



Hosting collectivity: 'We' as a person reference in interactional reflective practice in peer observation sessions[☆]

Jaume Batlle

Facultat d'Educació, Universitat de Barcelona, Passeig de la Vall d'Hebron, 171, Barcelona 08035, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 31 May 2022

Revised 18 January 2023

Accepted 20 January 2023

Available online 27 January 2023

Keywords:

Person reference

Teacher identity

Personal pronouns

Peer observation

Reflective practice

ABSTRACT

Personal pronouns are a common linguistic element in the construction of teachers' identities. Teachers often articulate their reflections through a collective personal reference, as it is in the use of the personal pronoun 'we', which emerges in the construction of the arguments that are used as the basis for reflective practice. The study presented here examines the use of 'we' as a personal pronoun to construct teacher identities in interactional reflective practice in post-observation feedback sessions. More specifically, aim to understand how teachers express their identity as a group through the use of the personal pronoun 'we'. Findings demonstrate that teachers actively identify with the group to which they belong. The reference to collectivity is established along a continuum that stretches from teachers in general to teachers of the school in question to individual practitioners as teachers of a class group. The article contributes to a better understanding of how teachers' identity is constructed in peer observation feedback interactions.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Inc.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

One of the most popular tools for teacher development in foreign language learning is peer observation (Bell, 2005; Mann & Walsh, 2013, 2017; O'Leary, 2014; O'Leary & Price, 2016; Shortland, 2004, amongst others). Defined as "peer observing each other's teaching to enhance teaching quality through reflective practice, thereby aiding professional development" (Shortland, 2004, p. 220), peer observation is a collaborative exercise grounded in mutual understanding that is predicated on an equal relationship between participants (Gosling, 2002; Kohut, Burnap & Yon, 2007). It is an effective tool for professional development in the teaching community (O'Leary & Price, 2017). In peer observation, discussion usually focuses on the strengths and weaknesses of the observed teaching action and on how the teacher's performance can be improved. The observer leads the discussion, setting out their thoughts and feelings about the actions carried out by the observee.

The discussions carried out in peer observation feedback sessions are developed with a formative aim. In that sense, their characterization are similar to post-observation feedback inter-

actions generated in training contexts. In consequence, research about these interactions is significant to understand how interactions in peer observation feedback sessions are carried out. Copland (2010) states that feedback conferences can be dispiriting for trainees if they do not affiliate with the observer's stance and accept the inherent asymmetry between observer and observee. Farr (2011) examines the interactional strategies that trainers use to give feedback to trainee teachers. Phillips (1999) emphasizes the importance of the asymmetrical relationship for the development of the interaction. Waring (2014) studies the resources that are unfolded by the mentors to generate teacher's reflections. Dobrowolska and Balslev (2017), meanwhile, analyse the discursive strategies employed by an observer during feedback in a mentoring conversation. Using the parameters of sociocultural theory, Engin (2015) explores how trainers establish scaffolding to enable observed trainees to engage in reflective practice and learn from their formative actions. Looking at the different elements involved in feedback interaction, Farr (2003) analyses interactional practices such as overlaps and interruptions in trainer-trainee interactions. However, few studies have examined peer observation feedback interactions in the context of in-service teacher training. On this topic, Batlle and Seedhouse (2020) analyse how the interactional infrastructure is developed between observers and observees after a negative assessment during peer observation feedback and find that when the observee expresses alignment with the observer's position, the observer adopts an affiliative stance through

[☆] Declaration of interests statement: The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

E-mail address: jaumbatlle@ub.edu

the use of their epistemic expertise, either putting themselves in the observee's shoes or appealing to the epistemic community to which they both belong. For their part, Topal and Yiğitoğlu Aptoula (2022) report that in-service teachers use references to their own past teaching events to mitigate a negative assessment in post-observation conferences and as a tool for doing reflection on teaching action.

The study of post-observation interaction has traditionally focused on interactional practices specific to the initial stages of teacher training (see Copland & Donaghue, 2021). However, few studies have attempted to describe the interactional settings constructed for reflective practice by in-service teachers in post-observation conferences (Topal & Yiğitoğlu Aptoula, 2022). In order to look more closely at the development of feedback interactions between in-service teachers, this study will examine how teachers construct their identities in peer observation feedback conferences through the use of the personal pronoun 'we'. Specifically, I will analyse how participants identify themselves as teachers and establish their membership of the epistemic community.

2. Person reference in interaction

A universal characteristic of interactive speech is the capacity to refer to people. All languages provide the possibility of referring to a person or a group of people in multiple ways (Sacks & Schegloff, 2007, 1979; Schegloff, 1996; Enfield & Stivers, 2007), from the use of a name that identifies the referent to allusions constructed from generic forms that may enable the speaker to "claim the non-knownness of the referent" (Whitehead & Lerner, 2020, p. 50). In interactive speech, references to people necessarily entail the verbalization of additional information about the speaker, the listener, or the relationship between them (Betz, 2015) and their categorization in a particular social group (Schegloff, 2007a). The choice of a particular element with which to recognise a particular person derives from the preference for minimization (Sacks & Schegloff, 2007 [1979]) according to which the referential expression is as short as possible. The person reference can point directly to the referent, for example when the person's name is used, or may allude to them indirectly. The choice between these alternatives is determined by the pragmatic action that the speaker is carrying out (Lerner, 1996). In other words, the communicative intention determines what element is used to refer to a particular person (Whitehead & Lerner, 2020). amongst the most common elements for referring to people are personal pronouns. Levinson (2007, pp. 32–33) points out that in English, personal pronouns specify the person, number and, in some cases, gender. For example, the first-person singular form implies self-identification and self-reference (Schegloff, 2007b). The most significant pronoun to this study however, is 'we'. Unlike the first-person singular, the first-person plural (1PP) signifies *collective* self-reference. Selection of this pronoun has implications not only in terms of action formation but also for recipient design, as the speaker aggregates the recipient to the collectivity (Lerner & Kitzinger, 2007).

In both Spanish and English, the 1PP is a pronoun form that can both include the recipient ('we' as 'I' + 'you') and exclude them ('we' as 'I' + 'other people') (Fillmore, 1997; Filimonova, 2005; De Cock, 2011). The reference to 1PP involves several actions, such as the construction of speech acts as mitigating devices that include the addressee in the action described (Haverkate, 1992; Wilson, 2019) or the reference to a given group to which both the speaker and listener belong (Lerner & Kitzinger, 2007). The group in question may be delimited by its affiliation to a particular organization or relationship or it may be purely circumstantial and delimited by the situation and the specific context in which the communicative exchange takes place. In this case, the 1PP signals a specific organization to which the speaker and

listener are affiliated. Collective self-reference is used as a device to categorize a specific form of membership and may serve as the initial referent when membership of a particular group is apparent from the context in which the interaction is produced (Kitzinger, 2005). For example, when it is restricted to a particular organization, the situated identity is associated with a specific institutional reality (Drew & Heritage, 1992). The 1PP in this collective self-reference is tied to a particular situated identity: teacher identity (Donaghue, 2020a). Consequently, the use of 'we' connects the speakers to the institutional reality they are discussing and helps to construct the teacher identity.

