“From Her Eyes”: On the Affordances of Video Resources in Supporting Teacher Reflection

Julia Hüttner
University of Vienna, Faculty of Philological and Cultural Studies, Department of English and American Studies

Abstract: The contribution presents data and findings from a teacher education intervention, which aimed at supporting (student) teachers’ professional vision in order to improve their (dialogic) reflective practices. In order to facilitate meaningful dialogue, video-recorded English lessons were used as bases of discussion. The 19 participants were early career teachers (with about two to four years teaching experience) from diverse geographical and educational backgrounds. Overall, interactions amounting to 349 minutes were recorded. Data show interesting interactions between participants describing and noticing specific teaching events on the video material, the challenges of suspending evaluation and the crucial role of dialogue in deepening the reflective process. Findings also show the affordances of video materials on fostering professional vision, such as the means of re-watching episodes and of several participants having seen the same teaching event. Although the participants had teaching experience, the facilitators were crucial in guiding towards both specific moments in the teaching events observed and to theory-based knowledge available to the participants. This raises implication for both pre- and in-service teaching aimed at reflective practice.

Keywords: English Language Teacher Education, professional vision, video-based lesson analysis, reflective practice

A professional foreign language teacher needs to be able to provide research-based, varied, stimulating, inclusive, yet standards-oriented, instruction. In addition, they need to respond continuously to developments in wider society, such as the pervasiveness of English outside of school environments or the increased use of new media by learners, and adapt their teaching practices accordingly. While no pre-service teacher education programme can in itself provide sufficient preparation for all the challenges teachers might face in their professional careers, it remains crucial to ensure that language teachers continuously develop so that they avoid the trap of “teach[ing] as they were taught” (Braun & Crumpler, 2004, p. 61). This phenomenon – also known as “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975; Borg, 2004) – contributes to strongly held beliefs on the part of student teachers about education, which need to be explicitly and continuously addressed in teacher education to prepare the ground for teachers’ acting in a principled and research-based manner.

A key element in fostering such development towards professionalism in teaching is reflection, and hence Reflective Practice (RP) has increasingly become the default framework of both pre- and in-servicer teacher education programmes. As with so

https://doi.org/10.14712/23363177.2022.4
www.orbisscholae.cz
© 2021 The Author. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0).

many concepts and practices in (language) education, also for RP we have to note, however, that this widespread use does not indicate the existence of one definition, universally shared by practitioners and researchers, either of RP itself or of its key concepts (Clarà, 2015; Mann & Walsh, 2017, p. 9). There is also still much room to expand on data-based evidence of how reflection is verbalised in (student) teachers or how and with which tools to best foster its development.

The present contribution will first present a brief overview of RP in Second Language Teacher Education (SLTE) to then outline the potential of one specific tool, i.e., videos of classroom practice, in fostering reflection. Data from the explorative project VARIETE will serve to illustrate some of the patterns in reflective dialogues, drawing attention to the affordances of video in RP and to the (professional) language use of students.

1 Reflective Practice in Second Language Teacher Education

To state that reflection is the be-all and end-all of RP is, in many ways, a banal statement, yet it is important to note that this term reflection is used to signify quite distinct concepts, both in lay and expert discourses. For lay persons, reflection is often simply equated with thinking about or recalling an experience and the emotions attached to it, leading many early-stage students to simply recount teaching or learning events when asked to reflect on these. Crucially, however, reflective practice in SLTE refers back to two distinct origins in educational theory. Firstly, this is John Dewey’s (1933, p. 118) definition of reflection as the “active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge”, which crucially is linked to the experience of some level of incongruity. Thus, he views the function of reflective thought as “transform[ing] a situation in where there is experienced obscurity, doubt, conflict, disturbance of some sort, into a situation that is clear, coherent, settled, harmonious” (Dewey, 1933, p. 195). Importantly, for Dewey this movement towards clarity is related to the reflective engagement with “any belief or supposed form of knowledge” (Dewey, 1933, p. 118), indicating already the role given to theory and research in this rationalistic conceptualisation of reflection. Through such thinking processes, teachers can develop alternatives to routine actions. Donald Schön (1983, 1986) also highlights the starting point of reflection as “uncertainty” and its movement towards “mak[ing] sense” (Schön, 1983, p. 61), but places more emphasis on practice as a point of reference for reflection. Schön also addressed the relationship between reflection and actions, and distinguished between asynchronous reflection, i.e., on past events, termed reflection-on-action, and synchronous reflection while engaged in practice, known as reflection-in-action (Schön 1983). Later, the possibility of reflecting on future or planned actions was added in the notion of reflection-for-action (Killion & Todnem, 1991). In this context, Zeichner and Liston’s (1996) suggestion is relevant that reflection, especially the process of verbalising this process, improves teachers' future decision-making processing.

Despite the importance attached to linking reflection to practice, it has to be noted that some questions remain on the exact level of influence of beliefs on practice. Basturkmen's (2012) review shows the role of contextual factors; thus, situational constraints affect teachers negatively in putting their beliefs into practice. Additionally, she shows that teachers' levels of experience affect alignment between beliefs and practices, with more experienced teachers showing a closer correspondence. Finally, there was a higher alignment between beliefs and practices with regard to planned aspects, rather than spontaneous ones, in teaching. Farrell (2008) and Farrell and Ives (2015) highlight the importance of bringing teacher beliefs to the level of consciousness, typically through asking teachers to verbalise their beliefs, to facilitate a reflection on the relationship between these beliefs and teacher practices.

