

doi.org/10.61425/wplp.2025.20.50.67

MANIFESTATIONS OF DIRECTIVENESS AND COLLABORATION IN THE POST-LESSON CONVERSATION BETWEEN A HUNGARIAN EFL MENTOR AND TRAINEE: A CASE STUDY

Anna Szegedy-Maszák 

Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest
szegedy.maszak.anna@apaczai.elte.hu

Abstract: Teacher education has increasingly become interested in the relationship between mentors and trainees, especially in connection with the mentor's directive or collaborative stance. Studies have focused on the more specific context of EFL mentoring in Hungary, but have not used conversation analysis. This study uses some of the findings of conversation analysis and adopts these findings for the Hungarian EFL mentoring context in order to reveal the observable linguistic manifestations of collaboration and directiveness. The findings reveal a structure of the conversation, the stages of which are initiated by the mentor, but the inherently directive stance of the mentor is mitigated with the help of linguistic tools. This paper closes by considering how the findings offer an example of the potential applications of conversation analysis to analyses of mentor-trainee talk.

Keywords: *EFL mentoring, directiveness, collaboration, speech acts, post-lesson conversation*

1 Introduction

In the second half of the 20th century, there was a shift towards more collaborative approaches in education. The reason behind this shift was that researchers had found that less directive approaches had several social, psychological, and cognitive gains (Johnson & Johnson, 1999; Oxford, 1997; Storch, 2001). This change from less directive to more collaborative approaches also had an influence on EFL mentoring practices. More supervisory mentoring practices were abandoned for collaborative mentoring, where the mentor was less concerned with imparting teaching skills and more with supporting the development of the trainee (Hobson & Malderez, 2013). This shift has influenced EFL mentoring in Hungarian education as well, as the EFL mentoring course, which has been taught for over two decades, has been based on a course book with a clear collaborative stance (Malderez & Bodóczy, 1999).

Around the turn of the 21st century, however, came a renewed interest in education based on more directive approaches (Eckstein, 2019). The reason for this revival of direction can be found in both practice and theory (Eckstein, 2019), with some arguing that avoiding giving direction to learners solidifies economic

and social differences and hinders mobility (Salem, 2016). Research done in the context of writing centres affiliated with higher education institutions, in particular, found that non-directive tutoring is unhelpful for students without a strong academic background (Salem, 2016) or L2 learners (Eckstein, 2019). Collaboration has also been criticized as disingenuous (Lunsford, 1991). Lunsford argues that a collaborative environment can stifle creativity, when the “tutor is still the seat of all authority, but is simply pretending it isn’t so” (p. 96). Carstens and Rambiritch (2021) suggest, furthermore, that withholding information can frustrate tutors and tutees alike. Although conclusions based on tutoring relationships indicate that the efficacy of collaboration is context-dependent and highly variable, with more directive approaches being suitable for some, directiveness and collaboration have not been studied as of yet in the context of Hungarian EFL mentoring.

Empirical studies on the linguistic manifestations of collaboration and directiveness have been conducted in the context of writing centre tutor and tutee relationships. Thonus (1999) combined thematic content analysis of semi-structured interviews and conversation analysis to examine twelve academic writing tutorials in order to characterise and compare the tutorials with Non-Native Speakers (NNS) and Native Speakers (NS). The characteristics for which the tutor talk was examined reflect the degree of collaboration or directiveness present in the discussion: topic initiation, directive and mitigation type and frequency, negotiation of acceptances and rejections of suggestions and evaluations, volubility, backchannels, overlaps, and laughter (Thonus, 1999). The interpretation of the analysis was subsequently checked with the tutors and the trainees, who did not always agree on the findings. Directives, for example, were sometimes not interpreted as such by the tutee. Moreover, tutees repeatedly ranked the forcefulness of directives according to non-linguistic criteria. The results of the study showed that there was a difference in how tutors conducted tutorials with NNS and with NS tutees, but they also indicated that the expectations and preferences of NNS and NS tutees differed, with the former preferring a more directive approach. Thonus found that the reason behind this preference is the cultural inclination of the exclusively Asian students towards politeness and a more formal relationship with the mentor (1999).

