview is briefly defined as “a form of data collection in which questions are asked orally and subjects’ responses are recorded, either verbatim or summarized” (McMillan, 2012, p. 167). An interview, as Croker (2009) states, allows for the exploration of people’s experiences, worldviews and the meanings they attach to them. Interviews should be conducted, within qualitative research, when the phenomenon approached in a study cannot be directly observed, such as feelings, thoughts, intentions or how people interpret the world around them (Merriam, 1998). Given that one of the main objectives of this research was to describe teachers’ and students’ beliefs, which comply with the aforementioned description of a phenomenon not directly observable, an interview seemed an appropriate data collection instrument to further characterize these beliefs.

Individual or in groups, there are, according to Merriam (1998), 3 types of interviews within an interview structure continuum, ranging from highly structured to unstructured interviews. The first type, also known as standardized interviews, consists mainly of predetermined questions with possible answers, given by the interviewer, from which the respondent must choose (McMillan, 2012). The other pole of the spectrum are unstructured, or informal, interviews which consist of open-ended, general and exploratory questions that have not been set in advance but that arise from the natural course of the conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee (Merriam, 1998).

The type of interview chosen for the qualitative phase of this research is situated midway between the structured and unstructured type: semi-structured interviews. In this type of interviews “the question is open-ended yet specific in intent, allowing individual responses (…); [it] is reasonably objective, yet it allows for probing, follow-up, and clarification” (McMillan, 2012, p. 168). Considering that the questions for the interviews (individual and focus groups) attempted to complement the findings from the quantitative phase (and, as such, were derived from categories already present in said findings), this type of interview seemed most appropriate.

The semi-structured, individual interviews, individual with teachers and in group with students, were conducted following a guided approach since the topic, the categories and some of
the questions were selected in advance but the sequence and some extra questions were decided during the interview (Cohen et al., 2000). This approach allowed the researcher to cover important, mandatory topics while giving the respondent the opportunity to emphasize on other emergent areas (McMillan, 2012).

To further explore the quantitative data gathered during the first phase of the research, two focus group interviews were conducted with students from a High Intermediate and a Low-Advanced group, respectively. A focus group, as Cohen et al. (2000) define it, is a form of group interview that relies on the interaction between its participants (between 4 and 8 individuals), who discuss a topic that is supplied by the researcher. In a focus group, “the participants interact with each other rather than with the interviewer, such that the views of the participants can emerge” (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 288).

Seven students participated in each of the two focus groups conducted, for a total of 14 students interviewed, none of which had answered the initial questionnaire. Rather than answer a set of questions, the participants in the focus groups discussed, in Spanish to avoid bias caused by language difficulty, the same statements present on the student questionnaire, corresponding to the following categories: efficacy, skill development, autonomous learning, entertainment, motivation, culture, material selection and language difficulty.

The focus groups, with an average duration of 53 minutes, were recorded and then transcribed, therefore, both audio and text served as materials for the analysis. For the transcription of both group interviews, see Appendixes C and D.

To supplement the quantitative data collected from the teachers’ questionnaire, three individual semi-structured interviews were conducted, in Spanish, with three of the teachers who had answered the online survey. The questions of the interviews covered the same macro-categories as the questionnaire, including the efficacy of television on language learning, the relationship between language level and TV understanding, the effect of TV on skill development, motivation, class preparation and workload, and subtitle and genre usefulness. For a written version of the guiding questions used during the individual interviews, refer to Appendix E.

Given that the teachers interviewed had already answered the survey, a copy of each teacher’s answers was present during the interview so that they could confirm, elaborate on or contradict their previous answers. These interviews, which lasted an average of 35 minutes, were
recorded and then transcribed so that both audio and text could be used as analysis material. For the transcription of each of the three interviews, see Appendixes F, G and H.

To conclude this chapter, we now offer a visual representation of the present research design, adapted specially for this project from Ivankova et al.’s (2006) guidelines:

**Figure 1: Mixed-method Sequential Explanatory Design**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
<th>Sampling</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Quantitative data collection</td>
<td>Online Likert-scale questionnaires in Spanish</td>
<td>Ts: no sampling</td>
<td>Ts: 12 of 17 (70.5%)</td>
<td>Numeric data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sts: probability cluster sampling</td>
<td>Sts: 199 of 342 (58.18%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quantitative data analysis</td>
<td>Frequency distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Connecting quantitative and QUALITATIVE phases</td>
<td>Development of interview and focus groups questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. QUALITATIVE data collection</td>
<td>Individual interviews Focus groups interviews (both in Spanish)</td>
<td>Ts: criteria sampling Sts: convenience sampling</td>
<td>Ts: 3 (from the 12) Sts: 14 (not from the 199)</td>
<td>Text data (interview transcripts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. QUALITATIVE data analysis</td>
<td>Coding and thematic analysis (Atlas.Ti)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Integration of results</td>
<td>Triangulation Interpretation of quantitative and qualitative results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Further research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Results and Data analysis

This chapter presents the results obtained and the analysis process conducted after the data collection. Regarding data analysis, frequency distribution was used to process the quantitative data collected from the Likert-scale questionnaires. Subsequently, interpretive analysis was conducted to group similar ideas together, find and define major categories, and discover patterns of behavior and thinking (Croker, 2009) among the qualitative data collected from both types of interviews conducted, individual and focus groups. For this codification, the software Atlas.Ti for Mac (Version 1.0.36), a tool for qualitative data analysis, was employed. Using this software, the data collected from both types of interviews was coded according to the categories established a priori for both the questionnaires and the interviews: **Efficacy**, **Skill development**, **Culture**, **Accessibility**, **Motivation**, **Television as Entertainment**, **Television and Autonomous Learning**, **Selection Criteria** and **Language Difficulty**. Smaller codes, belonging to the previous categories, as well as a few emergent codes, were also identified using the aforementioned software. Appendixes I and J correspond to the two projects created with this software and may be consulted for a more detailed view of the codification process, a visual representation of the codes and categories used and a set of extra codes, such as frequency, workload and time investment, re-viewing, activities, subtitle, genre efficacy and many others that were codified but, due to time and space constrains, could not be included in this research document. It is important to notice that the software Atlas.Ti is needed to open these files.

After the quantitative and the qualitative data were accounted for, triangulation ensued. Triangulation, as pointed out by Croker (2009), aims at “obtaining different perspectives on a phenomenon by gathering data from different participants, and using a variety of data collection methods like observations, interviews and questionnaires” (p. 11). Given the mixed-method nature of this research, and the corresponding use of different types of data collection instruments, methodological triangulation, the use of different methods on the same object of study (Cohen et al., 2000), seemed like the appropriate approach for data analysis.

A presentation of the quantitative and qualitative results now follows, by category, and within each category, a comparison between teacher’s and students’ beliefs is made.
whenever possible. First, the results corresponding to an exploratory inquiry on television practices made possible by some initial questions on the quantitative questionnaires are reported. Within this first section, 3 categories are analyzed: Time spent using/watching TV, Devices students use to watch TV (related to accessibility) and Reasons for using/watching TV. The second section, which corresponds to the analysis of the beliefs expressed by the participants in both the questionnaires and the interviews, approaches 6 main categories: Efficacy (and related to it, two other beliefs: TV as entertainment or learning tool and TV for autonomous learning), Skill development (with a section for each skill: Reading, Listening, Writing, Speaking, Grammar and Vocabulary), Motivation increase, “Window on culture”, Language difficulty and Selection criteria. Additionally, the results are reported and described by using findings derived from both types of data collected. To guarantee the anonymity of the participants of the qualitative phase, a reference system is employed to report data from focus groups (FG01 or FG02), including the participant (student) who uttered that statement (ST01, ST02, etc.) and the quotation number, i.e., FG01-ST04-Q072 corresponds to an opinion expressed in focus group 1, by student 4, localizable in quotation 72 of the Atlas.Ti project. A similar reference system is employed for interviews with teachers: I01, I02 and I03 to identify which interview and Qn to localize the quotation.

4.1 Exploratory inquiry on television practices

As part of the initial Likert-scale questionnaires applied to both teachers and students, some general questions regarding the participants’ television practices, particularly the time spent watching or using TV in the classroom, as well as the devices used for said watching activities, were asked. The purpose of asking these questions was to characterize, even if just on the surface, participants’ practical relationship with television since it seemed more appropriate to describe beliefs held by students and teachers that use and watch television than those of people who do not, especially if, as Richards and Lockhart (1994) point out, experience is a very important source of beliefs.

To this respect, and pertaining to the use of television in English inside the classroom, 83% of the 12 teachers admitted they use it, with an average usage of less than an hour per week. Additionally, 96% of the 199 students expressed they currently watch
television in English. These results may be considered similar to the ones reported by Kines (2012) in the case of teachers and by Wu Man-Fat (2012) in the case of students: a considerable number of teachers in the South Korean context expressed they used television in English in their classes, just like in the BEd program; regarding students, Wu Man Fat (2012) reported that television watching was one of the most important out-of-class activity for a number of students in Hong Kong, a trend that appears to be similar in the context where this research was conducted since almost all students admitted to watching TV in English.

Students were also asked to detail the amount of time per week that they spend watching television and Figure 2 shows these results.

**Figure 2: Hours students spend watching TV in English per week**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours students spend watching TV in English per week</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't watch TV</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than an hour</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 hours</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 hours</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 hours</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8 hours</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 hours</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 hours</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Figure 2 shows, 9% of students watch less than an hour per week, 23% between 1-2 hours, 27% between 2-4 hours, 17% between 4-6 hours, 8% between 6-8 hours, 5% between 8-10 hours, 3% between 10-12 hours and, finally, 8% watches over 12 hours of television in English per week. It can be concluded, then, that an average BEd student watches between 1 and 6 hours of television in English every week, a considerable amount of time outside the classroom that is being spent on exposition to the English language.

It is important to point out that, since teachers were asked to report the time they spend using TV inside the classroom per week and students were asked about their weekly television-watching time in general (either for leisure or education), the average number of
hours dedicated to this activity (less than half an hour for teachers, between 1 and 6 hours for students) differs considerably due to the different nature of the questions asked.

When asked about the moment in which they watch TV in English, and having the opportunity to choose multiple options, 96% of students said they watch television in English during their spare time while only 18% of them expressed they have watched TV during one of their English classes. This data seems to contradict the teachers’ answers given that 83% of them admitted they use TV inside their classroom. These results appear to be quite different to the ones presented by Cabrales and Rojas (2013) given that, according to their research report, only a small number of teachers admitted to having used television in their classes, a fact that apparently was confirmed by the percentage of students (circa 30%) that admitted to having watched TV in class. However, considering that these preliminary questions (in both the current research and in Cabrales and Rojas’ (2013) study) belong to the domain of practices and not beliefs, even if these two concepts are effectively connected, as Pajares (1992) points out, further research into practices around television in the BEd context would be needed to expand on this data and confirm how much time is really allotted to television-watching inside the average BEd English classroom.

As part of this exploratory inquiry into students’ practices, they were asked to detail the devices they use to watch TV, results that are reported on Figure 3.

**Figure 3: Devices students use to watch television**

![Figure 3: Devices students use to watch television](image)

Figure 3 shows, then, that 70% of students watches on a television set, 83% on the computer, 29% on the tablet and 44% on their cellphones. It is necessary to mention that
they could choose more than one option. The results gathered from this question, particularly the percentage of students who say they do not watch television on the television set, seem to reflect what Sherman (2003) points out regarding accessibility and the ways in which the Internet has reshaped television practices and availability (a phenomenon already mentioned by Scolari (2008). Furthermore, portable devices appear to be gaining strength and, consequently, time and location constrictions are becoming less of a hindrance for television watching, particularly considering independent study practices or possible homework assignments.

The only open-ended question on both online surveys asked teachers and students who had admitted to using or watching TV about their reasons behind said practice. Using interpretive analysis, the open-ended responses given by participants were categorized with 14 emergent codes for each group of participants, some of them (vocabulary, grammar, etc.) present on both sets of codes. The results from the answers given by the teachers, reported in Figure 4, show that 8% of 12 teachers expressed, as reasons for using television in ELT, an improvement in pronunciation, in writing, in reading, in vocabulary acquisition, in grammar, in student motivation and, additionally, the fact that TV complements the topics being studied. Furthermore, 17% said they consider that TV improves speaking, is an authentic material, adds variety to the English class and is a useful tool for generating discussions. 25% of teachers highlighted its efficacy on listening as well as the fact that it presents different types of accents and, finally, 33% thinks TV is useful because it presents language being used in a real context.
Figure 4: Teachers' reasons for using TV in the classroom

On their part, 0.5% of the 199 students said that the reason they found TV in English effective is that it is motivating, 1% expressed it helps them to understand native speakers, 2% highlighted that it helps to learn grammar, 3% underscored the presence of different accents on TV as well as the fact that the majority of the TV shows they watch are already in English, 4% said that TV helps to explore cultural aspects and 5% expressed that TV in English is better or more interesting than national television. Improvement in speaking was mentioned as an important reason by 6% of students, specifically in pronunciation by 8% and that same percentage expressed they watch TV in English because they dislike dubbed versions. On a similar note, 11% of students reported they are interested in watching the original version (OV) of films or shows, 22% voiced that, in general terms (without specifying a skill), TV helps language learning, 35% stated that it helps to acquire vocabulary and, finally, 43% stressed the effect of TV on the improvement of listening skills. These results can be better appreciated on Figure 5.
Figure 5: Students’ reasons for watching television in English
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In general, it is apparent from Figure 4 and Figure 5 that some of the reasons both teachers and students have for using and watching TV in English respectively are similar, albeit to different extent. Reasons such as motivation, vocabulary, accents, culture and, specially, listening, are mentioned by both agents. The most important reasons for using TV in the classroom, as expressed by teachers, are its effect on skill development and its presentation of language in real contexts. Given that students’ were asked about their reasons for watching (not using) television, their answer also include reasons that are mainly connected to television watching as entertainment (disliking dubbed versions or preferring to watch the original are important reasons for them), although skill development, specifically listening improvement, is seemingly the most important reason for watching TV in English.

This preliminary inquiry about teachers’ and students’ practices regarding television made it possible for us to construct an initial characterization of the relationship both these agents have with television, particularly in the context of their EFL learning and teaching. The fact that a considerable percentage of teachers and students admit that television plays a role in their academic life, in a way, supports the pertinence of the findings solely related to beliefs about television, presented in the next section.
4.2 Reasons for using or not using television (Advantages and Challenges)

We now present the results that pertain directly to the categories highlighted in the conceptual framework of this research, beliefs and the advantages and challenges that suppose the use of television in ELT contexts.