A large body of research has addressed Reflective Practice in SLTE (e.g. Watanabe 2016; Barnard & Ryan, 2017; Mann & Walsh, 2017; Farrell, 2018), which also shows the specific needs of ELT in terms of RP. The complex relationship between the foreign language being both the object and medium of learning makes the teacher's own use of the foreign language into a focus of reflection (e.g. Watanabe, 2016), which sometimes leads to a more general reflection on the type of English suitable as a learning target in a specific context (e.g. Sifakis, 2007).

We can summarise existing research on reflection, then, by stating that it needs to focus on gaining a deeper understanding of teaching and learning processes, which can fruitfully relate to the (student) teacher's own past or present action, an observed practice of another teacher, or an envisaged future practice.

In addition to mental and cognitive processes, affective stances have been identified as part of being a reflective practitioner, such as open-mindedness, responsibility and whole-heartedness (Dewey, 1933) and the relevance of reflecting on emotions experienced during practice and/or reflection (Gibbs, 2013). Especially the latter aspect of addressing one's feelings in a particular teaching situation can be a crucial means of pinpointing areas of incongruity or tensions, and thus giving space to this emotional knowledge in relationship to experience to as starting point for reflection.

Synthesising these thoughts, and in line with Boud and Walker (1998) as well as Mann and Walsh (2017), I shall be employing the following definition of reflection for the purposes of this paper: "The cognitive and affective processes and activities that (student) teachers engage in to make sense of (their own or others') teaching practice by taking recourse to diverse types of knowledge."

Reflective Practice (RP), then, uses reflection as a central feature in processes of teacher education and development. It aims to support teachers in extending their expertise through such reflection, which can be focused on their contexts, resources and actions, and to raise awareness of the complexity of decision making in planning and doing teaching (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Thus, RP aims to make "the difference between the expert teacher, who actively seeks to become a better teacher, and the teacher who is merely more experienced than the novice teacher' (Burton, 2009, p. 299).

Various models of RP phases and cycles have been proposed (e.g., Kolb, 1984; Korthagen, 1985; Farrell, 1996), but in this contribution I shall not be concerned with arguing for a specific RP model; rather, I wish to note that the various steps and cycles described highlight the complexity of the processes individuals engage in to make sense of an incongruous situation. I concur with Mann and Walsh (2017) in viewing RP as an essentially social process, which requires dialogue and can be effectively assisted through scaffolding (Bruner, 1983). This social process is intertwined with an equally crucial individual, internal one, where (student) teachers make any new knowledge or belief their own. This relationship between the internal and the external or dialogic in reflection is complex and can be facilitated through a number of formats, including, for instance, Action Research. Finally, RP aims to create a reflective habitus that continues throughout a teacher's career and so creates a sustainable practice of continued development for both pre- and in-service teachers.

Despite its many benefits and its prevalence in teacher education programmes, RP is not without problems, including an over-focus on problems in teaching, an unintentional neglect of increasing knowledge bases of novice teachers and the difficulties of ensuring fair assessment of reflection (e.g., Fendler, 2003; Akbari, 2007; Hobbs, 2007; Mann & Walsh, 2013, 2017; Farrell, 2018). The two areas that I would like to focus on here, however, are, firstly, the continued difficulties in developing and implementing tools that facilitate reflection (rather than surface recollections and evaluations) and, secondly, an under-appreciation of the need to develop disciplinary literacy in subject-specific reflection (Wipperfürth, 2015, 2019; Mann & Walsh, 2017). These two issues are to some extent linked; we need activities within RP that foster dialogue and facilitate scaffolding, but at the same time (student) teachers need to be socialized into the discourse community of professional teachers, which includes using appropriate forms of disciplinary literacies as well as sharing and developing the knowledge bases of (professional) teachers.

In the following, I will suggest ways of using video-recorded lessons as a basis for dialogic reflection of student teachers.

2 Videos as a tool for reflection in teacher education

The use of classroom videos features quite prominently in teacher education, with its origins very much located in STEM teacher education[1]. However, as Sherin (2004, p. 20) noted and as still holds largely true, "the use of video in teacher education does not always reflect an understanding of precisely what it is about *video* that might provide support for teacher learning". As with any type of tool, the use of videos does not in itself constitute a methodology, but can be integrated into a range of teacher education programmes; here, my question is how video can support RP.

---

[1] See Hüttner (2019) for an overview.

To my mind, the greatest benefit of this tool is that it allows an escape from the speed and synchronicity of teaching and observing. In practical terms, viewers can pause, re-view, play at slow motion or stop a video, allowing them to go back to viewing a sequence at a later time and in a different mind-set. Especially for student and novice teachers, this offers a means of breaking down some of the complexity of classrooms. Additionally, video recordings give access to practices that the viewers might be less familiar with, either because they are innovative or simply not that common in the viewers' educational environments (Gaudin & Chaliés, 2014). I would argue that a further, major affordance of using video recordings lies in allowing several viewers, including, for instance, student teachers and teacher educators, to view the same events and to have a record of these events to refer back to. Given the difficulties of especially student and novice teachers to use observation grids effectively, the ability to refer back to an event is priceless. As we shall see later, this shared viewing experience gives an unstilted reason for interactive meaning-making; the only way of arriving at a shared interpretation of what has been observed is through talking it through.