Although the research referred to above is concerned with the tutor-tutee relationship in the writing centres of American universities and not Hungarian EFL teacher training, the findings might well be relevant for the study of Hungarian EFL mentoring relationships, as the two contexts share some important characteristics. The academic writing tutorial is akin to the post-lesson conversation (PLC) in the sense that both have the aim of reflecting on the past production of the tutee, and they both involve the spoken dialogue of two participants. In both contexts, there is a power difference between the two

parties. The tutor of the writing centre is more knowledgeable and experienced in the subject of writing, as is the EFL mentor teacher in language pedagogy. The settings also share certain features, as both writing centres and practice schools are affiliated with a university, although they have a certain degree of independence. Finally, both tutees and trainees are university students. Nevertheless, to my knowledge, no linguistic analysis has yet been conducted on Hungarian EFL mentors and trainees. However, considering how relevant the issue of direction is in tutoring based on recent research (Prescott-Pickup, 2024), it might be useful to look for the observable linguistic manifestations of directiveness and collaboration in the talk of Hungarian EFL mentors if we seek to shed light on the intent of the participants and arrive at a more nuanced understanding of the uses and limitations of the practice of Hungarian EFL mentoring.

The aim of this pilot research was to reveal the observable linguistic manifestations of collaboration and directiveness in an EFL PLC of a Hungarian seasoned EFL mentor and a trainee in order to explain what roles collaboration and direction have in their discussion. Some of the empirical research conducted on directiveness in the tutoring relationship used conversation analysis (Carstens & Rambiritch, 2021; Eckstein, 2019; Thonus, 1999). Conversation analysis is especially suited for the study of the observable linguistic manifestations of directiveness or collaboration in dialogue. Carstens and Rambiritch (2021) argued that “we are of the opinion that the domain of pragmatics, specifically speech act theories and theories of situated pragmatic action, may provide us with the tools to describe and appraise seemingly directive tutor strategies more flexibly” (p. 153). Speech Act Theory (Austin, 1962) and, more specifically, the notion of illocutionary speech acts as proposed by Searle (1976) offer a framework which can aid in uncovering intent. Therefore, my aim was to adopt Searle’s (1976) taxonomy of illocutionary acts in describing the observable linguistic manifestations of directiveness and collaboration in the PLC between a seasoned mentor and a trainee. A further aim of this pilot research was to describe the structure of an EFL PLC between a seasoned Hungarian EFL mentor and a trainee based on the presence or absence of collaboration or directiveness. Finally, the research aimed to give a linguistic description of the stages in the structure of the PLC between a seasoned Hungarian EFL mentor and a trainee. Previous research using conversation analysis in the teacher mentoring context has found that the identity of the initiator of the discussion is crucial for the success of the reflection. Therefore, this study will focus on the beginning of the conversation, where the identity of the individual who initiates the topic is more evident (Kim & Silver, 2016). Overall, this study tests the feasibility of the research method in the context of Hungarian EFL mentoring.

In order to achieve these aims, the following research questions were formulated pertaining to the first three minutes of PLC between a seasoned Hungarian EFL mentor and an EFL trainee:

RQ1 What illocutionary speech acts are used in a post-lesson conversation (PLC) between a Hungarian EFL mentor and an EFL trainee?

RQ2 How do the illocutionary speech acts used in a post-lesson conversation (PLC) between a Hungarian EFL mentor and an EFL trainee relate to directiveness and collaboration?

RQ3 What stages emerge indicating the structure of the discussion in a post-lesson conversation (PLC) between a Hungarian EFL mentor and an EFL trainee?

RQ4 How can the different stages be described linguistically in a post-lesson conversation (PLC) between a Hungarian EFL mentor and an EFL trainee?

2 Research Method

This study is based on textual data and is grounded in an interpretive paradigm, as it assumes that reality is socially constructed (Creswell, 2009). Both the setting and the choice of corpus reflect the constructivist worldview (Croker, 2009), since the participants are studied in their natural setting, which is a Hungarian secondary school, and an authentically occurring dialogue is used (the PLC, which follows the trainee's lesson). Any attempt to venture conjectures concerning the meanings of statements made by the participants is necessarily based on qualitative methods (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). These methods, thus, are appropriate for this study, as the individual statements are treated as speech acts precisely in order to make it possible to arrive at conclusions concerning the participants' intentions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

Although this is a corpus-based linguistic study and, as such, it is not predominantly ethnographic, the analyst of this study is an EFL mentor teacher and is, therefore, familiar with the socio-cultural context of Hungarian EFL mentoring. In this sense, the analyst might be said to function as "a kind of mediating ethnographic specialist informant to shed light on the corpus data" (Flowerdew, 2005, p. 329). Although there was no interaction with the participants, the study can be said to have adopted an emic perspective on account of the researcher's insider stance (Creswell, 2009). In this section, a detailed description of the choice of corpus, the setting, and the participants will be given.