3. Personal pronouns and teacher identity

The construction of teacher identity has been widely studied in the field of foreign language teaching in recent years (Alsup, 2005; Block, 2007; Clarke, 2008; Barkhuizen, 2017; Gray & Morton, 2018), given its importance to teaching practice and professional development. Teacher identity determines how teachers view themselves individually and collectively (Varghese, Motha, Park, Reeves & Trent, 2016, p. 548). It is constructed in and influenced by the specific context, pedagogic strategies and educational practices in which the teachers participate (Norton, 2000; Barkhuizen, 2017; Karimi & Mofidi, 2019). The identity is constructed discursively (Gee, 2000; Varghese et al., 2005; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006), whether through personal reflections, which are usually expressed in writing, or interactionally, in a process of co-construction with other people (Clarke, 2008; Joseph, 2013; Donaghue, 2018, 2020a).

In the field of teacher training, teacher identity is constructed through reflections that combine specific linguistic and discursive elements (e.g. Johnson, 2006; Riordan, 2018; Farr, Farrell & Riordan, 2019), most notably personal pronouns. These elements are used in reflective practice to share experiences, thoughts and opinions pertaining to the context in which the reflection is done (Farr, Farrell & Riordan, 2019, p. 103).

One of the most widely studied personal pronouns in this area is the 1PP pronoun. For example, Irwin and Boulton (2010), in their study of blog-based reflective practice, observe that trainee teachers initially use the 1PP to self-identify as *trainees* but that once they have completed several months of training they use the pronoun more frequently and self-identify as *teaching professionals*. Waring (2017), in mentor-teachers post-observation interaction, identifies the use of the 1PP as *going general*, that is, as a resource to depersonalize the advice (see also Phillips, 1999) and secure "teacher alignment with the mentor's critique" (p. 30). Donaghue (2020a) suggests that the change from first-person singular to 1PP implies identifying the speakers as representatives of a particular institutional context, while Riordan (2018), in a corpus linguistics analysis of trainee teacher identity, observes that 'we' is more frequently used in interactional reflection than in written reflections and is generally more common than the first-person singular and second-person forms.

The 1PP is very common in peer observation feedback (Farr, 2005; Farr et al., 2019) and the pronoun is widely used in reflections derived from peer observation, although it is far less common than the first- and second-person singular forms. Kim and Silver (2016), for example, observe that the use of 1PP by observees in mentor-teacher interaction is not an affiliative device but rather an act of defence against the potential face threat of negative assessment. Trent and Lim (2010) observe that the 1PP pronoun is used by teachers as a means of speaking on behalf of the teaching community as a whole, while Wernicke (2020) finds that 'we' also entails "a re-positioning of [the teacher's] identity in terms of authority and responsibility" (p. 52).

Farr et al. (2019) report that 1PP is more commonly used by trainee teachers with a degree of experience than by those with

no experience, such that trainees with experiences demonstrate a stronger sense of belonging to the teaching community. In general, trainee teachers use the 1PP pronoun to identify themselves as students, trainee teachers, teachers or simply a group of people in the broad sense. According to [Farr et al. \(2019, p. 104\)](#), as a general rule this pronoun form signals joint initiative, activity and organization, as well as transmitting the notion of a community of practice and membership of the group. [Farr et al. \(2019\)](#) identify four different references for this pronoun when it is used in conjunction with the verb “to be”: ‘we’ as humans in general, ‘we’ as Irish (the participants’ nationality), ‘we’ as members of the teaching community and ‘we’ as experts in applied linguistics or teacher training. Whereas the first three forms are inclusive, that is, the speaker uses them to include the listener in the community in question, the fourth form is ‘exclusive’ since the speaker is identifying themselves as a member of an expert group to which the listener is not affiliated. Similarly, [Farr \(2005\)](#) observes that tutors use ‘we’ primarily to identify themselves and tutees as members of the population as a whole, as participants in the feedback action itself, as members of the community of EFL teachers or as members of Irish society, to refer to the tutee alongside the students with which the observed practice was carried out, or to identify them as a member of the trainee teacher community. In addition, the tutor also uses the 1PP to self-identify as a member of the teacher training community.

[Vaughan \(2010\)](#) used a corpus linguistics approach to analyse the creation of language teacher identities within a community of practice, identifying five different uses of ‘we’, listed here from most to least frequent: as members of the institution where they work, as members of a specific professional group, as participants in the reflective practice activity they are carrying out, and as members of the community of teaching professionals. Vaughan observes that these identities are negotiated in interaction in such a way that participants use personal pronouns to construct participation frameworks (see [Goffman, 1979](#)) in order to mitigate possible face threat.

Studies that focus on the values of the 1PP in constructing teacher identities have generally analysed tutor-tutee interactions in the area of teacher training or interactions between in-service teachers who make up a specific community of practice. The most common methodological approach to analyse the use of personal pronouns in the construction of teacher identities is corpus linguistics (e.g. [Vaughan, 2010](#); [Riordan, 2018](#); [Farr et al., 2019](#)). However, until now there has been no attempt to examine the values of the pronoun ‘we’ in the construction of teacher identities in class observation by in-service teachers and the post-observation feedback interactions used for reflective practice in this context. This study reveals how teachers use ‘we’ to construct their identities in peer observation feedback and seeks the understanding of the teacher identities themselves and the way in which post-observational feedback interactions help teachers to build these identities through reflective practice.

4. Data and method

The corpus used for this study contains 30 video-recorded feedback interactions with a total duration of 15 h and 19 min (with an average of 30 min per meeting), recorded in the framework of a peer observation training activity carried out between in-service teachers at a Spanish as a foreign language (SFL) school in Barcelona (Spain) in February and March 2017 and February and March 2018. The activity was designed by the school’s head of studies as part of an in-house training programme. Eight teachers (six women and two men, aged between 28 and 48) took part, working in four pairs. Seven of the teachers hold master’s degrees and all of them have completed specific SFL teacher training. All of

the teachers had prior experience of peer observation through in-house training at the school in previous years. In addition, some of the participants have tutored master’s degree placements for SFL teaching students. Professional and personal relationships amongst the group were excellent. The researcher did not participate in the design or the implementation of the training. All research was conducted in accordance with the guidelines on ethical practice established at their home university. All teachers took part voluntarily after signing the corresponding informed consent form. Transcriptions are encoded to protect the participants’ privacy.

