**NSW ADULT MIGRANT ENGLISH SERVICE**

3rd Floor, 84-86 Mary Street, Surry Hills 2010

Telephone: (02) 289 9222

Correspondence P.O. Box 1222, Darlinghurst 2010

Facsimile: (02) 281 9682

17 June 1993

Ms Ruth Wajnryb
41 Wiley Street
WAVERLEY NSW 2024

Dear Ruth


I am really sorry it has taken me a long, long time to reply to your undated letter about the current requirements for AMES teachers. The letter was here when I got back from overseas in May and I am sorry I just did not respond immediately.

In fact the situation is unchanged from when you were on the interview panel. This is mostly because we haven't had another recruitment.

In the meantime you may be aware that we are working through ATESOL on the development of some TESOL Teacher Competencies now which, down the track, might allow us to specify the sorts of TESOL skills and competencies that we hope AMES teachers will have.

At this stage we have not changed from the generalist teacher training as an essential and TESOL qualifications/experience as a desirable. As you know in fact this works out as specifying TESOL qualifications since on a competitive selection basis people without them are not called in for interview.

Yours sincerely


ROSALIND STRONG
Director

Appendix 2

Data sources for literature search

Data collection for the literature search incorporated secondary, primary and informal channels (Cooper, 1989; McMillan & Schumacher, 1989). Secondary channels included computer searches of abstract data bases: ERIC; British Educational Index; Australian Educational Index; Modern Languages Abstracts; Linguistics and Language Behaviour Abstracts; Psychology Index; Wilson's Social Sciences Index; and Dissertation Abstracts International. The main descriptors were: 'Teacher Supervision'; 'Conference'; 'Language'.

Primary channels included: tracking cited research through obtained relevant literature, as in the 'ancestry' method (McMillan & Schumacher, 1989:147); the researcher's own library and subscription to professional journals; and regular reading of the contents page of relevant journals e.g. The Journal of Curriculum and Supervision (USA); The Teacher Trainer (UK); South Pacific Journal of Teacher Education (Aust.); The Journal of Teaching Practice (Aust.); Prospect (Aust.); English Language Teaching Journal (UK) Journal of Pragmatics (Holland); Communication Research (USA). Informal channels included: previous personal research by the researcher; conference attendance; and the 'invisible college' (Price, 1966) - the network of interpersonal contact and communication established by researchers who know of each other's work (e.g. contacts made with key researchers in supervision at the School of Education, University of Georgia, USA).

Deploying a combination of channels, such as those outlined here, helps to overcome the bias factor pertaining to informal channels, as well as the systemic drawbacks of secondary channels e.g. indexing time delays and discipline-focused descriptors. The last mentioned is certainly an issue in an inter-disciplinary project, requiring separate subsequent searches to be conducted using the descriptors 'Discourse', 'Mitigation', 'Face', 'Politeness' and 'Criticism'.

Appendix 3

Supervision stories

Within the context of the ethnographic interviews - collecting qualitative data for the second prong of the project - a number of supervision stories emerged. These were generated in response to Question 12 of the interview schedule (see App. 13), which elicited from respondents 'a memorable experience' of supervising. The approach is comparable to the methodology in educational research of eliciting 'critical incidents' (Housego & Boldt, 1985, and references contained therein).

The ease with which such narratives emerged is testimony to the power of the particular in shaping experience and attitude. While these anecdotal vignettes are not central to the project's methodology (c.f. Holland, 1989), the propensity for supervisors to recall their experience in subjective and narrative terms emerged as a pervasive trend. In addition to this, and the value of maintaining a first-person perspective, an argument exists for including individual experience for the margin of richness and insight that it offers¹.

A sample selection of eight such supervision stories are included below. Because they were evoked in the context of the difficulty of giving critical feedback, a self-selecting influence for more negative stories seems to have been exerted. They are presented in the first person, and subjects are identified only by an initial.

The reader may prefer to read these narrative episodes in conjunction with the ethnography in the thesis (Ch. 6), where they are thematically connected, though not explicitly linked to the data used in that chapter.

Supervision story #1

M was an older woman, about 10 years older than me. She'd already had a lot of success in the school system, teaching ESL to primary school age kids. It was very clear that she was intelligent, dedicated and very professional. It was also evident that she had a perfectionist attitude towards things, and lacked confidence. In particular, and very sadly, she seemed unable to draw confidence from her previous successes. In receiving feedback, she implemented an interesting strategy. She would begin the conference by being so highly self-critical - self-castigating in fact - that by default I was cast into the role of building up her confidence. By the time she had finished demeaning herself, during which time I couldn't get a word in edgewise, there was no place at all for me to offer any negative feedback. It would be like driving another nail into the coffin of her teaching. I don't think this strategy was deliberate and conscious, but I do think it was dominant. In the short-term, M got what she wanted: a supervisor who built her up with lavish praise and said nothing negative about her teaching. But in the long run, it was self-defeating, because the feedback failed to be specific and constructive, and didn't go anywhere².

¹ Waite (1989), for example, cites Friedlich's (1989) view that the suppression of the individual's voice in this kind of endeavour is akin to the political suppression of the individual's voice in an oppressive regime.

² This 'syndrome' is also described in Chambers, 1993.

Supervision story #2

I had one recently (L) who started crying when I was telling her what I thought she could do to improve her teaching. Actually, she should have failed the course (she didn't). She seemed incapable of taking any criticism, no matter how it was put to her. She only wanted to hear the good things. I went through my usual routine - being nice and soft and very helpful. But towards the end of the prac, I started to change. L didn't teach the lesson I gave her and what she did teach was really terrible. It was only politeness that kept the students from walking out. In fact, after the very first session, I knew she had a lot of problems. I thought it would help her give a successful lesson if I gave her quite directive suggestions. But she did it differently because she wasn't convinced that it was a good plan. For example, she wouldn't use an OHP (which she called 'new fangled'). I supposed being older (she was in her 50s) and never having taught before, didn't help. In the second week, she said 'I've tried to do what you said but it didn't work'. But in fact, she hadn't tried; she'd given the lesson plan about half an hour 'to figure it out and it didn't work so I left it'. When she started crying, I was very surprised. I didn't put my arm around her - I'm not the type to do that. It's the first time I've had someone cry. I spoke over it for a while, and then suggested a break, but she wanted to continue, but then continued to be weepy through it. Later she rang me up and said it was really a personal problem, and not me or what I had said, and told me I shouldn't worry about it. Actually, I had felt right from the start that she would not make it as a teacher. There was a lot of inappropriate language and dithering behaviour. It wasn't just because of her teaching. She was pretty unfocussed.

Supervision story #3

The worse thing for me is someone who's just after grades and not interested in learning. I had one like that recently. After she got a C grade, she came looking for me. Because in her earlier prac with another co-operating teacher she had got an A, she was really put out about the mark I gave her. During the pracs she had been difficult to feed back to - defensive when I tried to make suggestions or give criticisms of what went wrong. She just didn't want to hear it and she'd argue about it with me. Anyway, at the end-of-course BBQ, she arrived waving the report with my grade on it, saying 'what's this?'. I refused to change the mark, which is what she wanted. She wrote a few letters to the powers-that-be, who reacted by trying to set up a meeting. But I said I didn't want a meeting and I refused to change the mark.

Supervision story #4

I had a feedback recently (with M) that I felt very uncomfortable about. During the session, M was continually and increasingly defensive. I could tell this by the way she responded to the suggestions I was making. She didn't seem to receive them or take them up in any way. There was kind of sceptical response. This came across from her body language - crossing of arms, moving backwards, her tone of voice, which was whining, even strident. I kept having to give more and different reasons to support the remarks I was making. The irony of it was that the points I was making were really quite minor, and I said as much, repeatedly. She made the session much more difficult than the content of the criticism warranted. The result was that I became increasingly self-conscious. I kept asking myself 'Why isn't this working?' I am very sensitive to what it's like to get criticism, because I once received such scathing criticism that I don't think I have ever recovered, at least not entirely unscathed. That incident made me feel very exposed, as if I had no value. It has made me aware of how I give feedback; I have become more reflective about the process. So when I was feeding back to M, I was sensitive to her negative reaction but the frustrating thing was that I felt powerless to do anything good about it.

Supervision story #5

I remember well a girl called N. She came out of the lesson very pleased with how it had gone. She said to me very cheerfully and enthusiastically: 'Did you see how well it went?' 'Did you see what a good feeling there was with the students?' Her questions were asked in such a way that I couldn't give anything less than full-on agreement. I felt I wasn't able to qualify or mitigate at all, which is in fact what I really felt about the lesson. But once I had agreed with her immediately the lesson was over, I then found it very difficult to criticise her. When in time, I did come to criticise her, she took it very badly. It seems to me that her apparent over-confidence was really a cover for some deep fears and sensitivities and a delicate ego. I don't think it was an accident that she used this interactive style - it makes it difficult for you to criticise. I don't think it is conscious, but I do think she uses it as a strategy because she doesn't like facing up to things that aren't perfect in her own teaching.

Supervision story #6

This happened at TAFE and it was in relation to an office worker in the department rather than one of the teachers. She was a clerical assistant and she had been transferred to my section. She had had Repetitive Strain Injury workers' rehabilitation for months and also she was having major dental treatment, which was costing a fortune for which she had had to have a second mortgage. Every time I went to her intending to counsel her about her poor performance, I decided not to, because it seemed so cruel to be doing it to a person with so many problems. When I finally did do it, because I couldn't stand it any longer nor could all the other people in that section, she turn on me with accusations: 'Why haven't you said this before?' 'Why have you let it go on before this?' And she was right because I had let her go on thinking everything was OK. Even though my intentions had been good, as I hadn't wanted to put added pressure on her, in the end I was adding pressure by not telling her. I always bear that experience in mind - I can still remember where we were sitting and her feeling totally aggrieved that I had not brought it up before with her and I so now I tend to sort of bite the bullet and raise things early on, rather than leave them and have them fester.

Supervision story #7

Sometimes you encounter people who resist you and there's nothing you can do. There was this one teacher who made his views about what we were trying to do (i.e. introduce genre teaching in the school) in no uncertain and very negative terms. During an in-service session on this he did everything he could to make his presence felt. He kept disagreeing with the presenter, even though his presence was voluntary; he had not been coerced to be there. In the morning break I went up to him and we chatted about pleasant general things, and once I'd set the context up as a one-to-one, intimate conversation, I asked him full-on, quite directly about his own teaching and his own view of language, and what it was, ideologically, that made him so opposed to genre. He had nothing to say - he vaguely said he was into eclecticism - and I said - 'so, are you just stirring shit for the sake of it?'. After the break, he didn't give us any more opposition. But in fact he had the last laugh because he had so steered the work that his group had done that it was unproductive and ineffective. So what can you do? If they don't want to learn, they won't. You can take them to water but you can't make them drink.

Supervision story #8

The most difficult student teachers to deal with are those in danger of failing. Of this category, there are two types: the ones that were doing poorly and know it; and ones that are doing poorly

but don't know it because they lacked adequate critical self-awareness. The latter group are the harder to deal with. An example was E. The problem here was 'attitudinal'. E believed he 'would sail through' and not much effort was needed, there was no chance of failure. Repeated efforts to tell him that he needed to 'pull his socks up' had no effect. He tended to discard advice regarding teaching points until half-way through the course, after a 'fail-counsel' session, when he went away with the task of writing up the meeting. Here he seemed for the first time to realise that he was in danger of failure. In the fail-counsel meeting, the lack of self-awareness emerged in quite vague terms: he called it 'time management' and the remedy: 'I have to figure it out and it's just going to take a bit of time'. The sense was that 'things just need practice' and they will 'work out' in the end.

The following quotations are taken from a tape-recording of the fail-counsel meeting: The supervisor was at pains to point out that the basics 'were not securely in place and it needs to be there in order for you to complete the course successfully'. He was obliged to use quite direct, explicit language e.g.

- * 'I have not seen it yet and we have two more weeks to go'.
- * 'You're going to have to be prepared to work really hard to work on these areas'.
- * 'What I'm saying here is that this is borderline, it's a fail- counsel; and if you're not going to work on it, you're going to fail the course'.
- * 'It's imperative for you to really focus on what is happening in your classes'.
- * 'A lot of your work, it's messy, it needs to be tightened up. I know you can do it. '
- * 'This is definitely a situation where if you don't change you're not going to be successful on the course, and so you need to work at it. But I think you're capable of doing it'.
- * 'This advice is not meant to reprimand but meant to help you - take this advice and use it as you can only do better as a result'

E offered excuses - lack of time, need for more input and more consultation; he said he had already spent a lot of time. At the end of the fail counsel, the supervisor said: 'Think about what we've said and write it down - like, ' this is what I understand from what we've said'. Just so that I know you've understood what I've said to you'. E wrote an essay instead of just a paragraph. Clearly this was the turning point. In the last two weeks he did make a big effort, and finally scored a weak pass.

Appendix 4

Transcribed conference, Barry and Margaret (from Grimmett and Crehan, 1990: 226-227).

The conference is between Barry (teacher) and Margaret (principal and supervisor) following and observed lesson¹. The topic is on how to involve certain disengaged pupils in the interactive stage of the lesson.

The face-threatening act (FTA) is hinted at, elliptically, in Turn 3. This is followed by strong efforts at agreement (e.g. Turns 9, 11); efforts to bolster the teacher's confidence through praise (e.g. Turns 13, 15, 21); efforts to emphasise optionality (e.g. 'you might' Turn 17; 'you could' Turn 19); and efforts to minimise the degree of gravity associated with the implied criticism (e.g. Turn 19). By the teacher's Turns 22 and 24, there is clear recognition that the teacher's reflection and discussion have brought about a shift in awareness. However, his embryonic efforts at 'framing' the problem are cut off by the supervisor's 'anyway' (Turn 25). This precipitates a topic switch and they move on, effectively closing off the issue. Just as the supervisor sought to counter the face threat of the criticism by various means of collegiality and minimisation, now there is a sense that she wants to refrain from dwelling too long on the 'unpleasantness'.

Transcript

- 1 S now the ones I did wonder about I commented on later in here ((the observation notes)).
- 2 T like...
- 3 S yes, but you know when you went into that second one, the second limerick, then you moved over to those kids. Now they were amazingly involved, but even so...
- 4 T it's interesting that you picked that up because I think it was before we left that side of the room. And with my own class, I think it's a couple of things; there's some strong personalities on the centre and right sided of the classroom. So there's Frank sort of central, Laura and Angie over on the right...
- 5 S Paulo...
- 6 T Paulo way over on the right side, Dario toward the right centre, and those kids tend to attract my attention and the attention of the rest of the kids. That leaves...
- 7 S the quiet Annas...
- 8 T that's right, the four or five not really flag-waving kids, either, so my attention tends to get directed to that part of the room, and I know that I don't even get eye contact with them as much as I should.

¹ The names used are pseudonyms.

9 S yes

10 T I think that though the kids that are involved there are also fairly reliable, they are quite comfortable not being noticed.

11 S yes yes they are

12 T so that they reinforce for me...

13 S but they're also hard-working

14 T yes

15 S they're a hard-working group. You're still getting results with them too

16 T but I'm not sure what to do... you know, find some technique...

17 S well, especially for instance, when you're moving near the overhead... When I think of it, those kids with whom you generally interact are much closer to the overhead, which is where you are. And you might think at a certain point of sort of changing that position so it's on the other side

18 T I think I could almost flip the room around

19 S You could try it. It would be really interesting to see how that affects what you see is happening with those kids.

20 T because I don't get over to the left side of the room as much.

21 S well, you know, you're certainly successful in the sense that I watched the kids, and they were just as involved, from their own point of view, they were just as involved, even though they were not doing as much talking, not as much actual obvious interaction with you. They were still into it, so you're successful at that. Probably if you found that those kids were just doing nothing, then that would be sort of like jumping up and down and saying... and get a wheelchair, and that's not really happening.

