

When Things Go Wrong: Feedback on Teaching Practice in TESOL.

Louw, S., Watson Todd, R., & Jimarkon, P.

In Ben Said, S. & Zhang, L.J. (Eds.), *Language Teachers and Teaching: Global Perspectives, Local Initiatives* (pp. 185-200). London: Routledge. 2013.

The definitive version of this article was published as Louw, S., Watson Todd, R. & Jimarkon, P. (2013). *When Things Go Wrong: Feedback on Teaching. Practice in TESOL*. In S. Ben Said and L. J. Zhang. *Language Teachers.& Teaching: Global Perspective, Local Intiatives* (185-200). New York: Routledge.

WHEN THINGS GO WRONG: FEEDBACK ON TEACHING PRACTICE IN TESOL

Stephen Louw, Richard Watson Todd, and Pattamawan Jimarkon

Introduction

Private sector pre-service TESOL courses offer a popular and convenient means of entry into the ELT profession for thousands of teachers annually (Ferguson & Donno, 2003), and usually involve intensive full-time courses with at least 100 hours of training and an additional supervised teaching practice component (Brandt, 2006). Teaching practice (TP), which is well-established as a crucial component of pre-service teacher training courses, offers trainees useful experience in the field, a practical means for putting their newly gained theoretical knowledge into action, and an opportunity for the trainer to assess the trainee's uptake of target skills (Leshem & Bar-Hama, 2008).

While TP in itself is valuable, it is the post-observation feedback conference which offers trainers meaningful avenues to help trainee teachers improve. Post-observation feedback typically takes the form of a relatively formal dialogue between the teacher and the supervisor (Farr, 2006), and serves to give the trainee teacher a chance to talk through their reactions to the lesson, identify effective practices, establish a link between theory and practice, increase self-awareness, and encourage a habit of reflective practice (Akbari, 2007; Bailey, 2006; O'Donoghue, 1997; Pekkanli, 2011). Feedback on TP plays a critical role in the

training of pre-service teachers, and is arguably one of the most valuable elements of teacher education programmes (Cobbold, 2011).

The implementation of supervised TP in training courses, however, can be a source of tension for both teacher trainees and the course trainers. Brandt (2006), for example, outlines eight critical issues associated with feedback in pre-service CELTA courses. Among these, Brandt found that trainees objected to feedback that was overly lenient or critical and they experienced inconsistency in expectations from different tutors on the course. While such issues are perhaps unavoidable, their existence undermines the potential benefits of feedback on TP, and therefore of the training course as a whole.

Given the large numbers of teachers who enrol on these private sector TESOL programmes for whom TP is a first brush with teaching and the potential value of this experience, the dearth of literature into problems in feedback on TP is surprising. This paper reports on an investigation into one trainee teacher's experiences with feedback on TP in a four-week TESOL programme in Bangkok. The starting point is her complaint about the feedback she received following TP. Using a corpus informed approach, we investigate her feedback sessions, and use inputs from her expressed expectations for the TP and the trainer's beliefs about TP to seek out possible sources for the problem. Our analysis of the findings is guided by a dialogical view of meaning making through interaction (Bakhtin, 1986 [1979]; Linell, 2006).

Background

Trainee teachers on Chichester College's intensive four-week pre-service TESOL programme in Bangkok are required to teach a minimum of four lessons to adults as part of the TP component. These lessons are co-taught with a peer trainee and supervised by one of five trainers, but not by the same trainer every lesson.

Our focus in this paper is Jenny (all names are pseudonyms), who approached the course coordinator with a complaint about feedback she had received following her TP. Jenny is a Filipina teacher in her early forties who came into the course already having a certificate in elementary education and over five years' teaching experience .

Over the four weeks, Jenny received feedback on her TP from two trainers. For her first two TP lessons, Jenny was supervised by Craig, an Australian in his early thirties with considerable teaching and training experience. Jenny's final two TP sessions were scheduled with Simon, a British trainer in his fifties who had two years' training experience at the time. Following her third TP, Jenny wrote about her experience in her reflective journal as follows:

I was quite disappointed with the comment/suggestion that I received from the evening tutor. Although he commented that I and my partner did a great and excellent job in our lesson – a successful, progressive lesson – he mentioned about planning/considering planning for a big size class – that our lesson/activities might have been a great success in our evening lesson, but what if it's a bigger class of mixed ability students. As teachers, we always consider the number of students, activities to do and the level of learners when planning for a lesson – this comes out naturally! I was just surprised to hear a comment being made/included in the current lesson that I would say is really inappropriate. For feedback, I was hoping for positive and negative, which I could use to improve my teaching skills in the future. I always welcome criticisms and I take it constructively.