The ability to argue an interpretation of classroom events is linked to the possession of so-called "professional vision" (Goodwin, 1994), which van Es and Sherin (2008) paraphrase as the ability to notice and interpret significant classroom events. We can see how the target of such professional vision is or at least can be linked effectively to RP and how especially the ability to notice might well be fostered by using video-recorded, re-viewable lessons.

Existing research into the use of videos in RP originated largely within STEM teacher education and has shown that videos help student teachers move from very general descriptions of classroom events to analyses, while also encouraging foci on specific aspects of the learning and teaching event, and abandoning the level of generalities. The benefits of so-called video clubs, i.e., regular teacher meetings to discuss video-recorded elements of their own teaching in group, have also been highlighted. This body of research also underlines the importance of scaffolding and guidance for student teachers to achieve these developments (van Es & Sherin, 2008; Stockero, 2008; Star & Strickland, 2008; Harford et al., 2010; Sydnor, 2016).

More recently, however, research interest into the use of video resources as a tool in RP has grown in language teacher education, both in an Anglophone context and in the German-speaking world (e.g., Aguado et al., 2010; Baecher, 2011; Eröz-Tuğa, 2013; Köhler, 2014; Kourieos, 2016; Endacott, 2016). Some of the benefits – and challenges – reported in other teacher education contexts are mirrored within SLTE, highlighting the affordances offered by video use. Trip and Rich (2012, p. 279), for instance, report positive effects of videos in pre-service teacher education, highlighting the ways in which video recordings offer an anchor for student teachers' attention, reflection and ultimately development. As one of their participants stated "it is something that you are really looking at in your own teaching and finding that you want to change." (Trip & Rich, 2012, p. 733). Some studies within SLTE have addressed language itself, as a focal point of reflection. Thus, the student teachers, who were working with video recordings of their own teaching practices, in the studies by Kourieos (2016), Köhler (2012) and Eröz-Tuğa (2012) were forced to re-assess their English language use, both in terms of general proficiency, but more importantly, in terms of their ability to successfully accommodate their language use while giving instructions.

Mann and Walsh (2017, p. 22) point out the need for an in-depth account of the "language of reflection", i.e., the linguistic practices observed and used in RP. As the authors state (Mann & Walsh, 2017), such a research focus is an analytic challenge for Applied Linguistics, but it also enables a deeper understanding of how critical thinking and reflection itself is verbalised in (student) teachers and, ultimately, how it develops. This acknowledges also the dialogic nature of learning as envisaged in Socio-Cultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006), where language mediates the learning processes between expert knower and novice (see also Example 2 below). Additionally, such a focus on the language used in reflective processes also bears crucial information on the socialisation into a professional group and the development of the professional language practices associated with this discourse community. Wipperfürth's (2015) study of the video-based discussions of a network encompassing of eight teachers shows the complexity of teachers arriving at a shared, professional discourse to verbalise their specific knowledge base. The dialogues that emerged as a result of viewing video clips recorded and suggested by network members enabled novice teachers to benefit from experts, who in turn were empowered by making their expertise accessible through a shared professional language practice. Wipperfürth's study underlines the importance of dialogue, leading her to suggest the concept of "reflective best practice in dialogue" (Wipperfürth, 2015, p. 315), i.e., the ability of teachers to not *present* their pedagogical content knowledge in action, but also to *reflect upon and explain* it in dialogue. In addition to highlighting the need for dialogue in such RP, this study also indicates the role of integrating specific subject knowledge.

The studies reported on here underline that the relationship between professional vision, RP and the use of video-based material is a potentially fruitful one. Studies like Stürmer et al. (2013) or Star and Strickland (2008) have already shown how video resources foster the development of professional vision, partly by allowing a more guided noticing of specific aspects of classroom action. This can specifically relate to aspects of foreign language use by the teachers themselves (e.g., Eröz-Tuğa, 2013), which might be hard to notice when confronted with the complexity of live classroom observations or own teaching. As Brouwer (2015, p. 139) puts it: "the concreteness of video images invites teachers to make the analysis of teaching and learning subject-specific". In line with other formats of RP using, for instance, lesson transcripts (Walsh, 2013), this affordance of noticing language use in more detail, putting he use of video allows for a clearer focus, especially on aspects of ELT that might be hard to give attention to. In terms of developing this selective attention to move towards the element of knowledge-based reasoning of professional vision, the overarching framework of RP is crucial.

In the following section, the preliminary findings of a study with an international group of in-service teachers attending a Masters course in Applied Linguistics (for Language Teachers) in the UK will be presented. This project aims to incorporate the video-based resources in the development of professional vision and ultimately RP.

3 VARIETE: Illustrating the affordances of video-based reflective dialogues

The exploratory project VARIETE (Videos as a Resource in English Teacher Education) was undertaken within the context of the teacher education modules of the Master of English Language Teaching (MA ELT) programme of the University of Southampton, UK, with a view towards improving the development of RP within a very heterogeneous group of students. The MA ELT and is typically attended by students from a range of geographical locations and educational contexts and although a minimum teaching experience of two years is required, the type and intensity of this experience varies. The data collection ran over the course of two semesters and was coordinated by two teacher educators; Richard Kiely[2] and the author of this paper. The analysis of the data is still ongoing so I am only able to present preliminary findings and to outline some of the challenges of tackling a data set based of dialogic data here.

