I. ARTICLES
IN THE SPECIAL ISSUE

ANNA BĄK-ŚREDNICKA
Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce

Navigating feedback conference episodes in Polish: Cultivating the self-awareness of tutors

ABSTRACT. This study was a (self-)analysis of supervisory discourse of preservice Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages practicum post-observation feedback conferences (POFCs). This discourse was analysed using the framework of conversation analysis (CA) in five areas that constitute POFCs as a communicative genre. The aim was to identify dialogic elements that constitute supportive, democratic, and open dialogue, which, in turn, fosters the development of the characteristics of a professional and empathetic teacher. The analysis of this corpus revealed that the two tutors' utterances contained elements of both conversational and institutional styles, and they were dominated by a strategy of anchoring when a practical topic or problem observed in the classroom was a point of reference for introducing a more complex topic. When the tutee was not ready for discussion at this conceptual level, the conversation shifted to what took place during the observed lessons. Emotional support was linguistically realised via face support/tenderness utterances that protected, supported, and provided space for developing self-confidence, personal, and professional identity of the students. This study fits into the debate on the topic of effective and empathic POFCs. The examination of tutors' own utterances raises their awareness of the language they use with tutees.

KEYWORDS: teaching practice, post-observation feedback conferences (POFCs), university tutors.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper delves into the issue of conducting effective and empathic post-observation feedback conferences (POFCs). POFCs constitute a genre whose research-evidence features can be self-analyzed both manually and with the help of corpus-analytical software, as was the case of this study. The rationale behind this research is that university supervisors' self-examination of one's corpora of utterances produced as part of POFCs can be reflection provoking. As a result, they can better understand the language they use with tutees as well

as modify and adapt it. The pre-recorded and transcribed corpora can be also used as authentic teaching sources in classes with preservice language teachers.

The theoretical framework for this work is conversation analysis (CA). Since 2004 a new branch, linguistic ethnography LE, has been emerging, which combines ethnographic designs with "close analysis of language practice" (Copland & Donaghue 2021: 11). Research methods in LE and CA include observation and fieldnotes, interviews, as well as recordings and transcriptions (e.g. Shaw et al. 2015: 10−11). In this paper, the supervisors' feedback was examined both manually and with the help of corpus analysis software, which resulted in the selection of not only their typical features, but also new patterns that would have been invisible otherwise.

This paper starts with the definition of POFCs presented in the context of the Bakhtinian understanding of a pedagogical dialogue. A brief literature review that follows shows the research in question as two waves of studies; while the earlier studies were quantitative in nature, the current ones focus on quality changes so that supervisory discourse is both productive and empathic.

The analytical part of the paper fits into the body of studies on teaching practice feedback which have already been published by offering five conference episodes conducted in Polish by two supervisors interacting with their seven supervisees majoring in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages.

2. (NON)INSTITUTIONAL AND POST-OBSERVATION FEEDBACK DISCOURSES

The manifestations of language are realized through oral and written "individual concrete utterances" in various social contexts (Bakhtin 1981: 60). Different methods of using words and utterances in discourse inform individual linguistic styles (Brown & Gilman 1960: 271−272). Linguistic style is one of five[1] canons of rhetoric (Burke 2010: 518). It has four virtues, including correctness, clarity, ornamentation, and propriety (Leff & de Velasco 2010: 458−460). Of these, ornamentation is subject to linguistic analysis of the distribution of words in discourse.

Personal conversational styles are culturally learned, habitual, taken for granted, and axiomatic ways of using language (Tannen 2006: 344, 346). Communication meta-messages include topics, agonism, amplitude/pitch/tone of voice, intonation, overlap/interruption, turn-taking, and indirectness (Tannen 2006). In non-institutional and conversational interaction, interlocutors reconsider what and how to talk about to achieve their *social* goals.

---

[1] I.e., intention, style, arrangement, delivery and memory (Leff & de Velasco 2010: 457).

In institutional discourse, the discursive and institutional roles of interlocutors determine what and how to talk about accomplishing their *task-based* goals (Thornborrow 2002). For example, in the educative genre of post observation feedback conversations (POFCs), the status of the participants is restricted to that of a tutor and tutee who meet to discuss lessons observed by the former and conducted by the latter, to trigger learning to teach. The framework of such interactions where participants have unequal status shows an asymmetrical distribution of turn-taking and social power. Moreover, Thornborrow (2002) claims that the contrast between non-institutional and institutional talk can be problematic.

According to Bakhtin (1981: 63), speech genres that require institutional or standard forms are "the least favorable conditions for reflecting individuality in language." In standard speech genres "the creative aspect is almost completely lacking" (Bakhtin 1981: 77). For example, in the genre of feedback sessions, a shift or stretch from highly formal to less formal dialogic discourses is observed, which are "supportive, democratic and open" as a necessary condition for tutees to "reflect, construct identities, exercise agency and develop plausibility" (Copland & Donaghue 2023: 195, 196). Certain studies report that tutor-tutee relationships deepen and develop when supervisory discourses resemble tender, empathic, frequent, and meaningful family ties. For example, longitudinal studies conducted by Jarvis on tutor-tutee dialogues incorporate the concepts of shared meaning theories on dialogue (Bakhtin 1981, 1986), and on Vygotskian's (1962, 1978, 1987) zone of proximal development (2001, 2002 as cited in Farr 2011: 48). In these studies, the discourse of those conferences "change[d]" becoming less dominated by the tutor (Farr 2011: 48). Additionally, Kim and Schallert (2011) developed the framework of a caring tutor-tutee relationship based on the concepts of Bakhtinian dialogue (Bakhtin 1986) and of caring (Noddings 1984, 1992). A case in point is the promissory model of Brown and Hoffman (1969: 95) that informs the "empathetic and harmonious relationships" of tutors and tutees within the affective domain of one of its three domains.