Jenny's journal entry highlights two issues with her feedback from Simon. Firstly, she felt that because the decisions she made in the TP were in line with what she knew about the learners, Simon's comments that the lesson would not have worked with a different class were 'inappropriate'. Secondly, while acknowledging the positive feedback she was given, she felt there was a lack of constructive criticism that could benefit her development as a teacher. Jenny's journal following her second feedback with Simon expressed similar sentiment.

Methodology

Investigating the issues brought up by Jenny about her feedback on TP requires a closer look at the feedback conferences themselves, which were audio recorded and transcribed for

analysis (Gibbs, 2007). The following contextual data sources related to the feedback sessions were also available for analysis:

1. *Jenny's critical reflections*: as part of the goal of encouraging reflective practices, trainees on the course write daily journals and reflections on teaching.
2. *Simon's beliefs on feedback*: prior to the collection of the data from the feedback on TP conferences, course trainers' beliefs about teacher training were elicited using semi-structured interviews (Louw et al., 2011). There has been considerable interest in the ways in which beliefs affect practitioner decision making and practice (Borg, 2006). It would stand to reason that beliefs trainers hold about feedback have an effect on their supervision techniques.
3. *Trainer and trainee expectations*: written expectations for the TP sessions were elicited from all participants before each session.

With few clear pre-existing expectations of what to focus on in the data, we needed to take a qualitative approach to analysing the data. Such an approach aims to understand the data from the participants' perspectives, and is interpretive and humanistic (Seliger & Shohamy, 1989), but findings may be biased by issues such as the selection of the data to be analysed or presented to the reader (Duff, 2002).

To minimize the possibility of bias either in favour of or against the trainee's account of the feedback, a mixed methods data analysis (MMDA) was undertaken, which allows the research to benefit from the rich, descriptive findings of a qualitative analysis, yet maintains the potential objectivity afforded by a quantitative approach (Jimarkon & Watson Todd, 2011). Sequential explanatory MMDA (Watson Todd, forthcoming) begins with a quantitative investigation to get an overview of the data and avoid the possibility of bias either in the selection of the data to be focused on or in the investigation itself, and then uses the results to guide a subsequent qualitative analysis of the same data.

Our analysis, then, is in three stages. First we investigate the contextual data, to inform our understanding of the TP feedback. Second, following the principles of sequential explanatory MMDA, we conduct a quantitative analysis of Jenny's four feedback sessions on TP to find pertinent patterns in the discourse. Finally, using these findings, we explore the data qualitatively, framed in dialogicity theory (Linell, 2006).

Findings from Contextual Data

In her expectations prior to the lesson with Simon, Jenny wrote:

I expect that our lesson would run smoothly. In case I make mistakes/missed out anything, I do hope that our tutor will not hesitate to jump in and help out. I expect to get positive and negative feedback so I'll know my strengths and weaknesses – areas I need to maintain and areas that I still need focusing/improving on.

Jenny was expecting balanced and specific feedback on the outcomes of the lesson with the aim of developing her teaching methodology. We have already seen from Jenny's reflections on the feedback from Simon that this expectation was not met.

In his expectations of the TP with Jenny, Simon wrote:

Jenny seems happy with her lesson, and confident enough not to need much input from me. I have not observed Jenny before, so I am unsure what to expect. Especially so late on in the course.

Simon perceives Jenny as a capable and confident teacher and is expecting her to perform well and to need little input. Simon's expectations here are clearly at odds with Jenny's own expectations of active involvement from the trainer.

In the interview with Simon, which was held three months before the TP session, he expressed his belief in the need for the trainer to show empathy for trainees during the feedback on TP.

*I'm just.. understanding what they are going through the fact that they've just.. come from England.. never taught before.. [...] three hours. four hours to prepare a lesson. so.. **empathy**. I think empathy would be you've got to be empathetic*

For Simon, sheer intensity of the course creates an environment in which trainees need support, encouragement and confidence building.

In addition, Simon sees the feedback on TP as a valuable opportunity to give trainees insights on the teaching environments facing them once the course is finished.