4.2.1 Efficacy

Probably the most important question asked on both the teachers’ and students’ questionnaires was whether participants consider that television has a beneficial impact on language learning and language improvement, especially since the subsequent beliefs (particularly skill development) would have to depend on that first central belief (Pajares, 1992, drawing on Rokeach, 1968), the efficacy of television in ELT. To this respect, the statements “Watching television in English helps improve the language level” and “Watching television in English helps me improve my language level” aimed at identifying the presence of this belief in teachers and students respectively. As reported on Figure 6, 50% of the teachers surveyed completely agree with the statement and the remaining 50% agree with it, thus apparently confirming that all teacher participants hold the belief that watching television in English helps improve the language level. Students’ responses to this statement were along the same line, with a few students who were undecided towards the efficacy of television or disagreed completely with the previous statement. However, 55% of students completely agreed and 32% agreed with the statement, thus making it possible to conclude that most students believe that television may be useful for language level improvement.
The expressions shared by all of the participants in the students’ focus groups and by the three teachers interviewed, in general, seem to support the data collected through the questionnaires. Given that this central efficacy belief is rather general, and that it is obviously connected to others that derive from it, particularly skill development, its presence in the participants discourse may become more apparent in some of the excerpts that relate to those other categories. It is necessary to mention, now, that the excerpts in this document are translated versions of the utterances expressed in Spanish by participants of the interviews and focus groups (the original excerpts, in Spanish, are quoted in footnotes throughout this document). The following utterance, made by a teacher, albeit vague, might serve as an example of the existence of this first efficacy belief in the teacher population studied.

*Well, that the language is authentic, real, and, well, exposing students to that is the best thing you can do. And you can use that language that is seen in a TV show or in a video to teach grammar, for listening, for any skill, I think.*

This excerpt shows, then, that for this teacher, using television in the classroom is effective in that it can help improve any language skill and in that it presents authentic

---

11 “Pues que el lenguaje es o el idioma es auténtico, real, y pues exponer a los estudiantes a eso es lo mejor que uno puede hacer. Y puedes utilizar ese lenguaje que se ve en un programa o en un video para enseñar gramática, para listening, para cualquier habilidad, me parece”. Translation by the author of this document.
language to the students. This latter idea is also expressed by one of the students of the focus group when asked about the usefulness of TV in language learning:

To me it is useful because, what St03 was saying is true, the context that is shown on television is a more informal context and is one you may be exposed to in an easier way when you finish the BEd program.12 (FG02-St02-Q03)

Therefore, it is apparent from these excerpts that one of the reasons why, if not all, at least some teachers and students seem to believe on the efficacy of television in English on language improvement is its authenticity, which, in turn, is connected to the presence of informal and real contexts. It is important to mention again that authenticity was mentioned by 17% of the 12 teachers as a reason for using TV in English (Figure 4). The relevance of the authenticity of television, in relation to the efficacy this medium may pose in language learning and teaching, is also highlighted by Sherman (2003), Ulusoy and Demirbilek (2013), Katchen (2002) and Hui Yang and Fleming (2013); it comes as no surprise, then, that this aspect of television is also mentioned by students and teachers. Besides its authenticity, however, there could be, according to Kiley (2005) some reasons for teachers and students to undermine the efficacy of television in language teaching, such as considering it purely as entertainment or considering it better suited for autonomous forms of language learning. The next two sections approach these two possible beliefs.

4.2.2 Television as entertainment

The fact that television is mainly a form of entertainment may be seen as an impediment for its use on education, in general, and on language learning in particular, predominantly in educational contexts where the line between learning and amusement are kept separate. Furthermore, as it was apparent from the reasons students gave for watching television in English, entertainment seems to play an important role behind this preference. The following statement then, “Television in English is more a form of entertainment rather than a tool to learn English”, was incorporated into the student questionnaire to explore this apparently contradictory function of television as either entertainment or a learning tool.

12 “Para mí sí es útil porque, lo que decía St03 es cierto, el contexto que muestran en la televisión es un contexto más informal y al que uno se puede llegar a exponer con más facilidad cuando termina la licenciatura”. Translation by the author of this document.
Figure 7: Students’ belief on whether television is more a form of entertainment or a learning tool

To this respect and as presented on Figure 7, 35% of the 199 students neither agreed nor disagreed with the aforementioned statement and 27% disagreed and 14% completely disagreed with it. Perhaps what these results suggest, particularly the 35% that neither agrees nor disagrees, is that a considerable number of students probably belief that television is not necessarily more a form of entertainment or that it can be both a form of entertainment and a tool for learning English. This latter view was expressed by some of the participants in the focus groups conducted, as the following excerpts show.

I think it’s both. But in an unconscious way. For instance, in my case, I always watch movies in English and now I feel that I don’t need to put on subtitles. So, unconsciously that helps me a lot. Because, it’s like my classmates were saying, I mean, they, yes, it increases vocabulary a lot and idioms, that are totally the natural way of speaking, then, that’s what you acquire. So I would say that it is a tool as well as entertainment. And I think that is what is appealing about it, that since it is entertainment, then you continue doing it and it continues helping you.13 *(FG01-St03-Q12)*

...you watch television because you like it, you don’t watch television just to watch television. So, when you watch television, you can see that enjoyment from the TV

---

13 “Yo creo que es ambas. Pero es de manera inconsciente. Por lo menos, en mi caso, yo siempre veo películas en inglés y ya siento que no tengo la necesidad de poner subtítulos. Entonces, eso inconscientemente me ayuda muchísimo. Porque es como dicen mis compañeros, o sea ellos, sí, se aumenta muchísimo el vocabulario y como los idioms que son totalmente de la manera natural de hablar, entonces, eso uno lo adquiere. Entonces yo diría que tanto una herramienta como entretenimiento. Y yo creo que eso es lo que más llama la atención, que como es entretenimiento entonces uno lo sigue haciendo y eso le sigue ayudando”. Translation by the autor of this document.
show or from whatever you’re watching, and that makes you learn more, I mean, knowledge sticks more.\textsuperscript{14} (FG01-St07-Q13)

I also think it’s a mix of both, I mean, of entertainment and learning because it depends on what you like. If you are watching something you like, you can also learn from it. So, If I’m watching, for example, I don’t know, a TV series about detectives, I really like the investigation part or the part about, something more like, or that kind of topics like suspense, then I’m going to be learning while I enjoy.\textsuperscript{15} (FG02-St02-Q22)

From these excerpts, it is possible to conclude that for some students, television can serve as entertainment as well as a tool for learning a language. This idea may seem to contradict Kiely’s (2005) assertion about the fact that television is underused in education in part because it is usually considered more a form of popular culture and a source of entertainment that a useful resource for education, which traditionally concentrates on literature and other forms of high culture. Additionally, these excerpts also show a relationship between television watching and unconscious learning: these students seemingly believe that watching a TV show or film, even if it is just for the sake of being entertained, may help to learn a language, in a form of implicit language learning that McLaughlin (1990) associates with some of Krashen’s acquisition theories. McLaughlin (1990) and Frensch and Rünger (2003) point out that the concept of implicit learning, even if theoretically acknowledged, is still very much understudied, particularly because its mechanisms are yet to be defined. Nonetheless, McLaughlin (1990) suggests that, regardless of this conceptual difficulty, unconscious learning is undoubtedly a subjective experience that effectively occurs, an assertion that relates to the ideas expressed

\textsuperscript{14} “…uno ve televisión es porque le gusta, uno no ve televisión por ver televisión. Entonces, uno ve la televisión, uno ve ese gusto por el programa o por lo que uno esté viendo, y eso hace que uno aprenda más, o sea, que el conocimiento se fije más”. Translation by the author of this document.

\textsuperscript{15} “Yo creo que también es una mezcla de la dos, o sea, de entretenimiento y de aprendizaje porque va en gustos. Si uno está viendo algo que a uno le gusta, de eso también puede aprender. Entonces si yo estoy viendo, por ejemplo, no sé, una serie de televisión acerca de detectives, y a mí me gusta mucho la parte de investigar o la parte de, algo más como, o ese tipo de temas de suspenso, entonces voy a ir aprendiendo a medida que voy también disfrutando”. Translation by the author of this document.
by these students on the focus groups: they believe television watching to be a form of implicit learning particularly potent due to its entertainment component.

4.2.3 Television for autonomous learning

One of the other reasons mentioned by Kiely (2005) that would explain, at least in part, certain teachers’ reluctance towards using TV in the classroom is, mainly, that this practice has not been strongly associated with a specific language learning approach and, therefore, has usually been considered a tool or resource more suitable for learning without a teacher, i.e., autonomous learning experiences. To the statement “TV shows in English are more appropriate for students' autonomous work than for class work”, 50% of the 12 teachers expressed their disagreement, 8% completely disagreed and 33% were undecided, as can be observed on Figure 8.

Figure 8: Teachers’ belief on whether TV is more appropriate for autonomous learning than classwork

More than half of the teachers, apparently, do not hold this belief, i.e. that TV is more appropriate for autonomous learning than classwork, although it is necessary to mention that these results may reflect, on the one hand, that they believe it is more appropriate for classwork than for independent study or, on the other hand, that it is equally effective for both. Perhaps the latter is the option associated to the 33% of teachers that reported they neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement, such as the teacher that said the following during one of the interviews:
I believe I did it more [answer the ‘neither agree nor disagree option’], like, because I think they are, that it is equally effective in any of the both... [modalities].

Regarding the first hypothesis, that TV is more suitable for classwork, no explicit expression of this idea was found in any of the interviews. However, and perhaps in relation to this supposition, all three teachers interviewed accepted that TV may well serve as a tool for autonomous work, but two of them clarified this idea by stating that the existence of comprehension activities is of paramount importance for this to actually happen.

I mean, autonomous learning implies that you do a task related to the activity you are doing. For example, I tell them “Well, are you going to listen to a song? Okay. ‘Oh, this song is cool’, and so forth, no. Listen and write the lyrics, do a summary, then compare the lyrics to the audio and the original version”, do you understand? Of course, watching television, even if it is for entertainment, helps them, but it helps them more by doing something related to what they’re saying, by doing a task.

Oh... Well, it can be done, but then you have to make a very well crafted guide. I mean, I can’t tell them “watch this and tell me about it” but, then, I have to prepare a material that answers to what I want them to learn from that video. So, yes, if you prepare yourself and give them the material so that they can do it.

The previous excerpts hint at a relationship, in the opinion of some teachers, between autonomous learning and the necessity of doing activities for television to be at its most effective, even if an important distinction is evident from the teachers’

---

16 “Creo que lo hice más [responder ‘Ni de acuerdo ni en desacuerdo’], como, porque me parece que son, que es igual de eficaz en cualquiera de las dos... [modalidades]”. Translation by the author of this document.
17 “O sea, el aprendizaje autónomo implica que tú hagas una tarea con respecto a la actividad que estás haciendo. Por ejemplo, yo les digo “Bueno, ¿van a oír una canción? Listo. ‘Ay, tan chévere la canción’, tata, no. Saquen la letra, hagan un resumen, luego comparen la letra con el audio y la versión original”, ¿si me entiendes? Claro que sí, o sea, ver televisión, así sea para entretenimiento, les ayuda, pero les ayuda más haciendo algo con respecto a eso que están diciendo, hacer una tarea”. Translation by the author of this document.
18 “Ah... Pues sí se puede hacer, pero pues hay que hacer una guía muy bien hecha. Es decir, no puedo decirles “vean esto y me cuentan” sino, pues, hay que preparar un material que responda a lo que yo quiero que ellos aprendan con ese video. Entonces, sí, si se prepara uno y les da el material para que lo puedan hacer”. Translation by the author of this document.
utterances: for the first teacher, these activities must come from the student’s own initiative while, for the second, it is the teacher’s role to provide guidance in this regard. However, the views expressed by the three teachers during the interviews apparently ignore that, according to Thanasoulas’ (2000) definition, autonomous learning involves a greater responsibility on the part of the learner, particularly in that he or she should decide how to approach the language learning process (and that decision may or may not include activities such as the ones proposed by the teachers).

Some students explicitly mentioned, during the focus groups discussions, that they don’t always consider it necessary to accompany television watching, even while acknowledging its academic potential, with activities when they are at home or outside the context of the class. The following two excerpts in a way show how at least some students feel about the relationship between watching TV as autonomous learning and doing activities:

_No, because what you do, you are being entertained, the maximum you’ll do is that, vocabulary, we need a lot of vocabulary: “no, I didn’t understand this, it’s, like, essential, let’s look it up” and that’s all, but I’m not going to do a worksheet with checklist questions and if I understood the story, then no... it’s not real, you don’t do that._19 (FG01–St06-Q78).

..._But, well, in my case I think no, it’s not necessary._20 (FG02-St05-Q272).

Further research on this matter would be necessary to comprehensively understand both the teachers’ and the student’s definition of what constitutes autonomous learning (and its connection, perhaps, to incidental learning if we consider the results reported in Figure 7 regarding this topic, where students apparently believe they can learn English watching TV even when that is not their main goal and, presumably, no activities are carried out while watching). However, what can be concluded from this question is that over half of the teacher population surveyed does not agree with Kiely’s (2005) assertion regarding the

---

19 “No, porque lo máximo, lo sumo, que uno hace, uno se está es entreteniendo, lo máximo que podemos hacer es eso, vocabulario, necesitamos mucho vocabulario: “no, no entendí esto, es como esencial, venga busco qué es” y ya, pero yo no me voy a hacer ahí una hojita como con checklist questions y si si entendí la historia, pues no... no es real, uno no hace eso”. Translation by the author of this document.

20 “...Pero, pues, en mi caso creo que no, no hace falta”. Translation by the author of this document.
perceived exclusivity of TV as an autonomous learning activity, even if the necessity of doing activities is highlighted by some teachers as compulsory for learning to take place.

4.2.4 Skill development

The effect of TV on skill development is directly related to its efficacy in language learning, as has already been stated, in the sense that believing that TV can help improve any or all skills would mean also believing on its efficacy, as proposed by Rokeach’s (1968) model of connections between beliefs within a specific belief system (in Pajares, 1992). In terms of skills, it is necessary to mention, all four communicative skills were accounted for in the questionnaires, plus two additional general skill-related language elements, grammar and vocabulary. Rather than having participants express their degree of agreement, the statement related to skill development demanded of them to grade how much television aids the improvement of each one of the six ‘skills’, ranging from “A great deal” to “Not at all”. We will now present the general results on the teachers’ and students’ beliefs on skill development and, later on, in detail per skill.