3. POST-CONFERENCE TUTOR DISCOURCE: A LITERATURE REVIEW

This reviewed research on feedback evolves from POFCs resembling institutional talks of a high degree of formality and predictability with the institutional status of the participants restricted to that of tutors and tutees toward dialogic conferences where tutors identify as life-long co-learners (cf. Trevethan & Sandretto 2017).

Studies published in 1969–2011 (e.g., Blumberg & Cusick 1969; Zeichner & Liston 1985; Christensen 1988; Wajnryb 1994; Phillips 1993, 1999; Strong & Baron 2004; Copland 2008b; Farr 2011) focused on the *status quo* of feedback discourse while selected studies published in the last decade have experimented with new conceptual frameworks to render supervisory discourse effective and empathic (e.g., Long et al. 2013; Arshavskaya 2014; Kurtoğlu-Hooton 2016; Pulvermacher & Lefstein 2016; Dobrowolska & Balslev 2017; Mena et al. 2017; Bjuland & Helgevold 2018).

Phillips (1999: 107) lists the features typical of institutional conversations when tutors self-select and self-nominate tutees; turn-take after moments of silence, "when the topic seems to be exhausted"; take more frequent turns than tutees; take longer turns at the end of conversations; and introduce and control topics (Phillips 1999: 97−100). This can be completed by the findings of Blumberg and Cusick (1969) where the discourse of tutors dominates in the areas of disseminating information, asking for opinions, and stating what to do in problem-oriented behaviors. Tutors are more indirect than direct (Blumberg & Cusick 1969; Strong & Baron 2004: 50). The extensive use of indirect talk may be dictated by cognitive coach programs attended by tutors (Strong & Baron 2004: 55; Zeichner & Liston 1985). Alternatively, this may be an indicator that some tutees are more independent and experienced as compared to their peers who "may need more direct pedagogical advice" (Strong & Baron 2004: 55).

Conversation topics overlapped with the recurrent topic of *a lesson* and other topics, such as *trainees' behaviour*, *pupils' behaviour during the lessons* (Phillips 1999: 103, 104, 109; Blumberg & Cusick 1969; Zeichner & Liston 1985: 166). Occasionally, tutors return to their "past behaviour or personal experience" (Phillips 1999: 105). This may be because, as Copland (2008: 151) explains, tutors empathize with tutees, with a priority to "calm down and boost confidence" and "teach pedagogy and language awareness."

Tutors are more positive than negative in their interactions (Blumberg & Cusick 1969). Even if the language is mainly negative, in the perception of tutees, the encounters constitute "a useful and positive experience" (Phillips 1999: 13). Farr (2011: 164) revealed that while the tutors "feel" that they are empathic, the tutees associate their behavior with "power and authority." The criticism of tutors is mitigated by politeness strategies (Phillips 1999: 155, 159). These strategies create "a specific stylistic effect" (Tannen 2005: 15). Wajnryb (1994: 88) developed a typology of politeness in supervisory discourse, revealing a spectrum of strategies tutors use to cushion their "bad-news messages." Moments of providing negative comments are termed "face threatening acts (FTAs)" by Wajnryb (1994: 154; see also Goffman 1967; Brown & Levinson 1987). They occur in the subsequent part of the supervisory discourse (Wajnryb

1994: 173). This criticism can be softened by first providing positive comments, followed by a negative comment (Jaworski & Coupland 1999 after Vàsquez 2004: 44); providing a positive comment prior to or after a negative comment; hedging (Phillips 1999: 160, 163, 172); providing a negative comment between two positive comments (Copland 2008b: 153); replacing *you* with *we*; ensuring that the negative comments provided are impersonal; using modality (Phillips 1999: 162). As much as "mitigation can make negative feedback bearable," there are more current voices that say that hedging is a waste of time (Copland 2008a: 21) or that a tutor's "advice is lost or buried in other talk" (Copland 2008a: 22 as based on Vàsques 2004: 33, 36, 52, 53).

This evidence-based behavior of tutors does not necessarily indicate the unwanted unbalanced distribution of power and control over the discourse on their part. It can be rather interpreted as empathy towards the less experienced, who may welcome such imbalance. This imbalance can be perceived as a necessary stage in the journey to becoming a professional (Farr 2011: 100). Thus, as rightly stated by Zeichner and Liston (1985: 170), the modes of conferences are adjusted to "the conceptual levels" of tutees; a tutee "may exert a stronger influence than the supervisor in determining the level of supervisory discourse." Farr (2011: 23, 89) recommended a shift from asymmetrical feedback toward a well-balanced "effective and affective feedback" environment in a state of "pragmatic equilibrium." Farr described such a POFC discourse as "ideal jointly and socially constructed" with reduced FTAs (Farr 2011: 111). For example, a tutor's young age, as Farr (2011: 143) reflected, "may help form more symmetrical and less authoritative relations" with tutees and the desired "realistic yet affective feedback."

A breakthrough in feedback genre constraints is that feedback conferences can be organized around formulas, which yield either tutor's formal (Round Robin, Paired Feedback) or group informal feedback (Board Feedback, Card Feedback) (Copland 2008: 143). Copland (2008: 248) reported that Card Feedback was more democratised, compared to other formulas, because it ensures everyone has an equal number of turns in a discussion.