I look at the students and think [...] well actually.. they might. just fit into the system somewhere

*For somebody that's taught before.. right. **really** to **guide** them towards the way that we t- we're: [1.7] teaching in Thailand.*

Simon tries to build the trainees' strengths and guide them accordingly within the Thai teaching context. In this way, he sees the feedback on teaching practice as providing a link to the real world of teaching. Given Jenny's extensive previous experience, however, such expectations may not have been appropriate in her case.

Quantitative Analysis

Jenny's first two TP sessions were supervised by Craig and the final two by Simon. We can, therefore, employ the data from her four sessions to compare the two pairs of supervision sessions. As an initial analysis, Table 1 summarises each of Jenny's four supervision sessions.

Table 1: Summary of data from Jenny's turns for each of the four feedback sessions

	Session 1: Craig	Session 2: Craig	Session 3: Simon	Session 4: Simon
Session length	00:19:57	00:32:23	00:12:21	00:18:55
Total number of turns	269	161	145	183
Total word count	3580	4938	1831	2608
Jenny's total number of turns	81	42	28	47
Jenny's total word count	495	817	206	274
Jenny's contributing turns	29	21	11	16
Jenny's average words per turn	6	19	7	6
Jenny's non-contributing turns	12	8	6	10
Jenny's turns as backchannel cues	40	13	11	21
Jenny's turns as % of total turns	30%	26%	19%	26%

Jenny's word count as % of total word count	14%	17%	11%	11%
Jenny's contributions as % of Jenny turns	32%	50%	39%	30%
Backchannels as % of Jenny's turns	49%	31%	39%	45%

Backchannel cues (such as 'mm', 'yeah' or 'uhuh'), which are a useful signal of engagement as a listener in the dialogue (Farr, 2006; Fox Tree, 2007), are at their highest in Jenny's first session, suggesting perhaps that in this sessions Jenny was engaged but as yet unwilling to get too involved in the feedback dialogue. In her second session, backchannel turns are lower, but Jenny's word count and average turn length, which give a sense of her involvement in the discourse during the feedback session (Duff, 2002), are at their highest. Also high in the second session is Jenny's high proportion of contributing turns (50%), which we define as a turn that brings new information (Carroll, 1999) into the dialogue (as opposed to backchannel cues, confirmations or repetitions), indicating greater control over the feedback through the co-construction of the dialogue. The greater involvement and participation in the dialogue we see in Jenny's second session may be ascribed to a growing confidence in her role in the feedback process. This momentum, however, is lost in sessions three and four, where Jenny takes fewer and shorter turns, and makes fewer contributions, signifying lower levels of control and involvement in Simon's feedback sessions.

While this initial analysis provides some insights into Jenny's experience, a deeper understanding may be gained through an analysis of the lexico-grammatical frequencies in the data using corpus analysis tools (Koester, 2002). Using the two pairs of feedback sessions, two small corpora were created. They were analysed using AntConc (Anthony, 2004), a freeware concordance programme which calculates relative frequency of lexical items in the corpus, measured as log likelihood, or keyness (Baker, 2006).

Table 2: Keyword output for feedback on TP for Simon and Craig

Keywords from Simon's Sessions				Keywords from Craig's Sessions			
Rank	Freq	Keyness	Keyword	Rank	Freq	Keyness	Keyword
1	112	70.238	yeah	1	21	17.638	sure

2	15	32.108	production	2	47	17.256	class
3	11	23.546	exercises	3	96	14.200	okay
4	11	23.546	pictures	4	56	14.017	were
5	11	23.546	school	5	16	13.438	person
6	57	22.325	is	6	16	13.438	task
7	20	19.760	will	7	96	13.018	er
8	24	18.578	up	8	15	12.598	maybe
9	15	18.408	keep	9	14	11.758	also
10	31	18.236	we	10	30	11.512	kind
11	10	15.543	practice	11	154	11.314	of
12	7	14.984	develop	12	13	10.918	alright
13	7	14.984	sentences	13	13	10.918	trying
14	18	13.152	need	14	12	10.079	erm
15	6	12.843	favourite	15	12	10.079	feedback

The analysis of the top fifteen keywords from the two corpora, sorted by keyness highlights interesting differences between Simon and Craig's feedback sessions. Starting with the content words, which can indicate aboutness (Scott & Tribble, 2006), Simon's content words (production, pictures, exercises, practice) show a focus on the planning elements of the lesson, while Craig's (task, feedback, listen, fortune) address elements of the tasks in the lesson. Further evidence of this is to be found by examining contrasting keywords, in this case verb usage and educational setting.