22 T there's this thing too. The kids that are there don't interact with the rest of the class very much

23 S no

24 T you know, either way, they others don't interact with them very much. It seems like they're almost a little class within the larger class. It's strange.

25 S anyway... just moving on in the lesson, you know, in some ways, a lesson like that could tend to be...

Appendix 5

Pilot study. Data discussion and display

The data of the pilot study displayed severely asymmetrical discursal features, showing that the power was clearly invested in the supervisor. Table A (below) shows that topic initiation is the near-exclusive domain of the supervisor. In the single instance that the teacher initiates a topic, it was in response to the supervisor's invitation to do so ('are there any other areas that you felt you needed to work on in the course, that you want to talk about in terms of that lesson' - Turn 60); being elicited, it may perhaps more rightly be thought of as a response to an invitation, rather than a 'pure' topic initiation.

Related to this, Table B (below) shows the patterns of adjacency pairs. These are important both because they contribute to the orderly organisation of talk (Talbot, 1992); and because, in having the character of a Summons-Response, they realise fundamental elements of discursal power. The data reveal 16 adjacency pairs, primarily of the Question-Answer type, all but one of which are supervisor-initiated. In the case of the single teacher-initiated question ('know what I mean?' -Turn 63), it is at best a 'soft' initiator, being rather of a phatic nature seeking a phatic response, in contrast to many of the supervisor's information-seeking questions (e.g. 'did you know what they were confused about?' - Turn 68) . The adjacency pair analysis reveals what is allowable in this discourse: in effect, only the supervisor may initiate, suggesting that the conference is not perceived by the teacher as a vehicle for exploring his own issues but rather as a time to be 'held to account'.

That the communication is essentially one-way rather than interactive, is further borne out by the talk-time distribution, measured through counting lines in the transcript, with the supervisor carrying 62% to the teacher's 38%. A great deal of the supervisor's talk time is taken up with information and evaluation transmission, punctuated by the teacher's minimal responses. Pearson writes, 'the longer an FTA is, the more conversational airspace it monopolises' (1988:74), and this principle can be applied to other supervisory talk, apart from FTAs. This suggests that the speech event of the conference is largely perceived by participants as an opportunity for supervisors to report back to the teacher on their assessment of the teaching; rather than as an opportunity for colleagues to exchange or explore issues relevant to the teaching experience.

TURNS	TOPIC INITIATOR	TOPIC	SUBSTANTIVE CATEGORY *
1-8	S	phatic/ warm-up	lesson, general
9-11	S	structure of feedback	meta-discoursal**
11-26	S	drilling	procedures
27-30	S	back-chaining	procedures
31-38	S	choral drilling	procedures
38-44	S	concept checking	procedures
44-47	S	pacing/timing	procedures
48-57	S	responding to learners	procedures
58-60	S	teaching style	procedures
61-2	T	lesson staging	goals
62-66	S	learner confusion	procedures
66-68	S	board work & language analysis	procedures
68	S	lesson aims	goals
68	S	self-reformulation	meta-discoursal
68	S	giving instructions	procedures
74-75	S	self-reformulation	meta-discoursal
76	S	phatic/closure	lesson, general

Table A. Patterns of topic initiation [SD1]

Key: * following Zeichner et al. 1988
 ** turn devoted to management of discourse, not content-based
 S Supervisor
 T Teacher

TURNS	ADJACENCY PAIRS		INITIATOR
	INITIATING UTTERANCE	RESPONDING UTTERANCE	
1-2	compliment	response	S
3-4	question	answer	S
5-6	question	answer	S
9-10	question	answer	S
13-14	question	answer	S
15-16	question	answer	S
17-18	question	answer	S
21-22	suggestion	response	S
38-41	question	answer	S
44-45	question	answer	S
52-55	question	answer	S
60-61	question	answer	S
63-64	question	answer	T
66-67	question	answer	S
68-69	question	answer	S
76-77	question	answer	S

Table B. Patterns of adjacency pairs [SD1]

Key: S = Supervisor
T = Teacher

Appendix 6

Categories of face threat

TARGET OF THREAT	POSITIVE FACE	NEGATIVE FACE
threatens speaker (S) (self-directed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● apologises● acceptance of compliments● physical & emotional 'leakage'● self-humiliations● confessions, admissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● expressing thanks● accepting apologies, offers● making excuses● responding to H's faux pas● unwilling offers or promises
threatens hearer (H) (other-directed)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● negative evaluations (e.g. disapproval, criticism, contempt, ridicule, complaint, reprimand)● challenges, disagreements, contradictions● indifference (e.g. irreverence, bringing bad news, boasting, raising divisive topics, non-co-operative acts, insulting address use)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">● orders, requests● suggestions, advice● reminders● threats, warnings, dares● offers, promises● compliments, expressions of envy, admiration● expression of strong negative emotion

Table A.

FTAs classified according to four conceptual facework categories: self (i.e. speaker) directed positive and negative face work; and other (i.e. hearer) directed positive and negative face work (following Brown & Levinson, 1978).

Appendix 7

Structure of a critical incident (CI)

While all instances of CIs do not conform strictly to a given template, a basic structural configuration pattern was the following:

- CI = P + FTA + CT + D
where:
CI = critical incident
P = preamble
FTA = face threatening act
CT = co-text
D = denouement

As a sample of this pattern, an instance [5.11] from the data is displayed below with the structural features marked. As outlined in Ch. 4, determining boundaries proved to be perhaps the most difficult aspect of ‘carving’ up the primary data into the CI ‘chunks’ that would form the basis of the analysis. For example, determining the boundaries of the co-text vis-a-vis the FTA is not always easy. Guidance was taken from Brown and Yule’s discussion of co-text (1983:46-49) as the constraints on interpretation set up by the discourse environment.

Critical Topic: teacher’s boardwriting

CI	1	S	is there anything you want to add?	P
	2	T	um... no well I ma- made some notes beforehand	
	3	S	um um... it was something I’ve forgotten it, ah... use of whiteboard which I ah	
			that’s fine [yeah], you tend to use capitals	
	4	T	a lot when you write	FTA
	5	S	yeah I use it because my handwriting is [absolutely	
	6	S	[is dreadful is it?	
	7	T	absolutely appalling so that’s why I use I only use capitals	
	8	S	there’s two problems with capitals [yeah], one capitals are harder to read than	D
			lower case [mm] and secondly, um we’re, we’re also teaching them to write	
	9	T	[mm] and over-capitalisation is not a model [yeah] but I can, very often bad	
	10	S	handwriters use this as a strategy	
	11	T	ah no, yeah that’s that’s why ah no that’s ah	

CT

11

10

9

8

Appendix 8

Sample language classification

To illustrate the decision-making behind the coding - as part of the audit trail needed for reliability - a small sample of text is included. The reader may like to read this appendix before chapter 5 as a prelude to the larger discussion. Alternatively, the reader may prefer to read first the full explanation of the pragmatics of mitigation (Ch. 5) where the pragmatic accounts are organised according to the coding of the typology.

It must be pointed out that no one text includes an instance of every code, so this sample is included only to give an indication of how decisions have been reached.

- The decision-making involves three phases:
- a) recognising that the language used is marked;
 - b) speculating on the unmarked equivalent; and
 - c) surmising through the discrepancy, how the mitigation operates.

Text [7.2]

Context

In what is a common avoidance of confrontation, the supervisor has elicited from the teacher what she perceives to be a weak area in her teaching and now agrees with her but reassures her that the forthcoming experience (teaching on a lower level) will help her with this very problem.

1	S	um drilling I agree it's still an area that you know can be worked upon but I think you're going to find that by going to the lower level you're going to be forced it's going to be forced upon you
2	T	yeah that's true
3	S	and so you'll get a lot more experience there
4	S	OK

Commentary

can - the modal verb mitigates by allowing for possibility rather than obligation [code 5]

worked - this a lexical hedge, allowing the supervisor to avoid saying that the problem needs practice or refinement or improvement [code 10].

be worked upon - the use of the passive allows the agent 'you' (= the teacher) to be avoided [code 7].

I think - the statement of expressive modality mitigates the assertion through its own inherent ambiguity. 'I think' may mean 'it is only my subjective opinion, others, including you, might disagree and that's OK'; or it may mean 'I'm not sure, I'm less than 100% certain'. Either interpretation is mitigating, and the mitigation is enhanced by the ambiguity [code 11].

going to - the alternative, unmarked form here, using 'will' for future predictions ('you will find') carries greater certainty.

to be forced - the passive avoids the obligation carried in the active alternative: 'you will have to' [code 7].

it's - the passivisation is carried one step further by nominalising the drilling - pronominalised to 'it'). Thus we move from the passive of 'you're going to be forced' + to drill [understood]; to 'it (i.e. the drilling) is going to be forced upon you' [code 7].

going to be forced upon you - the rephrasing / false start denotes qualms in getting to the point [code 8]

you'll get a lot more experience there - this is an indirect excusing aside. Indirectly, the supervisor is implying that the reason for the current problem is lack of practice/experience [codes 9, 13].

Note: Code 13 applies to instances of implicit indirectness wherein the teacher-hearer has to compute the criticism from a connection between text and context (see Ch. 5, Section 5.5.3.5, p. 311f).

Appendix 9

Contextual information pertaining to primary data: 10 x SDs

This appendix supports Table 2, in Ch. 4 (pp.165-166) in the thesis; and contains background information on the 10 SDs that provided the data for the grounded study. The information covers: aspects of the institutional context; the two participants in the dyad (teacher and supervisor); the class; and the lesson. All conferences were recorded (either audio or video).

SD1

The supervisor and teacher are approximately the same age, working in the same institution - a large private English language school teaching adult EFL students, with a teacher training course on site. The teacher has had some minimal experience in language teaching, and is employed at the college where he is currently being trained at TESOL Certificate level. The supervisor has about 3+ years TESOL experience; and at the time of the conference, she had recently completed a training course in supervision and training. The lesson observed was a functional language item, involving presentation, controlled practice and free production stages; and the class was almost entirely adult Chinese, low-level learners. Both the lesson and subsequent conference were videoed, and used (with permission) as a resource in supervisor training: specifically, the video of the lesson was shown to supervisors-in-training who then practised giving feedback to the teacher.

SD2

The context is a private secondary school, where the student teacher had been allocated for the duration of her practicum in the TESOL method within a University Diploma of Education course. The supervisor, who is also the regular class-teacher/co-operating teacher, is a highly experienced teacher supervisor who regularly takes on supervision duties within the TESOL practicum associated with a number of training authorities. The class is composed of overseas students completing their secondary education at the school, where the ESL department caters specifically for their needs. The lesson, taken from the school's ESL curriculum, had to do with conventions of presentation in academic assignments.

SD3

The institutional context is a university provider centre of English language courses, where the teacher training department uses the classes for its practicum. The teacher is a student of the TESOL Certificate course and has a non-teaching background. The lesson is only her second in front of a class. The supervisor is a very experienced ESOL teacher, with little supervision experience and no specific training. The lesson, a functional unit on 'offers' using 'will', is taught to a mixed class of migrant students.

SD4

This conference took place in a medium-sized, well established private English language school and was the first of a series of observed lessons scheduled for the 'probation' period of a newly appointed teacher. The teacher had three years' experience overseas and this position was her first teaching EFL in Australia. The supervisor was a very experienced ESOL teacher, with supervision training, whose position as teacher development co-ordinator involved inducting new staff and ensuring that newly appointed teachers were performing to a satisfactory standard. The class was a mixed Asian group and the lesson was a vocabulary exercise leading to a revision of past tense forms.

SD5

The institutional context of this conference is a small private English language college, with about seven teachers, catering largely for adult Asian overseas students. Once a year, over the past two years, an external consultant (the researcher) was contracted to work with the teachers individually in teacher development. This involved observing and conferring with staff individually. The conference [SD5], which was audio-taped, was held with a neophyte teacher who was a francophone, with previous experience in the teaching of French as a Foreign Language. This teacher had made a change to EFL but had not yet sought certification. The supervisor is very experienced teacher and supervisor, specialising in TESOL. The class was a small beginner group, mostly Asians in their late teens, with a few Europeans as well. The lesson was situationally based (real estate language), with a functional intent (renting a flat), and a strong focus on grammatical patterns.

SD6

The institutional context and student teacher here were the same as for SD2. The supervisor was an experienced TESOL teacher with quite a lot of supervision experience behind her, although not as much as the supervisor in SD2; she had had Special Education training, which she consciously used during supervision in order to seek co-operation and avoid confrontation with trainee teachers. The lesson was taken from the school's ESL curriculum.

SD7

This conference took place in San Francisco in the context of a RSA/UCLES CTEFLA course. The meeting was one of the regularly scheduled, one-to-one, mid-course counselling sessions that trainees in this school have with their supervisors (see also App. 30). The trainee had no teaching background, and the lesson is of the prototype training format: Presentation, Practice, Production. The class was a mix of overseas students and migrants, diverse nationalities, and an age range of 19-65.

SD8

This conference is the same institutional context as for SD1. In this case the teacher is already trained, and being newly employed, is under probation - during which time a supervising coordinator in the school is appointed to observe and confer on several occasions. The supervisor is an experienced ESOL teacher, with very little supervision experience but with supervision training. The two are both male, approximately the same age (mid-twenties), and have a friendly, collegial relationship. The class was composed of overseas EFL students; and the lesson used pictures to stimulate group-based task work and discussion. The conference was quite short and was video-taped.

SD9

The institutional setting is the same as for SD1 and SD8. The teacher here is trained, and as with the teacher in SD8, is undergoing a probationary observation and conference. The supervisor is a very experienced ESOL teacher, with very little supervision experience, but with supervision training. The class was a mixed Asian EFL class and the lesson was on question tags for politeness applied to a range of situations. The conference was video-taped.

SD10

This conference took place in the practicum of a University Diploma of Education course, on site at the high school where the student teacher had been placed. The teacher is a francophone with high oral proficiency in English. The supervisor is the visiting university supervisor, who is also the lecturer on the TESOL Method course which the student would have attended through the year. The class is a mixed migrant ESL class of teenagers and the lesson was literature-based, involving reading comprehension on a given text.