The current scope of the reviewed research focuses on nuances in terms of the productivity of tutors' talk, tenderness (e.g., face support), and dialogic space for tutees to exercise agency and develop their identity. In the discourse of post-observation meetings, Long et al. (2013: 179) identified an educative frame that offers space for "productive learning opportunities" combined with "challenges." Arshavskaya (2014: 132−133) focused on an expert L2 teacher educator's (Melanie's) dialogic mediation reframing and renaming of tutee's (Edie's) thinking, encouraging her to position herself as a co-learner alongside her pupils or reinforcing her aspiration to establish a personal relationship with the pupils. Although during the practicum, Edie is unable to use Melanie's sug-

gestions as pedagogical tools, she expresses her willingness to involve them in her future teaching. Edie's words are sufficient as evidence of learning, as they may cause a desirable change in the future. A study by Kurtoğlu-Hooton (2016) on post-observation confirmatory feedback, was "in the spirit of caring" (Egan 2002: 361 as cited in Kurtoğlu-Hooton 2016: 9) and grounded in counselling (Egan 1990, 2002). This model of supervision is geared toward clinical supervision. For Jack, a student teacher in his mid-fifties, this confirmatory feedback resulted in desired identity changes "triggered by positive feelings" generated by the feedback (Kurtoğlu-Hooton 2016: 84−85).

Small situated narratives can contribute to the construction of identities and a professional vision of teaching, as researched by Pulvermacher and Lefstein (2016). In their study, most of the small stories were narrated by tutees about their experience as teachers. If the tutor did not "inquire into the stories", as was the case of their study, they had a limited productive potential mainly because their "emotional and aesthetic qualities" dominated over their content (Pulvermacher & Lefstein 2016: 264).

Critical incidents raised by tutees can be "transformed into professional knowledge," as investigated by Dobrowolska and Balslev (2017: 11). The educators used negotiation and co-construction strategies. The co-construction strategy appeared successful when the educators who play the roles of companions, facilitators, and trainers provided the tutee a lot of dialogic space "to express and explain her concerns" and assisted her by framing her statements, leading to "progress in the discussion and the construction of shared meanings" (Dobrowolska & Balslev 2017: 17).

Mena et al. (2017: 47) stated that the concept of "educative mentoring" (Feiman-Nemser 1998) involves supervision, which goes "beyond offering technical advice or emotional support" to "interacting with novice teachers; fostering an inquiry stance; and, creating opportunities to support teacher learning" (Mena et al. 2017: 48). Mentoring roles range from more to less directive. The low professional knowledge of the tutees corresponds here with "high level of participation in the generation of knowledge" by the educators who apply a directive style and introduce their topics (Mena et al. 2017: 57).

Bjuland and Helgevold (2018) investigated a framework of five productive discourse moves (requesting information, making supporting contributions, expressing shared ideas, providing evidence, challenging ideas) in two science mentoring sessions and their impact on the learning of tutees about their pupil learning in the practicum. This study shows how a dialogic space was created to enable tutees to learn collectively and individually about their pupil learning in the field practice.

4. THE STUDY: THE FIVE EPISODES

This linguistic ethnographic (LE) study is grounded in conversation analysis (CA) that provides a conceptual framework for understanding linguistic behavior of interactants considered a community of practice (CofP) (Steensing 2010: 101; Llamas 2010: 495−496). The pioneers of CA approach are Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson (e.g. 1974, 1977); the founders of LE are Gumperz and Hymes (e.g. 1972); whereas the concept of CofP as an enhanced version of collaborative partnerships was introduced in a model of situated learning by Lave and Wenger (1991/2020). In this study the university supervisors' decision to engage in LE studies was influenced by their own professional experience and practice (Rampton et al. 2015: 38). This analysis had the objective of identifying dialogic elements that contribute to supportive, democratic, and open dialog. Supervisory feedback was analysed through the lens of its generic constraints of face, identity, power, agency, and dialogic space (Copland & Donaghue 2023).

The TESOL practicum in Poland

In general, supervisors at universities in Poland observe "selected lessons conducted by trainees" (Dzięcioł-Pędich 2019: 215). The process of evaluating the lessons is a subject of internal regulations in universities. Here, the seven tutees were third-year English philology students specialising in TESOL in the first cycle study program. The author of this paper and her colleague were their practicum supervisors, supervisors of their BA theses, and lecturers regularly contacting them via various courses for the last 2 years of their studies. This correlates with the current situation in Poland where university supervisors are "people whose scholarly interests [are] various aspects of language teaching methodology and who lecture in applied linguistics" (Dzięcioł-Pędich 2019: 217). The ten lessons were observed in 2021 and in 2022. The online feedback, conducted by the author of the paper, as well as face-to-face sessions, conducted by the colleague, were recorded upon the consent of the majors.

4.1. Observation 1: genre

This analysis covered 2 h and 19 minutes of POFCs. Online conversations C1, C2, and C3 covered six lessons and lasted circa 33, 29, and 24 minutes, respectively. The first supervisor's (US1) talk lasted approximately 67.3 minutes (80.9%) (9574 words). The three trainees' talks lasted approximately 15.1 minutes (18.2%), and silence was approximately 3.9 minutes (4.7%). Face-to-face conversations

C4 and C5 covered four lessons and lasted about 26 minutes each. The second supervisor's (US2) talk occupied 39 minutes (73%) (5485 words). The four trainees spoke for 12.4 minutes, which constituted 23% of the total time. There were also silent moments that lasted 1.7 minutes (3.2%). The details are in Table 1.