The keyword analysis shows that Simon uses verbs in the present and future tense (keywords 6 and 7), while Craig favours the past tense (keyword 4). . The concordance lines (Baker, 2006) of 'is' from Simon's sessions (table 3) reveal how Simon generalises in his feedback about teaching (lines 1 and 4, for example) and the nature of students (line 3), but makes limited references to the recently taught TP session itself (lines 5).

Table 3: Sample concordance lines for 'is' in Simon's feedback sessions

1	d talk about it worked here.. you must think "now	is	that going to work with younger students? are the
2	yeah er for instance. putting students into four	is	okay here. but in a classroom.. there's some vari
3	ah will there be one st- a dominant student.. who	is	going to do everything and the other three don't
4	p them interested yeah yeah that's that's the key	is	keep it on= x2 =but your your um.. your. teaching
5	ine but what you'd have to do probably have to do	is.	hold up a picture and say what am i going to loo

In contrast, the concordance lines from Craig’s feedback for ‘were’ (table 4) show how he focuses much more on specific aspects of the TP class.

Table 4: Sample concordance lines for ‘were’ in Craig’s feedback sessions

1	uring that {yeah} first initial stages when they	were	talking about. their jobs. that worked well.. mm:
2	was a little congested there. and and some people	were	not as active as others okay. i just want to give
3	re they were actually participating you know they	were	talking a lot okay but do i know for sure. they a
4	ook but i couldn’t see everything no er they they	were	quite /speaki:/. er quite talkative. um your less
5	u raised. getting the students involved. so those	were	you-. your points and then. the others. of what t

The second contrast between Simon and Craig’s feedback is the difference in their focus on educational settings: ‘school’ in Simon’s feedback (keyword 5), and ‘class’ for Craig (keyword 2). The TP sessions in the Chichester College TESOL course are conducted with a relatively small class of volunteer students in a classroom in a commercial high-rise office, making the high occurrence of ‘school’ as a keyword in Simon’s feedback interesting. The concordance lines for this keyword (table 5), reveal how Simon draws attention in his feedback to the realities of teaching beyond the TP classroom environment.

Table 5: Concordance lines for ‘school’ in Simon’s feedback sessions

1	utes?” yes so you. wi- with younger learners or a	school.	. er students. you need to think about.. what wil
2	d this classroom {mm:} and.. er they would suit a	school.	environment but you need to to develop it. yeah
3	re never going to get it. perfect {yeah} but in a	school	environment you’ve got to. keep the students inte
4	ing. would y- would the student in a classroom. a	school	classroom {mm:} with say thirty and give them pic
5	f.. creative. ways to do these= things =well in a	school	in a school environment if you go to a school you

Concordance lines of ‘class’ from Craig’s feedback (table 6) show that he focuses specifically on aspects of the recently taught lesson, like giving instructions (line 2) and action zones (line 3). Even so, like Simon, Craig acknowledges the unusual nature of this teaching environment (in lines 1 and 5), but does not make this a central feature of his feedback in the way that Simon does.

Table 6: Sample concordance lines for ‘class’ in Craig’s feedback sessions

1	know i liked that part but. you not always have a	class	like that so you got to =X3 =well h- how can you
2	sten. but your rule is. if you're speaking to the	class	. and that includes um. giving feedback like going
3	. this area. you'll notice that when i teach this	class	i take those two chairs away and i put them at th
4	hen you speaking to the class. {mm:} speak to the	class	and er.. kind of shift your eye contact. around r
5	ents.. and that should help you out {okay} X3 the	class	. i know it was a small class tonight so. the smal

Since noticeably different language use emerged in Simon and Craig's feedback sessions, we thought it worth investigating how Jenny's language differed with the two trainers. Jenny's turns were isolated from the full data set to create two specific sub-corpora, one consisting of her turns with Simon, and another of her turns with Craig. The keyword output of the analysis is presented in table 7.