Beginning with the teachers’ answers, to the statement “Television in English potentially helps to develop/improve… [specific skill]”, 50% of the 12 teachers were very convinced of the fact that TV can help students improve their reading, 100% considerably believe it helps listening, 33% positively believe on its positive effect on writing and 83% on speaking while 67% powerfully accept it helps with grammar and 100% with vocabulary. These percentages reflect those teachers who either answered “A great deal” or “A lot”. However, answers such as “Neither a lot nor a little” and “Very little”, even if they reflect less effectiveness, are still within the scope of accepting a certain degree of efficacy. Considering this, and from this general overview, it is possible to assert that, apparently, over 90% of teachers believe that TV can have a positive effect on possibly all skills, but to different degrees. This idea was explicitly stated by one of the teachers in an interview:

...I believe it is useful for everything [for every skill], it’s just that, in my opinion, it is more useful for some things than others.\(^{21}\) (I02-Q49)

\(^{21}\)“… yo creo que sirve para todo [para todas las habilidades], sino que, en mi opinión, sirve más para unas cosas que para otras.”. Translation by the author of this document.
Figure 9: Teachers’ beliefs on the effect of TV on skill development

As it is strikingly evident in Figure 9, the obvious unanimity expressed by teachers regarding the efficacy of TV on listening and vocabulary development is worth commenting (specially because it corroborates the predominance of listening, already showed in Figure 4). The fact that TV watching is unanimously associated with listening practice and development is only logical considering that aural input, in terms of language elements present on TV without subtitles, is the most recognizable feature of TV. Furthermore, in television watching, for language learning or leisure, comprehension is the main objective and is achievable specifically through the spectator’s capacity of understanding what is being said (even if, as Sherman (2003) mentions, the visual component of video generally aids comprehension). Regarding vocabulary, this belief may derive from the fact that television presents vocabulary in context and, moreover, can be considered as a moving picture book, “worth a thousand of picture dictionaries and magazines” (Sherman, 2003, p.3).

Students’ responses to a statement similar to the one presented to teachers (“Television in English potentially helps me to develop/improve... [specific skill]”) presents a somewhat similar picture: 19% of the 199 students expressed that TV has a considerable effect on reading, 98% strongly highlight its effect on listening, 15%
underscore its effectiveness when it comes to writing, 79% consider it particularly helpful to develop their speaking and, finally, 43% and 95% think TV is highly effective on grammar and vocabulary improvement respectively. It is necessary to indicate, as was done with the teachers’ results regarding this category, that the other answers except for “Not at all” would constitute positive indications of the presence of a belief on the efficacy of television on a particular skill, even if that positive effect is seen not as strong. It is important to comment that these results are consistent with what was already reported in Figure 5 where listening and vocabulary had important places in the list of reasons why students watch TV in English. In general, then, over 80% of the students surveyed apparently believe that TV may help them develop all skills, again, to different degrees.

Figure 10: Students’ beliefs on the effect of TV on skill development

In general, Students’ results, as Figure 10 suggests, seem to be similar to those extracted from the teachers’ questionnaires: listening and vocabulary also appear to be believed the most positively affected by TV in English, probably due to the reasons that were already mentioned. Additionally, writing, reading and grammar, in that order, are also the skills where students saw TV efficacy as not particularly useful. These results suggest that, when it comes to the degree in which TV can potentially help develop skills, students and teachers appear to have similar belief systems, at least in terms of efficacy distribution.
A further exploration into each one of the skills would have to follow in order to determine if this similarity between beliefs systems transcends the mere consideration of degree and includes the reasons behind said consideration. The following results are presented in accordance to the order in which each skill appeared in the questionnaires, first the receptive skills (Reading and Listening), then the productive ones (Writing and Speaking) and finally the extra two ‘skills’ (Grammar and Vocabulary).

4.2.4.1 Reading improvement

After writing, reading was the second skill on which both teachers and students believed television did not have such a powerful positive impact. There is, however, a difference between teachers’ and students’ answers in relation to the level of impact TV has on this skill. While the predominant trend among teachers was that TV helps a lot to improve reading, most students’ believed that the impact lies somewhere between “A lot” and “Very little”, a difference that is visually reported in Figure 11.

Figure 11: Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve reading

This difference in degree consideration may be explained, as part of one possible interpretation among many, by mentioning some of the opinions expressed by both teachers and students on the interviews. That students found TV not so useful when it comes to reading development could possibly be related to the fact that reading, while watching television, was mainly circumscribed to vocabulary acquisition and subtitle reading.
Yes, because I have more vocabulary. And for reading you need more of that.\textsuperscript{22} (FG01-St04-Q17)

But not so much. It would be useful for vocabulary, but, let’s say, when it comes to the structure of a text, it doesn’t help at all. Just to learn new words.\textsuperscript{23} (FG01-St02-Q21)

As these two excerpts show, lexical acquisition, product of TV watching, is associated with reading improvement since, as some students apparently believe, it is necessary to know a wide range of vocabulary to read properly. Concerning subtitles, the other apparent aspect in which TV may contribute to improve reading skills, students pointed out that reading subtitles in English is another way in which reading can be improved upon by TV.

...like, you’re watching the TV show, normal, okay, but then you are reading at the same time the way in which the words are written, the way in... like understanding the text that is under there and that’s it. But, other than that, I don’t think so because it is more and exercise in listening, visual and aural comprehension.\textsuperscript{24} (FG02-St04-Q34)

One student, while proposing a subtitle-audio combination that had not been considered in the conceptual framework of this study (audio: any language unknown by the student; subtitles: English), stressed that this option is the one that probably helps the most since she cannot rely on her listening skills to understand, only on her reading skills.

Yes, because I’m really reading the subtitles, because I can’t understand anything of what they’re saying.\textsuperscript{25} (FG01-St04-Q185)

That teachers, in general, seem to consider TV’s impact on reading as more productive than students could possibly be explained by the fact that they probably consider

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22}“Sí, porque tengo más vocabulario. Y para un reading necesitas más eso”. Translation by the author of this document.
\item \textsuperscript{23}“Pero no tanto. Sería útil por vocabulario, pero, digamos, a la hora de la estructura de un texto, no ayudaría en absolutamente nada. Sólo para aprender nuevas palabras”. Translation by the author of this document.
\item \textsuperscript{24}“…como estás viendo el programa, normal, bien, pero entonces estás leyendo al mismo tiempo cómo se escriben las palabras, cómo se... como comprendiendo el texto que dice debajo y ya. Pero de resto, no creo porque pues es un ejercicio más de listening, de comprensión visual y auditiva”. Translation by the author of this document.
\item \textsuperscript{25}“Sí, porque estoy leyendo de verdad los subtítulos, porque no puedo entender nada de lo que dicen”. Translation by the author of this document.
\end{itemize}
more uses of television in regards to reading. Nonetheless, two of the teachers interviewed coincided with the students in that they considered subtitle reading to be the most direct way in which TV improves reading skills.

For reading? If you put... There was a question that said “putting subtitles in English and listening in English”, there you are learning reading as well. Or... well, for reading it would be only that. Reading the subtitles... What else? Nothing else, for reading it would be just that.26 (I01-Q16)

Reading... Well, I believe we should find an equivalence between what they read, well, they would be the subtitles specifically... that they read the subtitles and look how, how what is being said converges with what is happening in the scene. I would do that for reading.27 (I03-Q20)

However, another way of connecting reading and television emerged during the interviews with the teachers: using television as a way to introduce a topic that would be approached with a text later on. This would certainly correspond to Sherman’s (2003) second use of television, as a contextualization tool.

Let’s say that, for reading, I wouldn’t know, I wouldn’t know if it can affect directly, but I do think that when you give them a context before reading, that helps them a lot. I mean, if you arrive to class and say “Today we’re going to read about this. Sit down and read”, I think you start, like, a little dry. So, in that sense, for example, for reading, I have not worked directly with videos, but as input for the context, I think it helps them a lot as a little warm up, and then they sit down and read, already knowing what they’re going to face and not just read.28 (I02-Q28)

26 “¿Para reading? Si tú pones... Había una pregunta que decía “colocar los subtítulos en inglés y escuchar el inglés”, ahí estás aprendiendo reading también. O... bueno, para reading sería sólo eso. Leer los subtítulos.... ¿Qué más? No más, para reading sería eso.”. Translation by the author of this document.

27 “Reading... Pues yo creo que deberíamos encontrar una equivalencia entre lo que leen, bueno, ahí sí serían los subtítulos específicamente... que leyeran los subtítulos y miraran cómo se, cómo converge eso que están diciendo con lo que está ocurriendo físicamente en la escena. Eso lo haría para reading”. Translation by the author of this document.

28 “Digamos que en, en reading, no sabría, no sabría si directamente puede afectar, pero si creo que cuando tú les das un contexto antes de hacer una lectura, eso les ayuda mucho. Es decir, si tú llegas a la clase y les dices “Hoy vamos a leer sobre esto. Siéntense a leer”, creo que empiezas, como, un poco seco. Entonces, en ese sentido, por ejemplo con reading, no lo he trabajado directamente con videos, pero como input para el contexto, creo que les ayuda mucho como para calentar un poco, y ya sentarse a leer, sabiendo a qué se van a enfrentar y no leyendo a secas”. Translation by the author of this document.
And I have reading and writing. I don’t read with them during the two hours of the class, rather I always bring a video related to the reading. And they like that. And it may used for speaking, or for comprehension questions, for listening.²⁉ (I02-Q28)

Despite the fact that teachers seemed to consider more possibilities when it came to television and reading, it is important to notice that both teachers’ and students’ reference to reading corresponds to the traditional approach to customary written texts. This is perfectly logical given that, within the context of the BEd program, the reading skill is immediately understood, by both teachers and students, as the contact with written traditional texts (evidence of this can be found on the syllabi of the English courses). However, these apparent beliefs serve as proof of the absence of notions, such as those brought forth by Martín Barbero (1992) and Fiske (1989), by which the concept of reading and (inter)textuality transcend the written word and can now be applied to complex communicative and argumentative structures, such as the audiovisual media, including television. The question that remains then, from the teachers’ and students’ results is: What is being understood by reading within the BEd program?

4.2.4.2 Listening improvement

For the reasons stated before regarding the obvious relationship between television and aural comprehension, listening was the skill that, according to both teachers and students, benefits the most from TV use. As reported in Figure 12, the totality of teachers and students believe that TV can potentially improve this skill. This data seems to suggest, then, that these two agents within the BEd context share this belief.

²⁉ “Y yo tengo reading y writing. Yo no me pongo a leer las dos horas con ellos sino, yo siempre llevo un video relacionado con la lectura. Y eso les gusta. Y eso se presta para speaking, o para preguntas de comprensión, para listening”. Translation by the author of this document.
However, the degree to which they consider the efficacy of TV on this skill varies: 58% of teachers believe the impact of TV on listening is particularly potent while 74% of students consider the same, thus making it apparent that the latter perceive this audiovisual tool as more potent. This data is consistent with the fact that listening was the second most mentioned code by students on the focus groups (after “skill development”, which was assigned whenever the improvement of any of the six skills was mentioned, and vocabulary), mostly because even if they were talking about another skill, they usually referred to TV mainly as a listening exercise. Despite being the most mentioned code by students, it was hard to make both students and teachers elaborate on how exactly this improvement takes place since, apparently, this efficacy is so obvious that sometimes it’s not worth commenting. The following four excerpts, the first two by students and the other two by teachers, show how strongly some of the participants believe on this efficacy and how succinct they are when referring to it.

* A lot. * It helps me a great deal because when I listen to TV shows in English, or I watch television in English, I’m always aware of what I’m listening to.* (FG01-St01-Q37)

---

30 “Mucho. A mí me ayuda muchísimo porque cuando yo escucho series en inglés, o veo televisión en inglés, siempre soy consciente de lo que estoy escuchando”. Translation by the author of this document.
That’s like the best skill [on which TV has a positive impact].\textsuperscript{31} (FG02-St02-Q67)

Listening, well, of course.\textsuperscript{32} (I01-Q16)

Good, listening, well, it is implicit that they are going to listen to the dialogues.\textsuperscript{33} (I03-Q28)

Additionally, some students expressed that they believe there is a relationship between listening and speaking in that they perceive an improvement on this particular productive skill as a product of listening and watching TV shows.

\textit{I think it does because, well, it’s, let’s say, like the part that is the most, well like, the most sensible, let’s say, that you can have, let’s say, when you listen, so it’s like you have more retentive, so you can produce, like that, speaking.}\textsuperscript{34} (FG02-St06-Q62)

The effect of listening and watching TV programs on speaking will be further described when this particular skill is addressed. Nonetheless and relating to this topic, it is pertinent to point out that some teachers also mentioned this relationship but mostly in terms of using TV as input for speaking. This aspect of the relationship between both skills will also be described when reporting the findings on the speaking skill.

Regarding listening and TV, some students pointed out that the existence of varied accents and dialects on TV shows and films makes watching and listening particularly interesting but also, as will become apparent on the section that corresponds to language difficulty, quite challenging. The following excerpt aptly expresses how a student perceives listening skills can be improved by the fact that these types of audiovisual resources are very rich on accents and dialectal variations.

\textit{I would say that it works a lot for listening because depending on the variety of shows we watch, well, we would also have a variety of vocabulary and accents,}

\textsuperscript{31} “Esa sí es como la mejor habilidad”. Translation by the author of this document.
\textsuperscript{32} “Listening, pues, por supuesto”. Translation by the author of this document.
\textsuperscript{33} “Bueno, listening pues sí está implícito en que van a escuchar los diálogos”. Translation by the author of this document.
\textsuperscript{34} “Yo creo que si porque, pues, es, digamos, como la parte más, pues como, más sensible, digamos, que uno puede tener, digamos, al momento pues de escuchar, entonces ya como que uno tiene más retentiva, entonces puede producir, así, hablando”. Translation by the author of this document.
mainly, that we’ll be listening to all the time. So, there’s people that like to watch certain shows, certain TV channels that, let’s say, are American, so they are going to have a certain strength on that accent, it’s going to be easy for them, while if there’s people who listen to other accents, like British, I don’t now, then they are going to have an advantage there. So, there is diversity, I would say, regarding accents when you watch television.\(^{35}\) (FG01-St05-Q31)

Furthermore, this particular reason for watching TV in English and, that television can help understand accent diversity, was mentioned by 3% of the student respondents and by 25% of teachers on the questionnaires (Figures 5 and 4 respectively). Another reason that supports the usefulness of TV on listening is its authenticity and the fact that, since TV is not usually made with ELT purposes in mind, it uses colloquial, natural language rather than the standard form students perceived as being used the most in their classes. This aspect of television also appeared on the reasons given during the quantitative questionnaire (in Figure 4), 17% of teachers mentioned it, and is very well explained in the following excerpt.

\[
I \text{ also agree with St02 because on this, well, on academia usually, as I was saying before, standard language is always used and bringing audiovisual materials, that also helps to open ourselves more to those different types of registers, which is what is actually useful, not so much the standard language, because if you go to a place where they speak English, you are not going to say like \textit{“hey, don’t talk to me like that because I speak the standard language, so speak to me using that language because I don’t understand what you’re saying”}, no, obviously he’s going to talk to you like he naturally does and you need to understand, no matter where you go, and that, usually those audiovisual materials help you with that.}\(^{36}\) (FG01-St07-Q142)
\]

\(^{35}\) “Yo diría que funciona mucho para listening porque dependiendo de la variedad de programas que veamos, pues, así mismo vamos a tener una variedad de vocabulario y de acentos, principalmente, que vamos a estar escuchando todo el tiempo. Entonces, hay gente que le gusta ver ciertos programas, ciertos canales de televisión, que digamos son de origen americano, van a tener como cierta fuerza en ese acento, se les va a facilitar, mientras que si hay gente que escucha otros acentos, como británico, no sé, entonces van a tener como ventaja por ese lado. Entonces, hay como una diversidad, diría yo, en cuanto a los acentos en el momento de ver televisión”. Translation by the author of this document.