Table 1. Corpus of C1, C2, C3, C4, and C5

C	Length: minutes / percentage / words			
	Total	Tutees/No	Tutors	Silence
C1 C2 C3	32.8 min	6.0 min (18.2%)/1	25.2 min (76.8%) 3507 words/T1	1.6 min (4.9%)
	29.4 min	4.7 min (15.9%)/1	23.4 min (79.6%) 3406 words/T1	1.3 min (4.4%)
	24.1 min	4.4 min (18.2%)/1	18.7 min (77.6%) 2661 words/T1	1.0 min (4.1%)
C4 C5	26.6 min	6.1 min (22.9%)/2	19.3 min (72.5%) 2873 words/T2	1.2 min (4.5%)
	26.5 min	6.3 min (23.7%)/2	19.7 min (74.3%) 2612 words/T2	0.5 min (1.9%)
Σ	139.4 min (2h 19.4)	27.5 min (19.7%)	106.3 min (1h 46.3 min) (76.2%)	5.6 min/336s

Source: current study.

The US1 and US2 supervisory discourse overlapped in terms of the most frequently used 10 words (types), phrases (ngrams), and collocations. In particular, in the two corpora there were eight top identical words: *you*, *this*, *and*, *no*, *yes*, *on*, *that*; five identical top phrases: *simply*, *for example*, *for me*, *this is*, *it was*, as well as the main collocation: "you simply have to."[2] These language patterns could be indicative of a common style of communication, as well as the specific genre of POFCs.

C1, C2, and C3 differed in length; each consecutive talk was shorter. The US1 talk was dominated by 65 questions (approximately one question every 60 s.), which were mainly cognitive wh- questions. This tutor's talk yielded 32 positive and 24 negative statements regarding the lessons and descriptions of seven critical incidents. The dominance of the tutor's talk was partly impacted by the close- or open-mindedness of the tutees toward what happened during the lessons. C1, C2, and C3 evolved from close-mindedness in C2, through a state of passive open-mindedness in C3, and active open-mindedness in C1.

---

[2] Brezina et al. (2020). *LancsBox 5.x and 6.x [software].* Available at http://corpora.lancs.ac.uk/lancsbox

Conversations C4 and C5 were almost identical in length (26 minutes). US2 asked 33 questions, mostly organizing yes/no questions, which were evenly distributed in the two conversations. This tutor shared with the four tutees 18 positive statements, which were followed by 27 negative statements, and provided many examples of practical modifications and improvements of given fragments or elements of the observed lessons. Eight critical incidents were also singled out. US2 language dominance in the conversations resulted from her belief that POFCs as a genre *are* as a rule dominated by the supervisor, who *should* provide balanced assessment of the lessons with some clues and solutions for the future.

4.2. Observation 2: corpus of the tutors' utterances

The tutors' utterances were divided into educative, supportive, and evaluative (Long et al. 2013). Educative/productive cues concern teacher development and are realized through high cognitive questions, critical comments, explorations, explanations, and suggestions. Supportive cues employ gentle language in "a comfortable and nonthreatening space," whereas evaluative cues "note […] the quality" of the practice of the tutees (Long et al. 2013: 184). Dobrowolska and Balslev (2017) noted that mentoring conversations are (more) symmetrical if they are less evaluative.

The findings revealed that US1 utterances were mainly productive, covering approximately 49% of the talking time of the tutor. Approximately 41% of the time was devoted to language evaluation of the observed lessons, and 10% of the tutor's utterances was supportive. The US2 talk was mainly evaluative with more than 62% of such utterances. About 34% of the utterances were educative, and 3% supportive in nature. Table 2 shows the distribution in the five frames.

Table 2. Tutors' utterances labelled as educative, supportive, and evaluative in C1, C2, C3, C4, and C5

Conversation		The tutors' utterances in minutes / percentages			
		educative/productive	supportive	evaluative	∑
US1	C1	14.5 min/59.75%	1.2 min/5.08%	9.5 min/37.69%	25.2
	C2	8.86 min/37.86%	3.75 min/16.15%	10.79 min/45.97%	23.4
	C3	9.5 min/50.8%	1.9 min/10.23%	7.3 min/38.96%	18.7
US2	C4	7.1 min/36.7%	0.4 min/2%	11.8 min/61.1%	19.3
	C5	6.3 min/31.9%	0.9 min/4.5%	12.5 min/63.4%	19.7
∑		46.2 min/43.5%	8.1 min/7.6%	51.8 min/48.7%	106.3 min

Source: current study.

4.3. Observation 3: educative/productive tutors' utterances

In the conversations, topics related to what happened during the *lessons* and those related to *teacher development* were the linchpins of the dialogues. They initiated and ended the talks and were a reference point for other topics. This shows how those tutors mediated between the reality of a given lesson and theoretical aspects. A practical topic anchored a developmental topic.

Conversation 1

In incident 22 in C1 the tutor praised the tutee for giving Mikołaj, a pupil, extra wait time to think and prepare a response although other pupils were ready to answer:

(22) "When it comes to Mikołaj, for example, during the first lesson… he could not answer a question, and someone else wanted to answer this question, but you said… it happened twice… on the consecutive one as well… you kind of protected that person so that s/he could freely, slowly provide an answer" **[turn 18, time 9.03−9.24]**

The case of Mikołaj was developed in prompts 24 and 28 when the tutor wanted the tutee to realize that her class was heterogeneous in terms of, for example, the language level of the pupils. Once this problem is diagnosed, it can be successfully dealt with:

(24) "Why do those other persons want to provide answers for someone else, for Mikołaj, for example, what do you think? " **[turn 18, time 10.09−10.16]** "Do you have an idea, for example, [how to help pupils who are bored during a lesson]? " **[turn 23, time 10.04−10.10.06]**
(28) "What about those who perform [tasks] faster? What can we do for them?" **[turn 26, time 12.18−12.23]**

In prompts 24 and 28, the tutor drew the tutee's attention from the slower pupil to the faster pupils who also need the teacher's attention. In excerpt 71, the tutor drew the tutee's attention to Dominik, a pupil who reads English texts using the same strategies as in Polish, which was ineffective. Therefore, the tutor wanted to elicit from the tutee, a strategy that can free pupils like Dominik from the teacher's dependence:

(71) "Dominik read the text literally; now, how can such kids be helped?" **[turn 59, time 27.53−27.54]**

The tutor wanted the tutee to reframe her future behavior in cases like that of Dominik:

(72) "You expertly provided [Dominik] with the correct form, but how can they become independent?… you cannot hold his hand all the time, can you?" **[turn 59, turn 27.56−28.06]**

Conversation 2

Most of the topics in C2 paired the topics about *teacher development* and *boredom & motivation*. It was US1 strategy to reduce FTAs and avoid open criticism of the ineffectiveness of the tutee to conduct a challenging lesson, as displayed in excerpts 4, 7, 8, and 36 below. The tutor began here with probing questions to determine if the tutee recognized the problem (4). Thereafter, she used an example to illustrate it (7), and encouraged the tutee to reframe her future lessons to avoid such problems (8). In the recapitulation stage, the tutor again raised this topic with an exemplary solution and ended with an encouraging question tag (36):

(4) "I would like to ask you if you also think so [i.e., that, according to the pupils, the lesson was a little boring]… and that the lesson could have been improved somehow so that the children were less bored… how do you evaluate it?" **[turn 9, time 2.25−2.44]**
(7) "If you had looked at the schoolboy in a red tracksuit, [you could have noticed that]… he was very bored,… the boys were probably rocking on the chairs…" **[turn 14, time 3.58−4.09]**
(8) "Maybe we could do something with this, [i.e., that some pupils were bored] what do you think?… in the lesson plan… change something minimally… next time" **[turn 16, time 4.17−4.46]**
(36) "You should have introduced a chain drill… something unexpected… because children are bored when things are predictable, aren't they?" **[turn 88, time 20.20−20.41]**

Conversation 3

In C3, in one fragment, the tutor motivated the tutee to cater to every pupil in her class even if the tutee's impression is that all pupils in the class but one are uninvolved. The tutor began with a yes/no question (13), dug deeper by suggesting that one pupil matters (13), and returned to this problem in the recapitulation stage. At this stage, a longer statement relating this critical incident to teacher development was generated and ended with a question for an opinion used as a strategy to avoid silence (27):

(13) "Even one person would not benefit [from assigning exercise four as a home-work task]?" **[turn 18, time 6.29−6.30]**
(15) "Don't you think that it was worth sending it [i.e., unfinished exercise four as a homework task] to only that person?" **[turn 19, time 6.45−6.48]**
(27) "It is important… that you do not try to excuse yourself by saying that this class is like that… if you want to develop you have to try doing things in this or another way… this is a challenge… these are things you have to find yourself… if one thing does not work, then try something else, until the end of the school year… what do you think about it?" **[turn 27, time 11.56−13.51]**

Conversation 4

In C4 the tutor emphasized the importance of authenticity in teaching:

(7) For example, if someone drew the word "laugh", and they were composing sentences like "I am laughing now", it would be untrue because they are not laughing at that moment. So, for instance, they would have an option that would be more meaningful, like "I am not laughing now" **[turn 7, time 8.56−9.12]**

In (27) the tutor praised the tutee who made good use of the last 3 minutes of the lesson:

(27) I saw that you were wondering at the end what to do with those exact three minutes left, and it was a good decision… just those questions, because you had just enough time to ask them a few questions. So, that was good. You handled the situation well, because I was afraid that you would start some other exercise… from the end of the lesson, but luckily you didn't do that. **[turn 27, time 16.58−17.22]**

Conversation 5

To continue, in C5 the tutor gently pointed out to the tutee that he did not make good use of the last few minutes of the lesson. His reaction about that particular event was suitable.

(14) Uhm. Did you have a bit of time left at the end? Yy **[turn 14, time 13.34−13.36]**
PsT7: Well, there is (smile) yes, but
(15) Yes **[turn 14, time 13.38]**
PsT7: There at the end and just then instead of… I could, for example, repeat yy instead of asking such further questions I could repeat the vocabulary that appeared yy in this lesson, I think. That iii…

Later on, US2 used a critical incident to point out that the tutee's reaction did not take the opportunity to initiate an authentic conversation during the lesson:

(18) Well, I noticed that one of the students mentioned Sherwood Forest. It surprised me. And I think it surprised you too (smile) **[turn 18, time 18.27−18.32]**
PsT7: Yes, yes, yes, yes
(19) Because you didn't ask, so to speak, any follow-up question about Sherwood Forest, and you could have expanded a bit on this topic. And elicit something more. After all, Robin Hood is also a figure associated with culture and you could have asked this student about what he knows about this topic **[turn 19, time 18.34−18.42]**

This tutor also wanted the tutee to realize that his class was heterogeneous in terms of the language level of the pupils and she used the litmus paper metaphor to show how to treat weaker students.

(31) Simply put, weaker students are like a test that indicates whether a lesson is understood or not. If these weaker students understand and are able to participate and perform the exercises, it means that the lesson is understandable for everyone. However, if there is a problem with these weaker students, it may be that the lesson is not entirely understandable for these students **[turn 31, time 25.44−26.18]**

To sum up, the tutors' productive or educative language oscillated around lesson management, Rowe's (1972, 1986) 'wait-time', learner autonomy, learner centeredness, and authenticity.