As teacher educators committed to RP, we were faced with several challenges working with this group of students; firstly, for practical reasons, there was no possibility of getting students to do any actual teaching while on the MA programme. Secondly, the students came from a variety of educational backgrounds, where some were using Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and others worked in a context of grammar-translation-based teaching, often with very large classes of 100+ students. Additionally, the MA students had teaching experience with diverse age groups of learners. As part of their degree programme, students were familiarised with CLT and with the underlying theoretical approaches, including those related to language learning.

In our experience as teacher educators, we noted that this diversity of teaching experiences often remained unnoticed within the group of students and so individuals rarely described their teaching practices in detail. Thus, reflections by individual students frequently suffered from a lack of clarity with regard to the actual teaching processes and practices referred to, making responses to and engagement with these harder. Finally, students were still in the process of developing their abilities to talk about their professional practices, especially in English, which for most students was not their first language or, indeed, the language in which they had originally been trained as teachers.

---

[2] Many thanks go to Professor Richard Kiely for being a generous and optimistic collaborator in the challenging journey of fostering RP within MA courses for teachers.

The idea to use videos as a basis for reflective discussions had arisen earlier, both in terms of videos of students' own teaching practice and of the practice of other teachers. With regard to the former idea, most students experienced difficulties in obtaining videos of their own practice in time before committing to the MA ELT programme. In terms of the second, the nature of many commercially available videos hampered their effectiveness for our purposes. Many such videos are heavily edited to show specific teaching practices, often to the extent of appearing unduly idealised and generally focused on the teachers only. Freely available videos on the internet give a more realistic image of teaching practices, but frequently have very poor recording quality, especially of sound, and remain unclear in terms of permissions obtained from the participants visible on the videos. An attempted solution to this problem was for the author of this paper to create VELTE (Video Resources for English Language Education), a freely available suite of videos of classroom lessons with background information from the teachers observed and teacher education activities, with funding from the Higher Education Agency of the United Kingdom[3]. The videos are full-length, high-quality recordings of entire lessons of English as a Second Language (ESL) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP) classes in the UK. While ultimately, this resource should include videos of ELT classrooms from a range of context, within VARIETE we could only make use of the existing UK-based ones.

Overall, the aims of the VARIETE project are to improve understanding of video materials as triggers for teacher reflection and learning; and to provide information on most effective means of integrating videos in (reflective) teacher education. More precisely, we ask the following research questions:

In what ways do video materials facilitate teacher reflection and learning?

Which areas of classroom practice do student teachers focus on?

Which patterns of engagement with the materials can be observed?

In what ways does group discussion extend learning from video materials?

The 19 student teacher participants were early career teachers with a minimum of two and a maximum of four years of teaching experience. Their backgrounds varied, but the majority were from either Asian, typically Chinese, or Middle Eastern background. Informed consent was obtained from the students to take part in this research study. In the course of one semester, students were given two extended video-based tasks, which involved a teacher-educator-led group interaction. Around five students and one teacher educator made up these groups, which were audio-recorded.

Recordings amounted to a total of 349 minutes, which were transcribed and are currently being analysed within a frame of qualitative content analysis. Codes were developed, firstly, top-down, drawing on concepts from a) professional vision, with code clusters for 'selective noticing' and 'knowledge-based reasoning', b) dialogic space in mentoring conversations (Bjuland & Helgevold, 2018), with codes for 'requesting information', 'making supporting contributions', 'expressing shared ideas', 'providing evidence' and 'challenging ideas' and c) identifying targets of noticing, e.g. speaking activity, monitoring, etc. Secondly, codes emerged bottom-up from the data to include, for instance, lack of / alignment with own practice; expression of novelty of observed practice and link to specific course material. An ongoing challenge is to find a way of clearly reflecting the dialogic nature, both between peers, i.e., the five or six student teachers, and between teacher educator and student teachers. As reflections are collaboratively developed, we can see that, at times, reasoning sequences are not fully developed by one speaker, but one aspect might be picked up by another speaker and developed further; whether in line with the original contributor's ideas or not is frequently not clear. Disagreements among student teachers might lead to a discursive resolution (often also presented by student teachers with higher English proficiency), where again it remains unknown whether all individual student teachers subscribe to this view. Finally, student teachers at times present a continuation to another speaker's description, evaluation or any other aspect of reasoning, where again the alignment with the original speaker's reasoning remains unclear. Work is in progress on developing a clearer coding scheme to identify as clearly as possible, the collaborative development of knowledge-based reasoning, including evidence of alignment and disagreement among speakers.

---

[3] The resource is available freely to teacher educators and student teachers from http://www.southampton.ac.uk/velte.

Example 1 shows how ST3's evaluation of the video sequence featuring the teacher 'Emma' is taken up by ST4 and ST5. ST3 seems to indicate a negative view of a speaking activity by stating that the teacher controlled the activity too much and that students could not focus on their answers. She seems to imply that the speed of the activity and especially diverse students being called up individually to answer meant there was too little time for the learners to have their answers ready and so engagement was low. Whether the critique by ST3 relates primarily to the control by the teacher or the speed of the activity is not entirely clear. ST4 takes on one part only of this statement, namely the control by the teacher and links that with a lack of free practice of specific language items. ST5 then takes these points up and again stays primarily with the control of the teacher and posits that learners are 'not interested to talk to each other' as a result of the teacher's action. This is clearly a moment where ST5 interprets rather than describes and she maintains the position that facilitating communication among learners is the responsibility of the teacher (Lines 18–19) which ST4 positions as "another question here". ST3's point about speed and enabling students to focus on a specific question with enough time has by now been completely side-tracked.