\(^{36}\) “Yo también concuerdo con St02 porque por esto de, pues, en lo académico normalmente, lo que yo decía antes, siempre se maneja es una lengua estándar y el hecho de traer material audiovisual, eso también ayuda como a abrirnos más en ese sentido de diferentes tipos de registro, que es lo que realmente es útil, no tanto como una lengua estándar, porque si tú vas a cualquier lado que hablen inglés tú no vas a decir como ‘oye, pues no me hablas así porque es que yo hablo la lengua estándar, entonces háblame en lengua estándar porque yo no te entiendo’, no, obviamente te va a hablar como él habla naturalmente y tú necesitas entenderlo, vayas donde vayas, y eso, normalmente esos materiales audiovisuales te ayudan con eso”. Translation made by the author of this document.
Authenticity, as these two students point out, is one of the main reasons television should be used in ELT, particularly because it offers a wider range of language elements and forms (Hui Yang & Fleming, 2013) than textbooks and materials designed for language learning. It may be important to also notice, though, that authenticity and accent variety appear to be connected, in some of the students’ minds, with the notion of register. However, like St07 in Focus Group 1 from the previous excerpt, some students mentioned that, although television does seem to prepare them for interaction with native speakers using informal register and colloquial language, there is a mismatch between the language they listen to while television-watching, non-standard English they may need to understand outside academic circles, and that employed during their lessons, particularly in their exams. This is, perhaps, a consequence of the phenomenon mentioned by Cabrales and Rojas (2013) when they highlight that there continues to be a significant mismatch between what students tend to experience as the target language in the classroom the actual use of that language outside the classroom.

*Yes, what St01 was saying is true, that you have to, like, challenge yourself a little more because there are times when you, let’s say, have been watching a TV series for a week and you are convinced that your listening is fine and then you don’t understand anything during the listening exam, so...* (FG02-St03-Q213)

The idea expressed on this student’s comment, an experience that was shared by some of the learners on the focus group (they verbally agreed to having lived this mismatch), could probably affect the belief on the efficacy of television since students may feel that the benefits derived from watching TV may not apply to academia, the context in which they currently need to apply their English skills the most. If, as Richards and Lockhart (1994) comment, experience is a major source of beliefs, a recurrence of events like these, where the students are trapped in a dichotomy between standard and colloquial language, may well contribute to a change on the belief on the efficacy of TV or to add a

---

37 “Sí, que lo que decía St01 es cierto, que uno tiene que como que exigirse un poquito más porque hay veces que uno, digamos, lleva una semana viendo una serie y uno convencido que está bien en listening y viene y no entiende nada del listening del examen, entonces...”. Translation by the author of this document.
certain nuance to it, that TV is not so useful for developing the listening skills that are required of them at the BEd program.

Moreover, students expressed they value that their English classes focus on academic and standard language, because that is the main form of the language they might be using for their professional development, but they also mentioned that they consider important to explore those other social forms of the language:

_We as teachers, obviously, need to know the formal characteristics [of the language] but it would be important, within the BEd program, for them [teachers] to use a tool like television, to include certain expressions that do not have a technical connotation but that have a social connotation. Then, it would be very important for us to start studying and looking at, like, the way discourse is at a societal level._

(38 FG02-St02-Q03)

_Language is comprehensive. It’s not just the academic or just the informal, we need both._

(39 FG01-St06-Q203)

Teachers, on their part, highlight TV’s authenticity and its use on listening development, particularly because it shows language use in real contexts, as expressed on the questionnaire and reported on Figure 4 and in accordance to Sherman’s (2003) third use of television. However, teachers did not mention or approach this relationship between standard and colloquial language, perceived as particularly problematic by students. When speaking about listening, teachers tended to concentrate more on how to exploit the materials to develop that particular skill, especially in the form of comprehension activities, as can be inferred from the following excerpts.

_Comprehension questions, a table for them to identify concepts, from what is there, when it’s listening, no? If it’s comprehension. Because if it’s grammar, there you have to see, “What was said here?” for example, reported speech or… Yes, it_
depends. But yes, comprehension questions, filling out charts or questions for discussion.40 (I01-Q113)

On listening, obviously, [the effect] it is amazing, if you use it right. And there are a thousand listening activities that you can have them do, open questions, multiple choice, to fill out the summary, that can be literal or just a... oh, well, just a summary. On listening it’s amazing, I mean, the, what you can do with television or with those, with clips, with advertisement, not movies because they miss it, but yes, short videos, on listening, it’s amazing, but I do think that they need support material, otherwise they don’t know what to listen for, they don’t know what to pay attention to, they don’t know if they have to listen for the general idea, or if they need to listen for different details, make descriptions. I do think it is essential to accompany listening TV with materials, so that it works on listening, for example.41 (I02-Q32)

The examples of the kind of activities mentioned on the previous two excerpts were more numerous than in the case of other skills and, since these examples were probably drawn for the teachers’ own experiences, it is possible to suggest that maybe this is the skill they have worked on the most when using TV, a practice that could probably explain their apparent expertise on the subject. Nonetheless, what can be probably be concluded from the divergent values and ideas expressed by students and teachers on the effect TV has on the improvement of listening skills and, more specifically, on the difference between the language and the activities a student must do inside the L2 classroom as opposed to what he or she should do in authentic communicative contexts, is that there is not a communal definition of what constitutes listening (and what it is for) within the BEd program.

40 “Preguntas de comprensión, una tabla para que identifiquen conceptos, de lo que está ahí, cuando es listening, ¿no? Si es comprension. Porque si es gramática, eso sí toca en la clase mirar, “Aquí qué dijo”, por ejemplo, reported speech o... Sí, depende. Pero sí, preguntas de comprensión, llenar tablas o preguntas para discutir”. Translation by the author of this document.
41 “En listening obviamente es brutal, si lo utilizas bien. Y hay mil actividades de listening que les puedes poner a hacer, preguntas abiertas, multiple choice, que llenen el summary, que puede ser literal o puede ser solamente... ah, bueno, pues un summary. En listening es brutal, o sea, la, lo que puedes hacer con televisión o con ese, con cortos, con mensajes publicitarios, películas no porque se la pierden, pero sí, videos cortos, en listening, es brutal, pero si creo que necesitan material de soporte, o si no, ellos no saben qué escuchar, no saben a qué prestarle atención, no saben si tienen que escuchar la idea general, o si necesitan escuchar diferentes detalles, hacer descripciones. Si creo que es fundamental acompañarlo de materiales, para que funcione con listening, por ejemplo”. Translation by the author of this document.
4.2.4.3 Writing improvement

Regarding the relationship between television in English and the development of writing skills, 92% of teachers believe TV has a potential positive impact on students’ writing, on a degree ranging from a lot to very little. Figure 14, besides showing teachers’ belief, also reports that 80% of students hold the same belief on the efficacy of TV on this skill, but to a different, less effective degree that can be better described as somewhere between “Not a lot” and “Not a little”.

Figure 13: Teachers' and students' belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve writing

![Bar chart showing teachers' and students' belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve writing](chart)

Despite the fact that, as represented on Figure 13, around 80% of students believe in this particular potential of television, this is the skill on which students consider TV has the least positive effect. Some of the students from the focus groups and their utterances conveyed that it was very hard for them to think about the usefulness of television for writing, other than spelling when subtitles in English are being used.

*I think it depends on the type of writing because, in the context where television is made, it’s a context, like I said, very informal, let’s say, unless you have the intention of writing like that. But, what St01 it’s true, it may help with spelling but no, on writing what matters is not how you write the words but rather the coherence and cohesion of what you’re saying, so... I would say that [TV improves writing] not much.*42 (FG02-St02-Q49)

42 “Creo que depende del tipo de writing porque, en el contexto en el que se maneja la televisión, es un contexto, lo que decía, muy informal; muy rara vez es formal, digamos, a menos de que uno
No, because when we talk about writing it’s more like a competence, I don’t know, I think, independent. You need more, like, internal concepts, whereas watching a television show it’s, like, only listening and you understand the idea and that’s all. So, I don’t think it helps much. (FG01-St06-Q25)

But more like written production, like ideas, like developing complete ideas and that, well, I think not. So, I don’t think it helps much. (FG02-St01-Q47)

Well, the writing part would be... the writing structure itself, like an academic text, it wouldn’t help. (FG01-St07-Q28)

As can be inferred from the previous excerpts, some students believe that television does not improve writing, particularly academic writing, in a meaningful way. In fact, it appears that students circumscribe writing to the knowledge of structures and ideas about coherence and cohesion, all elements they, for the most part, do not believe television can provide them. Teachers, on the other hand, seem to believe that television in English effectively improves writing in that it can be used as input for it. All three teachers interviewed mentioned, when asked about the efficacy of TV on this particular skill, that it could be used as input so that students could, after watching, create a text of their own. The following three excerpts explicitly show this belief.

...I believe that the relationship between reading and writing and a video or a clip or something from, well, an audiovisual resource, in any case, is very important. That there isn’t such a direct relationship, for me, as there is with language use or listening, well, it’s true, but no, in reality, it does help. As input. (I02-Q49)
You can listen to a dialogue, a TV show, and “do a summary” and we look at writing. (I01-Q18)

Yes, as input for them to write. (I01-Q20)

And for writing, I would use it as input. Like, for example, “well, you saw this on the...” that’s what I do in my class, “you saw this on the TV show, how is it that it can help me write an essay about this topic?” That’s how it would work for me regarding writing.47 (I03-Q22)

At least one student shared this view, perhaps as a representative opinion for the 15% of students that believes TV does indeed improve writing skills, especially because, as Fiske (1989) proposes, the process of television watching is dynamic and viewers, as part of their dialogue with the TV show and within their sense-making process, could eventually create these intertextual relationships by communicating, in this case in writing, about their viewing experience. The following excerpt gives credit to the previous hypothesis.

I think also that many times it’s not just the fact that, I mean, it’s not just the fact that when you are writing or when you are watching you see the... like, spelling of the words and that, rather that, sometimes, television itself inspires you to write. So, in that moment, the creative process, the writing process, comes, comes all... in a moment so that you can start writing in English, in the language that you are listening in. So, for that, I think yes, it would help.48 (FG02-St04-Q53)

Not only does this student’s and the teachers’ belief about writing seemingly contradict that of apparently most students, but also whereas some learners expressed that they do not believe on the efficacy of television on writing, particularly on the writing of

47 “Y para writing, lo utilizaría como input. Como, por ejemplo, “bueno, vieron esto en la...”, eso es lo que yo hago en mi clase, “vieron esto en el programa de televisión, ¿cómo eso me puede ayudar para escribir un ensayo acerca de tal tema?”. Para eso me serviría el writing”. Translation by the author of this document.
48 “Me parece también que muchas veces no solo el hecho de, o sea, no solo es el hecho de que cuando estés viendo tú escribas o cuando tú estés viendo veas el... como el spelling de las palabras y eso, si no que, a veces, la televisión misma te inspira a escribir. Entonces, en ese momento, el proceso creativo, el proceso de escritura, se viene, se viene todo... en un momento para que tú comiences a escribir en inglés, en el idioma que estás escuchando. Entonces por eso, digamos, yo creo que sí, sí ayudaría”. Translation by the author of this document.
academic texts, at least one teacher apparently believes that television in English is exceptionally useful for writing academic essays (whether it is as input or as a model, it is not clear).

This semester we used one for a cause-effect essay, we watched a documentary.  
(I03-Q128)

TV News is very useful when, for example, we are talking about debates or we are doing an argumentative essay.  
(I03-Q128)

Some other students expressed that rather than affirming or denying the positive effect television can have on writing, they believe it depends on what they watch and what they want to write, thus not completely contradicting the ideas stated on the previous excerpts regarding academic writing. The following utterance shows further how, for some students, the relationship between writing and television may well be an issue of genre selection and writing purpose.

It’s different when you talk about academic texts and when you talk about texts just because. Because what I write, what I know how to write and can write, it’s all thanks to what I have listened. And when I write I realized that I write things that I have heard. All the English, or the little English I know, it’s because I have acquired it all through hearing, I haven’t acquired through any other way.  
(FG01-St01-Q29)

This passage makes it explicit how the listening exposure that happens while watching television has apparently helped this student improve his or her writing while also mentioning that this efficacy may depend on what the student is trying to write. The following two excerpts could be considered as a complement of the views already reported

49 “Este semestre utilizamos uno para cause-effect essay, vimos un documental”. Translation by the author of this document.
50 “Noticieros es muy útil cuando, por ejemplo, estamos hablando de debates, o estamos haciendo el ensayo argumentativo. Súper útil como input, por ejemplo, una entrevista me parece clave. Si lo uso”. Translation by the author of this document.
51 “Es que es diferente cuando uno habla de escritos académicos a escritos de porque sí. Porque yo lo que escribo, lo que sé escribir y puedo escribir, es todo gracias a todo lo que he escuchado. Y cuando escribo me doy cuenta que escribo son cosas que he escuchado. Todo el inglés, o poquito inglés que sé, es porque todo lo he adquirido por el oído, por ninguna otra forma lo he adquirido”. Translation by the author of this document.
in that they suggest that the genre, in relation to the writing purpose, may affect the efficacy of TV on writing skills.