2.1 Corpus

In order to conduct this pilot research, I transcribed a recording of a half-hour-long EFL PLC between a seasoned Hungarian EFL mentor and a trainee (see Appendix). A PLC was chosen because it is a focal communicative event of the mentoring relationship. These discussions take place after an observed lesson taught by the mentor or the trainee teacher, with the focus being the observed lesson and the aim of reflecting on the lesson in order to better prepare for the next lesson. Since all observed lessons are conventionally followed by PLCs, these conversations are an integral part of the teaching practice, where observable manifestations of collaboration and directiveness are most likely to occur. Although there are no formal requirements concerning the PLCs in documents detailing the responsibilities of mentors, Hungarian EFL mentor trainings include the development of mentoring skills in conducting PLCs. Moreover, conventions for the PLCs have informally evolved in practice schools, where mentors continuously observe and discuss lessons with their own trainees and with their colleagues and their trainees. The recording that was used for this study was originally made for educational purposes, to be used at university for mentor training. This PLC was chosen based on purposive sampling, since it was conducted in English, although these discussions are normally conducted in Hungarian in Hungarian EFL mentoring. As the study was envisaged as a pilot study to explore whether Searle's (1976) speech acts can be used to reveal the structure of the PLC, an English transcription was deemed more suitable to check the adaptability of the linguistic terms originally formulated in English.

The research required a deep analysis of the text and repeated reanalysis. A section of the PLC was selected in view of the aim of the study, which was to check whether conversation analysis focusing on speech acts, the differentiating categories of illocutionary acts, and the linguistic signs of directiveness would produce insights as to the presence or absence of directiveness and collaboration in a seasoned EFL mentor's PLC with a trainee. The analysis of the data was stopped as soon as the research questions were answered.

2.2 Participants and the Setting

For the study, I chose a PLC that was conducted between an EFL mentor who is reputed to be among the best in the profession in Hungarian EFL circles and her trainee. This mentor has been a mentor for 18 years. She has mentoring qualifications and belongs to the category of *mestertanár* [master teacher], which is the highest category in the Hungarian official teacher appraisal system. She has also been an active participant in professional teacher development programmes. The trainee has since become a full-time member of the staff as

an EFL teacher at the school where the sample PLC was conducted. Although the school where the PLC was conducted is not a practice school, it is still a prestigious secondary school which receives trainees in part because it has a seasoned EFL mentor. A careful selection process was therefore conducted in accordance with the qualitative research method (Creswell, 2009), as the participants can be said to be highly professional representatives of the English teaching profession in Hungary. A PLC held at a practice school was not used, mainly out of convenience, as all available PLC recordings from the practice schools were in Hungarian and thus were not suitable for the research. For the purposes of this study, an English corpus was used. In the future, PLC transcripts in English from the practice schools might become available through data collection. However, future research might instead focus on PLCs conducted in Hungarian, adapting Searle's categories to the Hungarian text. The results of these findings would possibly be more transferable to other EFL mentor contexts, given that EFL mentoring in Hungary is predominantly conducted in Hungarian.

2.3 Methods of Analysis

In this section, the three stages of the study will be described. First, in the course of Study 1, the illocutionary speech acts of the transcript were identified. Then, in Study 2, differentiating categories of speech acts were used to describe the speech acts in greater depth. Finally, one specific speech act was selected in order to see whether certain categories first suggested by Thonus (1999) would reveal signs of directiveness in Study 3.

2.3.1 Study 1 Conversation Analysis: Illocutionary Speech Acts

In order to answer RQ1, I analysed the corpus according to the classification of illocutionary speech acts as described by Searle (1976):

- representatives, as in "Passengers are hereby advised that the train will be late" (Searle, 1976, p.22)
- directives, as in "I advise you to leave" (Searle, 1976, p.22)
- commissives, as in "I pledge allegiance to the flag" (Searle, 1976, p.17)
- expressives, as in "I congratulate you for winning the money" (Searle, 1976, p.18)
- declarations, as in "I declare the meeting adjourned" (Searle, 1976, p.20).