While it is clearly relevant to code and analyse each student teacher's reaction, there are two possible reasoning tracks here; firstly, the control by the teacher (i.e., calling up individual students) results in little preparation time for learners and hence low engagement. Secondly, this level of control results in little willingness by students to communicate with one another. I am currently working on the development of a suitably sensitive coding-system that distinguishes clearly between

Example 1

Line	Speaker	Statement
1	TED2:	that it was too fast or that it was too similar an activity or that's ok
2 3 4 5 6 7	ST3:	the speech I think but it cannot focus on the students'activity even the (?) activities there maybe the purpose of deciding that this is good but just the teacher just control all the situation and then the answer their your question now but that is not it is not this student's turn and then maybe they cannot just focus on this question so that's the point not all the student can get engaged into all the activities
8	TED2:	Mhm
9 10 11	ST4:	generally, it seems that single students would be called on most of the time and as as again as you said before there's (barely) in the way of free free practice of that language items to actually communicating all ideas
12 13 14 15	ST5:	I think that what you said that probably the students do not communicate very well in between them just because they have no chance to do that because everything which is happening is happening through the teacher and that's why they are not actually interested to talk to each other
16 17	ST4:	yea I think not just in that particular learning environment but also just generally I don't think they are are socially homogenous group
18	ST5:	yea but isn't that the task of the teacher for them to start doing that
19	ST4:	yea to help develop those relationships yea
20 21 22 23	ST4:	[…] well that's that's sort of looking at another question here about the role of the teacher which is maybe the role of Emma has is is slightly different from that facilitative role that it's more that it's the that the instructor role is closer

Note: ST – student teacher, TED – teacher educator

shared reasoning sequences, where at least some speakers align with the arguments developed, versus individual or abandoned reasoning sequences, where a contribution is not further developed on or shown any kind of engagement by other speakers (dis/agreement).

A general observation related to the importance of the presence and activities of the teacher educator (see also, Bjuland & Helgevold, 2018; Dawidowicz, 2019). These included scaffolding student teachers' contribution through probing questions and engaging all group members, primarily, but also through the modelling of a critical engagement with the video material. This supported the development of professional vision in the student teachers, by showing how a separation of the levels of observation and interpretation is possible and fruitful in allowing for alternative interpretations, and so helped student teachers move away from overly quick evaluations of the teaching practices observed. However, it proved quite challenging to effectively maintain a balance of fostering open discussion among the student teachers, and hence taking very much a facilitator role, versus providing clear feedback, as expected by several of the students (see also Chick, 2015; Hall, 2020).

The student teacher participants homed in on a range of issues and practices as objects of their dialogic reflections. Prime among these were differences, and to some extent similarities, of the teaching events shown on the videos to student teachers' own experiences, sometimes accompanied by emotionally coloured expressions of surprise. This also shows the affordance of video to ensure that the same practice is discussed and so to highlight diverse expectations of teaching. Example 2 shows how one Thai student reacts to observing a class focusing on oral production.

Example 2

Line	Speaker	Statement
1	TED2:	ok good so in general just starting off with that lesson quite different
2		both in terms of audience and teacher and everything from the (word)
3		we watched for last week so what did you find most most striking or
4		interesting or significant just quite generally about that lesson for you
5	ST4:	@ first of all I have I have seen the the speaking the speaking lesson that
6		was really interesting as said before
7	TED2:	mhm
8	ST4:	I mean because the speaking lesson perhaps doesn't exist in Thailand @@

Note: ST – student teacher, TED – teacher educator, @ – laughter

While attention was paid in the instruction to separating the three levels of description, interpretation and evaluation, students did continue to merge these. With the help of probing questions on the part of the teacher educators, some clarity in terms of specific aspects of teacher and/or student behaviour that led to a specific evaluation could be gained, but the tendency to jump to an immediate evaluation remained strong.

Example 3 shows this merger and the evidence that the student teacher provided for her interpretation when probed.

Example 3

Line	Speaker	Statement
1	ST1:	yes she [the teacher on the video]'s kind of listening (to) them moving her
2		head but she's really listening really attentively and she interrupts at the
3		right times to correct their mistake sometimes
4	TED1:	how could you tell she was listening attentively
5	ST1:	from her eyes @ I'm not kidding actually I think it is clear to see when we
6		the way she ok I can understand that she's really listening

Note: ST – student teacher, TED – teacher educator

Line 4 shows the teacher educators attempt to get the student teacher (ST1) to provide some evidence for her interpretation of attentive listening by the teacher (Line 4), which is then specified as being from “her eyes”. The laughter and phrase of “I’m not kidding actually” in Line 5 seems to indicate an awareness that this might not be the expected kind of evidence in terms of professional discourse. It is one of the affordances, however, of a shared video resource that the teacher educator and student teacher could continue to debate in more detail this specific evidence.