The study focuses on the value of post-observation feedback as a developmental strategy ([Copland & Donaghue, 2019](#), pp. 403–405) to establish a process of reflective practice. The feedback itself can be classed as collaborative ([Farr, 2011](#)), since, although there is an interactional asymmetry regarding, for example, questioning and answering ([Battle & Seedhouse, 2020](#)), the observer and the oversee are in a symmetrical relationship: both are teachers at the school and each teacher worked as observer and observee during the in-house training. The peer observation procedure was carried out as follows: i) All of the participants met to discuss the focus of the observation; ii) The observation groups decided which classes would be observed, with each teacher observing their colleague on two occasions. Observations would not focus on any aspect in particular, instead aiming to acquire a general impression of each participant’s teaching practice, although in some cases the pairs agreed to determine a more specific focus after the first observation; iii) After each observation, the pairs shared their recordings and notes using the Video Enhanced Observation (VEO) software ([Seedhouse, 2021](#)); iv) Finally, all of the teachers held a meeting to discuss the outcomes of the different observations and what reflections could be transferred to future training activities.

No specific procedure was defined for giving feedback; each pair carried out this part of the activity according to their own criteria. No questions were prepared in advance and the content of the feedback was not planned, so no specific structure (for example, the ‘sandwich approach’) was employed. Participants were not instructed to reflect on their performance as observees before receiving feedback from the observer. As a result, the observer did not necessarily know the observee’s impression of the activity before the feedback discussion: in two of the pairs, feedback began with the observer asking the observee how they felt about the observed practice; in the other two, this pattern was not followed.

Since discourse – understood as the combination of language use with thoughts, beliefs and values – can be used to establish speakers’ membership of a particular social group ([Gee, 2014](#)), the analysis offered here will follow a qualitative-descriptive methodology to examine in detail how teachers use the 1PP for self-categorization. First, I selected those cases in which participants used the 1PP pronoun and then I analysed what refers to the inherent teacher identity in the specific interactional context. Discussions were transcribed according to the Jefferson system ([Jefferson, 2004](#), see appendix).

5. Analysis

An initial review of the 1PP pronoun in the recorded interactions identified four uses: (1) ‘we’ as members of the teaching community as a whole, (2) ‘we’ as members of the institution (language school), (3) ‘we’ as members of the class group, that is, a reference that includes both the teacher and his/her students, and (4) ‘we’ as participants in the post-observation activity.

The 1PP pronoun was used a total of 339 times in the recorded interactions. The table below shows the distribution across the four identities it was used to establish ([Table 1](#)).

As seen, the distribution is highly uneven. The most frequent use ($n = 121$) was pseudo-inclusive ([Haverkate, 1992](#);

Table 1
Distribution of cases of 'we' for each type of teacher identity.

Identities established by the use of 'we'	cases
Members of the teaching community as a whole	110
Members of the institution	28
Members of the class group	121
Participants in the post-observation activity	80
TOTAL	339

Wilson, 2019), that is, the use of the 1PP that includes the speaker with more people, but not the addressee, who is not involved in the action, establishing a discursive reality in the form of direct discourse, as will be discussed. The second most frequent use ($n = 110$) was to denote membership of the teaching community as a whole, while the third was to self-identify as a participant in the post-observation activity ($n = 80$). Finally, in some cases ($n = 28$) the teachers alluded to the reality of their specific educational context and identify explicitly as members of their institution. These values are closely related to the activity in which the interaction takes place. The teachers establish and situate themselves in participation frameworks (Goffman, 1979; Vaughan, 2010) that are then used as the basis for critical reflection. As such, the situation in which the reflective practice is established informs the use of the 1PP to construct the teachers' identities, although it should be noted that the most common allusion is to membership of the group most closely related to the reality under observation. Moreover, I have to note that, for 1PP as participants in the post-observation activity, the implicit allusion to collectivity does not concern a specific teacher identity but rather the people participating in the post-observation feedback. For that reason, I do not focus on these cases in this article.

As seen below, in a detailed analysis of each of the identities established with the use of the 1PP pronoun, the 'we' that identifies the observee with the teaching community as a whole is very closely linked to the reflective practice they are carrying out and to the specific reality of classroom observation. As such, the activity that provides the basis for the reflective practice has a direct bearing on the conceptualization of the teachers' identities.

5.1. 'We' as members of the teaching community as a whole

The conceptualization of the 1PP pronoun as a reference to membership of the teaching community as a whole entails a degree of abstraction that establishes a distance between the observee and the specific classroom reality, indicating that the reflective practice activity elicits consideration of common actions or conceptualizations that encompass a wider community of practice. For example, in the following extract, FRA, the observer, and ALB, the observee, are discussing the use of the students' mother tongue in the classroom as a means of explaining aspects of Spanish grammar. Specifically, they are reflecting on a didactic action that FRA carried out to help the students distinguish between adjectives and adverbs. This prompts the observee to consider that on many occasions teachers overlook the fact that students do not have sufficient understanding of the grammatical features of their own language to be able to conduct the metalinguistic reflections they are tasked with in a Spanish class.

Extract (1) F-A_1_9/03/2017_1

1. ALB: ayer me pareció un buen ejemplo (.) de
yesterday I thought it was a good
example of
2. de::: eso [de-
that of
3. FRA: [era una cosa de:: (0.4) ^oeran:^o=
it was about... they were

4. ALB: =eran [sobre los adjetivos y adverbios
they were about adjectives and adverbs
5. FRA: [adjetivos (.) las diferencias entre
adjetivos y
adjectives, the differences between
adjectives and
6. adverbios
adverbs
7. ALB: sí
yes
8. FRA: yo ↑tengo la sensación (.) la- muchas
veces (.) con muchos
I have the feeling, a lot of times, with a
lot of
9. estudiantes que nosotros los profesores a
veces (0.5)
students that we as teachers sometimes
10. partimos de que los estudiantes tienen
unos conocimientos
assume that students have knowledge of
11. gramaticales o sa:ben identificar (0.4)
cuestiones
grammar or are able to identify questions
12. gramaticales que en muchos casos no lo
saben
of grammar that in many cases they don't
know
13. ALB: mhm
14. FRA: pero no lo saben ni en su lengua
but they don't even know it in their own
language

In the above case, FRA refers to teachers with the pronoun 'we'. It is specifically used to denote that both FRA and ALB belong to this group. Here, the allusion to the teaching community is generalized by the fact that it is situated in a characteristic reality of teaching practice: asking students to engage in metalinguistic reflection. However, what is being generalized is in fact a more specific conceptualization, that of the SFL teacher, since it concerns a comparison between the grammar of the students' mother tongues and grammatical forms in Spanish. Consequently, the teacher identity that is generalized is determined by the observational context in which the generalization is produced: the teachers identify themselves as SFL teachers and not as teachers in the broader sense.