Searle's (1976) classification is informative with regard to directiveness and collaboration, for *directives* are more reflective of direction (e.g., "I suggest that you give homework next time"), whereas *representatives* are more reflective of a collaborative stance (e.g., "No homework was given"), given that non-judgmental, objective statements are more indicative of a collaborative mentoring approach.

Study 1 was also used to identify the emerging structure of the PLC based on the different illocutionary speech acts, with the purpose of answering RQ3. The speech acts were analysed for any emerging pattern reflective of direction or collaboration, which would indicate the underlying structure of the PLC. Although the entirety of the corpus was analysed, only the speech acts which were relevant for indicating an underlying structure were reported on in this paper.

2.3.2 Study 2 Conversation Analysis: Differentiating Categories of Illocutionary Acts

The speech acts identified in Study 1 were analysed further according to three of the differentiating categories given by Searle (1976): (1) illocutionary force, (2) the status or the position of the speaker or the hearer, and (3) the way in which the utterance relates to the interests of the speaker or the hearer. These three differentiating categories were chosen because they were especially relevant with regard to the manifestations of directiveness and collaboration. This analysis was conducted to answer RQ4, as it revealed the linguistic manifestations of the speech acts.

2.3.3 Study 3 Conversation Analysis: Signs of Directiveness and Illocutionary Speech Acts

In their studies on directiveness in tutoring talk, Thonus (1999) and Eckstein (2019) used the categories of Thonus (1999) to analyse talk for signs of directiveness. These signs were the following: encouragement of tutee talk, mitigation/directiveness of suggestions, negotiation of revision, charge taking, holding of the floor, social closeness, reflection of authority, and involvement in conversation. In my research, I used all of these categories to analyse one specific speech act in order to see whether these categories give additional information about the use of the speech act in regards to directiveness. Study 3 informed me of whether this analysis is suitable to answer RQ2 concerning a deeper understanding of how directiveness is characteristic of a speech act.

2.4 Ethical Considerations

As the video recording had been made prior to my study and for an educational purpose, the participants were contacted after the taping. An email requesting the written consent of the participants was sent to both participants, to which they responded and thereby allowed the use of the transcription of their PLC in this research. The email referred to the purpose of the research and guaranteed anonymity. All names in the research are therefore pseudonyms, reflecting only the gender and nationality of the participants.

2.5 Quality Control

In order to ensure the trustworthiness of the study, a written transcript was made based on the video recording and subsequently checked. The Hawthorne effect might have been of relevance, as normally PLCs are not recorded (Dörnyei, 2007). That said, it is not unusual to have observers present during PLCs, as model lessons were part of the fifteen-lesson-long teaching practice until only recently. Furthermore, the purpose of the research was unknown to the participants at the time of the recording, as I used a recording which had been made prior to the research, thereby reducing the possibility that the Hawthorne effect would have any influence on the results. Finally, it might not be relevant whether the mentor and the trainee conducted a representative PLC, given the aim of the study pertaining to the expertise and practice of a seasoned mentor. If the PLC was conducted consciously on the part of the mentor and the trainee to show a best practice discussion for educational purposes, that in itself is revelatory and informative.

3 Findings and Discussion

3.1 Study 1

To answer RQ1 (What illocutionary speech acts are used in a PLC between a Hungarian EFL mentor and an EFL trainee?), Study 1 identified the speech acts used in the first three minutes of the PLC (See Appendix A). As can be seen in Table 1, three types of illocutionary speech acts as defined by Searle (1976) were identified in this section: representatives, directives, and expressives. According to Searle (1976), speech acts are classified by their illocutionary point, which is the purpose or function the utterance is intended to achieve in communication. For each identified speech act of the examined section of the PLC, Table 1 refers

to the illocutionary point to explain the categorisation of the utterance. The illocutionary point of expressives is to reflect the speaker's psychological state or attitude (Searle, 1976). Whereas the trainee in the first three minutes of the PLC uses exclusively expressives, referring to her psychological state, the mentor uses a larger variety of speech acts. The speech act used the most frequently by the mentor is the representative, the illocutionary point of which is to commit the speaker to the truth of the proposition (Searle, 1976). The predominance of representatives is suggestive of a more collaborative mentoring behaviour, which strives to present facts without attempting to influence the listener's actions or "judgementoring" (Hobson & Malderez, 2013, p.2). Nevertheless, the mentor does not shy away completely from expressing her feelings and uses an expressive. Moreover, an indication of a more directive approach to mentoring is present, albeit not dominant, for the mentor launches the discussion with a directive, the illocutionary point of which is to attempt to influence the listener's actions (Searle, 1976).