But, for example, I do watch BBC News and, like, being in that... like, the structure of the sentences can also help you a great deal, like “first comes the subject...” the structure. And, well, I don’t know, it also helps with different writing styles according to how you write and what you watch and, well, it gives you that dynamic, I think.52 (FG02-St05-Q51)

Well, it also depends on what TV show you are watching, because if you’re watching a documentary or something that teaches you something, it can help you to create a map or, yes, an idea according to a concept that you can transmit in writing later on. It’s relative, I would say.53 (FG01-St07-Q26)

There seems to be, then, according to what has been expressed by at least one teacher and some of the students, a relationship between writing academic texts and movies, documentaries or news over some of the other genres. This association may derive from practical implications like the fact that, as was already pointed out by one of the students on the previous excerpts, these genres usually present standard language, understood as the variety of English that is generally acknowledged as the model for the speech and writing of educated speakers (Cabrales and Rojas, 2013), and academic topics, both of which correspond, in reality, to more formal an academic settings, such as the BEd program, in which you are expected to write rigorous argumentative texts about complex, theoretical topics. However, as was stated before, this particular view does not appear to be a major trend among students.

52 “Pero, por ejemplo, yo sí veo como BBC News y, como, estar en ese... como la estructura de las oraciones pues también te puede ayudar muchísimo, como ‘primero viene el subject...’, la estructura. Y, pues, no sé, también te ayuda a diferentes estilos de escritura pues según cómo tú escribas y lo que tú veas y, pues, te da más esa dinámica, me parece a mí”. Translation by the author of this text.
53 “Bueno, también depende de qué programa estés viendo, porque si estás viendo un documental o algo que se instruya, te puede ayudar a crear un mapa o, sí, una idea de algún concepto que más adelante puedas transmitir escribiendo. Es relativo, diría yo”. Translation by the author of this document.
Finally, besides serving as input for writing, one of the teachers interviews also suggested another way in which television can help develop learner’s writing skills: finding and using a TV show that refers specifically to writing.

*Or, if not, or simply finding, there are TV shows that talk about writing. For instance, I use an episode of Lie to me where the lead character explains, well, one of the lead characters explains the purpose of a semicolon, for example. And it’s a video that lasts 30 seconds, but it explains it. And it’s useful for writing.*

These kinds of materials are not easy to come by because authentic video materials do not usually approach topics like this one. However, that this teacher provided a specific example, which, in addition, resulted effective in the past, gives credibility to the experience that is being reported.

**4.2.4.4 Speaking improvement**

In terms of code frequency, speaking improvement was the least mentioned skill by both teachers and students on the interviews and focus groups, even though the questionnaires show that *all teachers and 97% of students believe, to different degrees, that TV can help improve a student’s speaking skill.*

---

54 “O si no, o encontrar simplemente, hay series de televisión que hablan de writing. Por ejemplo, yo utilicé un episodio de *Lie to me* donde el protagonista explica, bueno, uno de los protagonistas explica para qué sirve un punto y coma, por ejemplo. Y es un video que dura 30 segundos, pero lo explica. Y me sirve para writing”. Translation by the author of this document.
Figure 14: Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve speaking

It becomes apparent, then, from Figure 14, in relation to the positive impact of TV on speaking, teachers and students seem to have a similar belief that apparently stresses a high efficacy level for this skill, as can be noted on the following quotations.

...showing them [students] a movie because it starts training their hearing. Even more so for people who are only at beginner’s level, who don’t have much contact with the English language, it helps them a great deal to start listening and when you listen well, you will speak well.55 (FG01-St01-Q66)

I think so, or at least it helps me a great deal because listening helps me develop my speaking skill, so, because I have a very... perceptive? “ear”, I think that’s how it’s said, so, when I listen usually things stick with me a lot. And listening to those TV shows, and specially given that they are native, and so they use a lot of colloquial stuff or are native from that place, it helps me to use those things when I speak, I do it without realizing it because I have heard it before. It helps me a lot to improve the language level.56 (FG01-St01-Q02)

55 “…mostrarles una película porque les va entrenando el oído. Y más personas que apenas están comenzando con el nivel, que no tienen tanto contacto con el inglés, les ayuda muchísimo a ir escuchando y cuando uno escucha bien, va a hablar bien”. Translation by the author of this document.
56 “Yo pienso que sí, o por lo menos a mí sí me ayuda muchísimo porque el escuchar me ayuda desarrollar mi habilidad de speaking, entonces, pues yo tengo como un oído muy ¿perceptivo?, creo que se dice así, entonces cuando escucho normalmente se me quedan mucho las cosas. Y el escuchar esas series, y sobretodo pues ya que son nativas, pues en el que utilizan muchas cosas coloquiales o que son nativas del lugar, me ayuda a utilizar esas cosas cuando yo hablo, sin darme cuenta lo hago porque ya lo he escuchado antes. Me ayuda a mejorar mucho el nivel”. Translation
As was done before when the beliefs around the listening skill were analyzed, the previous excerpts exemplify that for some students and teachers there seems to be a connection between speaking and listening, given that TV is considered mainly as a listening exercise. Additionally pronunciation was mentioned a couple of times as one of the particular aspects of speaking that benefit from television exposure:

*In terms of pronunciation, I think it is very useful because you sort of copy, copy what you hear, and you get used to, to listening to yourself pronounce correctly.*

(FG01-St03-Q340)

Certain teachers, on their part, seem to believe that television is useful in that it serves, as it happened with writing, as input for speaking, as an excuse to generate a debate or a discussion, a reason that was expressed by 17% of teachers. The next two utterances make this belief on the usefulness of TV on speaking more evident.

*Oh, for speaking too. You play the scene, “What do you think about this scene? What about this character? What role does he or she play?” Of course, for speaking too.*

(I01-Q22)

*For speaking, also as input and so that they can learn, they can observe, a little, how people on the show are speaking, their intonation, for example, how the evade a given topic. I would also use it for that.*

(I03-Q30)

This second quotation also helps to demonstrate that some teachers highlight the importance of the fact that TV provides students with a communicative context (with real communication purposes) that, after being understood by them, aids them to speak. The following excerpt explains in detail how television’s authenticity and its presentation of

---

57 “En términos de pronunciación yo pienso que es súper útil porque como que uno copia, copia lo que escucha, y se acostumbra, como a escucharse uno mismo a pronunciarlo correctamente”. Translation by the author of this document.

58 “Ah, para speaking también. Uno pone la escena, ‘¿Qué opinan de esta escena? ¿Este personaje qué? ¿qué papel juega?’. Claro, para speaking también”. Translation by the author of this document.

59 “Para speaking, también de insumo y para que ellos puedan aprender, puedan un poco, puedan observar cómo las personas del programa están hablando, cómo entonan las palabras, por ejemplo, cómo evaden cierto tema. Yo también para eso lo usaría”. Translation by the author of this document.
language in real situations and contexts helps, according to this teacher, to improve speaking.

For speaking, I believe it is very useful in that, as I’m telling you, they [students] see how structures are used. And that not only helps them understand how those structures work, but also, depending on what you show them on the video, if afterwards you do an activity that is related to what was shown there, with the same structures, well, already having an idea about how to use the vocabulary and how to use all those expressions, for instance, it will be a lot easier for them to express themselves, depending on what they remember they’re doing after the video. Why? Because they can see, I mean, they know what that’s for. If they don’t know what that’s used for, I strongly believe that’s very difficult for them to express themselves verbally, orally, if they don’t know... first, if they haven’t studied the structure, with you or with a video, and second, if they don’t know how it works in real life. In that sense, I believe it helps tons because they see it, see people’s reactions when you say it, if it’s a bad word, if it’s a colloquial expression, they know how a person reacts if you, if you use certain words in an inappropriate context, yes, that’s very complicated, but you have to have time, it helps them a lot so that later they can talk and know what reactions to expect from another person and how to interact.60 (I02-Q53)

This quotation, due in part to its extension, brings forth many aspects related to television and speaking, one being the role that language structures play on language learning and, particularly on the productive skill object of the present analysis. Since the efficacy of television on grammar acquisition or improvement will be analyzed in the next section, it is more convenient now to concentrate on the fact that television’s authenticity

60 “Para speaking, creo que sirve mucho en la medida en que, como te digo, ven cómo se usan las estructuras. Y eso no solamente les ayuda a comprender cómo funcionan esas estructuras, sino que, dependiendo de lo que les muestres en el video, si después tienes una actividad relacionada con lo que se trató ahí con esas mismas estructuras, pues ellos ya, teniendo una idea de cómo se utiliza el vocabulario, cómo se utilizan todas las expresiones, por ejemplo, para ellos va a ser mucho más fácil expresarse, dependiendo de lo que se acuerden que van a hacer después del video. ¿Por qué? Porque pueden ver, o sea, porque saben para qué les sirve. Si no saben para qué les sirve, yo creo fielmente que es muy difícil que ellos puedan expresarse verbalmente, oralmente pues, si no saben... primero, si no lo han visto, o por tu parte o por parte de un video, y segundo, si no saben cómo funciona en la vida real. En ese sentido creo que ayuda un montón porque ya lo ven, ven las reacciones de la gente cuando tú les dices eso, si es una mala palabra, si es una expresión coloquial, ellos ya saben cómo reacciona una persona si tú, si tú utilizas en un contexto no apropiado ciertas palabras que no son las mejores para el contexto, y todo eso se puede mostrar por medio de recursos audiovisuales. Difícil de encontrar, sí, eso sí es muy jodido, pero si tienes el tiempo, les ayuda mucho para después ellos hablar y saber qué reacciones esperar de la otra persona y cómo interactuar”. Translation by the author of this document.
and presentation of language in full social contexts (Sherman, 2003), a characteristic that has been mentioned many times already, allows for the development, according to this teacher’s beliefs, of students’ pragmatic competence, their ability to communicate and interpret intended message in a specific socio-cultural context. As Rose (1994) underscores, students in an EFL context, such as the BEd program, unless they have access to interaction contexts with native speakers, do not have the opportunity to develop their pragmatic competence with a speaker whose pragmatic model is adequate and serves as model for the interaction. Therefore, television, with its wide range of language forms and it predominantly interactional presentation of language, may not only help improve learners’ speaking skill (as proposed by Bahrani and & Shu Sim (2011) and Ulusoy & Demirbilek (2013)), but could possibly also aid them, as is this teacher’s belief, in adequately preparing themselves for exchanges with native or non-native speakers in authentic English communicative contexts (Sherman, 2003).

4.2.4.5 Grammar improvement

As was mentioned in regards to the improvement of speaking skills, language structures and grammar receive considerable attention on language learning, particularly by teachers within the BEd program who, as observable from Figure 15, not only believe on the efficacy of television on grammar improvement (92% seem to believe in this) but also mentioned grammar so frequently on their interventions that it became the skill code with the higher frequency on the three interviews conducted with teachers. Moreover, 91% of students also believe in the beneficial effect of television-watching on grammar.
Figure 15: Teachers' and students' belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve grammar

Figure 15 seems to suggest that teachers see a greater potential than students when it comes to this particular “skill” given that 67% of them consider it helps considerably, whereas in students’ case, 43% see it that way. From what was gathered during the interviews, the most important way in which teachers seem to use TV regarding grammar is exemplification, that is, by using it to show real context language use, to make abstract rules closer to real life and students’ experience.

On grammar, well, in relation to everything that has to do with language, it’s the natural use of what you want to teach them. And, for me, at least, has worked great, that they’re able to understand what to use it for is what’s most important for me. Later you can teach the structure and everything OK, but...

It’s good because I can explain a structure in class and see it replicated in a real context, I mean, that they see “Look, what I just explained is how they [native speakers] do it and no, I didn’t take it from a video that came out of the book, this is real life.”

61 “En grammar, bueno, en todo lo que tiene que ver con language use, es el uso natural de lo que quieres enseñarles. Y, por lo menos, a mí me ha funcionado súper bien, que ellos entienden para qué se usa, que es lo principal para mí. Ya después la estructura se las enseñas y todo bien, pero…”

62 “Es muy buena porque yo puedo explicar una estructura en clase y verla replicada en un contexto real, o sea, que ellos vean “Miren, eso que les acabo de explicar es como lo hacen ellos y no lo, no lo tomé de un video que salió del libro, esto es la vida real. Por eso”. Translation by the author of this document.
This acknowledgment of the efficacy of television for teaching grammar is also present in some of the student’s interventions during the focus groups. Here it is important to mention that when they broached the subject of exemplification, it seemed as though they were depicting something they had experienced first-hand, which possibly relates to the fact that this form of TV exploitation to teach grammar probably has appeared in their English classes.

And also many times it’s useful for exemplifying what you’re, well, saying, like the use of a structure, look “here it is being used in this video”, like... (FG02-St05-Q249)

This student’s words are very much alike to the ones employed by the teacher that uttered the second excerpt, giving credence, perhaps, to the hypothesis made before. Even if less enthusiastic than teachers about the use of television to learn grammar, students nonetheless seem to be aware of the advantages this tool poses in this regard:

So, I literally start forming the sentences in my head, then I start saying, like, this goes here, this goes there, the verb was said in the past here, that sort of things, and now I kind of have, let’s say, experience, for having listened so much, I can now identify many things that I couldn’t before. And that is why the structures, the way in which I form structures, grammar, have a lot to do with what I hear. (FG01-St01-Q37)

Despite agreeing with the positive impact that TV can have on grammar acquisition, it appears that some students believe they have to be careful with the grammar structures that appear on these sorts of materials because they perceive that some of the grammar that appears on TV, especially sitcoms and dramas, is not as correct as that present on formal contexts. Due to the authentic nature of television, the fact that it sometimes portrays colloquial and informal registers (typical of Non Standard English,

63 “Y pues también muchas veces sirve para ejemplificar lo que tú estás, pues, diciendo, como el uso de una estructura, miren ‘aquí se usa en este video’, como...”. Translation by the author of this document.
64 “Entonces, yo literalmente me voy formando las oraciones en la cabeza, entonces voy diciendo como esto va aquí, esto va acá, el verbo lo dijo aquí en pasado, ese tipo de cosas, y como ya tengo digamos experiencia, por haber escuchado tanto, ya puedo identificar muchas cosas que antes no hacía. Y eso solamente lo desarrollé porque ya llevo mucho tiempo escuchando. Y por eso las estructuras, digamos que la forma en la que formo la estructuras, en gramática, tiene mucho que ver con lo que escucho”. Translation by the author of this document.
Cabrales and Rojas, 2013), including the presence of specific cultural groups that develop a grammar that is alternative to the norm, seem to be a source of concern for some students.