4.4. Observation 4: face support, identity, power, agency, and dialogic space

There were FTA excerpts in this corpus, as shown below, when the tutees "willingly" tried to "defend their actions" (Copland & Donaghue 2023: 94). These excerpts signified the identity formation and agency of the tutees as they risked their face by externalizing their interpretations of incidents and defended them through arguments in alliance with their hitherto experience. The tutors offered them face support and dialogic space to do it:

Conversation 1

[Turn 26; 27; time: 13.21''− 13.50'']
(26) What do you think about it↓ did I exaggerate↑

PsT1: (0.6) one can try it, but I do not know whether this will not deconcentrate all of them
(27): uhm
PsT1: I suppose that there would be questions asked by the rest of them while [smile] he, for example, he got that clip, and they did not. There
could be certain deeper discussions on this, and I do not know if this would not deconcentrate the rest of the class
(27): uhm
PsT1: but of course, one can try
[Turn 56; time: 25.51''− 26.01'']
(56): Someone said the name of a game; it was a boy, and here, you moved backward because (0.3) well you didn't know that game↑
PsT1: aha yes yes yes yes [smiling]

In turns (26, 27) the tutee freely presented her arguments against the tutor's standpoint but finally used a conciliatory phrase, "But of course, one can try." Then, in turn (56) the tutee admits having problems with talking with pupils about a game they know and play. In this case, the tutee agrees with the tutor that she instinctively withdrew from that conversation with the pupils since she did not know that game. In excerpts (66), (69), and (70) US1 delved into a problem of creating authentic speaking situations in the classroom, and the effort of the teacher/tutee to venture into the world of teenagers and discover their interests.

(66) "How will you create speaking situations?" **[turn 56, time 25.38−25.39]**
(69) "How do you encourage them to speak? Will you show them your world, or will you venture into theirs?" **[turn 57, time 26.26. −26-33]**
(70) "How to do it?" **[turn 58, time 26.37]**

Conversations 2

In C2, the tutee defended her argument for using Polish translation related to online teaching, assuming that it ensures the teacher is both understood and heard well by her pupils.

[Turn 81; time: 18.20''−18.30'']
US1: Was it necessary for the pupil to translate [the words] into Polish again?
PsT2: right, he started to read at once, and I assumed that I would
simply make myself heard over him

Then, the same argument was used to defend her fiasco in making her pupils sing a song. In each case, the tutee blamed the online form of classes.

[Turn 100; time: 23.13''−23.48'']
(100): The kids did not want to sing (0.1), but they should have sung all of you should that was the poor quality that distanced you (0.1); we could hear something but not much
PsT2: yeah but
(100): you can (0.1) yeah
PsT2: yeah but I just think the kids would be too shy to sing he he I think so
(100): but maybe <u>you</u> would be too shy maybe simply you would be too shy to sing that is why (0.1) because you would have to sing maybe you sing <u>well</u>
PsT2: (0.2) eh (0.4) I do not know eh I thought I think that a live [lesson] would have been better eh

Conversation 3

In C3, the tutee disagreed with the tutor who said that translating individual words in a song does not result in the pupils conceptualizing the song. The tutee disagreed without being able to explain her position as if showing unreadiness to view translation as a complex activity.

[Turn 24; time: 10.50''−11.13'']
(24): so individual words which are translated (0.1) there is there the second level to know (0.1) what they mean in the song as a whole what do you think about it?
PsT3: (0.3) I think that this could be a good idea (0.1), but I <u>know</u> (0.1) that this does not depend on transla :: ting the text

Conversation 4

Again, in C4 US2 questions the practice of the tutee asking pupils to translate sentences into L1:

(4): I have doubts about whether it makes sense to give sentences for translation… I mean, I understand that the student had some problems with the answer and you were hinting him… **[Turn 4; time: 3.32''– 3.42'']**

In this case, though, the tutor's turn lasted 24 seconds and she did not ask the tutee about his opinion on the matter. In a different context, in turn (23) the use of L2 was gently criticised:

(23) Well, this is important, you did it in English, but, well it's good, but a bit complicated in a way (smile) that's why yes, I agree here, that, that one needs to be careful

and always check if the students understood it, and if not, explain it again in Polish. **[turn 23, time 14.16−14.33]**

Then the tutor drew the tutee's attention to a critical incident when one of two pupils who were "terribly disruptive" during the class, and when that tutee pulled one of them out, he said he "doesn't understand anything" (5). The tutor's comment is:

(5) "Well, they just keep talking all the time, so it's no wonder they don't understand anything. And that was also interesting. Ehm … maybe, if we have a situation where there are weak students, maybe to help them, it might be a good idea to write something on the board." **[turn 5, time 6.01−6.21]**

Next, in (28) she simply said:

(28) "I saw you were helping" **[turn 28, time 18.38−18.39]**

The mentees show an emerging reflective disposition as they recognize the concepts but they are not ready to internalize and use them as psychological tools (Bąk-Średnicka 2023: 253).

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study was aimed at raising self-awareness regarding what and how language is used by the tutors during their five POFCs. Becoming more self-aware can help a tutor to objectively self-assess their thinking, emotions, and effectiveness. The study revealed the tutors' conference stylistic features, which otherwise would have been unknown to them. They governed between two ends of the continuum, i.e., from being formal to informal/friendly, according to the dictum that "breaking the norms of power" is a way of regarding the tutee as equal (Brown & Gilman 1960: 277). Their utterances contained elements of both conversational and institutional styles, and were dominated by a strategy of anchoring when a practical topic, used to evaluate events observed in the classroom, was a point of reference for introducing a more complex topic, serving professional development. This strategy represented "feedback which is evaluative [*lessons*] and feedback which is developmental [*teacher development*]" (Copland & Donaghue 2023: 34−57). This is directly related to a classification of utterances by Long et al. (2013), which ranges from evaluative language used by supervisors, through supportive language, and towards productive or educative language. Emotional support was linguistically realized via supportive

utterances and providing space for developing self-confidence and identity. Two tutees admitted that they would change their teaching style. In C1, the tutee said: (65) "and I will surely want to speak more since so far I have such few speaking tasks" [turn 53, time 25.21–25.28]. In C3, the tutee admitted: (28) "I will surely try to solve it somehow [the problem of passiveness of this group of pupils], particularly because have a class with these pupils on Wednesday, I will try to think something up, to make the class interesting and motivating" [turn 27, time 13.57–14.19]. The feedback provided by these tutees indicated that they considered rethinking and reframing their teaching, although they do not know yet how to do it. At least, their journey has begun.