Appendix 10

Transcription conventions and samples

S	Supervisor
T	Teacher
,	short pause
.	long pause
...	hesitation, typically to allow hearer a speaking turn
<u>word</u>	words underlined are given emphasis by speaker i.e. greater than unmarked sentential stress
()	brackets indicate transcriber's doubt e.g. in softly spoken, inaudible or overlapping passages
(indist)	indistinct i.e. words not audible or interpretable
(())	double brackets show transcriber's comments on occurrences in setting which are not part of verbal talk
[single left-handed square bracket to show overlapping or simultaneous talk at end/start of turns
/	interjection i.e. interruption of speaker's turn by hearer's next speaking turn
um/ah	disfluencies or filled pauses - idiolectal differences are standardised
[mm]	hearer's listening cue, backchannel marker, acknowledgment token; does not count as a turn because it is not an attempt to take and hold the floor but rather encourages the speaker to continue to completion; is embedded in square brackets within speaker's turn. In dialogues transcribed from videos, kinesic cues e.g.[nod] are also included.
?	speaker's functional question, irrespective of intonation
l-o-n-g	dashes within a word indicate that it is unusually elongated
(h)	laughter accompanies the spoken words
X	replaces a name (to preserve anonymity)

NB: numbers indicate speaking turns

Supervisory dialogue [1.1]

Critical Topic: teacher's language model for drill stage

- 1 S *The main thing that's cropped up on all your priority lists is the drilling and ((both laugh)) ah I thought in this lesson you obviously made a lot of effort to incorporate all the input you've had in the drilling session last week because I thought it was a very well structured drill in your presentation phase. I liked the use of picture cues to start the presentation stage and then ah eliciting the dialogue without writing it up. I see you paid a lot of attention to using board cues to elicit the dialogue and that worked well and ah ah I noticed you trying to use some of X's suggestions...[indist] /*
- 2 T *I'm (h) glad you used the word 'trying' ((both laugh))*
- 3 S *what, you didn't feel it was successful?*
- 4 T *ah, no, it's it's difficult, it's not my voice on the tape [mm], so what they're hearing on the tape and what I'm saying back to them, I don't know, it's probably a different stress [mm] stress and the intonation is probably slightly different*
- 5 S *had you listened to the tape and practised it beforehand?*
- 6 T *I listened to it a couple of times*
- 7 S *and practised out the...?*
- 8 T *I'd been trying! ((both laugh))*
- 9 S *I thought, I thought it worked well ah but it wasn't always consistent*
- 10 T *no well that's how it felt when I was doing it I thought I'm going (down with this bit) um [mm] it's not [mm] [indist] it should be*
- 11 S *yeah um perhaps you could incorporate ah the suggestion of ah a separate gesture for intonation...*

Supervisory dialogue [2.3]

Critical Topic: comprehensibility of teacher language

S & T are negotiating a grade based on the next item on the assessment sheet which they have before them. This reads: 'Clarity of presentation - presents the content of the lesson so it is understandable to the pupils'.

- 1 T *clarity, my clarity of [presentation]*
- 2 S *[presentation presents the content, it's understandable, I think /*

- 3 T *it's understandable to (h) me, I think it's understandable to the smarter ones [yeah] but [I think I need to work on that*
- 4 S *[I'll give you a four on on that one [yeah] all others being five so far, but the four ah, because /*
- 5 T *because I don't even realise sometimes that you know what problems they will have. I should really be able to pick out some of the... [indist]*
- 6 S *maybe the speed, rate of speech [mm] OK, ah and then maybe the second one, talking up and down simplifying it, really reducing [mm] it to [yeah I know] v-e-r-y simple sentences and then, so, that, the bright ones who have already started it, don't get lost, go back and put it in more complex forms, so they can [mm] hear it again, and that's why when you wander around the room and just pick up different things [mm] and say it to them*
- 7 T *mm, mm, yeah actually it's been invaluable wandering around the room [yeah] and realising what they don't understand, which I thought I'd presented quite well so, [now I know*
- 8 S *[it might be interesting thing just to go and ask one of the teachers, in say oh accounting or economics or whatever and, go and observe them and see how much they wander round the room, what over-the-shoulder... you know, is there a style difference between teaching in ESL and in the other mainstream subjects?*

Supervisory dialogue [3.1]

Critical topic: Language input vis-a-vis level of class

- 1 S *that dialogue that you used in fact was r-e-a-s-o-n-a-b-l-y long, it was 6 lines I think wasn't it?*
- 2 T *yes it was quite long*
- 3 S *quite long, did you find [mm] that it was a little bit too long, you you were you were perhaps hoping in the middle of it I wish this were a bit [shorter*
- 4 T *[yes, yes, I think I shouldn't've, um, it should have been one line less I think*
- 5 S *mm or maybe even 2 [mm] um 6 lines for that level it was a sort of lower intermediate class, wasn't it? is think just for their memory load is [mm] perhaps did you find that? did you think [yeah] oh dear they're not remembering [mm] the little prompts, the wine, the food /*
- 6 T *well I couldn't even remember, I had to have the sheet of paper, that's right. I should've, I think probably cause, although I have observed them several times [mm], probably 3 times [mm], I've never seen them do anything like that [like that, no] all my observances of them have been spontaneous things [mm] that*

they said [mm], so I've never really had any indication [mm] what th- they're like in that area [mm], so I think that's probably the single most difficult [mm] thing to gauge [mm] [indist]

7 S *what do you think you could have done there with the drill?*

Supervisory dialogue [5.11]

Critical Topic: teacher's boardwriting

1 S *is there anything you want to add?*

2 T *um... no well I ma- made some notes beforehand um um... it was something I've forgotten it, ah... use of whiteboard which I ah*

3 S *that's fine [yeah], you tend to use capitals a lot when you write*

4 T *yeah I use it because my handwriting is [absolutely*

5 S *[is dreadful is it?*

6 T *absolutely appalling so that's why I use I only use capitals*

7 S *there's two problems with capitals [yeah], one capitals are harder to read than lower case [mm] and secondly, um we're, we're also teaching them to write [mm] and over-capitalisation is not a model [yeah] but I can, very often bad handwriters use this as a strategy*

8 T *ah no, yeah that's that's why ah no that's ah*

9 S *you can't improve your handwriting?*

10 T *I can work on it (h) [well OK ((both laugh))*
S *[yeah*

11 T *((laugh)) alright (h) alright um...*

Supervisory dialogue [9:2]

Critical Topic: management of student participation

1 S *um I was worried at one stage because you tended to be looking at one side of the class [mm] but then I noticed that you brought the the, people on the other side, in by naming them [nod] and asking them questions. That was nice the way you threw it open and elicited, openly [nod] firstly just by just asking them 'have*

you got [indist]' and [indist] whoever wanted to answer to answer, but then you did from time to time call on specific individuals, which is good, because you drew in some of those people who weren't, saying anything [mm] [nod] and especially that woman who came a bit later [nod] on the outside, and the man right on the end [nod], so I thought that was nice. Were you aware of the fact you were doing that?

- 2 T yeah
- 3 S were you aware of the fact you were looking at that [indist] ?
- 4 T I was aware [that yeah ... what happened
- 5 S [too were you aware that you were doing two things, one that was not so good [exactly] and one [nod] that was good?
- 6 T because ah I was trying to keep out of the light of the O.H.P. [nod] and, in doing that /
- 7 S [then [indist]
- 8 T [I moved to the left [nod] and I was just looking to the right of the class [nod] /
- 9 S I I hadn't thought of that [yeah] it is a problem, isn't it? [mm] well you, you overcame it very nicely by asking [mm] those people specifically um, to, answer, some questions, now um...

Appendix 11

Ethics Documentation

Document 1. Ethics Committee Documentation
Ethics Committee Application for Approval

- 1. *Title of project/course*
Ph.D.
School of Education
Macquarie University

- 2. *Principal Investigator*
Ruth Wajnryb
41 Wiley Street
Waverley. NSW 2024
Tel: 387-4404. Fax: 369-2630

Supervisor
Dr Harry Thompson
Tel: 805-8704

Position of Investigator
Student
School of Education
Macquarie University

- 3. *Funding Agency*
N/A

- 4. *Location*
Data to be collected from language teacher education sites: university, college, school.

- 5. *Summary of Project*
The project is an investigation of the language of supervision that characterises the feedback encounter. This dialogue takes place between a teacher supervisor and a student teacher after an observed lesson. The aim is to better understand what happens in supervisory discourse so as to allow such findings to inform the future training of supervisors. The methodology hinges on the analysis of the discourse of transcripts made from recordings of supervisors talking with student teachers after having observed their teaching. The project will also involve the collection of ethnographic information, using interview and questionnaire procedures.

- 6. *Participants*
The participants are teachers, student teachers and teacher supervisors from the field of teacher education for English as a second or foreign language.

- 7. *Recruitment*
I intend to approach a number of institutions where such teacher education programs are

conducted, make my research project known to people there, and with the permission of the relevant authorities, call for volunteers.

8. *Stress/Invasive procedures*
N/A

9. *Medication/Drugs*
N/A

10. *Risk*
N/A

11. *Deception*
The student teachers/teachers and supervisors will be told that the investigation generally concerns the language of supervision (feedback) that takes place after observation of a practice teaching session, with a focus on the impact of the roles of supervisor and student on the language used in the feedback. They will not be specifically told of the interest in mitigation or the constraints that power places on language.

The reason for withholding this information is fear that providing it may distort findings through a contamination of the data: were supervisors to be told of this feature, they may, for example, adjust their language (consciously or subconsciously) to conform to their own expectations of what the investigation is about. This deception is justified because it is central to the collection of uncontaminated data and it involves no harm or risk to the participants.

12. *Debriefing/feedback*
The intention is to provide a short report of the findings to all participants, communicating the results of the study. This will be in non-technical language aimed at ready comprehension.

13. *Consent (participants)*
Consent form (teachers and supervisors) attached (Document 2).

14. *Consent (institutional)*
Consent form attached (Document 3).

15. *Consent (others involved)*
N/A

16. *Confidentiality*
Participants, once recruited into the project, will be coded according to the Supervisory Dialogue (SD). All reference to participants will be through the established code and will therefore be anonymous. Display of the data and publication of the results of the investigation will not involve any identifying information. An undertaking to respect confidentiality is included in the informed consent forms (see attached). The key to the code will be held by the principal investigator who undertakes to make no copies, show nobody, and destroy it once the investigation and report of the investigation are completed.

17. *Other ethical issues*
N/A
18. *Expected commencement date*
January 1993
19. *Expected completion date*
December 1994

To the best of my ability the proposed project conforms in all respects with the NH&MRC Guidelines (1985 and supplements thereto)

Signed:

Name: Ruth Wajnryb
Phone: 387-4404

Date: 22 May 1992

Signature
of supervisor:
Harry Thompson

Document 2. Ethics Documentation Linguistic Study (Participants)

41 Wiley Street
Waverley NSW 2024
Tel: 387-4404
Fax: 369-2630

Dear

I am writing to you as one of a group of student teachers and supervisors whom I hope will consent to become involved in a research project related to the training of teachers in the field of TESOL.

This project is part of my studies towards a Ph.D. (Education) at Macquarie University, where I am being supervised by Dr Harry Thompson of the School of Education. I am interested in looking at the language that happens in the feedback session which usually follows a practice teaching lesson. I am primarily concerned with the impact of the roles of the people involved - student teachers and supervisors - on the language they use in the feedback session. The research will involve some recordings and transcriptions of feedback sessions and possibly some interviews and a survey.

The institution has granted permission for the study to proceed but your participation is completely voluntary. If you agree to take part, you may withdraw at any stage without prejudice. That is, the decision to participate or not will not affect either your work or study.

All information will be treated in a confidential way. In a final report there will be no reference to individuals; nor will individuals be able to be identified.

I hope you will consent to become involved in this project, and if so, look forward to further contact with you

Yours sincerely

Ruth Wajnryb

Informed Consent Form (Participants)

This document is a consent form for participants involved in research in the supervision of teachers. Information about the project, its aims and procedures, is provided below. Please read the form carefully before signing your consent.

The area being studied

The area of study is the language of supervision as it takes place in the supervisory dialogue - or feedback encounter - that occurs after a teacher supervisor has observed a teacher teaching. This dialogue is a regular and usual feature of teacher education program and takes place during the practicum or practical component of the training program.

The aims of the study

The investigation into the language of supervision hopes to provide enlightenment about the processes of supervision so as to inform the training of supervisors in the future.

People responsible for the project

Principal investigator: Ruth Wajnryb: the research is being carried out as part of the requirements of a Ph.D. (Education) at Macquarie University.

Contact Information:

41 Wiley Street

Waverley NSW 2024

Tel: 387-4404. Fax: 369-2630

Supervisor: Dr Harry Thompson, School of Education, Head of Teacher Education, Macquarie University. Tel: 805-8704

Procedures

The data to be gathered for the study comprise primarily recordings of feedback encounters between supervisors and student teachers as these happen as a regular part of teacher training procedures. The data will also comprise feedback encounters between teachers in a developmental rather than pre-service setting. These recordings will be transcribed and the transcripts will be analysed. Interviews and questionnaires may also be included in the procedures.

Anticipated discomfort/inconvenience

The presence of a tape-recording may initially be off-putting but it is expected that this will be a minimal inconvenience or disruption to the experience of the feedback. The fact that tape-recordings are a regular and usual feature of the professional life of language teachers should help minimise the discomfort of participants.

Confidentiality

The investigator undertakes to ensure that the anonymity of all participants be completely respected and that this anonymity be maintained throughout the project, from the initiation to the final report. No identifying information will be displayed, published or made available at any time. The investigation will have no bearing on the studies of the participating student teachers or the careers of the participating teachers and supervisors.

Feedback

Following the completion of the investigation, a special report of the project will be compiled and sent to all participants. This will be designed to inform them in readily comprehensible language, of the findings of the investigation.

Informed Consent Form (Participants) Research project, Ph.D., Macquarie University

I agree to participate in the study of the language of supervision which involves the recording of feedback sessions after an observed lesson. I understand that I am free to discontinue participation at any time without prejudice.

Participant's name:

Participant's signature:

Investigators name: Ruth Wajnryb

Investigator's signature:

Document 3. Ethics Documentation Linguistic Study (Institutions)

41 Wiley Street
Waverley NSW 2024

Dear

I am writing to you as the Director of an educational institution which I hope will become involved in a research project related to the training of teachers in the field of TESOL.

This project is part of my studies towards a Ph.D. at Macquarie University, where I am being supervised by Dr Harry Thompson of the School of Education. I am interested in looking at the language that happens in the feedback session which usually follows a practice teaching lesson. I am primarily concerned with the impact of the roles of the people involved - student teachers and supervisors - on the language they use in the feedback session. I hope to analyse the language of the feedback from transcriptions made of the recordings.

I would like to involve some student teachers and supervisors at your centre in this project. With their consent and yours, I will be able to collect the data that I need to pursue my research. This will involve some recordings of feedback sessions and possibly some interviews and questionnaires. Participants are provided with details of the project and its aims, as outlined in the second paragraph (above).

The proceedings will be conducted confidentially and the anonymity of participating people and institutions is assured. As the research nears completion, I will keep those involved in the study informed of the findings.

I hope you will consent to having your centre become involved in this project, and if so, look forward to further contact with you.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Wajnryb

Informed Consent Form (Institution)

This document is a consent form for appropriate authorities of the institution involved in research in the supervision of teachers. Information about the project, its aims and procedures, is provided below. Please read the form carefully before signing your consent.

The area being studied

The area of study is the language of supervision as it takes place in the supervisory dialogue - or feedback encounter - that occurs after a teacher supervisor has observed a teacher teaching. This dialogue is a regular and usual feature of teacher education programs and takes place during the practicum or practical component of the training program.

The aims of the study

The investigation into the language of supervision hopes to provide enlightenment about the processes of supervision so as to inform the training of supervisors in the future.

People responsible for the project

Principal investigator: Ruth Wajnryb: the research is being carried out as part of the requirements of a Ph.D. (Education) at Macquarie University.

Contact Information:

41 Wiley Street

Waverley NSW 2024

Tel: 387-4404.Fax: 369-2630

Supervisor: Dr Harry Thompson, School of Education, Head of Teacher Education, Macquarie University. Tel: 805-8704

Procedures

The data to be gathered for the study comprise recordings of feedback encounters between supervisors and student teachers as these happen as a regular part of teacher training procedures. These recordings will be transcribed and the transcripts will be analysed. Interviews and questionnaires may also be included in the procedures.