_The thing is, if it is very informal, maybe [African Americans] alter grammar a little._65 (FG02-St03-Q82)

_If we are talking about a student from the BEd program, for example, who is supposed to be a person who is going to be a professional linguist, who has to have very good theoretical foundations, in grammar, in all respects, and television is a very real context, therefore it is a context with a lot of errors, accepted, let’s say, within what is everyday language. But a professional, let’s say us, making the mistakes that maybe natives make, but they don’t know it, well, I don’t know if that’s so good._66 (FG01-St06-Q10)

This preoccupation regarding errors (that derive, in part, from TV’s authenticity) when learning grammar with television seems, as can be inferred from the previous excerpt and from the one to come, particularly important to students not so much because they are studying the English language but rather because they are pre-service teachers and as such, their utterances suggest, should be all the more aware of grammatical correctness than a language student who does not want to become a teacher.

_Well, regarding grammar I think that, looking at it from a point of view, not as a pre-service teacher, but as someone who, let’s say, at some point wanted to learn English just because, because he probably thought it would important later, grammar can be learned [with TV], I mean, maybe you won’t learn proper, strict grammar, but you do learn grammar by watching television because you are listening to how they form sentences, how they start linking words for meaning to exist and that is, in itself, grammar. Be it correct, from academia, or informal from the street._67 (FG02-St04-Q95).

65 “Lo que pasa es que si es muy informal, de pronto [los afroamericanos] alteran un poquito la gramática”. Translation by the author of this document.
66 “Si hablamos de un estudiante de la licenciatura, por ejemplo, que se supone que es una persona que va a ser profesional en la lengua, que tiene que tener bases muy buenas, tanto en gramática, en todo el sentido, y la televisión es un contexto muy real, por lo tanto es un contexto con muchos errores, aceptados, digamos, dentro de lo que es la lengua del común. Pero un profesional, digamos nosotros, teniendo errores que tiene quizá un nativo, que ellos no lo sepan, pues no sé si pueda ser tan bueno”. Translation made by the author of this document.
67 “Pues, por la parte de la gramática me parece que, viéndolo desde un punto de vista, y no como de un estudiante de lenguas, sino de alguien que, digamos, en un punto quiso aprender inglés porque sí, porque le pareció que de pronto le era importante después, la estructura gramática sí se puede aprender, o sea, no, tal vez no te aprendas la propia gramática estricta pero sí aprendes gramática al estar viendo televisión pues porque estás escuchando cómo forman las frases, cómo
What some students consider problematic, one of the teacher’s regards as a learning opportunity:

*And for grammar it’s looking at structures, well, not only when they are correct but also how they use them incorrectly, which is another thing I teach: “Look, we learn this in class, but they don’t care and say it like this”, for instance.* 68 (I03-Q28)

This dichotomy between what students believe to be a weakness of television in relation to skill development and what is not necessarily considered so by teachers, regarding grammar and colloquial language, as was already mentioned, is perhaps indicative of what St03 of the second focus group mentioned as being one the weaknesses of the BEd program: too much emphasis on grammar, correctness and standard language and not so much on the social usage of English. This topic may well need another research project to be clarified, however, what can possibly be concluded from this discussion is that some students apparently consider it very important to speak proper English above all, given their future role as language teachers, while others are also worried about being able to understand the language and perform in it in real social contexts.

**4.2.4.6 Vocabulary improvement**

As already stated, vocabulary was, along with listening, the “skill” that apparently was believed to profit the most from television-watching as a pedagogical practice (Figures 9 and 10). As can be seen in Figure 16, **all students and teachers stated they believe vocabulary can successfully be learned with television, and to a considerable extent.**
Figure 16: Teachers' and students' belief on whether TV in English potentially helps to improve vocabulary

That vocabulary is the most mentioned code on the focus groups with students is only logical given that, as it is evident in Figure 16, the majority of students, 69%, judge television a pedagogical tool that helps vocabulary acquisition “a great deal”. This is consistent with what was reported in Figure 5, that 25% of students stated they watch television and learn more vocabulary. One of the reasons, it seems, for the many times students referred to vocabulary is that it is related to all of the others skills, even if the relationship with reading, as has already been explained, was mentioned explicitly. Given the embedded nature of this particular skill in the participant’s discourse that comments mainly on categories, the number of quotations devoted exclusively to vocabulary is limited. Nonetheless, the following utterance succinctly expresses the use one of the teachers sees in television for vocabulary learning.

*For lexis, it is, I believe that is the easiest one, and it’s to look at what words they use specifically on certain situations.*\(^{69}\) (101-Q28)

The obviousness with which this teacher characterizes the impact of television on vocabulary, besides further supporting what was previously stated about the embedded nature of the category within the other skills, is also consistent with the idea that authentic video, such as TV, offers the possibility of studying vocabulary in situation, as the teacher

\(^{69}\) “Para léxico, sí es, creo que es la más fácil, y es mirar qué palabras utilizan específicamente en ciertas situaciones”. Translation by the author of this document.
points out, because it presents lexis in context (Sherman, 2003). A particular student who mentioned the experiences in which that contextual information had helped him or her learn new words evidently also cited this particular advantage of television as a pedagogical tool:

Because you, let’s say, have a scene, maybe you don’t understand the word, but from the context you understand the word, then maybe it sticks with you, because you remember and say “What was that word that they used when this and this happened?” and, well, it happens to me, at least.70 (FG02-St03-Q74)

Or, maybe, that, let’s say, you are watching a scene and you think they’re going to say or pronounce certain word and they say a synonym, so you feel like “whoa!” then that forces you to search and all, and then you know it’s a synonym.71 (FG02-St03-Q275)

Besides the provision of vocabulary in context, and even though most students apparently believe that vocabulary can be greatly impacted by television, the necessity of said impact was discussed among some students, bringing to the discussion again, as was shown on the section that corresponds to grammar, whether the students feel they should focus on grammar, on vocabulary or on other language skills. The next two excerpts relate to vocabulary, but present two seemingly contradictory views about the pertinence of the development of this skill on a particular level (High-Intermediate):

Yes, it’s similar to what happens when I read, I always try to identify vocabulary because, let’s say, on these last levels where you have already learned the structures and where you have a better level regarding those things, what were missing on this level, now, is vocabulary because sometimes you don’t understand because you lack vocabulary. That happens to me a lot. Then what I do with movies and also books is that I identify vocabulary and also what you said, well, that you listen and organize that in your mind, with idioms and stuff. That’s what I do, it’s not much, but it has helped me a lot because it’s thanks to vocabulary that you can understand.72 (FG01-St02-Q76)

70 “Porque uno, digamos, tiene la escena como tal, puede que no entienda la palabra, pero por el contexto uno entiende la palabra, entonces de pronto ya se le queda, porque uno se acuerda como ‘¿qué palabra fue que usaron cuando pasó esto y esto?’ y, pues, por lo menos a mí me pasa”. Translation by the author of this document.
71 “O de pronto que, digamos, uno está viendo una escena y uno cree que van a decir o pronunciar cierta palabra y te pronuncian es un sinónimo, entonces tú quedas como “¡uy!”, entonces te obliga a buscar y todo, y sabes que es un sinónimo”. Translation by the author of this document.
72 “Sí, es como lo que pasa igual cuando leo, siempre trato de sacar vocabulario porque, digamos, en estos niveles tan altos en los que ya se han visto estructuras y en los que uno ya tiene un mejor nivel ante esas cosas, lo que falta en el nivel, ahora, es vocabulario porque a veces uno no entiende
What happens is that us, in this moment, it’s not so good because if we watch a movie, we will learn a lot of vocabulary, yes, and well, we are going to learn English. But we are not going to learn grammar stuff that, right now, in our level, is very important and we need learn it because we are going to finish English, now in two… one and a half levels, and it will not be useful to just speak English because it is very different to speak a language than teach it.

As with the discussion about colloquial and standard language, the positions expressed by these two students may well be personal opinions and experiences that in no way reflect major trends in the belief systems of the majority of students, therefore it is not possible to extract a belief of it. However, their importance relies in that it makes explicit that, even if the quantitative data seems homogenous, the reasons and considerations behind a certain belief are as heterogeneous as the people who hold that belief. Furthermore, it also shows that the perceived efficacy and pertinence of television in language learning may vary according to, as Pajares (1992) and Richards and Lockhart (1994) state, personal experiences, motivations and objectives.

These results about vocabulary improvement and its relationship with television watching close the section on teachers’ and students’ beliefs about the effect of television in English on skill development. As can be generally concluded from this lengthy section, both teachers and students believe that television can positively impact all skills (Reading, Listening, Writing, Speaking, Grammar and Vocabulary) but its effects are not equal on all of them. Having finalized this section, we now present the next category: motivation.

es por vocabulario. A mí me pasa mucho eso. Entonces yo lo que hago en películas y también en libros es sacar vocabulario y también lo que tú decías pues de lo que uno escucha y organiza eso en su mente, con idioms y esa cosas. Eso es lo que yo hago, es poco, pero me ha servido mucho porque es gracias al vocabulario que uno entiende”. Translation by the author of this document.

73 “Lo que pasa es que para nosotros, en este momento, no es tan bueno porque si nosotros vemos una película, vamos a aprender mucho vocabulario, sí, y pues vamos a aprender inglés. Pero no vamos a aprender cosas de gramática que ahoritica, en nuestro nivel, son muy importantes de aprender porque ya vamos a terminar inglés, ahoritica en dos… nivel y medio, y no nos va a servir solamente saber inglés porque es muy diferente saber la lengua a enseñarla”. Translation by the author of this document.
4.2.5 Motivation increase

Both Sherman (2004) and Hui Yang and Fleming (2013) highlight that one of the most attractive features of television inside the classroom, for teachers, is that they perceive an increase on student motivation. Figure 17, then, shows that 84% of teachers apparently believe using TV inside the classroom improves their students’ motivation. The percentage of students that agree with the teachers is lower, 60%, but still substantial enough to be considered a trend, therefore, some students also believe they feel more motivated in class when the teacher uses television in English.

Figure 17: Teachers' and students' belief on improvement of student motivation when using TV in class

From the three teachers interviewed, one expressed that the increase in motivation is obvious, the other stated that, in general, motivation increases but it depends on students’ interest on the topic of the video and, finally, the third one indicated that motivation depends on the teacher’s role in presenting and exploiting the material and not on the material itself. These three views, not necessarily contrary among themselves, are presented in the three following excerpts.

Yes, watching videos, TV shows, motivates them a lot. Besides, it is more demanding for them to concentrate in class. I think that motivation increases as you bring interesting TV shows, videos or television. I always do it.74 (I01-Q30)

---

74 “Sí, ver videos, ver programas, los motiva bastante. Además que es más exigente que ellos se concentren en la clase. A mí me parece que la motivación sube a medida que tú lleves programas
Up to now, let’s say that... there is a match, in a way, between the use of television in class and students’ motivation. I’ve only had one class in which, honestly, I don’t know what else to do to motivate them, because it also depends on them, but usually there is a match, I mean, I think the really appreciate the fact that you show them these types of contents and they find them useful, or they have a laugh for a while, or they find it entertaining or interesting, or terrible, a thousand things, but I think they appreciate it a lot. And that, obviously, affects their motivation.  

No, because, if I don’t explain, no. It all depends on... because if I come and tell them “well, today we are going to watch this” and I sit down and don’t tell them anything and then don’t know what they’re watching, then they won’t feel motivated. I believe it has to do more with me and what I do with the material than with the material itself.

Perhaps these three quotations show at least part of the reasons behind teachers’ responses to the questionnaire. Like the first teacher, some believe that TV’s effect on motivation is quite direct, while others, perhaps the 42% that only agreed with the statement, like the second teacher believe television is mostly positive when it comes to motivating students, although there are the students’ preferences to consider and, finally, the other 17% that possibly believes, like the last teacher, that it depends on some circumstance or variable, like the teacher’s use of the material.

Students seem to share these views almost exactly. Some believe that, regardless of what the teacher does with television, the change in routine is enough to motivate in class, more so because TV, as mentioned before, is closely related to entertainment. Others, however, perhaps expressing the view of the 33% that felt neutral to the issue, believe that...
motivation depends on the topic of the video and the interest it arouses on them as well as on the way in which the teacher uses that to achieve a specific learning objective. The following excerpts support this range of positions among students.

*I do believe TV motivates a lot. For example, I once had an experience in listening class with a teacher who used an episode from the Supernatural TV series and for me it was an amazing class. Well, I loved that episode, I paid attention all the time, did the activity and I could see that my classmates were also happy, because it was something different. I loved it.*77 (FG01-St04-Q45)

*Well, I do think it motivates. The fact of bringing a movie to class itself, of bringing something different motivates because it’s like getting out of the normal routine.*78 (FG02-St04-Q113)

*I think using visual aids captures students’ attention in general because, as St04 says, it’s something different and it’s part of our context, right? We now watch online television and read pdfs, so these kinds of things are motivating and appealing.*79 (FG01-ST02-Q47)

The general results in this section, in a way, appear to provide certain nuances to Sherman’s (2003) and Hui Yang and Fleming’s (2013) assertions about the fact that television, intrinsically, seems to improve students' motivation in class. While some teachers and students in the BED program categorically accept the premise proposed by the aforementioned authors, some others highlight that there may well be other contributing factors that determine this positive affective effect, such as teacher methodology and preparation, the learning objective and its relationship with the television show employed and students’ personal preferences in genre and topic.

---

77 “Yo sí creo que motiva mucho. Por ejemplo, yo una vez tuve una experiencia en una clase de listening con un profesor y utilizó un capítulo de la serie Supernatural y para mí fue increíble la clase. Pues me encantó el capítulo, estuve todo el tiempo prestando atención, hice la actividad y todo el mundo, yo pude ver que mis compañeros estaban felices también, porque fue algo diferente. Me gustó mucho”. Translated by the author of this document.

78 “Pues, a mí me parece que sí motiva. En sí mismo el hecho de traer una película, de traer algo distinto a una estructura, de un libro, de lo que sea, motiva porque es salirse como de lo de siempre”. Translated by the author of this document.

79 “Pues yo creo que independientemente de los gustos, el usar audiovisuales captura mucho la atención en general porque es algo, como dice St04, es algo diferente, y es algo que está más que todo en nuestro contexto, ¿sí? Que nosotros que ya ahora todo es más televisión por computador, ya leemos por PDF. Entonces esas cosas motivan y atraen… mucho”. Translated by the author of this document.
Having concluded the analysis on motivation, we now present the results and the analysis of the beliefs held by teachers and students regarding the relationship between television and culture.

4.2.6 Culture

Culture, as can be appreciated from the definition taken from Gomez et al. (2012) and presented in the conceptual framework of this research, is perhaps one of the most difficult categories to define and approach, not only from the ones included in this research, but in the general domain of academic research. The questionnaires asked both teachers and students two questions regarding the relationship between television and culture. We acknowledge that this particular topic may well need a new, more extensive research to be properly addressed and, thus, the reader should recognize the limitations of the results presented in this section.