Because the activity is based on a specific, observed classroom reality and the reflective practice derives from didactic actions carried out in this particular context, the speakers self-identify within a common participation framework (Goffman, 1979; Vaughan, 2010). Of the possible identities the teachers can establish for themselves, the generalization that emerges in post-observation reflection is that of the foreign language teacher, despite the fact that some references are made to methodologies and classroom dynamics that are also found in other areas of teaching. This is the most general participation framework the teachers allude to in self-identifying as a community.

The generalizations are necessarily linked to this common participation framework and, by extension, to the teacher identity that corresponds to the specific context in which the observation was carried out. This can also be seen in extract (2), where the 1PP is used to denote collectivity in an affiliative response following a negative assessment (Batlle & Seedhouse, 2020). MIR, the observer, is reflecting on a problem encountered in the observed teaching practice: SIL had a problem planning the duration of the learning activities and was unable to complete all of the activities they had envisaged for the class. Following the negative assessment, MIR de-

clares this to be a common problem that is often encountered by all teachers.

Extract (2) M_S_1_27/03/2017_1

1. MIR: como cosas a mejorar (0.8) yo diría que
no (.) yo diría que
like things to improve, I don't think so.
I'd say because of
2. por falta de tiempo y porque tú te habías
preparado otras
a lack of time and because you had prepared
other
3. cosas e hiciste- esto nos pasa a todos
things and did those. That happens to all
of us
4. en las clases normales >o sea< (0.4) te
preparas una cosa y
in normal lessons, that is, you prepare
something and
5. haces ↓menos
do less
6. SIL: mhm

The affiliative stance adopted by the observer is established with a mitigating allusion to collectivity that minimises the potential face threat of the negative assessment. This is achieved by establishing a generalization of teaching practice (Waring, 2017) in which the observee is included. The observer constructs the affiliative speech act by implicitly acknowledging the observee as a member of the teaching community as a whole. The reference to “a todos” (line 3) implies that all teachers have experienced a situation like the one that has been negatively assessed; in using the 1PP, the speaker explicitly includes themselves in the group to which they belong. Here, the speaker aligns themselves with the teacher identity, implying that the 1PP should be understood as a reference to membership of the teaching community as a whole. With *going general* (Waring, 2017), they allude to the reality of their teaching profession – planning class sessions – and to a common problem that the teachers have encountered in their normal lessons (line 4), that is, as lessons perceived as general regarding to the planning of their SFL teaching. In this case, then, the allusion to collectivity is intended to aggregate the observee to the teaching community by presenting a problem that has been negatively assessed as common to the teachers.

5.2. 'We' as members of the institution

The use of the 1PP for collective self-identification also operates at the level of the institutional context in which the class observation took place: that is, in the language school that employs the participants in the post-observation feedback. In these cases, the 1PP does not signify a reference to the teaching community as a whole as an explicit relationship is established between the pronoun and the specific institutional context. This can be seen in extract (3), where ALB, the observer, is discussing the fact that FRA, the observee, did not state the learning objectives of the class at the beginning of the session. ALB makes the suggestion “quizás ha mencionado en la clase anterior” (lines 4–5) as a possible justification for FRA's oversight in failing to mention the class objectives for that day. However, FRA replies that this was not the case (line 6), which corroborates the negative assessment as the class session in question was with a group shared with another teacher (line 11), making it important to specify the objectives so that the students understand why and with what intention the particular didactic actions are proposed.

Extract (3) F-A_1_9/03/2017_1

1. ALB: no se hace referencia a los objetivos ni
de forma escrita ni
there's no reference to the objectives in
writing
2. de forma ora:l
or orally
3. FRA: ^oexacto^o=
exactly
4. ALB: =↑pero he comentado (.) quizás ha
mencionado en la
but I've mentioned it, perhaps you mentioned
it in the
5. clase anterior va[le
previous class, ok
6. FRA: [mhm no fue el caso
that wasn't the case
7. ALB: vale veníais de otra clase habíais
estado trabajando con el
ok, you came from another class, you've been
working on the
8. mismo ↑tema
same topic
9. FRA: no fue el caso
that wasn't the case
10. ALB: vale
ok
11. FRA: aparte este grupo es un grupo que está
compartido o sea que
and this group is a group that is shared,
so
12. no solo lo hago yo (0.5) con lo cual
realmente este tema
I don't just do it myself, so really this
topic
13. todavía es más importante o sea esta la
idea de compartir
is even more important, that is, the idea of
sharing
14. entre los profes que lo hacen (.) qué se
está haciendo (.)
between the teachers that do it, what's
being done
15. cuáles son los objetivos por qué y para
qué porque
what the objectives are, why and to what
end, because
16. no es un grupo de un solo profe
it's not just one teacher's group
17. ALB: vale
ok
18. FRA: o sea () tienes razón (.) y es verdad
es algo que::
so () you're right and it's true that it's
something that
19. ALB: mhm (0.5) ^ovale^o=
ok
20. FRA: =a pesar de que lo tenemos ahí escrito
despite what we have written there
21. ALB: sí (.) no no y: a veces se nos olvida y
hay días
yes, no no and sometimes we forget and there
are days
22. que no es tan claro quizá: el objetivo::
when it's not so clear perhaps the
objective

In the above case, the 1PP alludes to collectivity by identifying the teacher as a member of the institution. Although only the participants in the observation activity are explicitly situated in the classroom, FRA's reflection alludes to the whole community of teachers at the school, where groups are shared between more than one teacher (lines 13–14) and the objectives for each class session must therefore be clearly stated in the corresponding space on the board. FRA's reference to 'we' (line 20) alludes to the fact that all of the school's whiteboards display the word 'objectives',¹ so all of the boards in the classrooms the participants work in provide a space for specifying the learning objectives of each class session. Thus, the 1PP pronoun identifies the participants as members of the institution by referring to a specific classroom reality in which the classroom observation was carried out. As such, FRA's reflection establishes a participation framework that not only involves the immediate participants in the interactional context but can also be extended to the school's entire body of teachers, as explicitly stating the class objectives is a task required of all teachers responsible for shared class groups. In the same line, ALB's use of 1PP (line 21) operates as *going general* (Waring, 2017). With the reference to a past experience (Topal & Yiğitoğlu Aptoula, 2022), ALB identifies the participants as members of the school. Generalisations are constructed to soften the blow of the negative assessment. The focus of the criticism is therefore shifted from the specific action assessed in the feedback conversation to an action that is common to all of the teaching staff at the school. The action was not performed by the observee, who strayed from the general practice. Consequently, the use of 1PP reassociates him with the group of teachers at the institution despite this faulty practice.