Table 7: Keyword output for Jenny's turns only

Jenny's Turns with Simon				Jenny's Turns with Craig			
Rank	Freq	Keyness	Keyword	Rank	Freq	Keyness	Keyword
1	5	13.051	cough	1	29	8.733	they
2	12	12.204	we	2	11	6.958	if
3	4	10.441	pair	3	10	6.325	know
4	4	10.441	wrote	4	23	5.831	of
5	6	7.929	about	5	9	5.693	don
6	3	7.831	earlier	6	8	5.060	maybe
7	3	7.831	how	7	8	5.060	other
8	3	7.831	telling	8	8	5.060	two
9	3	7.831	use	9	15	4.617	but
10	33	6.210	I	10	7	4.428	ask

A notable pattern in Table 7 concerns Jenny's use of pronouns: first person with Simon (keywords 2 and 10), and third person with Craig (keyword 1). The concordance lines of the pronouns from Jenny's feedback with Simon (table 8) give a sense of her need to justify her planning (line 3 and 5) and classroom decisions (line 1 and 2).

Table 8: Sample concordance lines for 'we' in Jenny's discourse from Simon's sessions

1	i think it went pretty well. {yes actually	we	talked about pairing them when.. we were looking
2	at the number of students who were here first and	we	just decided okay let's just change the group. pr
3	it's it was our idea we talked about it. earlier	we	were when we were planning. we keep on changing a
4	about it. earlier we were when we were planning.	we	keep on changing are we going to do it in groups
5	re when we were planning. we keep on changing are	we	going to do it in groups or are we going to do it

In contrast, the higher occurrence of third person pronouns in Jenny’s sessions with Craig is revealed to be a function of her focus on the language learners and their response to the tasks (table 9).

Table 9: Sample concordance lines for ‘they’ in Jenny’s discourse from Craig’s sessions

1	okay {mm} mm yeah they ask questions too.. {when	they	are unsure of something {mm: right. is there anyt
2	om them.. you rephrased questions. and then while	they’	re filling.. what’s that. filling in the blanks (
3	ed the character traits for consistency and [3.7]	they	were working in pairs.. er they don’t know who th
4	istency and [3.7] they were working in pairs.. er	they	don’t know who they’re working with probably. er.
5	ey were working in pairs.. er they don’t know who	they’	re working with probably. er. put them together..

In summary, then, the quantitative analysis has highlighted a number of interesting differences between Jenny’s feedback with Simon and Craig:

- Jenny seems to have been more involved and to have had more control over the discourse in Craig’s sessions,
- Simon’s feedback seemed to focus more closely on elements relating to planning, while Craig’s focused more on the implementation and outcomes of the tasks in the lessons,
- In his feedback, Simon tended towards present tense verb usage and a focus on generalisations about teaching, where Craig’s feedback showed greater use of past tense, and specific events in the TP lesson,
- Simon focused more on teaching environments beyond the TP classroom, while Craig’s feedback was more centred on the TP class itself.
- Jenny’s discourse favoured greater self-reference in Simon’s feedback, while in Craig’s feedback sessions her focus was the language learners.

Our overall goal in the analysis is to find the source of Jenny’s complaint, and our quantitative analysis so far has provided clues about the differences between the two trainers

and Jenny's response to them. These key findings provide a focus for a closer qualitative analysis of the feedback.

Qualitative Analysis

Many of the benefits associated with feedback on TP, such as reflection and self-awareness, are dependent on the interaction between the trainer and the trainee(s) in the feedback conference. Since this interaction is a dialogue between the trainer and trainee, bound socially and culturally, dialogicity theory is relevant to an analysis of the feedback on TP (Farr, 2006).

Dialogicity is based on four broad principles:

1. Communication is an *active meaning-making* process which is aided by the sociocultural resources of the interlocutors, (Linell, 2010, p. 36),
2. Communicative acts are *interdependent*. The possible meaning of the dialogue does not lie in the utterance itself, but on its context and the response of the audience (Blommaert, 2005),
3. Meaning-making in dialogue is *sequential* in that each utterance's interpretation is subject to its temporal position in the context (Blommaert, 2005; Linell, 2006),
4. Dialogue is the result of active *co-construction* by interlocutors, rather than a transfer of pre-formed thoughts (Blommaert, 2005; Linell, 2010).

Where these underlying principles are absent, the dialogue and meaning-making process may be compromised (Blommaert, 2005) by the imposition of authority, partial sharedness or competing goals (Peled-Elhanan & Blum-Kulka, 2006).

The dialogue between the trainer and the trainee in feedback on TP is not carried out between equals. Because trainers hold power by virtue of their roles as expert, knower, supervisor and evaluator (Bailey, 2006), they can to allocate or withdraw turns, control and direct agendas, and make evaluations. Creating a responsive understanding in such an environment involves an active effort on the part of the trainer to mediate this power, the

success of which will determine whether the feedback dialogue provides a transformative meaning making opportunity.