While not wedded to a fixed trajectory of reflective episodes, a very tentative frame in the reflections by the student teachers could be observed as follows:
explicit, verbalised noticing → description of teaching event → evaluation of teaching sequence or action → evidence for evaluation → link to own teaching practice

In line with Mann and Walsh (2017), I do not consider the exact sequencing or indeed presence of all these stages as indicative of quality of reflections, and, indeed, very few episodes showed all elements. Descriptions of events and evaluations were most frequently made explicit, with evidence for evaluation the least frequently realised one. Example 4 illustrates some of these elements in one student teacher’s contribution.

Example 4

Line	Speaker	Statement
1	ST6:	I saw which is the organization of the lesson that she managed actually by
2		the end of the lesson to get students to produce. I have always imagined
3		that we cannot make students produce in one one session, so we give them,
4		for example, and we give them, by the end of the class, we may give them
5		limited or guided questions for opening questions [..] to produce some
6		writing some presentations some anything that is a little bit (?) and guided
7		questions that would be like homework or that would be for the next time.
8		Of course, she did it teach them that [i.e. make students produce writing in
9		one class]

Note: ST – student teacher

We can see here that ST6 makes explicit reference to noticing, viz “I saw” (Line 1), a specific teaching practice. i.e., the effective use of lesson organization to include learners’ written productions, which is briefly described in Lines 1 and 2. In Lines 2 and 3 ST6 goes on to contract this practice with her expectations (“I have always imagined that we cannot”) and implicitly her own practice described as finishing one session with writing tasks for homework. We can also note only a limited use of teaching-specific professional discourse in the terms “guided questions” and “opening questions”, but generally there seems to still be some struggling evident in the appropriate use of the language of education.

Example 5 shows the frequent pattern of students evaluating a described teaching event positively (Line 1) and indicating a willingness to incorporate this in their own envisaged future teaching practice (Line 2), again without providing evidence for the evaluation.

Example 5

Line	Speaker	Statement
	ST:	in two groups and having feedback for their presentations which is something very good I mean for myself next time when I'm gonna have writing session or speaking session

Note: ST – student teacher

We can see that the language of reflection of this student continues to be characterized by very limited use of clearly professional discourse items, with "feedback" the only semi-technical term of education in use.

In the data observed in VARIETE, we can thus see both similarities and difference to the three layers of reflection described by Blomberg et al. (2014) or van Es and Sherin (2002), i.e.: (1) Description of events; (2) Evaluation with regard to potential effects on student learning; (3) Integration of observed or experienced events with professional knowledge, leading to inferences on past and future action.

Firstly, while some student teachers did include all of these elements in their reflections, the evaluation element often did not refer to evidence as a basis of the evaluation at all, and only very rarely explicitly referenced envisaged student

Example 6

Line	Speaker	Statement
1	ST6:	one thing that I noticed that happened at different moments in the
2		classroom it was that the teacher was trying to link the content (in hand) to
3		the students' personal lives (.) even the […] activities they carried out was
4		mostly about their lives and minute thirteen he asks them 'is there anything
5		you are afraid (of) if so why' and he asks 'do you know anybody who has
6		phobia' it happened again in the minutes of forty-five he said 'do you like to
7		be hypnotized by this man' I think […] one good way to learn vocabulary and
8		for students to remember then it's (linking) them to
9	ST4:	I noticed that when he [..] offered the story about the cable car […] the
10		students were fascinated to listen to that and really wanted to know, but
11		they weren't so eager to divulge their own their own stories […]
12	ST3:	don't you think that because he didn't allow extended enough extended
13		time for example when he asked about the if one of them has a situation
14		when he felt afraid or […] so I think the time wasn't very wasn't enough for
15		them to answer because maybe they feel shy because it's about phobia and
16		about real life so, and then he moved to the imagination so imagine that
17		blah blah blah so yeah I think it wasn't enough time for them

Note: ST – student teacher

learning as a reason for their evaluations. The separation of individual layers of reflection in the data frequently proved difficult, as did any data-led, clear distinction of diverse quality or depth of reflections based on these layers.

The final example I wish to present (Example 6) is taken from an extended period of student teacher dialogue, uninterrupted and not scaffolded by the teacher educators.

The three student teachers in this extract are discussing an ESL lesson with advanced, teenage learners, focused on fluency. The overall theme of the 90-minute lesson related to fear and phobias.

Several elements of video-based reflective dialogues are shown clearly here; firstly, both ST6 and ST4 mention their noticing of specific aspects of the lesson observed explicitly (Lines 1 and 9 respectively), and the precision in terms of the point in time in the lesson (“minute thirteen”, Line 4; “minute forty-five”, Line 6) is evidence of ST6 having made use of the affordance of the video recording in terms of pausing, and possibly reviewing specific episodes. This is also shown in the exact quoting of the teacher questions in Lines 4 to 6. The link made is to the pedagogic principle in personalising potential learning material, such as vocabulary, to increase learner motivation. However, having established which specific time -span of the lesson is being discussed, ST4 offers a ‘yes-but’ disagreement with ST6’s positive evaluation of this sequence by describing the hesitance of students to talk about their own fears, in this sense challenging the assumed positive effect of personalising the teaching target of the lesson (i.e., “one good way to learn vocabulary”, Line 7). Some evidence for the evaluation is provided by ST4 in observing that students “weren’t eager to divulge their own stories”, a rare instance of a clear focus on learner, rather than teacher behaviour. ST3 finally introduces a complementary explanation by referring to extended (wait) time, i.e., suggesting that the teacher did not leave sufficient time for students to respond to the potentially challenging question of recalling their own fear-inducing experiences. On the plus side, I would argue that this extract shows how the use of video enables an in-depth discussion of the same event and how dialogue and the inherent questioning for detail and offering of alternative interpretations improves the quality of student reflections. However, we have to note that while some ELT-related concepts are used in the interpretation of this teaching extract (personalising learning; extended wait time), the use of professional language of the discourse community is not (yet) in place.