The sharing of class groups between more than one teacher is also the focus of the reflection transcribed in extract (4). In this case, ROG is the observer assessing the class given by JUL. ROG addresses the fact that JUL set the students a series of activities they had already completed in another group (details not shown), which the observer deems problematic, despite stating that they do not intended to categorise it "*ni como bueno ni como malo*" (line 1).

Extract (4) R_J_1_15/02/2017_1

1. ROG: *yo no lo pongo ni como bueno ni como malo fíjate o sea:* (0.8)

I don't see it as either good or bad you know

2. *decidí y tal- simplemente para pensar esta situación (.) si-*

I decided just to think about this situation if

3. *cómo podemos (0.5) hacer o como podemos ↓tal (0.5) porque*

how we can do or how we can whatever, because

4. *también es algo que no me corresponde solo para mí como*

it's something that isn't just my responsibility as

5. *profesor sino que es algo que tiene que ver con el hecho de*

a teacher but is also to do with the fact that

6. *que la clase sea (.) (.) los profesores a veces compartimos*

the class is (.) as teachers sometimes we share

¹ This information was observed during data collection by the author of the study.

7. *materiales (.) usamos diferentes cosas (1.4) y:: yo creo que*

materials, we use different things and I think that

8. *entre todos tenemos que ir ideando sistemas para que esto no:*

between all of us we have to think up systems so that this

9. *no pase no?*

doesn't happen, right?

This particular classroom reality warrants reflection, since it is a common problem for staff at the school and should therefore be taken into account in class planning. Here, the 1PP signifies collectivity in the form of membership of the institution through a reflection that focuses on a reality shared by all of the teachers at the school. ROG first alludes to this by arguing that they are not solely responsible for solving the problems derived from shared class groups between teachers (line 4), such as the specific problem referred to in which two teachers have set the same activities in class. ROG explains that the teachers share materials (lines 6–7). The reference to teachers could be understood as an allusion to teachers in the broadest sense, because, for example, they share materials online. However, we must understand it as an allusion to the teaching staff at the school, since the focus is on the need for "systems" (line 8) to regulate the sharing of materials so that class groups shared between two teachers are not set the same activities twice.

As we can see, the use of the 1PP to identify with the other teaching staff at the school is linked to reflections that are constructed to justify specific problems arising in the observed classroom practice. The 1PP is used in allusion to a specific community with shared problems that are particular to the educational context in which they work. Unlike the use of the 1PP to refer to the teaching community as a whole, the specific class situations considered here cannot be extrapolated to the wider community of foreign language teachers. We are dealing, then, with the same pattern: the allusion to collectivity in post-observation reflective practice is used as a justification in response to negative assessment carried out by both observers and observees, but in reference to a reality situated on a continuum from general to specific.

5.3. 'We' as members of the class group

The reflective practice carried out in the post-observation feedback contains another use of the 1PP that is different to the allusion to collectivity as a justification in response to negative assessment. The 1PP pronoun can also signify that teachers are seeking to identify themselves with a particular figure of the teacher as a member of a community of practice. In this conceptualization, the teacher is a member of the class group together with their students. This can be seen when the 1PP is used to reproduce classroom discourse, where the action students are asked to carry out is collectivized (Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990). The pseudo-inclusive use of the 1PP (Haverkate, 1992), reflects the teacher's desire to modulate their classroom instructions, similar to the use of 'we' as a defocalising strategy. By adopting this stance, teachers situate themselves within the social group that has asked to complete the learning activity. In post-observation feedback, both the observer and the observee reproduce the discursive reality of the classroom, repeating the instructional discourse that is constructed with the class group. As a result, the interactions studied here contain several examples in which the 1PP is used to reproduce what is discussed in class: the teacher identity implicit in this use of the 1PP is therefore aggregated to the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

This is the case observed in extract (5). The observer, MIR, is reflecting on the teaching practice of the observee, SIL. In this reflection, they refer to the fact that the teacher asks students to match a series of verbs to a series of nouns in order to form prototypical Spanish collocations. MIR considers that SIL should have introduced the activity differently, by asking students to think about what collocations are and whether they exist in the students' mother tongues or in English, a language in which all of the class is fluent.

Extract (5) M_S_2_31/03/2017_3 0'00''-0'30''

1. MIR: pero (.) allí es verdad que te flaqueó mucho esa: esa::=
but there it's true that you were much weaker in that
2. SIL: =⁰↑sí::⁰
yes
3. MIR: esa ↑actividad (0.5) primero porque tú empiezas &bueno vamos
that activity, first because you start well, let's see
4. a ver unas colocaciones porque es un verbo en sustantivo po-£
to see some collocations because it's a noun form of a verb
5. tú ↓sola (3.0) e:h (1.0) &qué es una colocación (.) ↑existe
you alone, 'what is a collocation? are there
6. alguna en ↑inglés a ver decidme una (.) o: y en tu
any in English, let's see, tell me one or, and in your
7. lengua también existe y:: vale (.) vamos a ↑ve:r y ↑pensáis
language does it exist too and, ok, let's see and think
8. si en tu idioma se hace con el mismo verbo
whether in your language it's constructed with the same verb
9. o diferente
or another one

MIR configures their proposal by reproducing how they believe the instructions for the activity should have been given, changing their tone with a smiley voice twice (lines 3–4 and lines 5–8) to illustrate what they consider SIL should have said in explaining the activity to the class. Smiley voice is produced in reported speech to emphasize the negative assessment (Clift, 2013). In both cases, the 1PP is used pseudo-inclusively, which is a characteristic device in pedagogic discourse (Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990). Here, the inherent allusion to collectivity in the use of the 1PP does not signal the speakers as holders of a specific teacher identity, whether as members of the teaching community as a whole or as members of the institution; it merely serves to reproduce the instructional discourse of the observational context. However, through the use of the 1PP, MIR is establishing the classroom as a common context in the construction of their participation framework.

The fact that the pseudo-inclusive 1PP in reference to teaching discourse is the most common use observed in the feedback conversations examined has to do with the nature of the reflective practice. Participants reproduce the words that the teacher uses for classroom management in a reflection-on-action (Dewey, 1933; Hatton & Smith, 1995). The replication of what the teacher says helps the observer and the observee to exemplify the reality of what is being assessed and underpins the arguments with which the assessment is carried out. Consequently, teacher identity as a

member of a community of practice is performed to sustain the arguments with which reflective practice is accomplished. The basis for the reflections of observers and observees alike is a particular form of teaching practice that informs their construction of the post-observation interaction. In other words, the interaction that is constructed in post-observation reflective practice is a situated practice determined by the nature of the observed activity itself.