Anticipated discomfort/inconvenience

The presence of a tape-recording may initially be off-putting but it is expected that this will be a minimal inconvenience or disruption to the experience of the feedback. The fact that tape-recordings are a regular and usual feature of the professional life of language teachers should help minimise the discomfort of participants.

Confidentiality

The investigator undertakes to ensure that the anonymity of the participants be completely respected and that this anonymity be maintained throughout the project, from the initiation to the final report. No identifying information will be displayed, published or made available at any time. The investigation will have no bearing on the good name of the institution, or on the studies of the participating student teachers or the careers of the participating teachers and supervisors.

Feedback

Following the completion of the investigation, a special report of the project will be compiled

and sent to the authorities and all people involved at participating institutions. This will be designed to inform people, in readily comprehensible language, of the findings of the investigation.

Informed Consent

I hereby give my consent for this institution to participate in the study detailed above which investigates the language of supervision in the context of teacher education. I understand that this involves the recording of feedback sessions between supervisors and teachers after an observed lesson and that these recordings are to be made with the permission of the participants. I understand that participants' anonymity and privacy will be completely protected at all times and that no bearing from this participation will proceed in regard to their studies or careers. I understand that I am free to withdraw consent and discontinue participation at any time without prejudice. I understand that following the completion of the study I will be made informed of the results and findings. I also promise in no way to affect the giving of willing permission by participants, such permission being a matter of individual choice by participants and in no way the result of pressure, obligation or the expectation of reward or punishment.

Name: Institutional authority:

Signature:

Investigator's name: Ruth Wajnryb

Investigator's signature:

Informed Consent Form (Institution)

Research project: Ph.D. Macquarie University

I give consent for this institution to participate in the research study on the language of supervision in the context of teacher education being conducted by Ruth Wajnryb.

In giving consent I am not guaranteeing that my staff will participate. The participation, and that of their students, is voluntary.

Both they and the institution may withdraw their consent at any time.

Institutional authority:

Signature:

Investigator's name: Ruth Wajnryb

Investigator's signature:

Document 4. Ethics Documentation

Ethnographic study (interviews)

29.10.92
41 Wiley Street
Waverley NSW 2024
TEL: 387-4404
FAX: 369-2630

The staff,

Dear Colleague,

I am writing to you in the hope that you may be willing to be involved in a research project related to the training of teachers in the field of Adult TESOL.

This project is part of my studies towards a Ph.D. (Education) at Macquarie University, where I am being supervised by Dr Harry Thompson of the School of Education. I am investigating the language of feedback that conventionally follows a practice teaching lesson.

Part of the research includes an ethnographic study of trainers about the experience of giving feedback. This will involve individual interviews (of about 30 mins) with trainers. The interview will be taped to enable analysis afterwards. The subject of discussion in the interview will be your experience of giving feedback to trainee TESOL teachers. If you decide to participate, this would, roughly, be the extent of the imposition on your time. The place at which the interview occurred would be subject to your convenience.

All information will be treated in a confidential way. In a final report there will be no reference to individuals; nor will individuals be able to be identified. Participants will be informed of the project's findings at the completion of study.

The institution has granted permission for the study to proceed but your participation is completely voluntary. If you agree to take part, you may withdraw at any stage without prejudice.

I hope you will consent to become involved in this project. It has very definite and practical implications for the training of teachers in TESOL, and will, I hope, serve our profession well.

Should you like to be involved, please contact me at home on the numbers listed above. I look forward to further contact with you.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Wajnryb

**Document 5. Ethics Documentation
Experiment (simulated conference)**

Informed Consent Form (Participants)

Ruth Wajnryb
Research Project
Ph.D. (Education)
Macquarie University.

I agree to participate in the study of the language of supervision in which I respond in a questionnaire to a simulated supervisory conference. I understand that the data I provide will be used confidentially.

Investigator's signature:

Participant's signature:

Appendix 12

Inter-rater reliability check for coding of linguistic data

The two authentic texts used in the final test stage of the inter-rater check were segments of the transcript of SD4.

i) [4.1.5]

5 S well in a case like that I often think ☐, I try to put myself in their shoes ☐ I think ☐ well if ☐ I'm given an activity which requires the sort of intensive work that you know the sheet then I'd ☐ probably ☐ want to be doing ☐ it by myself [mm] so if ☐ you ☐ are keen as a teacher to have them work in pairs for whatever reason then I would ☐ suggest that you know creating ☐ an information gap so that they have ☐ to [mm] have to exchange the information [mm] so in that case you could have ☐ for example had um people with the correct answers giving ☐ that information to other people [mm] or people with definitions of words or something like that ☐ to show [yeah] the others, you know, whatever ☐

ii) [4.2.1]

1 S ah I just ☐ sort of ☐ felt ☐ ☐ that ☐ while it may ☐ have been ah good revision for them for a previous lesson ☐ that it ☐ it ☐ somehow ☐ shifted the focus of your lesson um that it became a bit ☐ top-heavy ☐ with these past simple past ☐ [mm] um past simple verb forms ☐ um when you had such a very different focus the language focus ☐ [mm] of your lesson, if ☐ it had

been a lesson which built on the verb forms then I ☐ could ☐ see the point of it [mm] but I felt ☐ ☐ that it ☐ distracted [mm] and because it took such a long time

2 T yeah it did take longer than I thought

3 S it then made the point of your lesson ☐ just ☐ seemed ☐ really ☐ a long way down the track ☐ [mm] and um I don't ☐ know ☐, it ☐, don't ☐ get ☐ me wrong ☐ it's not ☐ like ☐ um it was a great problem ☐, I'm sure ☐ that they got a lot ☐ from doing that ☐

Texts: No. of mitigators	No. of correspondences between researcher and independent rater	No. of non-correspondences between researcher and independent rater	Correspondence rate in percentage
54	51	3	94%

Table A. Correspondence between researcher and independent rater in coding of linguistic data on sample texts.

Appendix 13

Ethnographic interview schedule

Preliminaries

- * purpose of the interview
- * terms of reference
- * ethics documentation

Phase A. Climate and context-setting

- 1 How many feedback conferences have you done?
Were they training, development, or 'quality control' in nature?
- 2 Do you generally do any preparation before the feedback?
Do you make any decisions before going into the conference?
- 3 How do you see the genre/stages/shape of the conference?
- 4 How do you usually feel before a feedback conference?
Probe/deepen: why?
Are there any parts of the job you don't like or would like to change?

Phase B. Opinion / belief questions

- 5 What do you think is the point of giving feedback?
- 6 What influences shape or affect the conference?
- 7 How do you describe the roles of the two people?
- 8 What about the role of the supervisor:
Is there more than one role?
Have you ever experienced any conflict among any of these?
Tell me about this...

Phase C. Central issues: delivering criticism

- 9 How do you feel about criticising?
Have you had any difficulties with it?
- 10 When you have to give criticism, how do you manage the situation? leading up to, during and following the delivery of the criticism?
- 11 What concerns do you have when delivering criticism?
Probe/Deepen
- 12 Can you recall to mind a memorable experience you've had giving criticism during a feedback?
Thinking back to that experience, tell me about how it happened.
- 13 Do you ever soft-pedal when it comes to delivering criticism? How/why do you do this?
Do you have any concerns about this? Probe/Deepen
- 14 What is something you have had to criticise a teacher for?
Let's role-play the situation. Imagine now that I am a teacher and you wish to criticise me for this.....
Now, stepping outside of the simulation, what do you remember about your language?
Do you remember saying...? Why did you express it like this?
- 15 When it comes to criticising, there is the message you have to deliver and the person sitting there who is receiving it:
Is there any conflict here?
Is one more important in your mind than the other? Or are they equally important?
How do you blend these two issues?
- 16 What do you do through the feedback to support the teacher's morale?
- 17 What do you do to make sure the message gets through?

Phase D. Rounding off

- 18 What's the best thing a supervisor can do for a teacher?
What's the best thing supervisors can do for themselves?
- 19 Are you the same now as when you started supervising or have you changed?
How? Why?
- 20 Would strategic training help supervisors?
What should be included?

Appendix 14

Issues related to questioning

Following Merton and Kendall (1946), the interview questions seek the following qualities: non-direction, specificity, range and depth.

1. Non-direction

The value of non-directive approach to interviews was notably promoted by Carl Rogers' work in therapeutic contexts. In essence, non-directive questions, in contrast to 'polling' questions, aim to find out what the respondent thinks, rather than what they think about what the interviewer thinks (Merton & Kendall, 1946). The rationale is four-fold: to allow spontaneous responses rather than forced ones; to encourage a greater proportion of respondent talk over interviewer talk (Rogers, 1942); to avoid interviewer lead-taking; and to afford opportunities for unanticipated responses.

Non-direction is achieved through three routes. The first is the question type. Merton and Kendall differentiate between structured and unstructured questions, and include the semi-structured question which itself is further differentiated according to whether the stimulus or the response (or both) is being structured. The second means of assuring non-direction is vigilant avoidance of 'leader-effects' - a phenomenon which results, at worse, in imposing the interview's frame of reference and invalidating the data; and, at best, creates informant inhibition and blockage. The third means is a cautious use of the interview schedule - sufficient so as to afford comparability of data across interviews but not so adherent as to create 'strait-jacketing'.

Non-directive interviewing, however, is difficult to achieve - a difficulty wrought both by the situation *per se* and the pre-conceptions of interviewees (astutely captured by Littlejohn as a series of 'interviewee questions' - 1987:74-5). Certainly, there is an over-arching tension: between the focussed interview as an exercise in hypotheses-confirmation and the fact that the validity of the research depends in part upon the free and uncontaminated elicitation of subject views. While the researcher does not claim to have approached the ethnography with the pristine detachment of the phenomenologist (Hycner, 1985), she did nonetheless seek, during the interviewing, to suspend or 'bracket' (Hycner 1985:280-1) preconceptions and instead use 'the matrices of that person's world-view in order to understand the meaning of what that person is saying' (Hycner, 1985:281).

The issue of non-directive questioning interlocks with the research issue of bias, easier to acknowledge than to eliminate. Because in interviewing, the instrument is human, there is a very real danger of bias (Bell, 1987; Selltitz, Jahoda, Deutsch, & Cook, 1962). With a team of researchers, this element is certainly easier to identify and guard against than in a single-researcher project. Given that the acknowledged purpose is corroboration, there was all the more concern that informants were not 'led' into responding in a certain way from the form of the question; the tone or seeming attitude of the interviewer; or other contextual inferences that might be drawn by the interviewee from the experiential act of the interview itself (Littlejohn, 1987). The means of this assurance derive from awareness and the vigilance of 'constant self-control' (Gavron, 1966:159).

procedure to 'aid the verbalisation of affect' (Merton & Kendall, 1946:556) is partially directive through suggesting meaningful parallels or comparisons.

Piloting

While the focussed interview has a set of *a priori* hypotheses underpinning the interview schedule, it would be a mistake to think that this schedule 'rolled off' the list of hypotheses in one attempt. Intensive piloting of the draft schedule on a small number of respondents refined the instrument and ensured that it was working effectively as a data elicitation mechanism. In fact, the schedule went through four drafts before it was considered 'ready'. Of course, even at this point, it is essentially a fluid concept, with the order and wording of questions being determined by the interviewer, subject to the kind of issues, influences and constraints that have been explored in the above discussion of non-direction, specificity, range and depth.

Appendix 15

Sample ethnographic interview log

#23 DC (Code name = Darren)

Male

Context of supervisory experience private language schools
teacher training programs

Purpose of supervision pre-service
in-service
quality control

Degree of experience very

29 *What preparation do you do prior to the feedback?*

Feedback is usually straight after the lesson so that preparation is in the form of structured note-taking during the lesson. I tend to prioritise rather than sequence. I usually use some sort of *pro forma*.

42 *What about the genre of the meeting?*

There are certain things that I consciously do, like asking them before I say anything what they thought of the lesson - partly to getting any initial reactions from them before contaminating them with any cut-and-thrust comments from me. I don't want to flash red lights to them by initiating any topic. This might make them defensive. I want their views before they've had a chance to hear what I think.

56 It's also an affective thing to give the teacher an opportunity to say something, anything, about the lesson; there might be something embarrassing that happened - it might help them to break the tension if they release it.

There's tension because nobody particularly enjoys being observed, because most observations are linked to assessment in some way; and those that aren't are still artificial - the observation process is by definition artificial.

68 From there I try and identify the priority areas and certainly try and find some parts of the lessons that were good and identify those along with the problems.

76 *What comes first?*

I don't have a consistent plan about this. It varies but I do wind up with the praise because it's good to have them wind up feeling good rather than demolished.

87 *How do you feel before the feedback?*

I can remember feeling positively nervous on occasion because there were flaws in the lesson or something in the teacher's attitude; it's the same type of nervousness you have when you're disciplining someone or giving them bad news. The person who has to do it finds it a stressful interaction.

99 Is this connected to 'face'?

It's connected to interpersonals - you don't find telling people nasty things enjoyable in a disastrous lesson and especially with a teacher you suspect is unresponsive.

110 Would you feel this in writing a report on them?

No, because in a report you're shielded from the person's immediate reaction. There are people who are angry or affronted or abusive, especially teachers who are very experienced who think they don't have much to learn.

114 What's the point of feeding back?

If you don't, what's the point of observing? It's supposed to be a learning process.

12 What about the roles of the two people?

It's a cliché, of course, to talk about power but that's what it is - a power imbalance - institutionalised power rather than personal power.

135 Is there any conflict in the role of supervisor?

Within the role yes, given that there are so many functions for the supervisor to perform. There has to be a bit of a conflict between counsellor and assessor - a positive person giving help with the power to cut people down with the administrative or career progression outcomes that evolve from the feedback and there's a tension there.

152 Do you have qualms about delivering criticism?

Not if I feel it is justified - but I am concerned to ensure that it is well supported, not just a feeling; for example I will point to an instance in the lesson where students perhaps didn't understand instructions.

163 How do you manage the delivery of bad news?

Not at an utterance level but on a higher level yes, for example, alternating between positive and negative points even in a diabolical lesson I will search around for something good to say, at the risk of damning with faint praise i.e. saying something that's perhaps exaggerated praise on a minimal point - if it's transparent it might come across as condescending - 'it was a dreadful lesson but you've got a lovely smile' - that's an exaggeration of course.

193 Are you aware of ever soft-pedalling?

I guess so, in that sometimes there's a sense that people can take so much but not more and then I might not push it beyond the point that I think the person is comfortable with.

Does this mean you're gauging them all the time?

Yes watching facial expressions and body language, sometimes it's a depressed sounding 'mm' as they begin to feel hemmed in by negative points and then I might, not withdraw it, but try and wind up and move on to something more positive

215 How else do you cushion the message?

I tend to try and lead them to draw conclusions about some of the weaknesses of the lesson themselves - using questions and elicitation - to involve them and limit the amount of talking so that I am not running off lists of criticisms.

236 What about building trust - what are you conscious of doing?

Sometimes there isn't the possibility of building a relationship. I make the attempt to have some sort of interaction with the person before the lesson rather than just turn up a minute before the

lesson; with someone you don't know, you work harder at the courtesies.

258 Mitigation in the language - can it obscure the message?

Oh definitely; I don't recall specific examples but I am conscious of people intentionally or unintentionally missing the point of the real criticism you're making; it becomes obvious later that they have missed it - maybe in another lesson - maybe the gravity of the message didn't get across or it came across as something that was optionally worthy of their attention only

285 What do you, if anything, to ensure that the message DOES get across?

The only thing I'm conscious of is ensuring that the key points are drawn out in the report so that they can look at that in the cold light of day and that might offset any soft-peddalling I've done during the feedback. I might use concessive clauses to explain the circumstances, but the problem is there.