Speaker and speech act (M=mentor T=trainee)	Categorisation of the speech act	An explanation of the categorisation
M: How are you?	Directive	Point of the speech act is for the hearer to respond to the question, to tell the speaker how she is.
T: I'm fine. Already fine.	Expressive	Point of the speaker is to express her psychological state specified in the propositional context. In this case, the propositional context is having completed teaching the lesson.
M: You didn't seem to be nervous.	Representative	Point of the speech act is to commit the speaker to the truth value of the trainee not having seemed nervous.
T: Yes, when I started the lesson, I felt like calming down.	Expressive	Point of the speaker is to express her psychological state specified in the propositional context. In this case, the propositional context is having started the lesson.
T: Everything's fine. Although at the beginning, it's these late comers [unintelligible].	Expressive	Point of the speaker is to express her psychological state specified in the propositional context. In this case, the propositional context is having started the lesson, the psychological state is a feeling of calmness as well as an indication of feeling disturbed (see: context of following speech act).

T: But after a time, I could come back.	Expressive	Point of the speaker is to express her psychological state specified in the propositional context. In this case, the propositional context is having been disturbed by latecomers but regaining a feeling of control, calm.
M: We couldn't feel that,	Expressive	Point of the speaker is to express her psychological state (and by her assumption, also the psychological state of the other observers) specified in the propositional context.
M: so, it was very nice.	Representative	Point of the speaker is to commit to the truth value of the lesson having been nice.
M: It was a nice lesson.	Representative	Point of the speaker is to commit to the truth value of the lesson having been nice.
M: I enjoyed it very much,	Expressive	Point of the speaker is to express her psychological state specified in the propositional context.
M: I mean, they didn't, the students didn't behave in a different way.	Representative	Point of the speaker is to commit to the truth value of the students not having behaved differently from other lessons.
M: I think this aim was reached and you could do what you have planned according to the lesson plan as well.	Representative	Point of the speaker is to commit to the truth value of the students not having behaved differently from other lessons.
M: And could you tell me something about... to what extent could you do what you have planned?	Directive	Point of the speech act is for the speaker to make the hearer explain how the lesson compared to her plans.

Table 1. Study 1: Analysis based on illocutionary speech acts by Searle (1976)

Note. Data collected and analysed by the author.

The results are also relevant to RQ3 (What stages emerge indicating the structure of the discussion in a PLC between a Hungarian EFL mentor and an EFL trainee?), which pertains to the observable signs of a possible underlying

structure of the PLC. As can be seen in Table 1, directives introduce the two different stages of the beginning of the PLC. The first directive asks the trainee to share her feelings about the lesson: “How are you?” The second directive, which can be found towards the end of the transcript, introduces the topic of comparing the lesson plan to the lesson: “And could you tell me something about... to what extent could you do what you have planned [sic]?” The shift in the topic of the conversation is clearly indicated by these two speech acts, indicating that the different stages of the PLC are introduced with directives. Therefore, it seems that directives bear a special weight in the discussion, as they introduce two main stages of the underlying structure of the beginning of the PLC. First, the sharing of emotions related to the lesson and, second, the evaluation of the lesson compared to the lesson plan, both initiated by the mentor.

3.2 Study 2

Study 2 allows for a deeper understanding of the directiveness of the PLC in order to answer RQ4 and give more detailed linguistic descriptions of the different stages reflecting the structure of the PLC. Table 2 shows the findings of the analysis of the speech acts identified in Study 1 based on the differentiating categories of Searle (1976). As can be seen in Table 2, the definitions of directives as more directive and representatives as less directive are rendered more nuanced by this reanalysis. As far as the illocutionary force of the speech acts is concerned, hedging is more present in the talk of the trainee, whereas the talk of the mentor is, in general, more forceful, even in representatives, which were thought to be an indication of a collaborative stance in Study 1. Nevertheless, the mentor strives to lessen the force of her talk with hedging, as in the following example: “I think this aim was reached and you could do what you have planned according to the lesson plan as well”. Similarly, in her second directive, she uses a polite form (“could you”) as well as hedging (“to what extent”) to inquire about the success of the lesson: “And could you tell me something about ...to what extent could you do what you have planned?”