6. Discussion and conclusions

In the feedback interactions deriving from the peer observation activity examined for this study, the participating teachers used the 1PP in allusion to different forms of collectivity. As also observed in Donaghue (2020a), in the interactions that form the basis of the reflective practice described above, the teachers use the 1PP to self-identify as representatives of a particular institutional context. On the one hand, then, the 1PP pronoun is an allusion to the identity of teachers in the general sense. However, the generalization of teacher identity built by the participants in the reflective practice activity is conditioned by their specific area of teaching and the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991) with which they affiliate. As foreign language teachers assessing teaching practice in this specific area, their generalization of teacher identity is necessarily situated within these parameters. In other words, the participation framework (Goffman, 1979; Vaughan, 2010) determines the way in which the participants in interactional reflective practice construct their identity. Similarly, though to a lesser extent, the teachers identify themselves as members of a more specific group: the body of teachers at the language school where they are employed. Since the focus is placed on a specific teaching practice carried out in a particular didactic context, in which both the observer and observee are situated, the teacher identity that emerges in the post-observation feedback interactions is closely tied to the teachers' daily activities, encompassing regular teaching practices that are common to all of the school's staff. However, because the reflective practice is generated by feedback from in-service teachers in the framework of a peer observation activity, the interaction is collaborative (Gosling, 2002; Kohut, Burnap & Yon, 2007). In my data, the teachers are not found to use the 1PP to reposition their identity in terms of authority and responsibility, in contrast to Wernicke (2020), who observes that the teachers take an authoritative position by using 1PP. This is significant for the construction of the reflective practice, because the assessments and justifications that provide the framework of the interaction refer to a specific reality that is shared by the participants. Again, we see how the participation framework informs the construction of the interaction and, by extension, the construction of the teacher identity in reflective practice.

In the interactions considered for this study, the 1PP is also used in allusion to a more specific teacher identity: teachers in action. The 1PP appears in reflective practice when the participants refer to the discursive reality of their classes. This pseudo-inclusive use is characteristic of teaching discourse (Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990; Haverkate, 1992) and can be seen in my post-observation interaction transcriptions when the participants reproduce the discourse generated in the teaching action that they are assessing. This teacher identity is specific to the classroom: the starting point for the reflective practice is the teaching action itself (Dewey, 1933; Hatton & Smith, 1995), so participants self-identify as teachers when they are recalling the teaching actions on which their reflections are based. The collectivity implied by the use of the 1PP is not only linked to the participants' construction of their teacher identities; during reflective practice, the 1PP is also used in allusion to the reality of the interactional context itself. In other words, the participants self-identify as participants in the post-

observation feedback exercise, referring to the pairing of observer and observee.

Studies analysing the use of the 1PP in post-observation interaction have tended to focus on interactional reflective practices between tutors and tutees. My study, which deals with interactional reflective practices between in-service language teachers, offers similar results but also some differences. For example, as in other studies with the same focus (Farr, 2005; Vaughan, 2010; Farr et al. 2019), in-service teachers are found to use the 1PP to situate themselves in a particular community of practice and to denote their membership of a specific group: SFL teachers at their home language school. The 1PP is also used to identify with participation in the feedback action (Farr, 2005) and to denote membership of the institution at which the participants work (Vaughan, 2010) or of the community of teaching professionals as a whole (Vaughan, 2010). However, there is no evidence of self-identification as experts in applied linguistics or as holders of a particular nationality (Farr et al., 2019). When doing reflective practice in peer observation feedback, in-service teachers identify themselves as practitioners. Their compelling arguments are based in a reflection-on-action more than in theories related with their practice. When teachers are practitioners, they link their reflections with their classroom reality. Teachers, then, are understanding their own reality, in contrast to a big amount of research in the field of applied linguistics (Sato & Loewen, 2022). The researcher-practitioner divide (De Costa, Gajasinghe, Ojha & Rabie-Ahmed, 2022) is established because researchers and practitioners do not work together and do not link their work. However, as De Costa et al. (2022) state, all of them may explore their own work in collaboration in similar actions that teachers carried out in a peer observation feedback. Consequently, how interactional reflective practice is established in peer observation feedback can work as an example of how researchers and practitioners develop their collaborations. Moreover, because the interactional reflective practice is developed within a peer observation feedback as a continuing professional development program (Shortland, 2004), theory in applied linguistics is not as present as it is interactional reflective practice carried out with pre-service teachers in their initial professional development. Within these parameters, it is interesting to note that the pseudo-inclusive value of the 1PP (Haverkate, 1992) is recorded more frequently in this study than other uses of the pronoun. This can be explained by the participation framework in which the interactions leading to the reflective practice are based. Post-observation feedback between in-service teachers entails assessing specific teaching action and therefore generates much more referred discourse than other types of reflective practice that are more concerned with constructing abstract reflections from theoretical parameters and less focused on what is said in the classroom.

The use of the 1PP to construct teacher identity in reflective practice interactions deriving from peer observation between in-service language teachers reflects a complex reality (Donaghue, 2018, 2020a, 2020b). As such, the nature of the feedback, which is based on the construction of appraisals and assessments of a specific teaching action carried out in a particular didactic context, informs the teacher identity that emerges in interactional reflective practice. In other words, the sense of collectivity implicit in the use of the 1PP is shaped by interactional practice. The influence of the interactional context also accounts for the predominance of a pseudo-inclusive use of the 1PP (Haverkate, 1992; Wilson, 2019). Since the focus of the observation is reflection-on-action (Dewey, 1933; Hatton & Smith, 1995), the reality of this action can be extrapolated by reproducing the teaching discourse use in class. The 1PP form, which is characteristic of teaching discourse (Kitagawa & Lehrer, 1990), is observed precisely because the reflective practice is based on an observable reality.

As in Vaughan (2010), I observe uses of the 1PP that can initially appear ambiguous, since the person reference in each statement may correspond to one or another collective. However, the qualitative analysis carried out here has enabled us to examine the use of the 1PP in context, observing the values attached to the pronoun according to the reflective actions in which it appears. Unlike other studies that have taken a more quantitative approach to the 1PP pronoun, using the tools of disciplines like corpus linguistics, this study has examined the emergence and use of the 1PP in specific interactional contexts that form the basis of reflective practice. Thanks to this qualitative approach, it has been possible to determine that the predominant use of the 1PP in reflective practice generated from in-service teacher classroom observation is linked to mitigation or justification, as occurs in ordinary interaction (Stivers, 2007) and instructional interactions (Wilson, 2019) or depersonalization to secure alignment with the critique in mentor-teacher interactions (Phillips, 1999; Waring, 2017). The 1PP is not simply a recognitional form, it in fact underpins a communicative intention specific to reflective practice derived from peer observation: the desire to justify the observed actions or the corresponding assessments. Although negative assessments may be acknowledged and accepted by the participants, in line with the findings of Copland (2011), Kim and Silver (2016) and Donaghue (2018), here we found that the allusion to collectivity is a device for mitigating criticism and limiting the potential face threat to the observee (Waring, 2017), similar to the technique of alluding to past experiences (Topal & Yiğitoğlu Aptoula, 2022).