308 Have you changed at all as a supervisor?

I certainly take a more open-ended approach now, though I probably don't do things differently. Rather than feel obliged to comment on everything on the sheet or everything that happened in the lesson, I'll only comment on as much or as little as I think will be useful.

333 What would you advise ought to be included in supervisory training?

They've got to be able to at the same time visualise the teacher's position as the person being supervised and empathise with that and the difficulties of teaching effectively at the best of times let alone under observation conditions; and at the same time be detached enough and clinical enough to be helpful.

Appendix 16

Ethnographic interview. Validity check

41 Wiley St
Waverley NSW 2024

Dear

Thank you for allowing me to interview you and to use the information in my research.

As part of a check to ensure validity, I would be grateful if you would read through the attached interview log, which is a summary of the main gist of our meeting, and check whether you believe it is a faithful record.

I have not created a verbatim transcript but have rather sought to capture the essence of your views and responses in your own language.

Could you please complete the questions below?

Kind regards

Ruth Wajnryb

* * *

Is the interview a reasonably faithful record of our meeting

YES NO OTHER

If OTHER: please explain (continue overleaf if you wish)

If there are any parts of the log that you wish to comment on (e.g. add extra information, comment on the existing record, highlight any omission) please do so on the log and return it with this form.

My warm thanks to you for your help and interest in my project.

RW

Appendix 17

Ethnographic interview. Member check

41 Wiley St
Waverley NSW 2024

Cover letter
Member checks

Dear

As you may recall, I am currently working on the ethnographic phase of my doctoral research. This stage involves my moving away from my previous close focus on supervisory language in order to take in a wider angle: the context of supervision. Here, I am trying to understand the bigger picture, seeking to bring into focus the factors which motivate, shape and constrain supervisory language. I do this by trying to describe supervision from the perspective of those who do it.

You may remember that in this regard we recently met for an interview. Now, as part of the process of ensuring the validity of my research, I wish to conduct a 'member check' i.e. involve some of the members of the original data base to comment on some developments drawn from the data. I have included you within the sample, I hope without incurring your wrath!

Let me explain. From the interviews I had with supervisors I created logs, which are non-verbatim records. These were then coded: chunks of text were named according to the main emergent ideas. Out of these codes developed a set of conceptual categories. It is these categories that I want to run past you. They are outlined on the attached pages.

I would be very grateful if you would read these to determine whether in your opinion I have induced the central ideas that make up your experience of delivery criticism in the context of feedback.

Please complete the cover sheet and do feel free to write comments on the pages also.

I would be grateful to receive it back before the end of April as I am racing to a tight schedule. If you need more time, please ring me. If you feel unable to oblige in this way - and I know it is an imposition - just return the material to me - no problems! A stamp self-addressed envelope is included.

Research is a lonely and frustrating process, punctuated by moments of insight and excitement. Input from others, such as yourself, certainly helps and I am very appreciative of your involvement.

Best regards

Ruth Wajnryb

Conceptual Categories

[drawn from the interview logs]

Themes are divided into two groups: A (uni-dimensional) and B (multi-dimensional).
The analysis is a summary with a minimum of examples or quotes.

A.

A1. Minding morale: this relates to the concern supervisors have with preserving the morale and confidence of the teacher. It is often characterised by metaphors of fragility and destruction: criticism is talked of as a 'stab' or 'blow' or 'attack'; and the verbal processes are: damaging, hurting, shattering, bruising causing to crumble, collapse etc.

A2. Juggling: there is a sense of the supervisor juggling the two sides of their job - helping and critiquing; and this involves a constant sizing up of reactions, weighing of considerations and making careful decisions about what to say and how to say it.

A3. Weighing words: the juggling is mostly realised in the caution taken in the language used; there is a sense of supervisors sifting through their options and carefully considering the impact of what they say to the teacher.

A4. Soft-peddalling: here we have the supervisors' concern with the impact of their words and a resultant hedging or soft-peddalling -intended to take the sting out of what they are saying and reduce the hurt factor.

A5. Shooting from the hip: though supervisors tend not to shoot from the hip, they often refer to this as a deliberately avoided way of being, as most see it as counter-productive to the nurturing/instructive side of the job.

A6. Biting the bullet: aware of the conflict between the helper/critic sides of the job, supervisors often concede, if reluctantly, that there comes a time when you have to face the music and say what it is you need to say, albeit gently.

B

B1. Purpose of feedback: the purposes of feedback fall neatly into 2 sub-categories - instructive and affective. The instructive sub-divides into transmitting information and providing and encouraging insight.

B2. Schematic structure of the conference: most supervisors subscribe to a 3-stage schema: a relaxing/eliciting phase; a report-back phase; and closure, ending with a focus on positives and plans for needed action.

B3. Supervisor angst: an overwhelming theme that emerged was angst about the impact of their actions and words on the teacher. Other worries had to do with unleashing and managing extreme and often negative emotions; failing to get their message across; failing to have positive outcomes etc.

B4. Supervisors' perceptions of conflict: at the heart of the role is an intra-personal conflict - the helper vs the critic, and many related conflicts clustering around this: such as, supervisor as developer of skills vs supervisor as judge who passes and fails. Some conflicts had to do with the face factor - criticising is a face threatening act and had accompanying tensions. Different supervisors had devised different strategies to help them deal with the conflict: from extreme cases, like 'going for the jugular and later picking up the pieces', to resigning the post because the task was perceived as an impossible one.

B5. Cushioning: most supervisors had highly developed means - verbal and otherwise - to cushion the impact of the blow carried by their criticism: eg eliciting self-criticism from the teacher which then propelled them into a 'confirm or deny' role that was infinitely easier than delivering the blow. They were very articulate about such strategies which suggested that they were devised to relieve the angst caused by a sense of role conflict.

B6. Strategies for building trust: a major strategy related to cushioning process was the effort expended to develop a context of trust. Again supervisors were very articulate about what they did in this regard, from the more trivial (using a cup of coffee as an equaliser) to the more subtle - such as deliberately mentioning their own weaknesses and faults so as to come across as more 'human'.

B7. Safeguarding the critical message: cognisant that their soft-peddling carried the danger of obscuring their criticism, many supervisors had built into the proceedings safe-guarding measures to ensure that the message did get through - such as a follow-up report neatly divided into strengths and weaknesses; concept-checking that the message was conveyed; eliciting plans for action from the teacher vis-a-vis upcoming lessons.

B8. Supervisor reflections on self-growth: supervisors almost unanimously were aware of having evolved over their years of experience; they often expressed shock and embarrassment at 'how they used to be'. These reflections suggest that supervisor skills are largely acquired, not intuitive, and that training may be an appropriate intervention.

Member check

Name:

When you have read the attached pages, please complete this cover sheet.
Please circle the preferred number. Attach additional pages if you wish.

Question 1
How familiar do the categories feel to you?

1	2	3	4	5
unfamiliar				familiar

Question 2
How 'spot-on' does my analysis (brief though it is) feel to you?

1	2	3	4	5
off-track				spot-on

Question 3
Do you feel that with these categories I am broadly 'speaking the reality' of your experience?

1	2	3	4	5
tend to disagree				tend to agree

Question 4
Have I, in your opinion, got anything substantially wrong?

Question 5
Have I exaggerated, understated, embroidered, shifted weight, misrepresented anywhere?

Question 6
Have I left something significant out?

Question 7
Any other comments?

Appendix 18

Grounded proposition survey

Ruth Wajnryb
41 Wiley Street
Waverley NSW 2024
Tel: 387-4404
Fax: 369-2630

Cover letter
Grounded proposition survey

Dear

As you may know, I am presently researching feedback in the context of teacher supervision. I am writing to you to ask you to check the validity of some statements that have come out of my research so far. This will call on your experience of supervising teachers, specifically observing and feeding back. Your experience may be pre-service (e.g. teacher preparation) and/or in-service (e.g. staff development).

My primary focus is on the language of feedback, especially delivering criticism. My intended long-term outcome is to develop strategic training for supervisors, which I hope will benefit our profession.

I would be very grateful if you would read the attached questionnaire and respond to the seven statements by choosing a point on the scale that best reflects your view.

You have my assurance that your confidentiality will be respected and your name will not appear anywhere in the report.

I enclose a stamped addressed envelope and ask that you please return the questionnaire to me as soon as possible.

With kind regards and grateful thanks for your involvement.

Yours sincerely

Ruth Wajnryb

Questionnaire for people supervising teachers

Instructions

The following statements all deal with the feedback meeting between a supervisor (or trainer or co-ordinator) and a teacher (or student teacher), which usually takes place after an observed lesson. The focus is on *giving negative or critical feedback*.

Please read the statements and choose a point on the scale that best reflects your view. *Tick the box at this point.* In each case I would like to know whether you think the statement *validly describes an element in the feedback situation*.

Statements

1. During feedback, supervisors are concerned with how what they have to say might affect the teacher's 'face', confidence and morale.

1 2 3 4 5

2. Supervisors are aware of juggling the twin demands of their role - the *helper* side and the *critic* side.

1 2 3 4 5

3. If the context in which the feedback takes place is a trusting one, it is easier to deliver criticism.

1 2 3 4 5

4. Supervisors rarely deliver criticism without first planning: this planning may involve structuring the order of what they say, or balancing elements, or phrasing carefully what they say.

1 2 3 4 5

5. In choosing their words, especially in delivering criticism, supervisors have to walk a tightrope between not hurting the teacher's feelings and not diluting or softening their message too much.

1 2 3 4 5

6. Supervisors sometimes worry that teachers may not be taking their message 'on board' and so they build in safeguarding measures (like concept checking) to check that the teacher has 'got' it.

1 2 3 4 5

7. Supervisors find the task of feedback challenging and would welcome strategic training to better equip them for the role.

1 2 3 4 5

Appendix 19

Ethnographic data. Phenomenon recognition check

41 Wiley St
Waverley NSW 2024
Tel 387-4404
Fax 369-2630

Cover letter
Phenomenon recognition

Dear

As you may know, I am currently working on the ethnographic phase of my doctoral research. This stage involves my moving away from my previous close focus on supervisory language in order to take in a wider angle: the context of supervision. Here, I am trying to understand the bigger picture, seeking to bring into focus the factors which influence, shape and constrain supervisory language. I do this by trying to describe supervision from the perspective of those who do it.

Now, as part of the process of ensuring the validity of my research, I wish to conduct a 'phenomenon recognition' procedure. This involves presenting my draft report to people who have 'daily lived experience' of the realities I have endeavoured to describe; and seeking out their corroboration (or otherwise) that what I am describing is familiar, lived and valid. Given your experience in teacher supervision, I have included you within the sample, I hope without incurring your wrath!

I would be very grateful if you would read the attached draft report to determine whether in your opinion I have drawn a true ethnographic portrait of supervision. *Please feel free to write comments all over it, and please complete the cover sheet.*

I would be grateful to receive it back before the middle of May, which is over a month away, as I am racing to a tight schedule. If you need more time - give me call. If you feel unable to oblige in this way - and I know it is an imposition - just return the material to me - no problems! A stamp self-addressed envelope is included.

Research is a lonely and frustrating process, punctuated by moments of insight and excitement. Input from others, such as yourself, certainly helps and I am very appreciative of your involvement.

Best regards

Ruth Wajnryb

Phenomenon recognition check

Name:

When you have read the attached chapter, please complete this cover sheet. Please circle the preferred number. For Questions 4-7, attach additional pages if you wish.

Question 1

How familiar does the content feel to you?

1	2	3	4	5
unfamiliar				familiar

Question 2

How 'spot-on' does my analysis (brief though it is) feel to you?

1	2	3	4	5
off-track				spot-on

Question 3

Do you feel that I am broadly 'speaking the reality' of your experience?

1	2	3	4	5
tend to disagree				tend to agree

Question 4

Have I, in your opinion, got anything substantially wrong?

Question 5

Have I exaggerated, understated, embroidered, shifted weight, misrepresented anywhere?

Question 6

Have I left something significant out?

Question 7

Any other comments?

Appendix 20

Distribution of positive and negative politeness

The critical FTA violates both the positive and negative face of the hearer. It would be logical therefore to expect mitigation to be addressed to both faces of the teacher, aiming to bolster their positive self-image and to counter threats to their autonomy. This would abide, too, by what is known about the 'mixing' of the two types of macro-strategies in natural language (Pearson, 1988:75). In Blum-Kulka's empirical cross-cultural study, for example, mitigating devices were found to 'appeal differentially to negative and positive face needs' (1990:267). Likewise, Craig et. al. (1986) and Shimanoff (1971) report complex intermeshings of positive and negative politeness in empirical studies.

While the present inquiry is not centrally concerned with the distribution patterns of positive and negative face, some findings are worth reporting.

Of the 36 categories in the typology:

24 represent mitigation addressed entirely to negative face

6 represent mitigation addressed entirely to positive face

6 have elements of both positive and negative face

Given the heavy preponderance of mitigation addressed to negative face, it would seem that a major concern of supervisors giving feedback is to reduce the perception of criticism as an imposition on the autonomy of the addressee. Correspondingly, this both reduces the sense of gravity or urgency and increases the notion of volition or optionality in uptake (see also Ch. 6). The message that teachers may 'deconstruct' may well be that criticism is something to follow up with or discard, at their discretion.

Appendix 21

Muted praise. The other side of the critical coin

While the focus of this study is on the delivery of criticism, it is interesting to observe, too, that issues pertaining to marked lexical choice also relate to the giving of praise. While beyond the parameters of the present inquiry, this is worth some preliminary attention because it throws light on the motivations underpinning supervisors' language choices. In the following instances of praise (all taken from SD1), there is an odd hedging, signalled by the use of incongruent forms.

Instead of:	the supervisor says:
Congruent	Incongruent
you tried to incorporate	<i>you made a lot of effort to incorporate</i>
	<i>you made the effort of incorporating</i>
you tried to concept check	<i>you made an effort to concept check</i>
you attended to error	<i>you were paying a lot of attention to error</i>
you used board cues	<i>you paid a lot of attention to using</i>
you tried to be clear	<i>you attempted to be very clear</i>
you modelled	<i>you tried modelling</i>

Incongruence in the context of criticism suggests mitigation or hedging. It is understandable as a choice made under the pressures of face-to-face interaction. However, in the context of praising, lexical incongruence raises a number of issues. Why is the supervisor clearly cautious and muted, even in discomfort, about praising?

One way to investigate this is to explore the outcomes of different choices. Take the first instance, above: it seems valid to suggest that had the supervisor chosen the more congruent form ('you tried to incorporate'), the focus then would have been on the attempt, which failed. Instead, wording the utterance incongruently ('you made the effort of incorporating'), gives greater commendation to the effort, irrespective of the failed outcome.

A reading of all of the instances of praise above suggests that the teaching behaviour which the supervisor is (trying to) compliment is indeed a complex matter, and perhaps not itself deserving of unqualified praise. What appears to be happening is that the supervisor is searching for good things about the lesson to comment upon in an effort to shore up the relationship and save the teacher's face (c.f. Terrell et al. 1986).