The differentiating category of status is especially relevant in the mentoring relationship. The mentor has a higher status than the trainee; the mentor always has the role of evaluating the teaching practice, even if the PLC is less evaluative. As the explanations in Table 2 indicate, the representative speech acts of the mentor are almost always evaluative. Even the expressive speech act of the mentor refers to an evaluation, which is more reflective of a directive mentoring style.

The speech act M=mentor, T=trainee (Category)	Illocutionary force	The status or the position of speaker/hearer	The way the utterance relates to the interests of speaker/hearer
M: How are you? (Directive)	Forceful: direct question	Discussion started by question posed by mentor to trainee: Mentor in charge of trainee's development. Trainee is subordinate of mentor.	Mentor expresses interest in learning about the feelings of the trainee. Is it, however, in her interests to talk about this? This is unclear.
T: I'm fine. Already fine. (Expressive)	Hedging: "already"	Trainee (subordinate) responds to the question.	Trainee responds to question posed by mentor, so it is unclear whether it is in her interests to talk about her feelings.
M: You didn't seem to be nervous. (Representative)	Hedging: "didn't seem"	Mentor (superior) comments on trainee's response about her feelings, validating by referring to what an outside observer saw.	Mentor reaffirms statement of trainee, although it is unclear in whose interests this is.
T: Yes, when I started the lesson, I felt like calming down. (Expressive)	Hedging: "when I started the lesson", experience of calmness stressed to be momentary, changing	Subordinate elaborates on her feelings	Trainee expresses agreement with previous statement. Is this in the interests of the trainee or the mentor? Although the topic is the psychological state of the trainee, this is unclear.
T: Everything's fine. Although at the beginning, it's these late comers [unintelligible]. (Expressive)	More forceful "everything" Hedging: "although" and reference to changing nature of feelings	Subordinate elaborates on her feelings	Unclear if trainee reassures the mentor that the trainee was overall calm and, therefore, the illocutionary act is in the interests of the mentor or the trainee to indicate that she was calm, regardless of the problems with the latecomers.
T: But after a time, I could come back (Expressive)	Hedging: "but after a time"	Subordinate elaborates on her feelings	Unclear if it is in the interests of the trainee to let the mentor know that the trainee was able to overcome the difficulties and remain calm.

M: We couldn't feel that (Expressive)	More forceful: negation	Mentor (superior) comments on trainee's response about her feelings, validating by referring to what outside observer felt.	Mentor refers to observers' remark, unclear if it is in the interests of the mentor to reassure trainee or in the interests of the trainee to be reassured.
M: so, it was very nice. (Representative)	More forceful: "very nice"	Mentor (superior) evaluates the whole lesson.	Unclear if it is in the interests of the mentor to reassure trainee or in the interests of the trainee to be reassured.
M: It was a nice lesson. (Representative)	More forceful: repetition	Mentor (superior) repeatedly evaluates the whole lesson.	Unclear if it is in the interests of the mentor to reassure trainee or in the interests of the trainee to be reassured.
M: I enjoyed it very much. (Expressive)	More forceful: repetition and "very".	Mentor (superior) refers to her own feelings about the lesson of trainee.	Unclear if it is in the interests of the mentor to reassure trainee or in the interests of the trainee to be reassured.
M: I mean, they didn't, the students didn't behave in a different way. (Representative)	More forceful: complete negation, repetition: "didn't...any"	Mentor (superior) evaluates the whole lesson.	Unclear if it is in the interests of the mentor to reassure trainee or in the interests of the trainee to be reassured.
M: I think this aim was reached and you could do what you have planned according to the lesson plan as well. (Representative)	More forceful, declaration: "aim was reached" Hedging: "I think"	Mentor (superior) evaluates the whole lesson.	In whose interest is it to find out how plan compares with the lesson? Unclear because mentor is evaluator, but I would argue that the inherent reason for having a plan is to follow it.
M: And could you tell me something about... to what extent could you do what you have planned? (Directive)	Form of politeness: "could you...?"	Mentor (superior) poses question to subordinate.	It is the mentor who is interested in comparing the two plans, although we can assume that the trainee would be interested to know how her plan compared to the lesson. Although it is not clear from the text that the trainee is interested in finding this out, the mentor probably assumes this (see previous speech act).