It seems important that university supervisors ask questions which evolve from organizing questions, such as "what did (not) you like in your lesson?" into high cognitive questions, such as "what have you learnt from this lesson?" This corpus analysis revealed that US1 discourse patterns included suggestions followed by questions about tutees' opinions, which extended the conference time; there were also examples of the speakers' overlaps that are characteristic for natural speech. Moreover, US1's each consecutive talk was shorter as a result of her dissatisfaction with her verbalism. US2, in turn, provided concise advice, suggestions, and modifications, leaving little space for the tutees' opinions. Also, US2 observational talks had a well-defined template for her talk, which she delivered confidently. At the same time, these conversations were similar in terms of the most frequently used words, phrases, and collocations by both university supervisors.

Even though the paper's conversational analysis is limited to the discourse of POFCs of only two university supervisors, it can provide valuable insights for other university supervisors, encouraging their self-reflection to improve communication with students. It can also be used with tutees as "an instigator for teacher learning to change" (Kurtoğlu-Hooton 2016: 25).

Funding acknowledgement

REFERENCES

Arshavskaya, E. (2014). Analyzing mediation in dialogic exchanges in a pre-service second language (L2) teacher practicum blog: A sociocultural perspective. *System, 45*, 129–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2014.05.007

Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bąk-Średnicka, A. (2023). *The practicum: Mentorship in supervision. A hybrid literature review and corpus-based analysis*. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego.

Bjuland, R. / Helgevold, N. (2018). Dialogic processes that enable student teachers' learning about pupil learning in mentoring conversations in a lesson study field practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *70*, 246–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.11.026

Blumberg, A. / Cusick, P. (1969). Supervisor-teacher interaction: An analysis of verbal behavior. *Education*, *91*, 26–134.

Brezina, V. / Weill-Tessier, P. / McEnery, T. (2020). *LancsBox 5.x and 6.x [software]*. http://corpora.lancs.ac.uk/lancsbox

Brown, P. / Levinson, S.C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, R. / Gilman, A. (1960). The pronouns of power and solidarity. In: T. Sebeok (ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 253–276). Cambridge: MA: MIT.

Brown, R.V. / Hoffman, M.S. (1969). A promissory model for analyzing and describing verbal interaction between college supervisors and student teachers. In: M. Lindsey (ed.), *Inquiry into teaching behaviour of supervisors in teacher education labs* (pp. 84–108). New York: Teachers College Press.

Burke, M. (2010). Stylistics. In: K. Malmkjær (ed.), *The Routledge linguistic encyclopedia* (3rd ed.) (pp. 517–524). London: Routledge.

Christensen, P.S. (1988). The nature of feedback student teachers receive in post-observation conferences with the university supervisor: A comparison with O'Neal's study of cooperating teacher feedback. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *4*(3), 275–286.

Copland, F. (2008a). Deconstructing the discourse: Understanding the feedback event. In: S. Garton / K. Richards (eds.), *Professional encounters in TESOL* (pp. 5–23). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Copland, F. (2008b). *Feedback in pre-service English language teacher training: discourses of process and power*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, the University of Birmingham.

Copland, F. / Donaghue, H. (2023). *Analysing discourses in teacher observation feedback conferences*. New York: Routledge.

Dobrowolska, D. / Balslev, K. (2017). Discursive mentoring strategies and interactional dynamics in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education*, *42*, 10–20. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.09.001

Dzięcioł-Pędich, A. (2019). The TESOL practicum in Poland. In: A. Cirocki / I. Madyarov / L. Baecher (eds.), *Current perspectives on the TESOL practicum. Cases from around the globe* (pp. 207–222). Cham: Springer.

Egan, G. (1990). *The skilled helper: A systematic approach to effective helping*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks / Cole.

Egan, G. (2002). *The skilled helper: A problem-management and opportunity-development approach to helping*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks / Cole.

Farr, F. (2011). *The discourse of teaching practice feedback*. New York: Routledge.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1998). Teachers as teacher educators. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *21*(1), 63–74.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. New York: Anchor Books.

Gumperz, J. / Hymes, D. (eds) (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Jarvis, J. (2001). Exploring trainer dialogue. *The IATEFL teacher trainers and educators SIG Newsletter*, *1*(16).

Jarvis, J. (2002). *Constructing dialogue with teachers*. Paper presented at the Inter-varietal Applied Corpus Studies Conference in Limerick.

Jaworski, A. / Coupland, N. (1999). *The discourse reader*. London: Routledge.

Jefferson, G. (1979). A technique for inviting laughter and its subsequent acceptance/declination. In: G. Psathas (ed.), *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology* (pp. 79–96). New York: Irvington Publishers.

Kim, M. / Schallert, D.L. (2011). Building caring relationships between a teacher and students in a teacher preparation program word-by-word, moment-by-moment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 1059–1067. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2011.05.002

Kurtoğlu-Hooton, N. (2016). *Confirmatory feedback in teacher education. An instigator of student teacher learning*. London: Palgrave Pivot London.

Lave, J. / Wenger, E. (1991/2020). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leff, M. / Velasco, A. de (2010). Rhetoric. In: K. Malmkjær (ed.), *The Routledge linguistic encyclopedia* (3rd ed.) (pp. 456–461). London: Routledge.