The first question regarding culture, “Television in English is the closest experience to living in an English speaking country”, aimed at determining if, when deprived of the opportunity of living in an English speaking country or immersion contexts, teachers or students believed watching TV was the second best alternative, as proposed by Hui Yang and Fleming (2013). As Figure 18 seems to show, most teachers and students appear to be indecisive about the statement, with an overwhelming 58% of “Neither agree nor disagree” in teacher’s opinion and a 33% of that same answer in students’ case.
Figure 18: Teachers' and students' belief on whether watching TV in English is the closest experience to living in an English speaking country

While the quantitative data shows a match between both agents’ responses, different views appear as the qualitative data from the interviews is taken into consideration. For instance, two of the teachers interviewed mentioned that, after travelling to an English speaking country, TV probably is the next best learning experience in terms of culture.

*Well, the closest, I would say, living there. But it comes close. Obviously, it is mediated, yes? Because it’s not real life... Also, being in contact with a person from that country who can tell us what it would be like, that’s an alternative, but without that person, yes [television] is the closest option.***

80 (I03-Q38)

Obviously, travelling being the closest, I mean, that’s as close as you can get without the possibility of travelling. I do think it’s true. Obviously, it depends on the content, yes?... It depends on what they watch and how they profit from it.***

81 (I02-Q59)

---

80 “Pues la más cercana, diría vivir. Pero sí se le acerca. Obviamente está mediado, ¿no? Porque no es la vida real. Pero sí, definitivamente es lo que más se acerca. Bueno, también estar en contacto con una persona de ese país y que nos cuente cómo sería, sería una alternativa, pero no teniendo otra persona, sí me parece la más clara”. Translation by the author of this document.

81 “Claramente, siendo la más cercana viajar, es decir, si es lo más cerca que puedes llegar, sin la posibilidad de viajar, es lo más cercano que puedes tener. A mí sí me parece que es cierto. Claramente depende del contenido, ¿no?... Depende de lo que vean, y también depende cómo lo aprovechen”. Translation by the author of this document.
Some of the teachers, then, believe watching TV in English is the closest way for students to experience how living in an English speaking country is like (albeit some conditions regarding the type of television being watched), whereas some students’ opinions reflect that there are more meaningful ways to experience that culture, such as spending time with people who come from that particular country or culture.

*No, the closest experience for me is to talk to a person who comes from the country.*  
*(FG01-ST02-Q81)*

*Maybe meeting someone who is native from that country.*  
*(FG02-St03-Q151)*

*Or being within a community, I don’t know. Where I work, let’s say, almost all the teachers, they are all from, like, the US. I think it’s a little closer because you are living it, whereas with TV you understand and learn, yes, but it’s not as close, it’s a fiction you’re watching.*  
*(FG01-St06-Q86)*

Among some of the students who participated in the focus groups, then, there are more interesting and fruitful options than television, such as interaction with native English speakers or belonging to a community where English is spoken. It is relevant to mention, regarding the last excerpt, that television is portrayed as a passive activity in this student’s discourse, as opposed to the dynamic, interactive nature of contact with a native speaker. This vision of television, as expressed by this student, defies theoretical constructs such as the ones proposed by Fiske (1989), whose notion of intertextuality is based upon the idea that watching television is an active, meaningful constructive endeavor. Perhaps, as was hinted in the section devoted to beliefs about writing improvement and television, it is

---

82 “No, la experiencia más cercana para mí es hablar con una persona que venga del país”. Translated by the author of this document.
83 “Tal vez conocer una persona nativa del país que venga”. Translation by the autor of this document.
84 “O dentro de una comunidad, no sé. Donde yo trabajo, digamos, casi todos los profesores, todos son como de Estados Unidos. Me parece un poco más cercano porque uno lo está viviendo en primera persona. En cambio acá, pues sí, uno entiende y aprende, porque lo hace, pero pues es algo más lejano, es una ficción que uno está viendo”. Translation by the autor of this document.
necessary to explore further on this particular view of television some students apparently hold.

Results from the second question regarding culture, “Television in English is a window to the English speaking world”, are reported in Figure 19. An astounding 100% of teachers and the 68% of students agree with the previous statement, percentages that can be seen to mean that both teachers and students, to different degrees, believe watching TV in English is a window to the English-speaking world. Television watching, the, seems to be related to the English speaking culture.

**Figure 19: Teachers’ and students’ belief on whether TV in English is a window to the English-speaking world**

The differences in the percentages between teachers’ and student’s beliefs become apparent as the utterances from the interviews and focus groups are analyzed. For the most part, the teachers interviewed see in television a great source of cultural contents, an idea that corresponds to Sherman’s (2003) fourth use of television, which emphasizes the fact that television shows how people behave, think and, in short, live (aspects that are key to the definition of culture proposed by Gómez et al., 2012). The following two excerpts, taken from two different interviews, defend this use of television in relation to culture.  

*There’s also a terrific input there, for me, of cultural contents, no matter how you see it. If they are direct, I mean, if you want to talk directly about culture, about “how they celebrate Halloween somewhere”, what are the appropriate or*
inappropriate social attitudes for this or that culture, if they are direct contents, it helps a great deal... 

(I02-Q57)

Because it’s a, let’s say that it shows, in a natural way, how people behave using English in their culture. Because speaking sometimes we leave aside elements that we cannot see, for example, how Americans form a line or how they behave when eating in a group and that goes beyond the language, it’s more cultural, so I like to see it that way. 

(I03-Q8)

To these teachers, then, television contains many important cultural aspects such as daily routines, overt behaviors and a specific understanding of the world (Gómez et al., 2012). Students in the focus groups, however, tended to concentrate on the idea that, even though television does show cultural content, it also seems to be mediated by stereotypes. The following excerpt clearly expresses this idea.

I believe sometimes TV reflects the culture of the language that is being spoken, but it can also present stereotypes and things like that. So, you may learn, like, the real culture of the language, or you can fall on clichés, what is always mentioned, I don’t know, the dumb blonde, whatever. But it would be nice if you could, like, really, really, learn culture from TV, like, real. 

(FG02-St01-Q141)

It is interesting to mention that at least one teacher, who also mentioned this “stereotypes issue”, sees it in a completely different view from that expressed by some students. The following excerpt expands on this contrary point of view. Although not all interviewed teachers seem to agree on this “Stereotypes” issue,

85 “Ahí también hay un input brutal, para mí, de contenidos culturales, por donde lo veas. Si son directos, es decir, si tú quieres hablar directamente de cultura, como “cómo se celebra Halloween en tal parte”, cuáles son las actitudes sociales apropiadas o inapropiadas para tal o tal cultura, si son contenidos directos, sirve muchísimo...” . Translation by the autor of this document.

86 “Porque es un, digamos que muestra de forma natural cómo se comportan las personas utilizando el inglés en su cultura. Porque a veces hablando dejamos de lado elementos que no podemos ver, por ejemplo, cómo hacen los estadounidenses una fila, cómo se comportan cuando comen en grupo y eso va mucho más allá de la lengua, es más cultural, entonces por eso me gusta verlo así”. Translation by the autor of this document.

87 “Yo creo que a veces de pronto la televisión refleja la cultura del idioma que se está hablando pero también puede caer en estereotipos o en cosas así. Entonces pues uno puede que aprenda, como la cultura real del idioma, o pues uno puede caer en lo de siempre, lo que siempre se pinta, no sé, la mona boba, lo que sea. Pero sería chévere que uno sí pudiera como aprender de verdad, de verdad, la cultura a partir de la televisión, como, real”. Translation by the autor of this document.
Yes, for example... We have a very mediated image of what a party in the United States is like. We believe that everyone drinks in red cups, they are all drunk on the floor, and no, some people are not like that, so perhaps television creates stereotypes but also you can break them because, if you look for something less Hollywood style, we can demystify that... these cultural conceptions we have.88 (103-Q36)

While some students see the presence of cultural stereotypes as a problem regarding English language teaching and learning, at least one teacher believes that these stereotypes do create opportunities to demystify pre-conceptions students have on culture. It can be stated, then, that the relationship between TV and culture is apparently seen as both an advantage and a source of problematic mediation (due to cultural stereotypes).

The next section, language difficulty, reports on students’ and teachers’ beliefs about the relationship between television and language difficulty.

4.2.7 Language difficulty

As presented in the conceptual framework of the current study, one of the reasons why teachers find it difficult to incorporate the use of television in the classroom is that they find the language being used in TV too difficult for some students, particularly of lower levels (Sherman, 2003). Figure 20, which shows the results on teachers’ and students’ beliefs about their capability of understanding TV regardless of their language level, seems to suggest that teachers find it very important to choose level-appropriate TV shows since 83% of them consider it is not possible for students to understand the

88 “Sí, por ejemplo. Tenemos una imagen muy mediada de cómo es una fiesta en Estados Unidos. Creemos que todo el mundo anda con los vasitos rojos, que todos están el suelo, borrachos, y, pues, no es así, hay gente, pues, que no le gusta tomar, entonces quizás la televisión, si bien crea estereotipos, también los puede romper, porque si uno busca algo menos hollywoodesco, menos de película típica del adolescente que se emborracha, y lo vemos en un contexto un poco más... más cerrado, más aterrizado, podemos desmitificar eso... esas concepciones culturales que tenemos”. Translated by the author of this document.
majority of TV in English, regardless of the language level. Students, on the other hand, tend to believe it is possible to understand TV shows in English.

Figure 20: Teachers' and students' belief on whether it is possible to understand the majority of TV in English regardless of the language level.

It is possible to better clarify this difference between teachers’ and students’ responses by appealing to the information gathered during the interviews. Teachers appear to be preoccupied by certain aspect of the language being used in TV, such as speed of speech and content, which is why, to overcome the difficulty these characteristics pose, they use them as aspects when choosing TV shows.

The other criterion... I already forgot. The other view is... that it is natural... or as natural as possible. I mean, yes, Friends are actors, but it sounds like, it sounds very natural. The speed, the speed is commensurate with the level and, if not, you can show subtitles, but, the way of speaking of the participants, actors, actresses, singers, whatever, presenters, it has to be commensurate to the level... 89 (I02-Q130)

It depends on the program, it depends on the scene of the program too, because I can choose, I can play the leader of the criminal gang talking to his followers and

89 “Pues depende, del programa, depende de la escena del programa también, porque yo puedo escoger, yo puedo poner al líder de la banda criminal hablando con sus secuaces y pues, seguramente, no van a entender nada, o puedo ponerles, no sé, Big Bang Theory y menos van a entender si están hablando de ciencia, pero si pongo de pronto un programa que tenga que ver con adolescentes, será más fácil para ellos. Entonces sí depende mucho cuál es la situación del programa para determinar cuál es el nivel que necesitan para entender”. Translation by the author of this document.
surely students will not understand anything, or I can play, I don’t know, The Big Bang Theory and students will understand less if the characters are talking about science, but if perhaps I play a TV show that has to do with teenagers, then it will be easier for them. Hence, it does depend a lot on the status topic of the TV show to determine what level they need to understand.  

On the other hand, some students were confident that they could understand any show, regardless of their language level, by using the right strategies, which will be exemplified in some of the excerpts below.

I think... well, not knowing the vocabulary doesn’t stop me because maybe I don’t understand something but from the context, what I am matching, I can make associations, so that helps me a lot.  

Yes, but I was about to say the same. What really stops me from watching a TV show in English is that the accent is so different that I don’t understand a thing. Sometimes I put the subtitles on and I say, “I know what they are saying, I mean, I read the subtitles and I know what they are saying and what the words mean” but I can’t understand the audio because of the accent.

Moreover, and as the two excerpts show, some students admit that their “frustration level” (Sherman, 2003) is marked mainly by “accents” given that they are very difficult to understand, mostly because they are not used to a great variety of them. However, they also think it is possible to understand TV shows in English if they use strategies such as trying
to understand the gist of the situation from context or by using subtitles. Teachers’ and students’ views, then, on language difficulty, are markedly different.

### 4.3.1 Selection criteria

Selection criteria, the last category in this research study, is related to the previous one, language difficulty, mainly because it derives, in the case of teachers, from a desire to avoid students’ frustration levels due to incomprehensible language.

#### Figure 21: Teachers' beliefs on the importance of certain TV selection criteria

Figures 21 and 22 seem to show that teachers and students have different opinions when it comes to expressing their beliefs on the importance of TV selection criteria. About 83% of the teachers interviewed believe that student’s language level should be considered when selecting appropriate TV materials, opposed to the 46% of students for whom language level does not seem to be so important.
Most teachers apparently believe that the material needs to match the curriculum and, above all, that it needs to be applicable to the class content, that it should be directly related to the objective of the class and the language it should teach. The following utterance, made by a teacher, clearly expresses this idea.

"The quality of the images and the audio must be good but most of all, that it meets all the requirements I have to fulfill my goal. I mean, if I'm going to play a video to illustrate how the simple conditional is used, the video needs to have clear examples of that." (103-Q102)

Both teachers and students strongly agree on the fact that the TV materials selected need to be attractive for students and should match their interests. One way to achieve this, apparently, is to look for TV series or funny materials.

"But that also is in taste, that is, if you like them, for example, I don’t know, say, in my case, I like detective thrillers, I love them, and obviously every time I looked for a series, I didn’t care much about the level but mostly in the plot of the story. Then, it’s all in the taste you have and what you want to see. If I like, for example, comics,

93 “Que la calidad de la imagen sea muy buena, que la calidad del audio sea muy buena, y que cumpla con todos los requisitos que tengo para cumplir mi objetivo. Es decir, si voy a hacer un video para que vean cómo se utiliza el condicional simple, pues que el video tenga el condicional simple, que se vea bien y que se escuche bien”. Translated by the author of this document.
I won’t mind watching that in English or in Spanish, but it's what I like, you see?  
(FG02-ST02-Q211)

Ah, yes, of course. No, I wouldn't play a boring documentary. A funny documentary, yes! But usually I look for TV shows that are very popular.  
(I03-Q104)

In conclusion, while language difficulty is not a particular selection criteria for students, it is an important factor to be considered by teachers, as was also stated in the section about language difficulty and television. Despite this major difference, both teachers and students agree on the fact that attractiveness is a criterion to consider when selecting TV material to use in class.

94 “Pero eso también va en gustos, o sea, si a ti te gustan, por ejemplo, no sé, digamos, en mi caso, a mí me gustan así las cosas de detectives, de suspenso, me encantan, y obviamente cada vez que yo buscaba una serie como para empezar a mirarla, yo no me fijaba tanto en el nivel sino me fijaba más que todo en la trama de la historia. Entonces, como en el gusto que tú tengas y lo que quieras ver. Si a mí me gusta, por ejemplo, digamos, las películas de muñequitos, pues no me va a importar vérmela en inglés o vérmela en español, pero es lo que a mí me gusta, ¿si me entiendes? Entonces es como en el gusto que tú le quieras, y con gusto pues uno más fácil puede irse como orientando a lo que uno quiere, no tanto por el nivel”. Translated by the author of this document.