4 Conclusion

The examples from the preliminary findings of the VARIETE project underline the potential of video-based dialogic reflections to help student teachers develop their professional vision as part of their RP, which aligns with findings by Stürmer et al. (2013); Star and Strickland (2008) and Janík, Minaříková & Gröschner (2015), to name a few. The student group investigated here is specific in many ways, as the mixture of educational and geographical contexts means that the practices available on the video resources were more diverse from the student teachers’ own practices than is the case in many reported research studies. For most student teachers, talking about their professional practices as teachers at all, and most definitely doing so in English, is an unfamiliar experience, which clearly benefitted from scaffolding provided by the teacher educators on the course. Using videos on this course presented the teacher educators with a way of promoting reflective dialogues and clarifying some of the existing assumptions held by student teachers, which made video a helpful tool for promoting reflection.

This diversity of students’ backgrounds and language proficiency levels also means that analysing dialogic reflective data bears some challenges in terms of coding the trajectories of individual and joint reflections. Continuing work on this project aims to provide quantitative trends and tendencies based on new and detailed coding in the frame of Qualitative Content Analysis.

One aspect that is noticeable also at this stage in the project is that the use of professional discourse patterns, be it at terminological or at argumentative level, only appeared in few instances of student teacher contributions. Whether this is inherent with the orality of the data, the L2 status of most participants in the study or simply the challenges of doing reflection and using the professional discourse of teachers at the same time cannot be answered in this project. It does remain evident that more work is needed; this has to address both the analysis of reflective discourse as evidence of processes of reflection, as well as the development of the clearer guidelines and tools that aid the development of professional language among (student) teachers.

Acknowledgment

My heartfelt thanks go to Prof. Richard Kiely for his collaboration in the teacher education classes investigated here. I am grateful for the funding by the Higher Education Academy (UK) for the creation of the VELTE resource.

References

Aguado, K., Schramm, K., & Vollmer, H. J. (Eds.). *Fremdsprachliches Handeln beobachten, messen, evaluieren: Neue methodische Ansätze der Kompetenzforschung und der Videographie*. Peter Lang.

Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System, 35*(2), 192–207. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.12.008

Baecher, L. (2011). Collaborative video inquiry in MA TESOL coursework: Working together to improve ourselves. *ELTED, 14*, 1–7.

Barnard, R., & Ryan, J. (Eds.). (2017). *Reflective practice: Voices from the field*. Routledge

Basturkmen, H. (2012). Review of research into the correspondence between language teachers’ stated beliefs and practices. *System, 40*(2), 282–295. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.05.001

Blomberg, G., Sherin, M. G., Renkl, A., Glogger, I., & Seidel, T. (2014). Understanding video as a tool for teacher education: investigating instructional strategies to promote reflection. *Instructional Science, 42*(3), 443–463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11251-013-9281-6

Borg, M. (2004). Key concepts in ELT: Apprenticeship of observation. *ELT Journal 58*(3), 274–276. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/58.3.274

Boud, D., & Walker, D. (1998). Promoting reflection in professional courses: The challenge of context. *Studies in Higher Education, 23*(2), 191–206. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079812331380384

Braun, J. A. Jr, & Crumpler, T. P. (2004). The social memoir: An analysis of developing reflective ability in a pre-service methods course. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 20*, 59–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2003.09.006

Brouwer, N. (2015). Video-based reflection on teaching: What makes it effective? *Orbis Scholae, 9*(2), 139–144. https://doi.org/10.14712/23363177.2015.84

Bruner, J. S. (1983). *In search of mind*. Harper and Row.

Burton, J. (2009). Reflective practice. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 298–307). Cambridge University Press.

Chick, M. (2015). Dialogic interaction and the mediation of learning during pre-service teacher education. In G. Pickering & P. Gunashekar (Eds.), *Ensuring quality in English language teacher education* (pp. 162–168). British Council.

Clarà, M. (2015). What is reflection? Looking for clarity in an ambiguous notion. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(3), 261–271. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114552028

Dawidowicz, M. (2019). Perspektiven auf das Lernen in virtuellen Gesprächen über eigene Unterrichtsvideos. *Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen, 48*(1), 84–102.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think*. D.C. Heath & Company.