We use dialogicity theory to guide our understanding of the dialogue through three extracts from Jenny's feedback sessions, the selection of which is based on the findings of the quantitative analysis, as they are illustrative of the elements identified in the corpus output as worthy of investigation.

Extract one is from Jenny's third feedback session, following a lesson taught with a co-trainee, Charles, and supervised by Simon.

Extract 1: feedback session 3 - Simon, Jenny and Charles

59	S	Where did this come from was this your idea or?
60	J	No it's it was our idea
61	S	Yeah
62	C	Yeah
63	J	We talked about it. earlier we were when we were planning. we keep on changing are we going to do it in groups or
64	S	{Yeah}
65	J	Are we going to do it as a full class. and how are we going to elicit the language from the learners..
66	C	{Yeah}
67	J	So..
68	C	But=
69	S	=Yeah no it was good because you gave them pictures and that was it. now again in a in a classroom situation best thing. would y- would the student in a classroom. a school classroom

The use of first person pronouns is evident in each of Jenny's turns, and turn 69 demonstrates Simon's focus on abstractions rather than on the specifics of the lesson recently taught. The extract also gives an indication of Simon's control over the session, evident from his question (turn 59), the dismissal of Charles' bid (turn 68), to the evaluation and commentary (turns 69 and on).

Dialogically, until turn 69, Simon is fairly passive (in the Bakhtinian sense of lacking an articulated response), missing opportunities to co-construct with Jenny an understanding of her planning decisions. In turn 69 Simon starts with an explicit positive evaluation of Jenny and Charles' idea. This praise is sequential: it is understood here in its place as an

addendum to the question about the idea in turn 59. However, Simon's turn lacks interdependence on the input provided by Jenny's previous turns about indecision and grouping, and his judgement of the reason for success of the activity (the 'pictures') lacks co-construction with the trainees.

In the second half of turn 69 Simon reiterates a former point about the classroom setting (indicated by 'again') in which the dialogic principles are compromised further. While it could be argued Simon's discussion about classroom situations is sequential in that it links to a preceding turn (not included in this extract), there is a marked gap to the reference, weakening the dialogue's sequentiality. Additionally, Simon's return to the topic of a classroom situation is not co-constructed from the dialogue, but rather imposed onto the discourse. The extract shows how, in breaking from the principles of dialogicity Simon's turns make the dialogue subject to asymmetry and lack of co-construction that prejudices effective meaning making.

Extract 2 from Jenny's second lesson, which was supervised by Craig and co-taught with Lionel, illustrates the focus in Jenny's feedback with Craig on the activities and student responses in the class which has just been taught through the use of third person pronouns and past tense verbs. There is also evidence of how Craig encourages involvement through a use of questions and prompts.

Extract 2: feedback session 2 - Craig, Jenny and Lionel

99	C		=Okay. when: when
		the students were doing their little presentation. er. did you notice that the students were a little bit.. {er:?	
100	J	{Yeah especially the ones who: were going to: report in front	
101	C	Yeah	
102	J	They're quite.. I don't know. some. felt excited about it. some were checking for "I I'm not good at this". so	
103	C	Okay. and some of the students. you picked up on it they were actually chatting while the students would be speaking but	
104	J	{Yeah (laugh)	
105	C	{But they they kind of got a little bit chatty. why: do you think that happened. why were they?	
106	J	Probably they were trying to preparing for their turn	
107	C	Okay. and also actually a similar thing happened to Leonard where. they didn't have a reason where they.. had to listen you know	
108	J		{Mm:}

109	C	That. that kind of activity there was. write then: then tell. essentially if you write it down then y-. then tell the class about it. very hard to get people to pay attention to something. like that. ...
-----	---	--

The extract gives a much clearer picture of the dialogical processes of active meaning-making, interdependence, sequentiality and co-construction. Craig's point in turn 109 about the lack of focus in the presentations is carefully co-constructed through the dialogue. In turn 103, for example, Craig acknowledges Jenny's evaluation of learner involvement, but rephrases Jenny's 'checking' to 'chatting' to guide meaning towards the problematic nature of the learners' behaviour. Craig continues to co-construct this meaning with Jenny (turn 105) to reach the point where he can make his evaluation in turn 107. Sequentially, Craig withholds his interpretation of the events until he is certain that Jenny shares his understanding of the learners' restlessness. Craig makes his turns dependent both on Jenny's understanding and acknowledgement of the situation, and on the context in which the event happened.