As interest in the study of interactional reflective practice grows (Mann & Walsh, 2013, 2017; Walsh & Mann, 2015), it is important to fully understand how the process is configured and what distinguishes it from other forms of formative reflection such as written appraisals, portfolios or teacher diaries. The study of the 1PP in interactions arising from post-observation feedback between in-service foreign language teachers has shown that the participation framework of interactional reflective practice is far more immediate to the participants' teaching reality than the frameworks established in written reflective practice (Riordan, 2018), which are further removed from the teaching action and place less focus on specific aspects of the teachers' performance. As such, the study illustrates how interactional reflective practice in post-observation feedback sessions addresses the reality of the participants' teaching practice in greater detail and with less theoretical focus than written reflections. The fact that the 1PP pronoun is used pseudo-inclusively in allusion to the participants' identity as members of the school's teaching staff (which is significant in constructing justifications to mitigate negative assessments) and that the form is not used by any of the participants to self-identify as specialists in the theoretical aspects of applied linguistics situates this form of interactional reflective practice closer to the classroom reality, to the participation framework in which the teachers act.

It should also be highlighted that the reflective practice was carried out in a framework of post-observation feedback conversations between in-service teachers. Its focus on the specific realities of the classroom rather than considerations of a more theoretical nature may also reflect the fact that the reflective practice was carried out not in the initial phase of the participants' training (Farrell, 2012) but in the context of later professional development. The teachers establish a participation framework in which the 1PP signifies the particular classroom reality and professional context, articulating reflection on their day-to-day experiences. In this sense, we might assume that interactional reflective practice with a more theoretical focus is more suited to initial training (Farr et al., 2019), in which it is important for students to understand the reasons behind what is happening in the classroom.

My analysis of the 1PP form has shed light on the parameters of post-observation interactional feedback between in-service

language teachers. Examination of the transcriptions has led to a better understanding of how the 1PP is conceptualized, providing valuable insight into how in-service teachers construct their teacher identities in post-observation reflective practice. The extensive use of the 1PP in reference to the participants' classroom reality underlines the significance of this type of training activity: post-observation feedback gives in-service teachers the chance to reflect on their teaching performance in a process through which they configure their teacher identity, giving continuity to professional development grounded in reflection-on-practice. Through an analysis of the use of the 1PP, this study demonstrates the suitability of a specific type of formative practice for teacher professional development.

Data Availability

The data that has been used is confidential.

Appendix

Transcription conventions

↑	Shift to high pitch on next syllable
?	Rising intonation on previous syllable
.	Falling intonation on previous syllable
=	Latching
.hh	In breath
hh	Audible aspiration (e.g., exhale, laughter token). The more 'h's the longer the aspiration.
[Top begin overlap
]	Top end overlap (when relevant)
[Bottom begin overlap
]	Bottom end overlap (when relevant)
<word>	Slower than surrounding talk
°word°	Softer than surrounding talk
<u>word</u>	Emphasized talk
£word£	Smiley voice
wo-	Cut-off
: (:::)	Stretching of previous sound (the more colons, the longer the stretching)
(0.2)	Length of pauses in seconds
(.)	Micropause (less than 0.2 s)
(word)	Uncertain transcription
*	Time when the nonverbal action happens

References

- Alsop, J. (2005). *Teacher identity discourses. Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Routledge.
- Barkhuizen, G. (2017). *Reflections on language teacher identity research*. Routledge.
- Battle, J., & Seedhouse, P. (2020). Affiliation and negative assessments in peer observation feedback for foreign language teachers professional development. *Applied Linguistics Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2020-0001>.
- Bell, M. (2005). Peer observation partnerships in higher education. Higher education research and development society of Australasia.
- Betz, E. (2015). Recipient design in reference choice: Negotiating knowledge, access, and sequential trajectories. *Gesprächsforschung – Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 16, 137–173.
- Block, D. (2007). *Second language identities*. Continuum.
- Clarke, M. (2008). *Language teacher identities. Co-constructing discourse and community*. Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781847690838>.
- Clift, R. (2013). No laughing matter: Laughter and resistance in the construction of identity. In P. Glenn, & E. Holt (Eds.), *Studies of laughter in interaction* (pp. 223–236). Bloomsbury.
- Copland, F. (2010). Causes of tension in post-observation feedback in pre-service teacher training: An alternative view. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 466–472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.06.001>.
- Copland, F. (2011). Negotiating face in feedback conferences: A linguistic ethnographic analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43, 3832–3843. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.09.014>.
- Copland, F., & Donahue, H. (2019). *The Routledge handbook of english language teacher education. In Post observation feedback* (pp. 402–416). Routledge. S. Mann, & S. Walsh (Eds.).
- Copland, F., & Donahue, H. (2021). *Analysing discourses in teacher observation feedback conferences*. Routledge.
- De Cock, B. (2011). Why we can be you: The use of 1st person plural forms with hearer reference in English and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 43(11), 2762–2775. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.009>.
- De Costa, P. I., Gajasinghe, K., Ojha, L. P., & Rabie-Ahmed, A. (2022). Bridging the researcher-practitioner divide through community-engaged action research: A collaborative autoethnographic exploration. *The Modern Language Journal*, 106(3), 547–563. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12796>.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think. A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Heath and Company.
- Dobrowolska, D., & Balslev, B. (2017). Discursive mentoring strategies and interactional dynamics in teacher education. *Linguistics and Education*, 42, 10–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2017.09.001>.
- Donahue, H. (2018). Relational work and identity negotiation in critical post observation teacher feedback. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 135, 101–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2018.08.002>.
- Donahue, H. (2020a). Feedback talk as means of creating, ratifying and normalising an institutionally valued teacher identity. *Journal of Language Identity & Education*, 19(6), 395–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2019.1696683>.
- Donahue, H. (2020b). Teachers and supervisors negotiating identities of experience and power in feedback talk. *The Modern Language Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12633>.
- Drew, P., & Heritage, J. (1992). *Talk at work. interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Engin, M. (2015). Trainer talk in post-observation feedback sessions: An exploration of scaffolding. *Classroom Discourse*, 6, 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19463014.2014.919867>.
- Enfield, N. J., & Stivers, T. (2007). *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural, and social perspectives*. Cambridge University Press.
- Farr, F. (2003). Engaged listenership in spoken academic discourse: The case of student-tutor meetings. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 67–85. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585\(02\)00035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1475-1585(02)00035-8).
- Farr, F. (2005). Relational strategies in the discourse of professional performance review in an Irish academic environment: The case of language teacher education. In *The pragmatics of Irish English* (pp. 203–234). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Farr, F. (2011). *The discourse of teaching practice feedback*. Routledge.
- Farr, F., Farrell, A., & Riordan, E. (2019). *Social interaction in language teacher education*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Farrell, T. S. (2012). Novice-service language teacher development: Bridging the gap between preservice and in-service education and development. *TESOL Quarterly*, 46(3), 435–449. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.36>.
- Filimonova, E. (2005). *Clusivity: Typology and case studies of inclusive-exclusive distinction*. John Benjamins.
- Fillmore, C. (1997). *Lectures in deixis*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gee, J. (2000). Identity as an analytic lens for research in education. *Review of Research in Education*, 25, 99–125. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1167322>.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1979). Footing. *Semiotica*, 25, 1–29.
- Gosling, D. (2002). *Models of peer observation of teaching*. LTSN Generic Centre.
- Gray, J., & Morton, T. (2018). *Social interaction and english language teacher identity*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11, 33–39. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(94\)00012-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(94)00012-U).
- Haverkate, H. (1992). Deictic categories as mitigating devices. *Pragmatics*, 2(4), 505–522. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.2.4.03hav>.
- Irwin, B., & Boulton, H. (2010). Analysing the development of professional identity in blogging discourse. In *Proceedings of the 17th improving student learning symposium* (pp. 22–32). The Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.
- Jefferson, G. (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In G. H. Lerner (Ed.), *Conversation analysis: Studies from the first generation* (pp. 13–31). John Benjamins.
- Johnson, G. (2006). The discursive construction of teacher identities in a research interview. In *Discourse and identity* (pp. 213–232). Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, J. E. (2013). Identity work and face work across linguistic and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Politeness Research*, 9, 35–54. <https://doi.org/10.1515/pr-2013-0002>.
- Karimi, M. N., & Mofidi, M. (2019). L2 teacher identity development: An activity theoretic perspective. *System*, 81, 122–134. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.02.006>.
- Kim, Y., & Silver, R. E. (2016). Provoking reflective thinking in post observation conversation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(3), 203–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116637120>.
- Kitagawa, C., & Lehrer, A. (1990). Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14(5), 739–759. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166\(90\)90004-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-2166(90)90004-W).
- Kitzinger, C. (2005). Speaking as a heterosexual: (How) does sexuality matter for talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 38(3), 221–265. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327973rlsi3803_2.
- Kohut, G. F., Burnap, C., & Yon, M. G. (2007). Peer observation of teaching: Perceptions of the observer and the observed. *College Teaching*, 55(1), 19–25. <https://doi.org/10.3200/CTCH.55.1.19-25>.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lerner, G. H. (1996). On the place of linguistic resources in the organization of talk-in-interaction: 'Second person' reference in multi-party conversation. *Pragmatics*, 6(3), 281–294. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.6.3.02ler>.
- Lerner, G. H., & Kitzinger, C. (2007). Extraction and aggregation in the repair of