Endacott, J. L. (2016). Using video-stimulated recall to enhance preservice-teacher reflection. *The New Educator, 12*(1), 28–47. https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2015.1113351

Eröz-Tuğa, B. (2013). Reflective feedback sessions using video recordings. *ELT Journal, 67*(2), 175–183. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccs081

Farrell, T. S. C. (1996). *A qualitative study on the reflections of four English as a foreign language teachers in Korea*. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2008). *Novice language teachers: Insights and perspectives for the first year*. Equinox.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2018). *Research on reflective practice in TESOL*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315206332

Farrell, T. S. C., & Ives, J. (2015). Exploring teacher beliefs and classroom practices through reflective practice: A case study. *Language Teaching Research, 19*(5), 594–610. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168814541722

Fendler, L. (2003). Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors: Historical influences and political reverberations. *Educational Researcher, 32*(3), 16–25. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X032003016

Gaudin, C. & Chaliès, S. (2015). Video viewing in teacher education and professional development: A literature review. *Educational Research Review, 16*, 41–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2015.06.001

Gibbs, G. (2013). *Learning by doing: A guide to teaching and learning methods*. Oxford Brookes Centre for Staff and Learning Development.

Goodwin, Ch. (1994). Professional vision. *American Anthropologist, 96*(3), 606–633.

Hall, A. R. (2020). Critical reflections on donor influence and the role of critical communication pedagogies in the classroom. *Communication Education, 69*(3), 387–395. https://doi.org/10.1080/03634523.2020.1768420

Harford, J., MacRuairc, G., & McCartan, D. (2010). 'Lights, camera, reflection': Using peer video to promote reflective dialogue among student teachers. *Teacher Development, 14*(1), 57–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664531003696592

Hobbs, V. (2007). Faking it or hating it: Can reflective practice be forced? *Reflective Practice, 8*(3), 405–417. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940701425063

Hüttner, J. (2019). Towards "professional vision": Video as a resource in teacher learning. In S. Walsh & S. Mann (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education* (pp. 473–487). Routledge.

Janík, T., Minaříková, E., & Gröschner, A. (Eds.) (2015). Striving for change: Video-based teacher education programmes and related research [Special issue]. *Orbis Scholae, 9*(2).

Killion, J. P., & Todnem, G. R. (1991). A process for personal theory building. *Educational Leadership, 48*(6), 14–16.

Köhler, A. (2014). Reflektierte strukturierte Videoanalyse als Mittel institutioneller Professionalisierung angehender Fremdsprachenlehrender: Fokus auf nonverbale Elemente. In C. Moritz (Ed.), *Transkription von Video- und Filmdaten in der Qualitativen Sozialforschung* (pp. 523–543). Springer.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. Prentice Hall.

Korthagen, F. A. (1985). Reflective teaching and preservice teacher education in the Netherlands. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36*(5), 11–15.

Kourieos, S. (2016). Video-mediated microteaching: A stimulus for reflection and teacher growth. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(1), 65–8. http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n1.4

Lantolf, J. P., & Thorne, S. L. (2006). *Sociocultural theory and genesis of second language development*. Oxford University Press.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. University of Chicago Press.

Mann, S. & Walsh, S. (2017). *Reflective practice in English language teaching: Research-based principles and practices*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315733395

Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2013). RP or 'RIP': A critical perspective on reflective practice. *Applied Linguistics Review, 4*(2), 291–315. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0013

Richards, J., & Farrell, T. (2005). Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667237

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. Temple Smith.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a design for teaching and learning in the professionals*. Jossey-Bass.

Sherin, M. G. (2004). New perspectives on the role of video in teacher education. In J. Brophy (Ed.), *Using video in teacher education* (pp. 1–18). Emerald.

Sifakis, N. (2007). The education of teachers of English as a lingua franca: a transformative perspective. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 17*(3), 355–375. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1473-4192.2007.00174.x

Star, J. R., & Strickland, S. K. (2008). Learning to observe: Using video to improve preservice mathematics teachers' ability to notice. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 11*(2), 107–125. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-007-9063-7

Stockero, S. L. (2008). Using a video-based curriculum to develop a reflective stance in prospective mathematics teachers. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 11,* 373. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-008-9079-7

Stürmer, K., Könings, K. D., & Seidel, T. (2013). Declarative knowledge and professional vision in teacher education: Effect on courses in teaching and learning. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*(3), 467–483. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8279.2012.02075.x

Sydnor, J. (2016). Using video to enhance reflective practice: Student teachers' dialogic examination of their own teaching. *The New Educator, 12*(1), 67–84. https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2015.1113346

Trip, T. R., & Rich, P. J. (2012). The influence of video analysis on the process of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 28*(5), 728–739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.01.011

Van Es, E. A., & Sherin, M. G. (2002). Learning to notice: Scaffolding new teachers' interpretations of classroom interactions. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education, 10*(4), 571–596.

Van Es, E., & Sherin, M. G. (2008). Mathematics teachers' learning to notice in the context of a video club. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*(2), 244–276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.005

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

Watanabe, A. (2016). *Reflective Practice as Professional Development Experiences of Teachers of English in Japan*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096985

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom discourse and teacher development*. Edinburgh University Press.

Wipperfürth, M. (2015). *Professional Vision in Lehrernetzwerken: Berufssprache als ein Weg und ein Ziel von Lehrerprofessionalisierung*. Waxmann.

Wipperfürth, M. (2019). Oberflächliche Unterrichtsanalyse: Wie handlungsleitendes Wissen in Unterrichtsnachbesprechungen verhandelbar wird. *Fremdsprachen Lehren und Lernen, 48*(1), 103–122.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Prof. Mag. Dr. Julia Hüttner, MSc.
Department of English and American Studies / Centre for Teacher Education
University of Vienna
Universitätscampus Hof 8.3.
Spitalgasse 2–4
1090 Vienna, Austria
Julia.Huettner@univie.ac.at