Table 1. Study 2: Analysis based on the differentiating categories of Searle (1976)
Note. Data collected and analysed by the author.

What is perhaps the most revealing as to the directiveness of the discussion, however, is the third differentiating category relating to whose interests the utterance reflects. Any categorisation of the speech acts for this criterion is ambiguous, as a speech act made with the apparent intention of sharing an emotion can serve as a form of reassurance for either party. Even the first directive, which expresses interest in the trainee's feelings, can be interpreted as an inquiry for the benefit of the mentor, who needs an important piece of information in order to direct the PLC. The findings of Study 2 thus indicate that even if the mentor incorporates the characteristics of a more collaborative mentoring style, the discussion is inherently directive.

3.3 Study 3

Study 3 aimed to pilot the analysis of the speech acts identified in Study 1 according to the signs of directiveness and non-directiveness as posited by Thonus (1999) and Eckstein (2019). This study answered RQ2 on how a speech act relates to the signs of directiveness in conversation by offering an analysis of one speech act, a representative uttered by the mentor: "You didn't seem to be nervous". As can be seen in Table 3, which is a summary of the findings of Study 3, the degree of directiveness in this illocutionary speech act is weak according to these criteria. The statement is used as an encouragement of trainee talk, as it repeats what the trainee has said about not having felt nervous. There is no suggestion in the utterance, nor is there a reference to taking a different course of action. The mentor completes the utterance, thereby allowing the trainee to speak. Moreover, by incorporating hedging, the mentor reduces the difference in status and does not claim to be an authority. She does not pretend to be one who knows but only one who has an impression. Finally, the context of the speech act also indicates a weak degree of directiveness, as the mentor's utterance is preceded and followed by the talk of the trainee. The only sign of a more directive stance is that of a change of perspective by introducing the observer's focus. This suggests that although the utterance is overall less directive, the mentor does not take up a passive stance and introduces a new element into the conversation.

Signs of directiveness in talk	Speech act: You didn't seem to be nervous. (Category: Representative)
encouragement of tutee talk	Mentor reaffirms statement of trainee. Repetition of content encourages a more in-depth discussion of the topic as an active listening strategy, characteristic of a weak degree of directiveness.
mitigation/directiveness of suggestions	No suggestion for action is present, although change of focus from how trainee felt to what was observed introduces a change of perspective.
negotiation of revision	This does not apply here, there is no indication of any hypothesizing about how to revise the plan or change trainee's behaviour, so its directiveness cannot be tested. The fact that it is missing, however, is relevant.
charge taking	Only indication of charge taking is switching the perspective, although it has a weak illocutionary force.
holding of the floor	The speaker completes the utterance, no speech act follows, indicating a weak degree of directiveness
social closeness	Hedging reduces status of mentor as the one in the know, indicating a weak degree of directiveness.
reflection of authority	Hedging reduces status of mentor as the one in the know, indicating a weak degree of directiveness.
involvement in conversation	Speech act preceded and followed by trainee's speech acts, indicating a weak degree of directiveness.

Table 3. Study 3: Analysis based on the signs of directiveness and non-directiveness (Thonus, 1999)

4 Conclusion and Implications

The aim of this pilot study was to identify the observable linguistic manifestations of collaboration and directiveness in EFL PLCs between an experienced Hungarian EFL mentor and a trainee in order to examine the roles these features play in their interaction. As demonstrated in this study, an analysis based on Searle's theory of illocutionary acts of PLCs in EFL mentoring relationships can be informative as to the presence of directiveness and collaboration in PLCs. The findings of this analysis indicate the linguistic manifestations of an inherently directive stance on the part of the mentor, which is mitigated using particular linguistic tools (e.g., hedging and repeating statements made by the trainee). Such findings might suggest that although Hungarian EFL mentor trainings have encouraged more collaborative mentoring practices in recent decades, directive approaches are still pertinent in the context of Hungarian EFL mentoring. Nevertheless, the

comparison with case studies of other seasoned Hungarian EFL mentors would help establish whether the role of collaboration and directiveness are specific to the individual mentor. This study, however, cannot address this question due to its single-case design. It would similarly be informative to compare the mentoring practices of the same mentor with the mentoring practices of different mentees, which this single-case study similarly does not allow.