95 Ah, sí, sí, claro. Sí, no, pues un documental aburrido no pondría. Un documental, pues, divertido, sí. Pero generalmente busco series de televisión que son muy populares. Translated by the author of this document.
5. Conclusions and implications

After having reported and analyzed the data collected during the two phases of this research, it is possible to affirm that a clearer picture of some of the aspects that constitute the beliefs systems of a considerable amount of teachers and students from the BEd program at PUJ in relation to the use of television in ELT is available for the reader. We now present a graphic summary of the beliefs found to be present in teachers’ and students’ beliefs systems.

**Figure 23: Summary of apparent beliefs identified in this research**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apparent beliefs identified in this research</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching television in English helps improve the language level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Television can serve as entertainment as well as a tool for learning a language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV is not more appropriate for autonomous learning than classwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skill development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV can have a positive effect on possibly all skills, but to different degrees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV can potentially improve listening skills (a great deal).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV can potentially improve speaking skills (a lot).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV can potentially improve reading skills (a lot)</td>
<td>TV can potentially improve reading skills (neither a lot nor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDAGOGICAL BELIEFS ABOUT TELEVISION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation increase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using TV in the classroom increases learner motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Window on culture”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree with the fact that watching TV is the closest experience to living in an English speaking country</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV is a window to the English speaking world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language difficulty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not possible for students to understand the majority of TV in English, regardless of their language level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible for students to understand the majority of TV in English, regardless of their language level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Selection criteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ language level is an important selection criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ language level is not necessarily an important selection criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the material is attractive for students is an important selection criterion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of the material according to the learning objective is a very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beliefs, such as the ones presented in Figure 23, as Pajares (1992) suggests, are a complex and yet fundamental part of individuals, even more so in educational contexts and, if it is feasible to emphasize even more, in teacher-training contexts where the perpetuation and continuation of pedagogical beliefs and practices take place. It seemed appropriate, then, to explore teachers’ and students’ pedagogical beliefs regarding the use of television not only to better understand a phenomenon that, as far as this research can present, has not been theoretically or practically approached in other contexts, but also to construct information whose main purpose is to ameliorate students’ and teachers’ learning and teaching processes respectively, by providing them with the opportunity to know and reflect upon their own and their colleagues’ apparent pedagogical beliefs.

The belief upon which the present research was constructed relates to efficacy, and the notion that, in accordance with the literature reviewed, particularly Hui Yang and Fleming’s (2013) and Sherman’s (2004) work, watching television in English can positively and successfully have a positive impact on a student’s language level. The data gathered during this research strongly suggests that the majority of both teachers and students believe this is true, due to the many beneficial effects television offers to learners, one of which is of paramount importance, skill development.

Most participants of the study, regardless of their status as teachers or students, agree that watching television can be useful to develop all skills, including grammar and vocabulary acquisition, even if not with the same degree of effectiveness. This is only logical if we consider that some of television’s inherent characteristics, its audiovisual nature, its authenticity, the topics more abundantly present in it, apparently make it more suitable to impact some skills more than others. Nonetheless, from the participants’ discursive rendition of their ideas, perceptions, experiences and beliefs, it became apparent that skill development, even with a tool mainly aural such as television, is a process that does not take place in a completely fragmentary way but that, rather, is ever showing that,
as some of the student’s highlighted about the dichotomy between colloquial and standard language, language, and by extension language learning, is comprehensive in nature.

Nonetheless, some skills were deemed as more suitable to be improved with television in English: both students and teachers strongly believe, it appears, that listening and vocabulary are more easily and effectively improved by television, a position that is consistent with the way in which television has been traditionally considered and used in ELT. However, interesting findings arose as other skills were put to consideration, particularly writing. It would seem as though teachers’ and students’ beliefs are qualitatively different in that teachers appear to be more optimistic about the way in which television can be put to good use inside the classroom to improve student’s written productive skills, even so when it comes to types of texts that may not be considered very close to TV shows, such as argumentative essays.

The fact that teachers consider television useful as mainly input for both productive skills, but especially for writing, while students limit the potential of television to those elements it can give them, in terms of language structures, vocabulary or argumentative tropes, can be interpreted, although this is not conclusive since more data would be needed, as though some students appear to perceive television watching as a passive activity, mainly a receptive activity that does not necessarily entail production on their part, be it on their free time or in class. Nothing more distant from what Fiske (1989) proposes as the intertextual relationship viewers construct with and through television in contexts where television is not seen as a learning tool but, rather, as a cultural product with which individuals interact. Considering television this way, and still highlighting its potential in language learning, would give students not only the opportunity to experience television in a way much closer to that of authentic viewers, but also could prove useful in successfully helping them to improve their writing skill. However, for this to happen, a research looking into the relationship of this specific belief and the pedagogical and personal practices that relate to it would have to take place given that belief modification (even if just in the form of assimilation) is a complicated process (Pajares, 1992).

A similar phenomenon occurs with teachers’ and student’s beliefs in relation to reading improvement and television-watching since, as was already suggested, students’ apparently circumscribe the act of reading as an interaction with the written word and, as
such, the closest relationship television can form with this particular skill is through subtitle use which, additionally, is not always regarded as an useful option beyond certain English levels (Katchen, 1992). Without subtitles to be read, then, how can television aid students’ reading skills? Teachers’ view of television as a way to introduce students in the context of a particular text or topic is an interesting alternative, one that seems to strongly shape their beliefs regarding the use of television, since it is the main strategy that teachers admitted to have used or that they would use.

Nevertheless, this closed vision of reading as exposure only to the written word, in contraposition to the views expressed by Pérez Tornero (1997) and Martín-Barbero (1992) and unaware of the ways in which the contemporary exposure to hypermedia, hypertelevision, and new audiovisual regimes are shaping not only current reading practices but also those of children (Martín-Barbero, 2005) who, in the future, will be the learners of these pre-service teachers today, may affect not only their future teaching practices but also could potentially create another version of the mismatch that they apparently believe to exist with their own teachers today regarding standard and colloquial language within the BEd context. This is a way in which teacher-training programs that do not reflect upon their beliefs and practices, clearly not only about television or skill development but also about their role in societal construction, contribute to the stagnation of pedagogical practices.

Participants’ beliefs regarding the listening, speaking and vocabulary development are consistently similar and appear to conform similar beliefs systems around the idea of the efficacy of television on skill development. The dichotomy that students reported, between colloquial language and standard language, is perhaps one of the most interesting findings of this research and may have implications on the way in which both students and teachers conceive the language that is worth learning, studying and, ultimately, using. Considering that most teachers and students apparently believe on the efficacy of television, and admitted to using it, either for formal language teaching, autonomous incidental learning or just for leisure, an interesting role could be constructed for television to become the tool or medium with which to resolve the dichotomy and integrate both sides of the language. However, for this to happen, a further inquiry on the perceived importance of these two forms of language and the role they are perceived to play, not only by teachers
and students, but also by the directive agents of the BEd program in charge of defining what is effectively taught, would have to be conducted in order for this to be feasible.

Additionally, and regarding motivation, this is one the categories in which both groups of participants seem to share the same belief, even to the point that the opinions expressed and the experiences shared tended to coincide between both groups. Some students and teachers seem to believe that one of television inherent effects on language learning, when brought to the classroom, is an increase in student motivation, especially because it is perceived as a change in class methodology, which, within the BEd program, some students characterized as “structuralist” and rigid. A hypothesis could be made, then, that those who hold this belief are not that frequently exposed to television in the classroom and are therefore awed by its novelty. Others, however, believe that other very important factor play a role in the relationship between television and motivation, some of them being interesting topic and, most of all, the teacher’s methodology in relation to the ways in which he or she used that material so that a clear learning objective is met. This second form of the belief leaves outside and criticizes what has come to be known within the BEd context as the “porno” (“Por no dictar clase”) approach (“Friday afternoon approach, according to Sherman, 2004), in which a teacher plays a movie or a form of television that takes the whole time of the class and leaves students’ appropriation of the material to themselves. Whether this approach is appropriate or not is up to debate (Sherman, 2004, for instance, highlights that television watching, even in learning contexts, can be considered useful in itself, without exploitation of the material), although the effects it may have on students motivation may suggest it might not be very advisable, at least not in this context.

Students’ and teachers’ ideas related to culture seem to be on the same line, at first glance, given that both believe that television in English is a window to English culture and the English speaking world, particularly in regards to those cultural aspects more frequently portrayed in television (the specificity of daily life). However, an emergent category, that of cultural stereotypes, came up in both focus groups as one of the main concerns students have when relating television and culture. Learners seemed particularly concerned about the fact that the representation of culture constructed by television is highly mediated by entertainment ideals and interests and, therefore, are very much related to cultural stereotypes that differ greatly from cultural reality. The fact that students identify this
weakness in television shows, perhaps, a first moment in approaching culture critically. Nonetheless, it seemed as though the presence of stereotypes constituted an insurmountable obstacle, whereas at least one teacher realized that television, as it constructs stereotypes, has the potential to demystify them as well.

Language difficulty and selection criteria are related since, apparently, teachers believe the most important aspect to consider when choosing what to present to their students is that it matches what they perceive to be their learners’ level. However, seemingly believe themselves to be more capable of dealing with difficult language in television than their teachers preconception. Students, on the other hand, probably are more concerned about whether the topic of the TV show or material is interesting and relevant to them than the level of the material itself.

In conclusion, this research provides an initial image of certain pedagogical beliefs held by teachers and students from the BEd program at PUJ about the use and efficacy of television watching and exploitation in ELT. The findings reported here, although interesting and relevant, do not account for the complexities of the whole phenomenon since, as Richards and Lockhart (1994) and Pajares (1992), drawing on Rokeach (1968), highlight that beliefs, as constituted by cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects, may not be completely deduced from what people say alone, but rather from the relationship between belief and practice. Therefore, the main recommendations that derives from this exploratory research is that more work needs to be done, not only in the context of the BEd program, but also in Colombia and the international ELT community, so that we have a better understanding of the full potential of television as a language learning tool.
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**Resumen**

Las películas y los programas de televisión son comúnmente usados en la enseñanza de inglés como lengua extranjera (ELT) dado que usualmente se considera que son herramientas que pueden mejorar el nivel de lengua de los estudiantes, una fuente del uso auténtico de la lengua, una actividad que aumenta la motivación de los estudiantes y una forma de explorar la cultura en el salón de clases. Sin embargo, en el contexto de la Licenciatura en Lenguas Modernas de la Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, un estudio realizado por Cabrales y Rojas (2013) sugirió que no muchos profesores de inglés efectivamente usan televisión (en particular comedias) en clase, contrario al deseo de 88% de los estudiantes consultados, quienes dijeron que les gustaría que sus profesores usaran televisión en sus clases. Esta aparente discrepancia entre las acciones de los profesores y las expectativas de los estudiantes en relación con la televisión, así como la ausencia de una caracterización general de las creencias sobre televisión como una forma de explicar dicha discrepancia, justifica este estudio. Por lo tanto, el principal objetivo de esta investigación es describir las actuales creencias pedagógicas sobre la televisión de profesores y estudiantes de inglés en el contexto de inglés como lengua extranjera (EFL) de la Licenciatura en la PUJ. Para cumplir este objetivo, se escogió un diseño mixto, secuencial y explicativo que consistió en dos fases consecutivas: cuantitativa seguida de cualitativa (quan → QUAL). Durante la fase cuantitativa, se aplicaron dos cuestionarios con escala de Likert diferentes, uno para estudiantes y otro para profesores, mientras que dos grupos focales se
realizaron con estudiantes y tres profesores fueron entrevistados durante la fase cualitativa. Después de usar estadística descriptiva y procedimientos de codificación (a través del software Atlas.Ti), se realizó una triangulación metodológica para analizar los datos recolectados durante ambas fases de esta investigación. El análisis de los datos sugiere que la mayoría de los estudiantes y los profesores creen que la televisión evidentemente ayuda a mejorar el nivel de inglés de los estudiantes, en especial sus habilidades de comprensión oral y su adquisición de vocabulario. Aunque las creencias de estudiantes y profesores, en relación con el uso de la televisión, en general parecen ser similares, ciertas diferencias se hicieron visibles, particularmente en torno al desarrollo de ciertas habilidades, estrategias para ver televisión con propósitos educativos y la relación entre la dificultad de la lengua y la comprensión de televisión en inglés. En conclusión, los resultados de esta investigación puede ser útiles no sólo para una futura caracterización de las creencias de los estudiantes y los profesores en relación a la televisión en la enseñanza de inglés como lengua extranjera en otros contextos, sino también para la descripción de las prácticas de estudiantes y profesores en torno a la televisión en la Licenciatura de la PUJ.

Abstract

Films and TV series are commonly used in English Language Teaching because they are usually considered as a tool to improve students’ language level, a source of authentic language, a motivation enhancing activity and a way to explore culture in the classroom. However, in the context of the Bachelor of Education at Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, a study conducted by Cabrales and Rojas (2013) suggested that not many English teachers effectively used TV (particularly sitcoms) in class, contrary to the desire of 88% of the students surveyed, who said they would want their teachers to use TV in their classes. This apparent mismatch between teachers’ actions and students’ expectations regarding TV, as well as the absence of a general characterization of the beliefs held about TV as a way to explain said mismatch, justified this study. Therefore, the main objective of this research is to describe the current pedagogical beliefs about television of English teachers and students in the EFL context of the BEd Program at PUJ. To accomplish this objective, a mixed-methods sequential explanatory design was chosen, consisting of two consecutive phases: quantitative followed by qualitative (quan → QUAL). During the quantitative phase, two different Likert-scale questionnaires were applied, one for students and one for teachers, while two focus groups
were conducted with students and three teachers were interviewed during the qualitative phase. After using descriptive statistics and coding procedures (through the use of the software Atlas.Ti), methodological triangulation followed to analyze the data collected during both phases of this research. The analysis of the data suggests that most students and teachers believe that TV effectively helps to improve students’ English language level, particularly their listening skills and their vocabulary acquisition. Although students’ and teachers’ beliefs towards the use of TV, in general, seem to be alike, certain differences arise, particularly when it comes to the development of some skills, strategies for watching TV with educational purposes and the relationship between language difficulty and the understanding of TV in English. In conclusion, the results of this research may become useful not only for a further characterization of students’ and teachers’ beliefs on TV in ELT in other contexts but also for the description of teachers’ and students’ practices regarding TV on the BEd program at PUJ.