Llamas, C. (2010). Sociolinguistics. Introduction. In: K. Malmkjær (ed.), *The Routledge linguistic encyclopedia* (3rd ed.) (pp. 494–497). London: Routledge.

Long, J.J. / Es, E.A. van / Black, R.W. (2013). Supervisor-student teacher interactions: The role of conversational frames in developing a vision of ambitious teaching. *Linguistics and Education*, *24*, 179–196. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2013.02.002

Mena, J., / Hennissen, P. / Loughran, J. (2017). Developing pre-service teachers' professional knowledge of teaching: The influence of mentoring. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *66*, 47–59.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Phillips, D. (1993). *The language of criticism*. London: Birkbeck College.

Phillips, D. (1999). *The feedback session within the context of teacher training and development: An analysis of discourse, role and function*. PhD thesis, Institute of Education University of London.

Pulvermacher, Y. / Lefstein, A. (2016). Narrative representations of practice: what and how can student teachers learn from them? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *55*, 255–266. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.01.013

Rampton, B. / Maybin, J. / Roberts, C. (2015). Theory and method in linguistic ethnography. In: J. Snell / S. Shaw / F. Copland (eds.), *Linguistic ethnography: Interdisciplinary explorations* (pp. 14–50). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rowe, M.B. (1972). *Wait-time and rewards as instructional variables: Their influence on language, logic, and fate control.* Chicago: ERIC.

Rowe, M.B. (1986). Wait time: Slowing down may be a way of speeding up! *Journal of Teacher Education*, January-February, 42–49.

Sacks, H. / Schegloff, E.A. / Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, *50*(4), 696–735. https://doi.org/10.2307/412243

Schegloff, E.A. / Jefferson, G. / Sacks, H. (1977). The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, *53*(2), 361–382. https://doi.org/10.2307/413107

Shaw, S. / Copland, F. / Snell, J. (2015). An introduction to linguistic ethnography: Interdisciplinary explorations. In: J. Snell / S. Shaw / F. Copland (eds.), *Linguistic ethnography: Interdisciplinary explorations* (pp. 1–13). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Steensing, J. (2010). Conversation analysis. In: K. Malmkjær (ed.), *The Routledge linguistic encyclopedia* (3rd ed.) (pp. 101–104). London: Routledge.

Strong, M. / Baron, W. (2004). An analysis of mentoring conversations with beginning teachers: Suggestions and responses. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*, 47–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.09.005

Tannen, D. (2005). *Conversational style. Analyzing talk among friends.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tannen, D. (2006). Language and culture. In: R.W. Fasold / J. Connor-Linton (eds.), *An introduction to language and linguistics* (pp. 343–372). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thornborrow, J. (2002). *Power talk. Language and interaction in institutional discourse.* London: Routledge.

Trevethan, H. / Sandretto, S. (2017). Repositioning mentoring as educative: Examining missed opportunities for professional learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, *68*(1), 127−133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.08.012

Vàsquez, C. (2004). 'Very carefully managed': Advice and suggestions in post-observation meetings. *Linguistics and Education*, *15*, 33−58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2004.10.004

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* London: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1987). Thinking and speech. In: R.W. Rieber / A.S. Carton (eds.), *The collected works of L.S. Vygotsky:* Vol. 1: *Problems of general psychology* (pp. 39–285). New York: Plenum Press.

Wajnryb, R. (1994). *The pragmatics of feedback: A study of mitigation in the supervisory discourse of TESOL teacher educators.* PhD thesis, Macquarie University in Sydney.

Zeichner, K.M. / Liston, D. (1985). Varieties of discourse in supervisory conferences. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *1*(2), 155–174. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(85)90013-7

Nawigowanie dyskusji pohospitacyjnych po polsku: kształtowanie samoświadomości tutorów

Abstrakt. Badanie dotyczy rozmów pohospitacyjnych w ramach praktyki zawodowej przyszłych nauczycieli języka angielskiego jako obcego. Wykorzystując metodę analizy konwersacyjnej, dokonano analizy dyskursu dwóch uniwersyteckich opiekunów praktyk w pięciu obszarach, które definiują go jako gatunek komunikacyjny. Celem było wyodrębnienie elementów językowych konstytuujących wspierający, demokratyczny i otwarty dialog, przyczyniający się do rozwoju cech profesjonalnego i empatycznego nauczyciela. Analiza tego korpusu wykazała, że wypowiedzi opiekunów zawierają elementy stylu konwersacyjnego i instytucyjnego oraz że są zdominowane przez strategię polegającą na zakotwiczaniu tematu bardziej złożonego, służącego rozwojowi sfery kognitywnej praktykanta, na temacie praktycznym, dotyczącym obserwowanej lekcji. W przypadku braku gotowości praktykanta do rozmowy na tym poziomie, opiera się ona na tym, co wydarzyło się na lekcji. Wsparcie sfery emocjonalnej jest językowo realizowane przez wypowiedzi, które chronią, wspierają i dają przestrzeń do rozwoju pewności siebie oraz tożsamości osobowej i zawodowej praktykanta. Badanie wpisuje się w debatę na temat efektywnych i wspierających rozmów pohospitacyjnych. Zwraca uwagę, że badanie własnych wypowiedzi podnosi świadomość opiekunów uniwersyteckich w zakresie języka, jakiego używają w kontaktach z praktykantami.

Słowa kluczowe: praktyki nauczycielskie, sesji feedbackowe po hospitacjach zajęć, tutorzy uniwersyteccy.

ANNA BĄK-ŚREDNICKA
Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce (Poland)
abak@ujk.edu.pl
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8932-659X