As part of the trainers' responsibilities, Simon and Craig are both evaluating the trainees' teaching. However, the ways in which this is done are very different. Craig's evaluation is implicit, does not include any overt judgemental language and is based on a co-constructed understanding of the lesson. Simon, on the other hand, makes an explicit judgement and bases this on his own understanding of the use of pictures, an aspect of the lesson which has not been co-constructed.

We noted earlier that active meaning making in dialogicity is dependent on the context in which it occurs. Our analysis of the contextual issues relating to feedback on TP revealed that both Jenny and Simon were bound by their own implicit contextual goals. In extract 3, we turn our attention to these contextual issues in the dialogical process, and how they were manifested in Jenny's feedback session with Simon.

Extract 3: from feedback session 4 - Simon, Jenny and Andrew

108	S	Yeah. yeah that's the only thing that [3.1] I think the only. thing that I could. add to that is yes. your instructions need. little bit of working on but that will come with time.. you soon realise that when the students get it. that you've. perfected. or as perfected as you can do instructions. you never get it right every time you'll always forget something. but it will come more naturally because you realise. that once your instructions are good. the students understand. and your life is a lot easier	
109	J		{Mm: Yeah}
110	S	come. obviously when you get bigger classes like twenty kids	So. but.. th-the test will
111	J		{Mm:}
112	S	learners. then you'll know that. I've got to get this instructions right. otherwise it's hard work then to go around and tell everybody individually so. it's important that the your instructions are good but you. no you did well. um. I didn't write a lot because.. there was not much to s- to write (laugh) you know you had a simple.. simple production that used that used the target language and you got them to make their own sentences which was..	Twenty students younger

The elements we now associate with Simon's feedback technique are evident in this extract: broad generalisations, a focus outside of the TP environment, and controlled dialogue which lacks co-construction. However, the feedback is consistent with Simon's beliefs. Following his belief that trainees need supportive feedback, repeatedly provides positive reinforcement for Jenny's successes. Also, consistent with his belief that feedback should provide insights into the realities facing teachers beyond the course, Simon notes the difficulties that may be experienced with bigger and younger classes. From Simon's perspective, the feedback has achieved a set of implicit goals matching his beliefs.

From the perspective of Jenny's expectations, however, the feedback has been less successful. She has received little of her expected critical feedback to develop her teaching skills, notably missing here is any indication of what exactly was amiss with her instructions or guidance on how they can be improved.

Extract 3 shows how Simon and Jenny have entered the feedback session with conflicting contextual frameworks and communicative purposes which serve to undermine co-constructive, interdependent dialogue and thus the potential for shared meaning making.

Discussion

Our purpose in this paper is not to make an indictment of feedback on TP. The value and usefulness of such feedback and its importance in teacher training are indisputable, but things can go wrong and its purposes can be derailed. Analysing problematic feedback sessions allows us to gain insights into the feedback process and of the factors that influence it.

In viewing TP from the perspective of dialogicity we can explain Craig's success in his feedback as resulting, at least in part, from his implementation of the principles of dialogicity in his feedback sessions. Simon's sessions, however, are subject to the imposition of meaning and a lack of interdependence and co-construction, with the result that effective meaning making with Jenny is forfeited.

Dialogicity provides a useful framework for looking at the dialogue between Jenny and Simon in the feedback sessions, but does not explain why Simon takes this approach. The answer seems to lie in Simon's close adherence to the beliefs he holds about TP, providing empathy and encouragement, and introducing trainees to the wider teaching environment. These beliefs are not inherently problematic. The literature on TP argues for a supportive context for feedback on TP (e.g. Randall & Thornton, 2001) and Simon's goal of giving trainees a 'bigger picture' seems sensible, particularly for trainees who are new to the field. What is problematic, at least for Jenny, is that these beliefs are a poor match for her expectations as a trainee. While Jenny is ready for constructive criticism on her teaching, Simon continues using an approach with her that is based on the needs of new teachers. In his position as supervisor of the feedback, Simon is able to impose his implicit goals on the dialogue, frustrating Jenny's goals. Jenny's contributions to the dialogue, where they occur, are seen by Simon as a poor fit to his objectives, but by ignoring these opportunities to create dialogue, and instead imposing his own meaning into the dialogue, effective co-construction of meaning is undermined.