In this regard, the pilot data of this study showed a definite configuration in the organisation of feedback: praise followed by criticism, reflecting Turney's recommendation that supervisors build

on strengths before turning to critical analysis of performance (1990:169). There is a sense that the compliments are designed to cushion the ground for the impending ego-fall to be brought by the forthcoming criticism. It is almost as if the compliments are handed out not for their own sake but rather as an ego management strategy to help both the supervisor deliver and the supervisee receive the criticism. Certainly, the 'sandwich' effect is well known in the literature (Calderhead, 1988; Farson, 1963; Gervasio, 1987; Tracy et al. 1987; Tracy & Eisenberg, 1990/91; Viega, 1988). Furthermore, supervisors interviewed (see Ch. 6) corroborate that they are conscious of, albeit not always comfortable about, using this strategy. Teacher-supervisees interviewed commented that they often see such supervisory praise as 'loaded' and feel themselves waiting for the 'but' that will act as the discourse marker to introduce the accompanying blow of criticism. This may be related to the ease with which subordinates feel defensive in communication with superiors (Fairhurst et al. 1984; Gibb, 1961).

Yet other evidence (Tracy et al. 1987) suggests that such positively-packaged criticisms are well regarded. Anecdotal evidence, supported by respondents (Ch. 6) suggests that the search for praise is a driving force guiding the feedback: there is a preference for the 'good things + bad things + good things' format, a generic staging that is reflected microcosmically at the utterance level with a tendency towards concessive clause (acknowledging merit, stroking) as a prelude to criticism e.g. *'while it may have been a good revision for them for a previous lesson, that it it somehow shifted the focus...'* [4.2.1].

Other investigators may be rewarded by studying patterns of praise/criticism in feedback to see how they inter-relate. Certainly it appears that, like the language of criticism, the language of praise is a complex matter, though perhaps not as complex as criticism as it lacks the inherent clash-of-goals that accrues to criticism in some contexts (Tracy et al. 1987; Knapp et al. 1984). Just as what often appears as critical is appeased, so too what appears as praise seems down-toned. It may prove fruitful to explore how far these strategies are conscious; what messages they cue to interlocutors; and how far they contribute to or detract from successful outcomes.

Appendix 22

Illustrations of pragmatic ambivalence in natural language

Five examples of the strategic use of pragmatic ambivalence are detailed below.

1. '*Socially tricky*' situations are prime opportunities for the expedience of pragmatic ambivalence, for here one may need to steer judiciously 'between two social reefs' (Weiser, 1974:726). A socially tricky situation is one 'in which the speaker has something to lose if he/she acts on the assumption that a certain state of affairs is true and it turns out not to be, but something to gain if that certain state of affairs is actually true (Weiser, 1974:724).

2. Pragmatic ambivalence serves people in *political and diplomatic situations* where one may want to offer possibilities of meaning without being able to be pinned down. Especially in contexts where one is likely to be quoted, indeterminacy is a valuable ploy.

Twenty years after Australian Prime Minister Gough Whitlam was propelled from office, he was asked his opinion of the judgement that history would make of him. He responded: 'It is not for me to say whether I was a good Australian prime minister. What I can say is (pause) that I was the best so far' (Sydney Morning Herald, Good Weekend, Nov. 28, 1992). More recently (Dec. 1993), a diplomatic incident in which the Australian Prime Minister, Mr Keating referred to the Malaysian Prime Minister, Mr Mahathir, as 'recalcitrant'. Subsequently, Keating's words ('I regret that offence has been taken' Sydney Morning Herald, 9 Dec. 1993, p.1) walked the delicate path of claiming to be 'tantamount to an apology' while not wanting to appear (in front of the Australian electorate) to grovel for forgiveness.

3. Pragmatic ambivalence is characteristically exploited in *jokes* such as the following example. A prominent politician is on a publicity visit to an old age people's home. Slightly perturbed that one old woman doesn't respond to his greeting or seem to recognise who he is, he says to her: 'Madam, do you know who I am?'. She responds: 'If you're not sure, dear, ask the lady down there on the front desk, she'll put you right'. Similarly:

[policeman to speeding motorist]

Why are you driving this fast?

Because the car won't go any faster.

The humour in such jokes derives, as Ervin-Tripp (1976:53) explains, from the 'sharp dislocation of awareness when the listener notices a meaning not apparent before'. Ervin-Tripp also cites examples of sarcasm and teasing:

[son to mother]

I need a ten-speed bicycle

I'm sure you do (1976:45)

[wife to husband]

Do you know how to put the water in the windshield wiper squirter?

How? (1976:53)

4. It is well known that many cases of *work-place sexual harassment* are difficult to prove precisely because the harasser often deliberately jostles on the uncertain border between various speech acts, exploiting insinuation rather than explicit utterances. The 'harrasee' may initially wonder at the intended meaning and therefore at what response is appropriate.

5. A notorious example of pragmatic ambivalence occurs at the end of the film The Silence of the Lambs (Tally, 1991). The central character, psychiatrist and escaped criminal, Dr Hannibal Lecter, known for his cannibalism, is at large again. Over the phone to the police investigator on his case, he says: 'I do wish we could chat longer but I'm having an old friend for dinner'. The viewer, like the investigator, is left to wonder at his meaning.

Appendix 23

Investigation of an instance of pragmatic ambivalence.

Transcript

The full text of the critical incident [4.4] referred to in the thesis is included below.

- 1 S *um I've made a comment here, are you still adjusting to teaching Latin Americans?*
- 2 T *no, I don't t-h-i-n-k so, well, not in the sense that, I mean, I've really, I'm not still always comparing but, I'm still adjusting getting used to teaching, Asians but I think [yeah] I'm adjusting pretty quickly I can tell, who's who and, I've started to work out the little, um idiosyncrasies that belong to certain groups [mm] you know and which, when I first started it was all a blur but you know*
- 3 S *I just imagined that for example that vocabulary activity, with, an Argentinian class I can see them all, jumping around and having a lot of fun and [showing each other the work*
- 4 S *[well it depends well they work together much more readily I think that's the thing, [they work together much more readily*
- 5 T *[whereas I think, our sort of classes need to be warmed up [mm] I think that, you know to me that while it was a very well constructed and interesting [mm] um way of presenting the vocabulary I didn't see it as warmer [no, no?] and I don't I didn't see that as warming up, in any way [no]and I think that our students really, particularly in that first lesson of the day and particularly with the lower levels, they need warming up you know, [like*
- 6 T *[more physical something more physical you think? or more?*
- 7 S *often physical things are very good [mm] um um games, um exchanging chairs [mm], yeah, contest noisy things like that they mightn't suit everybody*
- 8 T *but things that are related to the content of the lesson or not?*
- 9 S *not necessarily [no?] although I prefer it to be personally [yeah] it feels nicer to have it all integrated [yeah] it certainly, coming in as an outsider, into the room I felt, sort of I I met a wall of, silence [mm] and it felt, I sort of felt oh you know, this class isn't happening but, it gradually sort of [mm] you know started to happen. But I feel that with that sort of group, that reticent group, you know things to loosen them up are really important [yeah yeah] and then you might find that then would attack that vocabulary exercise more willingly in pairs, and so on [mm] if they if they had been suitably warmed up beforehand just a five-minute ice-breaker of some kind [mm]. There's lots of ideas floating round the staffroom here [mm] just yell you 'has anyone got a warmer?' someone, someone will come up [mm] with something for you*

- 10 T yeah no I see, in that way it is a little bit different in that case [yes], you didn't have to jump around quite so much like for example something like that would have been an a-c-t-i-v-e warmer
- 11 S yeah I can see [that
- 12 T you know what I mean? and like I usually, I prefer to have it connected with what's coming or in some way preparing them for what coming rather than just unrelated, thing, jumping around kind of thing [mm] which it can be, if it's just a warmer [mm] [you know not
- 13 S but you've got to think of the purpose of it [yeah yeah] the purpose is, in this case to warm up you know and that's, that's is a valid [mm] aim in itself [mm], um so that the rest of the lesson goes more smoothly [mm] and more energetically and so on, so in that case it doesn't really have to be related [mm] to a specific language, aim. You look a bit doubtful
- 14 T no no no something to think about
- 15 S ((gentle laugh))

Appendix 24

Post scriptum to the typology. Category 'demonstratives'

The typology of mitigation was intended at the outset to be exhaustive but in the end fell some small distance short of this goal. One of the methodological problems of the strategy of grounded theory is the difficulty of deciding on the relevance of data when the researcher is constantly 'at the interface between the collection and analysis process' (Battersby, 1982:3). Thus 'data which is judged as not being theoretically useful may, in the light of subsequent data, be extremely relevant' (Battersby, 1982:3). The recognition may come toward the end of the study when categories are deemed saturated and complete. In such an instance, following Battersby's recommendation (1982:3), the new data should be included separately as an appendix.

Such was the case in this study in regard to a syntactic class of demonstratives belatedly recognised to be pragmatically meaningful as mitigators. This group embraces a marked use of proximal ('this', 'these' 'here') and distal demonstratives ('that', 'those', 'there').

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), the proximal demonstratives convey increased involvement or empathy (1978:126), and therefore may serve a positive politeness function. R. Lakoff (1974b) explores this notion in her tripartite division of demonstratives: spatio-temporal, discourse and emotional deixis, the last of which is the one bearing pragmatic meaning. The data of this study reveals evidence of 'emotional' deixis in instances in which the proximal demonstrative renders the narrative more vivid, and by implication the participant relationship closer:

- *you don't want to be really be asking these other comprehension questions [3.4.4]*
- *you had your pairs... all set up and ready to go and then these people came in [9.6.11]*
- *you had this group... and you went through all six people... meanwhile these three were left out [8.11.1]*
- *so if you think... these words could come up then I need to know how to spell them [7.4.9]*
- *you've also got to be careful too so that you word it so that it's not just a yes or a no answer... these kids are more or less at that literal level [6.1.3]*

Conversely, distal demonstratives can convey distance or avoidance, or significantly, emotional distance from a source of distress and by implication, comfort. Criticisms pushed back in time/place carry less immediacy and hence less potency. Thus, demonstratives in instances of marked usage can perform a point-of-view flip akin to the tense, aspect and person shifts (described in Codes 1, 2 and 7 respectively):

- *so um do you think that's a problem there? [3.8.3]*
- *that time is precious to you [3.15.3]*
- *that's a bit of a problem [3.8.5]*
- *I did notice they did not know what you wanted [mm] and that creates a little bit of anxiety [3.3.7]*
- *there's a number of things happening there [5.1.10]*
- *I just thought that it was just going a bit fast there at the end [9.9.5]*

- *there was one problem there with that present progressive [9.10.1]*

In the following example, there is a mixed use of demonstratives: the suggestion for action is distanced while the lesson content, deemed valuable, is brought closer:

- *maybe you could do that tomorrow with them so that they can see that this is really the sort of language which is useful [9.14.1]*

An alternative explanation for the pragmatic behaviour of distal demonstratives is Pomerantz's. She states that 'delicate topics are sometimes talked about with terms or glosses that refer to the topic without naming or identifying it (1984:155). If indeed the use of 'that' is euphemistic, then the classification of marked distal demonstratives may be better placed in Code 10 (lexical hedges) or Code 11 (hedging modifiers, sub-category: specification hedge).

Appendix 25

Agency. An illustration

This appendix illustrates an instance of mitigating agency manipulation. In this case, the supervisor is discussing the way the teacher set up a task. She begins by praising the teacher; and then moves on to the FTA:

- *that was a great idea actually putting it up on the white board but I still thought there was a bit of confusion for the students [1.9.1]*

What other syntactic choices could she have made? Ranging from the least to the most mitigated, here are some options:

- a. you confused the students
- b. the students were confused by you
- c. the students were confused
- d. confusion struck (or some similar verb) the students
- e. 'there was (a bit of) confusion for the students'

In (a), the most unmitigated, the agent is named ('you') and foregrounded (by being placed up front of the utterance where it operates as the grammatical subject). The process is expressed as a verb ('confused'); and the object of the transitive action is stated ('students').

In (b) agency is weakened by the passivisation ('were confused') which syntactically places the agent ('by you') at the end, thereby de-focussing it. The passive also gives emphasis to the process and the receiver of the action, at the expense of the agent. Thus the 'done-to' element, not 'the do-er' (Butt, 1991:17) is foregrounded.

Instance (c) is the same as (b), except that agency is further weakened by being deleted and therefore suppressed. The passive construction, by allowing the deletion of agency, generates the implication: could it be that the students' confusion had nothing whatever to do with the teacher?

In (d), the relationship between cause and effect, performer and deed, agent and action, is again weakened by turning the verbal process into a noun ('confusion'). The implication is that there is no responsibility or attributable party. Indeed, perhaps confusion 'auto-generates' - just happens by itself? From this point, it becomes syntactically impossible to name agency: one cannot say 'confusion struck the students by you'.

Significantly, too, the process of nominalisation has achieved thematisation: 'shifting a noun-phrase into the informationally significant first-place in the sentence' (Fowler & Kress, 1979:208). The speaker is thus able 'to emphasise ... thematic priorities, to emphasise what a text is "about" even when the entities of the theme are... semantically subordinate (affected rather than agentive)' (Fowler & Kress, 1979:209).

In (e) - the real, unfabricated option - existential 'there' further increases distance between the issue (confusion) and the now deleted, hidden, invisible agent (the teacher). It is almost as if the confusion has a life and motivation of its own in objective reality: perhaps it is an unavoidable part of the contingencies of life? Syntactically, the subject is removed from the initial focal

position; and as with (d), naming the agent is syntactically impossible. The utterance now is very marked, rendering the prepositional phrase ('for the students') quite odd. This choice itself has pragmatic meaning: 'for' clouds the picture: reality would suggest the locative 'in', not the dative 'for'.

The utterance (*'I still thought there was a bit of confusion for the students'*) is further mitigated in four ways. Firstly, the speaker's pre-figuring 'I thought' implies that what follows is of the status of (mere) subjectivity (Code 11). Secondly, as the projection of the modalising main clause, the viewpoint or propositional thesis is subordinated (Code 6). Thirdly, the past tense ('thought') distances and ameliorates the impact: does it mean the supervisor no longer thinks this? could it be a mere fleeting thought, something that has passed and is so trivial as to have no lasting significance? (Code 1). Fourthly, a specification hedge reduces the noun to less than itself ('a bit of') (Code 11), raising questions like: How much confusion is 'a bit of' confusion? Given its indeterminacy, how important is it, anyway?

Appendix 26

Quantification of instances of mitigation

The quantification of instances of mitigation was carried out in the following manner. Firstly, with each supervisory dialogue (SD), the instances of mitigation were counted in each critical incident (CI) and allocated to the appropriate code (14 in all), which classifies them according to type (see sample shown in Table A, below). The sum of instances per code was totalled and the mean was calculated. The mean scores of all codes in the 10 SDs are displayed (see Table B, below).

As well as displaying the instances of mitigation per type (i.e. using the 14 codes), the number of mitigation instances per SD was totalled, and CI mean scores were calculated (see Table C, below). These calculations form the basis of Table 5 (Ch. 5) and its accompanying discussion.