- individual and collective self-reference. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 526–557. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607079165>.
- Levinson, S. (2007). Optimizing person reference – perspectives from usage on Rosel Island. In *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 29–72). Cambridge University Press.
- Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2013). RP or 'RIP': A critical perspective on reflective practice. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 4, 291–315. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0013>.
- Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2017). *Reflective practice in english language teaching: Research-based principles and practices*. Routledge.
- Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Longman.
- O'Leary, M., & Price, D. (2016). Peer observation as a springboard for teacher learning. In *Reclaiming lesson observation: Supporting excellence in teacher learning* (pp. 114–123). Routledge.
- O'Leary, M. (2014). *Classroom observation. A guide to the effective observation of teaching and learning*. Routledge.
- Phillips, D. (1999). *The feedback session within the context of teacher training and development: An analysis of discourse, role and function, phd dissertation*. University of London.
- Riordan, E. (2018). *TESOL student teacher discourse. a corpus-based analysis of online and face-to-face interactions*. Routledge.
- Sacks, H., & Schegloff, E. A. (2007 [1979]). Two preferences in the organization of reference to persons and their interaction. In *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 23–28). Cambridge University Press.
- Sato, M., & Loewen, S. (2022). The research-practice dialogue in second language learning and teaching: Past, present, and future. *The Modern Language Journal*, 106(3), 509–527. <https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12791>.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1996). Some practices for referring to persons in talk-in-interaction: A partial sketch of a systematics. In *Studies in anaphora* (pp. 437–485). John Benjamins.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007a). Categories in action: Person-reference and membership categorization. *Discourse Studies*, 9(4), 433–461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445607079162>.
- Schegloff, E. A. (2007b). Conveying who you are: The presentation of self, attractively speaking. In *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 123–148). Cambridge University Press.
- Seedhouse, P. (Ed.) (2021). *Video enhanced observation for language teaching. reflection and professional development*. Bloomsbury.
- Shortland, S. (2004). Peer observation: A tool for staff development or compliance? *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28, 219–228. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877042000206778>.
- Stivers, T. (2007). Alternative recognitionals in person reference. In *Person reference in interaction: Linguistic, cultural and social perspectives* (pp. 73–96). Cambridge University Press.
- Topal, P., & Yiğitoğlu Aptoula, N. (2022). Going beyond the post-observation's interactional agenda: The observers' references to their practices and pedagogical understandings. *Linguistics and Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2022.101016>.
- Trent, J., & Lim, J. (2010). Teacher identity construction in school-university partnerships: Discourse and practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 1609–1618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.012>.
- Varghese, M. M., Morgan, B., Johnston, B., & Johnson, K. A. (2005). Theorizing language teacher identity: Three perspectives and beyond. *Journal of Language Identity, and Education*, 4(1), 21–44. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327701jlie0401_2.
- Varghese, M. M., Motha, S., Park, G., Reeves, J., & Trent, J. (2016). This issue. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(3), 545–571. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.333>.
- Vaughan, E. C. (2010). *Just say something and we can all argue then: Community and identity in the workplace talk of English language teachers*. Limerick: Mary Immaculate College unpublished PhD thesis Retrieved from <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/47243192.pdf>.
- Walsh, S., & Mann, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice: A data-led way forward. *ELT Journal*, 69, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv018>.
- Waring, H. Z. (2014). Mentor invitations for reflection in post-observation conferences. Some preliminary considerations. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 5(1), 99–123. <https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2014-0005>.
- Waring, H. Z. (2017). Going general as a resource for doing advising in post-observation conferences in teacher training. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 110, 20–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.01.009>.
- Wernicke, M. (2020). Constructing 'other' identities as a french second language teacher. In *The complexity of identity and interaction in language education* (pp. 43–91). Multilingual Matters.
- Whitehead, & Lerner, G. (2020). Referring to somebody: Generic person reference as an interactional resource. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 161(1), 46–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2020.02.011>.
- Wilson, N. (2019). When we means you. In *The social dynamics of pronominal systems. A comparative approach* (pp. 35–56). John Benjamins.