While Simon's beliefs may have led to many successful feedback sessions with novice teachers, in Jenny's case they result in trainee disappointment. This does not mean, however, that the trainers should simply bend to trainee's expectations. In this case, Jenny's expectation of the trainer intervening in the lesson if problems occurred is specifically prohibited by the course management. Rather, a truly co-constructed dialogue requires awareness of and consideration for other participants' goals and expectations in the process of making meaning. Basing TP feedback sessions around the principles of dialogicity, while still allowing for the trainers' greater expertise and power, should reduce the chances of things going wrong in this vital component of teacher training.

References

- Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System*, 35(2), 192-207.
- Anthony, L. (2004). AntConc: A Learner and Classroom Friendly, Multi-Platform Corpus Analysis Toolkit. *Proceedings of IWLeL 2004 An Interactive Workshop on Language eLearning*, 7-13.
- Bailey, K. M. (2006). *Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986 [1979]). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2004). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher cognition and language education*. London: Continuum.
- Brandt, C. (2006). Allowing for practice: A critical issue in TESOL teacher preparation. *ELT Journal*, 60(4), 355-364.
- Brown, R. (2004). Beliefs, concepts and the training of teachers. In D. Hayes (Ed.), *Trainer development: Principles and practice from language teacher training* (pp. 81-103). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Carroll, D. W. (1999). *Psychology of language*. Pacific Grove: Brooks & Cole.
- Cobbold, C. (2011). Improving the practical aspect of pre-service teacher education in Sub-Saharan Africa: Issues of conceptualisation, planning and management. *Academic Leadership Journal*, 9(1).
- Duff, P. A. (2002). Research approaches in applied linguistics. In R. B. Kaplan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 13-23). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farr, F. (2006). Reflecting on reflections: the spoken word as a professional development tool in language teacher education. In R. Hughes (Ed.), *Spoken English, TESOL and*

- Applied Linguistics: Challenges for theory and practice* (pp. 182-215). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ferguson, G., & Donno, S. (2003). One month teacher training courses: Time for a change? *ELT Journal*, 57(1), 26-33.
- Fox Tree, J. E. (2007). Folk notions of um and uh, you know and like. *Text & Talk*, 27(3), 297-314.
- Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analyzing qualitative data*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Jimarkon, P., & Watson Todd, R. (2011). Using quantitative methods as a framework for qualitative analyses. *Proceedings: The International Conference on Doing Research in Applied Linguistics*, (pp. 45-51). Bangkok: KMUTT..
- Koester, A. J. (2002). The performance of speech acts in workplace conversations and the teaching of communicative functions. *System*, 30(2), 167-184.
- Leshem, S., & Bar-Hama, R. (2008). Evaluating teaching practice. *ELT Journal*, 62(3), 257-265.
- Linell, P. (2006). *Towards a dialogical linguistics*. In M. Lähteenmäki, H. Dufva, S. Leppänen & P. Varis (Eds.) *The XII International Bakhtin Conference: Proceedings* (pp. 152-167). Jyväskylä: Department of Languages.
- Linell, P. (2010). Communicative activity types as organizations in discourse and discourses in organizations. In S. Tanskanen, M. Helasvuo, M. Johansson & M. Raitaniemi (Eds.), *Discourses in Interaction* (pp.33-59). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Louw, S., Watson Todd, R., & Jimarkon, P. (2011, April 2011). Active listening in qualitative research interviews. *Proceedings: The International Conference: Doing Research in Applied Linguistics*, (pp. 71-82). Bangkok: KMUTT.
- O'Donoghue, C. (1997). Trainer induction: Reflecting on parallels between new trainers and teacher trainees. In I. McGrath (Ed.), *Learning to train: Perspectives on the development of language teacher training* (pp. 73-81). Hemel Hempstead, England: Prentice Hall Europe ELT.
- Pekkanli, I. (2011). Designing a questionnaire attempting to discover mentors' feedback on professionalism of the foreign language teacher candidate. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(3), 600-604.
- Peled-Elhanan, N., & Blum-Kulka, S. (2006). Dialogue in the Israeli classroom. *Language and Education*, 20(2), 110-127.
- Randall, M., & Thornton, B. (2001). *Advising and supporting teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, M., & Tribble, C. (2006). *Textual patterns: Key words and corpus analysis in language education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Seliger, H. W., & Shohamy, E. (1989). *Second language research methods*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Watson Todd, R. (forthcoming). Mixed methods data analysis in applied linguistics. *rEFlections*.