	SYNTACTIC							SEMANTIC				STRATEGIC		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
#	Tense	Aspect	Neg	Interr.	Modal Verb	Clause Struct.	Person	Qualm Indics.	Asides	Lex. Hedges	Hedging Mods	Con Ind.	Implicit	Amb.
1	✓✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓	✓✓✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓	✓✓✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓	✓✓	✓✓
2	✓	✓✓✓	✓			✓✓	✓	✓✓		✓✓✓	✓✓		✓✓	
3	✓		✓			✓	✓✓	✓	✓✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓		✓	
4					✓	✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓		
5	✓			✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓	✓✓✓	✓
6	✓			✓✓	✓✓✓	✓			✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓✓✓		✓
7		✓✓✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓		✓✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓	✓	
8	✓	✓✓✓	✓	✓	✓	✓✓		✓	✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓✓	✓	✓	✓
9	✓		✓	✓		✓✓✓	✓		✓✓✓	✓✓	✓✓✓✓		✓✓✓	
10	✓	✓			✓✓		✓		✓	✓	✓✓	✓	✓	
Total:	10	12	7	11	10	11	15	11	25	32	37	9	16	5
Mean:	1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1	1.7	1.5	1.1	2.5	3.2	3.7	0.9	1.6	0.5

Appendix 26.
Table A. Quantification of instances of mitigation per type (= code) [Sample: SD1]

	SYNTACTIC										SEMANTIC				STRATEGIC			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14				
# Δ σ	Tense	Aspect	Neg	Interr.	Modal Verb	Clause Struct.	Person	Qualm Indics.	Asides	Lex. Hedges	Hedging Mods	Con Ind.	Implicit	Amb.				
1	1	1.2	0.7	1.1	1	1.7	1.5	1.1	2.5	3.2	3.7	0.9	1.6	0.5				
2	0.3	0.25	0.5	0.9	0.3	0.08	2	1.5	1.2	2	2.8	1	0.8	0.4				
3	1.3	2.1	1.4	2	2	1.5	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.4	10.2	0.6	1.3	0.1				
4	2.7	1.2	2.6	0.4	2.1	1.6	2.9	5.2	2.5	1.9	1.7	0.4	2	0.1				
5	1.7	2.1	0.8	1	1.7	1	3.1	4.6	1.6	0.6	1.2	1.1	1.1	0.07				
6	1	3	2	1	2	2	8	1	1	2	13	1	1	1				
7	0.6	0.4	0	0.6	1.4	0.6	1.4	2.4	1.6	2	4.8	0.8	0.6	0.4				
8	0.7	0.1	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.3	0.9	1.2	0.9	1	3.3	0.4	0.9	0.2				
9	2.7	1.8	0.7	1.5	1.1	1	1.6	3	1.8	1.6	5.8	0.2	1.1	0.4				
10	0.25	0.75	1.5	1.75	1.5	0.25	1.75	6.25	4.5	0.75	6.75	1.25	1.25	.75				

Appendix 26.

Table B. Quantification of instances of mitigation in 10 SDs classified according to type (= code); and mean scores per type per SD.

SD#	No. of mitigation instance per SD	No. of CIs per SD	CI mean no. of mitigation instances
1	217	10	21.7
2	160	12	13.3
3	445	15	29.7
4	376	10	31.6
5	305	14	21.8
6	40	1	40
7	89	5	17.8
8	127	11	11.5
9	341	14	23.7
10	117	4	29.2

Table C. Quantification of instances of mitigation in 10 SDs and mean scores of CIs.

Appendix 27
Supervisor informants in ethnographic study

CODE #	CODE NAME	SUP. EXP.*	PURPOSE OF FEEDBACK **			CONTEXTS ***			
			PRE	IN	QC	a	b	c	d
1	Jane	V	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
2	Jim	V	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
3	Pam	M	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
4	Karen	V	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
5	Colin	V	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
6	Alan	F	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
7	Megan	V	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
8	Iris	F	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
9	Tom	M	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
10	Paula	V	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
11	Peta	M	+	+	-	+	+	-	-
12	Maria	V	-	+	-	-	-	-	+
13	Malcolm	M	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
14	Roy	M	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
15	Portia	M	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
16	Lucy	V	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
17	Gina	V	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
18	Ann	V	+	+	+	+	+	+	-
19	Andy	V	+	-	+	+	+	-	-
20	Chris	F	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
21	Sandra	F	+	+	-	-	+	+	-
22	Kate	F	+	+	-	-	+	+	-
23	Darren	V	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
24	Jack	F	+	-	-	-	+	-	-
25	Alison	F	-	+	-	-	-	+	-
26	Susan	V	+	+	-	+	+	-	+

27	Eve	M	+	+	+	+	+	-	-
28	Rose	V	+	-	+	+	+	-	+
29	Bill	M	+	+	+	-	-	-	+
30	Hilary	V	+	+	+	-	-	+	+

Table A. Background professional information: 30 supervisors in core ethnographic study.

Key

- * = *Supervisory experience*
V = very experienced > 30 conferences
M = medium experience 10-30 conferences
F = few conferences < 10 conferences
- ** = *Purpose of feedback*
pre = pre-service
in = in-service
QC = quality control
- *** = *Institutional contexts*
a = EFL (ELICOS) private language school
b= TESOL teacher training
c= ESL/Adult (AMES)
d= ESL/Schools

Appendix 28

Ethnographic data. Conceptual categories - code list

(preliminary stage)

- 1 Purpose of feedback
- 2 Preparation for feedback
- 3 Supervisory angst
- 4 The schematic shape of the conference
- 5 Participant roles
- 6 Shaping influences and constraints
- 7 Cushioning: management of the delivery of criticism
- 8 Morale: protecting and supporting the teacher
- 9 Face: respecting and attending to face needs
- 10 Supervisors' perceptions of conflict
- 11 Weighing words
- 12 Soft-pedalling
- 13 Juggling
- 14 Safeguarding the supervisory message
- 15 Power
- 16 Trust and empathy: the supervisory relationship
- 17 Shooting from the hip
- 18 Biting the bullet
- 19 Supervisor growth
- 20 Supervisor training

Appendix 29

Image of supervisors. Observer effects

It might be argued that the composite image of supervisors emerging from the interviews was subject to a Hawthorne effect, in that the supervisors may have been giving the investigator an image of themselves that they thought she wanted to hear i.e. a face-saving, professionally 'correct' image. Indeed, as Guba and Lincoln (1983) point out, putting one's best foot forward in public is no less than can be expected; and is consistent with Goffman's (1959) notion of 'frontstage' or the public presentation of self.

The central issue here is misinformation; and dealing with it is, of course, part of the shoring up of validity essential to the trustworthiness of any piece of research. As a general principle, it no doubt helps to assume the untrusting mind-set of the investigative journalist, rather than have naive assumptions about goodwill, shared values and co-operation (Douglas, 1976). Certainly, an unhealthy scepticism is a wise investigative stance if one considers that 'conflict is the reality of life; suspicion is the guiding principle' (Douglas, 1976:55).

Guba and Lincoln (1983) find it analytically useful to categorise the notion of subject misinformation according to *projected targets* (the self; others; the institution) and *intention* (intended; unintended), as displayed in Table A.

TARGET	UNINTENDED	INTENDED
self	self-deception	lie
others	misconception	cover-up
institution	myth	front

Table A. Analysis of misinformation according to target and intention, following Guba and Lincoln (1983).

The investigator in this study was, at different times, aware of the potential for generating the full range of misinformation covered in Guba and Lincoln's six categories, although the preponderance, it was felt, was more likely to ensue from the 'unintended' rather than the 'intended' column.

Being in one sense an 'insider' (perceived as belonging to the culture of supervisors) meant that a 'cover-up' was less likely. Being perceived as 'native' and 'sympathetic to the cause' meant that the need for misinformation was discouraged. As well, great care was taken in the interviews not to presume or suggest 'a halo image' of supervisors. Further, as there was often a good deal of criticism of their institution expressed, it is unlikely that such people would then engage in a 'cover-up'.

Intended misinformation of the nature of the 'lie' is more difficult to detect. There was only one instance (#24) where the investigator lacked confidence that the concerns expressed were indeed

concerns felt. Significantly, in this one case, when the mini-simulation took place (see App. 13 - Phase C: Question 14), the language used by the supervisor was noticeably bald and unredressed. That this occurred in the very instance where some doubt was experienced as to genuineness served to reinforce its value as a triangulation check through all the other interviews.

A propos the category of 'unintended' misinformation, one of the supervisors involved in the phenomenon recognition check pointed out a possibility that eroded the reliability of the information:

We may be influenced by what we think we think, or even more dangerously, what we would *like to think* we think... there is a possibility that self-knowledge or self-awareness is incomplete (#10).

This view has strong intuitive appeal, echoing Argyris and Schon's (1974) twin concepts of espoused theory vs theory-in-use. It may well be that the views supervisors put forward in this study are their conscious, public, articulated theories of supervision; and that their enacted theories would be quite different. At this point, it is not possible to speculate whether the fact that the views put forward are largely homogenous is supportive of an 'espoused' or an 'action' view. Certainly, there is an opportunity here for further research to explore the application of Argyris and Schon's construct to supervisors and supervision.

St Giles

Language Teaching Center



San Francisco
London
Brighton
Eastbourne

COUNSELING SESSION

To be sure that this counseling session has been fully understood, please write a paragraph summarizing the conversation you had with your trainer. Be sure to include your strong points, the areas that need to be improved over the next two weeks, and your understanding of your grade at this point (pass or danger of fail).

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Trainer: _____

One Hallidie Plaza, Suite 350, San Francisco, CA 94102, USA

Telephone: (415) 788-3552 Fax: (415) 788-1923

SOME POINTS TO CONSIDER BEFORE YOU ARE COUNSELLED

1. How do you feel you are doing?
Are you on the way to being able to handle a job as
an E.F.L. Teacher?

2. Are there any areas you feel you are not really
coming to grips with?
If so, how do you intend to deal with it/them?

3. Is there anything you want to know about your progress?

4. Are there any other areas you would like to talk about?

5. Where do you intend to work when you finish here?

Appendix 31
Numbers of male/female language teaching trainees in two institutions (1993)

	TESOL		LOTE	
	m	f	m	f
Macquarie University, School of Education (1993)	4	50	8	46
Sydney University, Faculty of Education (1993)	6	35	9	55

Table A. Numbers of male and female students enrolled in the Diploma of Education Course (TESOL & LOTE methods) in two Sydney universities in 1993.

Appendix 32

Recognising corroboration

The seven *a priori* hypotheses are listed in Exhibit 4 (Ch. 4, p. 186).

Recognising and evaluating corroboration required *a priori* decisions to be articulated about evidence: how would one know whether what was said amounted to corroboration?

Accordingly, a ground rule was established: a hypothesis was considered 'corroborated' from evidence in the interview of any (or a combination) of a given range of factors. Examples of these are:

- * where supervisors showed themselves to be aware of, familiar with, or sensitive to the issue;
- * where they demonstrated prior reflectivity (e.g. showing that this was not the first time they had considered this matter);
- * where they acknowledged the issue as a complex or problematic one;
- * wherever they had evolved strategies for dealing with and effectively managing, or even side-stepping the issue - certainly, evidence of strategic management was the least nebulous and most confidence-bearing sign of corroboration, and accounted for a considerable number of questions during the interview.

In terms of evaluating informants' responses for corroboration, more particulars are outlined below:

With **Hypothesis 1** (criticism as face-threatening), a supervisor need not use the word technical word 'face' to indicate awareness of face threat. They may, for example, cite awareness of discomfort - their own and/or the other's - in the context of an 'eyeball' interaction; or the need to be able to look the person in the eye the next morning; or the importance of smooth relations in the workplace.

With **Hypothesis 2** (on morale), they might stress the importance of a teacher's responding to the feedback in a positive and confident frame of mind; they might show their consideration of the issue by using metaphors of fragility and destruction ('shatter', 'destroy', 'bruise', 'crumble') by way of referring to the dangers.

With **Hypothesis 3** (on message), a supervisor might have evolved strategies for safeguarding the message, such as monitoring the planned objectives to follow-up lesson plans.

With **Hypotheses 4** (on conflict), acknowledgment of conflicting demands within the role of the supervisor was sought. Some showed this by evidence of having prioritised one of the twin functions e.g. by down-playing assessment; or by recognising the primacy of instruction. Evidence was also found in sought-out compromises in nomenclature (claims of being 'supportively' or 'constructively critical').

With **Hypothesis 5** (on mitigation as face-motivated), evidence was sometimes elicited through a mini-simulation which generated instances of mitigation upon which discussion then focussed.

Hypothesis 6 (on the problematic side of mitigation) was corroborated through acknowledgment of the issue as problematic; or of strategies evolved to counter the effect.

Hypothesis 7 (on strategic training) was often corroborated by asking supervisors what kind of strategies they would have benefited from, had they had the opportunity for pre-service or formal supervisory training.

Proposition	1	2	3	4	5	7	7
Mean scores	4.65	4.8	4.45	3.39	4.7	3.78	4.48

Table A. Corroboration of grounded propositions: mean scores of 40 respondents to survey (see App. 18)

Appendix 33

Simulation experiment. Scripts

Script A. Hyper-mitigated

Supervisor:

I think that, um, I think that, I've mentioned here in my notes that um, it's just a little thing really. It seems to me you were sort of tending to explain things, rather than concept check things. Now you do explain very well. You're very good at explaining and I think people ah get it, so they get the idea which is fine, so this is only a little point. The thing is um that for those who don't get it, if they miss the explanation for whatever reason, and there hasn't been a concept check, then they can get left behind, can't they? And I think that can be a little bit of a problem, because, I think, and I'm pretty sure you'd agree, that it's important at a low level, which this class is at, ah, I think it's important that learning is always, well, it's two things really, ah, it's important that learning is presented through concept, questions so, it sort of narrows down the possibilities, and so they can't help but understand. And also that the learning is then checked, with a comprehension a concept checking question ah to make sure that they've sort of got it, um, and you do, you you do that but I don't think it's early enough um I feel perhaps you could do it maybe just a little earlier in the piece.

Script B. Hypo-mitigated

Supervisor:

You tend to explain, rather than concept check things. Now I must admit, that, you do explain quite well, and so most of the students do grasp the idea. The difficulty is for those who miss the explanation. If you don't follow up with a comprehension check, or use concept questions through the explanations, then students can get left behind. So, with a low-level class like this one, you should do two things. Firstly, you should present learning, through concept questions to narrow down the possibilities, so they will definitely understand. And secondly, you should use a concept checking question to check that learning has happened, to make sure that they have understood it. Now you do use concept checks, but you use them too late in the lesson.

Script C. Above-the-utterance (AUL) mitigation + hypo-mitigation

Supervisor:

One thing I observed in your lesson was that your language is very clear and especially the language of your explanations, they were particularly clear. You have a, real talent for accommodating, the learner's level in your explanation but, not distorting or oversimplifying, which is important. Is it something you've consciously developed, or something you've, more sort of, acquired, on the way?

Teacher:

Well, um I think, it comes from having worked at a low level for some time, um, it's something you have to do with beginners so I guess, it is a conscious, strategy, in that sense.

Supervisor:

Yes, well, you certainly have mastered that, and this means that your language is very accessible to the students, which, is important. There is another thing, though, that I want you to consider, ah alongside explanations, and that is, concept checking, and the purpose that it serves.

Now I mention this because you tend to explain rather than concept check things. Now I must admit that you do explain things very well, and so most of the students do grasp the idea. The difficulty is for those who miss the explanation. If you don't follow up with a comprehension check question, or use concept questions through the explanation, then students can, get left behind. So, with a low-level class, like this one, you should do two things. Firstly, you should present learning, through concept questions to narrow down the possibilities, and so they'll definitely understand. And secondly, you should use a concept checking question to check that learning has happened, to make sure that they have understood it. Now you do use concept check questions, but you use them too late in the lesson.

Original script [SD4.8]

Supervisor:

I think that I think that um I've mentioned in my notes here that um you tend to explain rather than concept check things [mm] now I also said you tend to explain in brackets which you do quite well you're very good at explaining and so I think people get it they get the idea which is fine but um for those who don't get it if they've missed the explanation [mm] and there hasn't been the comprehension check [mm] or during the explanation if there hasn't the concept check then they can get left behind [mm] and I think that if I think it's important at a low level at which this class is I think it's important that learning is always well it's two things really it's learning is presented through concept questions so that it sort of narrows down the possibilities so they can't help but understand [mm] and also that the learning is then checked with a concept checking questions um to make sure that they've got it um and you do you do that but perhaps I feel you could do it a little bit earlier in the piece.