The study also indicates that the specific stages of the PLC are reflective of a possible underlying structure. In this case study, new topics are introduced exclusively by the mentor, whose status as an evaluator clearly places her above the trainee. Moreover, these new topics are introduced solely by directives, whereby the direction of the conversation is decided by the mentor. The dominant speech act used by the mentor during the discussion of each topic is subsequently the representative, which is more associated with a collaborative mentoring style. Nevertheless, analysis according to the differentiating categories of speech acts reveals that even the representatives are predominantly evaluative. Whereas this pilot study suggests that an underlying linguistic structure of the PLC between a mentor and a trainee exists, further linguistic analysis of the PLCs of seasoned EFL mentors and trainees might guide EFL course designers, EFL teacher trainers, or EFL mentors.

In conclusion, the benefit of exploring the mentoring practices of a seasoned professional who is respected by the Hungarian EFL community and has a long history of successful mentorships is revelatory for a richer understanding of Hungarian EFL mentoring today. Although the mentoring relationship has been extensively explored with regard to collaboration and directiveness in various educational contexts, this study has the benefit of focusing on a representative of the smaller community of Hungarian EFL mentor teachers. This case study indicated that the use of conversation analysis can aid triangulation and provide a more nuanced description of the presence or absence of direction and collaboration in EFL mentoring relationships. Other case studies exploring PLCs using conversation analysis would further our understanding of the dynamics and interactional patterns within EFL mentoring relationships for the benefit of EFL researchers, EFL mentor course designers, EFL teacher trainers, and EFL mentor teachers.

Proofread for the use of English by: Thomas Cooper, Department of English Literatures and Cultures, Károli Gáspár University of the Reformed Church of Hungary

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Carstens, A., & Rambiritch, A. (2021). Directiveness in tutor talk. *Perspectives in Education* 39(3), 151–168. <https://doi.org/10.18820/2519593X/pie.v39.i3.12>
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Crocker, R. A. (2009). An introduction to qualitative research. In J. Heigham & R. A. Crocker, (Eds.) *Qualitative research in applied linguistics* (pp.3–24) Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230239517_1
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp.1–32). Sage Publications Ltd.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Eckstein, G. (2019). Directiveness in the Center: L1, L2, and Generation 1.5 expectations and experiences. *The Writing Center Journal*, 37(2), 61–92. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26922018>
- Flowerdew, L. (2005). An Integration of corpus-based and genre-based approaches to text analysis in EAP/ESP: Countering criticisms against corpus-based methodologies. *English for Specific Purposes*, 24, 321–332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2004.09.002>
- Hobson, A. J., & Malderez, A. (2013). Judgementoring and other threats to realizing the potential of school-based mentoring in teacher education. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 2(2), 89–108. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-03-2013-0019>
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). Making cooperative learning work. *Theory into Practice*, 38(2), 66–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405849909543834>
- Kim, Y., & Silver, R. E. (2016). Provoking Reflective Thinking in Post Observation Conferences. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(3), 203–219. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116637120>
- Lunsford, A. (1991). Collaboration, control and the idea of a writing centre. *The Writing Center Journal*, 12(1), 92–99. <https://doi.org/10.7771/2832-9414.1252>
- Malderez, A., & Bodóczy, C. (1999). *Mentor courses: A resource book for trainer*

trainers. Cambridge University Press.

- Oxford, R. (1997). Cooperative learning, collaborative learning, and interaction: Three communicative strands in the classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(4), 443–456. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1997.tb05510.x>
- Prescott-Pickup, F. J. (2024). The importance of the mentor–mentee relationship in trainee teachers’ professional development. *Mester és Tanítvány*, 2(2), 53–61. <https://doi.org/10.61178/MT.2024.II.2.6>
- Salem, L. (2016). Decisions...decisions: Who chooses to use the writing center? *Writing Center Journal*, 35(2), 147–171. <https://doi.org/10.7771/2832-9414.1806>
- Searle, J. R. (1976). A classification of illocutionary acts. *Language in Society*, 5(1), 1–23. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4166848>
- Storch, N. (2001). How collaborative is pair work? ESL tertiary students composing in pairs. *Language Teaching Research*, 5(1), 29–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/136216880100500103>
- Thonus, T. (1999). *NS-NNS Interaction in academic writing tutorials: Discourse analysis and its interpretations*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics, Stamford, CT, USA. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED432916>