Appendix 34

Research video experiment. Instructions

I. Preparation

Know which video script is to be played.

Set the video to the right counter number.

Mark the questionnaires at the top with the appropriate script: A, B, or C.

II. Preliminaries

Tell the subjects the following:

a.

This study is part of a research project investigating the language of supervisors in conferences with teachers following an observed lesson. Such conferences typically happen between student teachers and supervisors during practice teaching.

b.

In the video, you will see part of a conference. The supervisor is talking about the need to concept check as well as give explanations. Concept checking is the teaching strategy of asking questions for the purpose of exposing whether the student has understood what has been taught.

For example, while or after teaching the word 'borrow', the concept question might be: will the person keep it (the thing that has been borrowed) forever or give it back when they have finished with it? Concept questions are distinguished by a number of features: they often require yes/no answers or offer a choice of two options (e.g. give it back/keep it?); and they focus on the key 'concept' being taught.

c.

You will watch the video and then answer some questions. Two of these are multiple choice. The others are scaled questions in which you are asked to choose a point on a scale that best reflects your opinion.

d.

As you watch the video, imagine that the supervisor had just observed your lesson and is feeding back to you about it.

III. Questionnaire

Give out the questionnaires.

Allow the subjects time to read. There should be no discussion or interaction among subjects at this stage.

Play the video once.

Subjects should complete the questionnaire after watching the video, making their preference on the points on the scale.

IV. Final

Collect the questionnaires and thank the subjects.

Be sure that subjects have signed informed consent forms.

Appendix 35

Simulation experiment. Questionnaire

Instructions

There are 13 questions.
In the first two items, which are multiple choice, choose the one which best completes the sentence.

1. *The supervisor criticised the teacher for:*

- a failing to explain well
- b failing to concept check
- c concept checking too late in the lesson
- d explaining without concept checking

2. *The supervisor:*

- a criticised, as well as praised, the teacher
- b praised the teacher, and did not criticise her
- c criticised the teacher, and did not praise her
- d neither praised nor criticised the teacher

Now, the next 10 items are in the form of scales. Imagine that you are the teacher receiving feedback from the supervisor. Choose a point on the scale that best reflects your opinion.

3. The supervisor’s criticism of the teacher was:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
unclear						clear

4. The supervisor was:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
unsupportive						supportive

5. The supervisor conveyed:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
no authority						authority

6. The likelihood of the teacher implementing the supervisor’s suggestion is:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
low						high

7. The supervisor’s criticism indicates that the problem is:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
not serious						serious

8. I found the supervisor:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
uncaring						caring

9. I found that the supervisor’s language inspires:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
suspicion						trust

10. I would be:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
likely to ignore						likely to implement

the supervisor’s suggestion

11. I interpret from the supervisor’s language that the matter is:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
petty						serious

12. If criticised in this way, I would be:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
upset						accepting

13. In a few lines please write your impression of the feedback you observed:

Appendix 36
Simulation experiment. T-Test results

For Questions 3 & 5: Clarity

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q03 Clarity				
GROUP A	85	4.1176	1.867	.203
GROUP B	87	5.5632	1.583	.170

Mean Difference = -1.4456

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 8.203 P= .005

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-5.48	170	.000	.264	(-1.966, -.925)
Unequal	-5.47	164.26	.000	.264	(-1.967, -.924)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q05 Authority				
GROUP A	85	4.4824	1.645	.178
GROUP B	87	6.0115	1.271	.136

Mean Difference = -1.5291

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 17.054 P= .000

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-6.83	170	.000	.224	(-1.971, -1.087)
Unequal	-6.81	158.08	.000	.225	(-1.973, -1.086)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q03 Clarity				
GROUP A	85	4.1176	1.867	.203
GROUP C	59	6.0847	1.208	.157

Mean Difference = -1.9671

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 24.511 P= .000

t-test for Equality of Means				95%	
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-7.12	142	.000	.276	(-2.513, -1.421)
Unequal	-7.67	141.38	.000	.256	(-2.474, -1.460)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q05 Authority				
GROUP A	85	4.4824	1.645	.178
GROUP C	59	5.9661	1.082	.141

Mean Difference = -1.4837

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 23.537 P= .000

t-test for Equality of Means				95%	
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-6.07	142	.000	.244	(-1.967, -1.001)
Unequal	-6.53	141.65	.000	.227	(-1.933, -1.034)

For Questions 4 & 8: Supportiveness

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q04 Supportiveness				
GROUP A	85	4.9765	1.640	.178
GROUP B	87	4.2184	1.595	.171

Mean Difference = .7581

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= .001 P= .973

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	3.07	170	.002	.247	(.271, 1.245)
Unequal	3.07	169.56	.002	.247	(.271, 1.245)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q08 Supportiveness				
GROUP A	85	4.7176	1.797	.195
GROUP B	87	3.9655	1.788	.192

Mean Difference = .7521

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= .088 P= .767

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	2.75	170	.007	.273	(.212, 1.292)
Unequal	2.75	169.86	.007	.273	(.212, 1.292)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q04 Supportiveness				
GROUP B	87	4.2184	1.595	.171
GROUP C	59	5.6102	1.300	.169

Mean Difference = -1.3918

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 4.666 P= .032

t-test for Equality of Means				95%	
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-5.56	144	.000	.250	(-1.886, -.897)
Unequal	-5.78	139.10	.000	.241	(-1.868, -.916)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q08 Supportiveness				
GROUP B	87	3.9655	1.788	.192
GROUP C	59	5.0678	1.400	.182

Mean Difference = -1.1023

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 4.582 P= .034

t-test for Equality of Means				95%	
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-3.98	144	.000	.277	(-1.650, -.555)
Unequal	-4.17	140.95	.000	.265	(-1.625, -.579)

For Questions 6 & 10: Productivity

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q06 Productivity				
GROUP A	85	4.5765	1.873	.203
GROUP C	59	5.6949	1.355	.176

Mean Difference = -1.1184

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 12.467 P= .001

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-3.93	142	.000	.285	(-1.682, -.555)
Unequal	-4.16	141.73	.000	.269	(-1.650, -.586)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q10 Productivity				
GROUP A	85	4.9529	1.812	.197
GROUP C	59	5.9661	1.189	.155

Mean Difference = -1.0132

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 18.200 P= .000

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-3.77	142	.000	.269	(-1.545, -.481)
Unequal	-4.05	141.61	.000	.250	(-1.508, -.519)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q06 Productivity				
GROUP B	87	4.9195	1.623	.174
GROUP C	59	5.6949	1.355	.176

Mean Difference = -.7754

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 3.441 P= .066

t-test for Equality of Means				95%	
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-3.02	144	.003	.256	(-1.282, -.268)
Unequal	-3.13	137.78	.002	.248	(-1.265, -.285)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q10 Productivity				
GROUP B	87	5.4483	1.590	.171
GROUP C	59	5.9661	1.189	.155

Mean Difference = -.5178

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 8.859 P= .003

t-test for Equality of Means				95%	
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-2.13	144	.035	.243	(-.999, -.037)
Unequal	-2.25	142.59	.026	.230	(-.973, -.063)

For Questions 7 & 11: Gravity

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q07 Gravity				
GROUP A	85	3.8706	1.791	.194
GROUP B	87	5.2184	1.289	.138

Mean Difference = -1.3478

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 13.793 P= .000

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-5.67	170	.000	.238	(-1.817, -.879)
Unequal	-5.65	152.38	.000	.238	(-1.819, -.877)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q11 Gravity				
GROUP A	85	4.2824	1.709	.185
GROUP B	87	5.3333	1.236	.132

Mean Difference = -1.0510

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 10.637 P= .001

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-4.63	170	.000	.227	(-1.499, -.603)
Unequal	-4.61	152.82	.000	.228	(-1.501, -.601)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q07 Gravity				
GROUP B	87	5.2184	1.289	.138
GROUP C	59	4.8814	1.366	.178

Mean Difference = .3370

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= .165 P= .685

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	1.51	144	.132	.223	(-.103, .777)
Unequal	1.50	119.76	.137	.225	(-.109, .783)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q11 Gravity				
GROUP B	87	5.3333	1.236	.132
GROUP C	59	5.3559	1.095	.143

Mean Difference = -.0226

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= .916 P= .340

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-.11	144	.910	.199	(-.416, .371)
Unequal	-.12	134.04	.908	.195	(-.408, .362)

For Question 9: Trust

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q09 Trust				
GROUP A	85	4.0353	1.911	.207
GROUP C	59	4.9153	1.546	.201

Mean Difference = -.8800

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 4.916 P= .028

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-2.93	142	.004	.300	(-1.473, -.287)
Unequal	-3.05	138.63	.003	.289	(-1.451, -.309)

For Question 12: Receptivity

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Q12 Trust				
GROUP A	85	4.7529	2.064	.224
GROUP B	87	4.5057	2.040	.219

Mean Difference = .2472

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= .023 P= .881

t-test for Equality of Means					95%
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	.79	170	.431	.313	(-.371, .865)
Unequal	.79	169.79	.431	.313	(-.371, .865)

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean

Q12 Trust				
GROUP B	87	4.5057	2.040	.219
GROUP C	58	5.5000	1.699	.223

Mean Difference = -.9943

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 5.891 P= .016

t-test for Equality of Means				95%	
Variances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff

Equal	-3.07	143	.003	.324	(-1.635, -.354)
Unequal	-3.18	135.97	.002	.312	(-1.612, -.376)

Appendix 37

Sample content analysis of positive and negative responses to Question 13 of questionnaire in simulation experiment

As a sample, the following responses from the first 25 respondents to Script A have been 'chunked' and classified 'positive' [POS] or 'negative'[NEG].

- A1 took an inappropriate superior attitude [NEG]
- A2 unusually careful not to be authoritarian [POS]
and to include praise [POS]
- A3 -
- A4 should have spoken more directly straight to the point [NEG]
but still caring [POS]
- A5 positive [POS]
constructive [POS]
could have been more direct [NEG]
could have given the criticism more confidently [NEG]
- A6 slightly nervous [NEG]
manner not without authority [POS]
- A7 didn't seek feedback (eg agreement, checked for clarity) [NEG]
no examples [NEG]
- A8 tried to be firm about the importance of the point but without being totally negative [POS]
- A9 mixed message given: acknowledged that she was good but implied that she wasn't [NEG]
condescending [NEG]
- A10 lost his train of thought a bit [NEG]
- A11 not clear, trying to say something simple but in a difficult way [NEG]
made teacher feel uncomfortable [NEG]
- A12 took too long to state his criticism [NEG]
condescending [NEG]
unpleasant manner [NEG]
- A13 did everything in his power not to make teacher uneasy [POS]
wishy-washy [NEG]
needed to get to the point [NEG]
- A14 very condescending [NEG]
criticism useful [POS]
but annoying manner [NEG]
- A15 good approach: started by praising [POS]
avoided negative language [POS]
softened criticism by modifying language [POS]
point made clearly [POS]
perhaps too hesitant [NEG]
- A16 extremely condescending [NEG]
patronising [NEG]
why could he not have been direct? [NEG]
if he was going to beat around the bush why not ask her what she thought her weakness was? [NEG]

- A17 started by saying it was 'a little thing', then went on to say it was an integral part of learning [NEG]
 language was like he couldn't have been bothered [NEG]
 how truthful is his criticism? [NEG]
- A18 vague language [NEG]
 he seemed so uncommitted [NEG]
 hard to take him seriously [NEG]
 uninterested in teacher's thoughts & feelings [NEG]
- A19 first he said she explained, later said she did concept check but too late [NEG]
- A20 I felt as though he was giving mixed messages [NEG]
 he beat around the bush and I just wanted him to spit it out [NEG]
 he tried to criticise but was too nice and left the teacher confused [NEG]
- A21 caring [POS]
 tactful [POS]
 but not direct enough which would have helped make it clear [NEG]
 and would have been more supportive of the trainee [NEG]
- A22 not totally clear [NEG]
 contradicted himself [NEG]
- A23 tended to ramble on without coming to the point v quickly [NEG]
 could have elicited from the teacher if she agreed with him or if she thought there were any problems to begin with [NEG]
- A24 very tactful [POS]
 pertinent to successful lessons [POS]
- A25 very affirming [POS]
 nebulous [NEG]
 I would have accepted his advice [POS]
 but wouldn't feel any urgency about correcting the problem [NEG]

Appendix 38

Validity check for qualitative assessment of Q. 13 of questionnaire in simulation experiment

41 Wiley St.,
Waverley NSW 2024

Dear

I am soliciting your help (it should only take 5 mins or so) with my research into the language of supervision.

The following responses were given by viewers of a simulated video showing a supervisor feeding back to a teacher.

Please indicate whether you think the response is a positive or negative one by marking each response with a [+] or a [-], according to whether you consider it positive or negative, respectively.

The point of my asking you to check these responses in this way is as a validity check on my own assessments: substantial agreement across assessors adds to the study's validity.

I thank you for your help and enclose a stamped self-addressed envelope for your convenience.

Regards

Ruth Wajnryb

- A1 took an inappropriate superior attitude
- A2 unusually careful not to be authoritarian
and to include praise
- A3 -
- A4 should have spoken more directly straight to the point
but still caring
- A5 positive
constructive
could have been more direct
could have given the criticism more confidently
- A6 slightly nervous
manner not without authority
- A7 didn't seek feedback (e.g. agreement, checked for clarity)
no examples
- A8 tried to be firm about the importance of the point but without being totally negative
- A9 mixed message given: acknowledged that she was good but implied that she wasn't
condescending
- A10 lost his train of thought a bit
- A11 not clear, trying to say something simple but in a difficult way
made teacher feel uncomfortable
- A12 took too long to state his criticism
condescending
unpleasant manner
- A13 did everything in his power not to make teacher uneasy
wishy-washy
needed to get to the point
- A14 very condescending
criticism useful
annoying manner
- A15 good approach - started by praising
avoided negative language
softened criticism by modifying language
point made clearly
perhaps too hesitant
- A16 extremely condescending
patronising
why could he not have been direct?
if he was going to beat around the bush, why not ask her what she thought her weakness
was?
- A17 started by saying it was 'a little thing', then went on to say it was an integral part of
learning
language was like he couldn't have been bothered
how truthful is his criticism?
- A18 vague language
he seemed so uncommitted
hard to take him seriously
uninterested in teacher's thoughts and feelings
- A19 first he said she explained, later said she did concept check but too late
- A20 I felt as though he was giving mixed messages
he beat around the bush and I just wanted him to spit it out

- A21

he tried to criticise but was too nice and left the teacher confused
caring and tactful
but not direct enough
which would have helped make it clear
and would have been more supportive of the trainee
- A22

not totally clear
contradicted himself
- A23

tended to ramble on without coming to the point v quickly
could have elicited from the teacher if she agreed with him or if she thought there were
any problems to begin with
- A24

very tactful
pertinent to successful lessons
- A25

very affirming
nebulous
I would have accepted his advice
but wouldn't feel any urgency about correcting the problem

RATER	POSITIVE CORRESPONDENCE	NEGATIVE CORRESPONDENCE	% CORRESPONDENCE
1. JC	63	0	100%
2. DC	58	5	92%
3. MS	62	1	98%
4. JD	63	0	100%
5. BT	55	8	87%

Table A. Inter-rater validity check