



# 12 Multilingual Digital Translanguaging and Storying with New Zealand Pasifika Learners

Rae Si'ilata

## Introduction

Current notions of effective practice for linguistically diverse learners within digital learning environments in Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ) are often restricted to the production of digital output or 'products' in the dominant language (English) only, and do not include the incorporation of learners' heritage language resources, or even of their particular English language varieties. In Aotearoa/NZ, the indigenous language, Te Reo Māori, is spoken by a linguistic (predominantly indigenous) minority, while other linguistic minorities, including those from the Pacific Islands, speak the languages of their island nation homes. This chapter focuses on NZ Pacific (Pasifika) learners within primary contexts, where teachers and educational leaders in English medium classrooms need to move beyond practices that rest on Pasifika learners adopting majority culture English language, literacy and identity in order to achieve academic and digital goals. This chapter explores the process and outcomes of transforming computer assisted language learning (CALL) in multilingual contexts to better meet both the learning and cultural aspirations of Pasifika peoples in Aotearoa NZ. A Pasifika metaphor of the Va'atele (double-hulled deep-sea canoe) is offered as a framework for Pasifika learners' success in order that schools and educators might understand how it is possible to both privilege and utilise students' linguistic and cultural resources within the digital learning space at school. In this way, Pasifika learners can make meaningful connections between home and school funds of knowledge (Gonzalez *et al.*, 2005), and are able to experience success in both domains. Evidence is presented from a case study that draws attention to the central roles teachers play in enabling Pasifika learners to connect, rather than replace, the world views, languages, literacy practices and experiences of their homes with

the digital language and literacy practices of school. The enactment of linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogies within digital learning spaces improves students' linguistic and literacy achievement in English and heritage languages, while also enabling stronger connections between home and school domains.

### Pasifika peoples in NZ

Pacific peoples began migrating from their island homes into a prevailing 'English NZ post-colonial environment' in the 1940s. In particular, island nations that were part of NZ's Pacific colonial administration, such as Western Samoa, Niue, Tokelau and the Cook Islands, comprised a significant proportion of the migrating diaspora. Children of those Pacific language communities that had been under NZ administration for a longer time period, tended to experience greater degrees of first/heritage language loss. As a consequence, many NZ-born Pacific children today, now speak Pacific varieties of English, and possess varying degrees of receptive or productive competence in their Pacific heritage language. A feature of NZ's existing Pacific population includes a growing proportion with multiple heritages or identities: 37.2% according to Statistics NZ (2013), resulting in increasing levels of cross-cultural relations within NZ society. Also, the Cook Islands, Niue and Tokelau have more community members living in NZ than in their island home nations, resulting in the resident communities within NZ becoming critical sites of language revival and 'cultural knowledge' transmission for their respective Pacific diaspora.

Pacific peoples in NZ form the third largest ethnic minority group after Māori (14.9% or 598,605 people) and Asian (11.8% or 471,708 people) (Statistics NZ, 2013). The number of Pasifika peoples in NZ is increasing, with 6.9% (265,974 people) in 2006, and 7.4% (295,941 people) of the total population identifying as Pasifika in 2013. NZ-born Pacific peoples (rather than migrant peoples) now comprise 62.3% of the total Pacific population in NZ (Statistics NZ, 2013). Although Pasifika peoples trace their heritage to distinct Pacific Island nations, they are identified by NZ government institutions under the blanket Pacific/Pasifika categories. The terms 'Pasifika peoples' or 'Pasifika' are used by the Ministry of Education (2009b), while the Ministry for Pacific Peoples uses the terms 'Pacific peoples' and 'Pacific population'. These 'masking' labels, while somewhat problematic for individual Pacific nation peoples, could also be said to represent the multiple identities and language resources of mixed heritage Pasifika peoples. 'Pasifika education' is the term used in the remainder of this chapter to refer to the education and development of the Pacific diaspora resident within NZ.

## What constitutes Pasifika success?

Success for Pasifika peoples and their children should be considered holistically, relative to the multiple worlds they live in. Generally for Pasifika communities, academic success is not only about the success of the individual but is also reflective of the success of the family and the community from which they come. To be deemed fully successful in Pasifika contexts, Pasifika children are encouraged to strengthen and build capability in the ‘valued knowledges’ and ‘ways of being’ of their family/community domains, as well as the valued knowledge of school. Ideally, success achieved in one domain should have benefits or ‘capital’ in the other domains in which learners are socialised.

Education that enables Pasifika learners in classrooms in Aotearoa NZ to see their languages, cultures and identities represented in the ‘valued knowledge of school’, and to be utilised as a normal part of language and literacy learning in their classrooms suggests that their perceptions of success will include, rather than exclude, their linguistic and cultural identities. The continued development of Pasifika languages and literacies not only enables learners to be successful in the worlds of their families and communities, but also has direct impact on their successful acquisition of English language and literacy (Baker, 2011; Cummins, 2008; Si‘ilata, 2014).

## Pasifika Languages Policy

Within English medium education, the Ministry of Education promotes the utilisation of family language resources to support successful transition to English. There is minimal systemic support for ongoing Pasifika language maintenance, or for biliteracy development through Pasifika bilingual/immersion education. As stated in a Ministry of Education (2014: 6) ‘request for proposals’ for teacher professional learning and development (PLD) in the utilisation of dual language texts in English medium education, ‘[t]eachers need to build on all of the Pasifika children’s language knowledge, skills and experiences to support English language learning and literacy’. Language shift and loss among NZ Pasifika communities is occurring at an alarming rate. Concerns about Pasifika language loss have been expressed within educational forums for many years: ‘According to NZ Census data (2006), all Pasifika languages in the Realm of Aotearoa NZ are showing significant signs of language shift and loss’ (Post Primary Teachers Association, 2010: 1).

Historically, the Ministry of Education has provided Pasifika language texts (Tupu Readers) in the five main language groups of Reo Maori Kuki ‘Airani (Cook Islands Maori), Vagahau Niue (Niuean), Gagana Samoa (Samoan), Gagana Tokelau (Tokelauan) and Lea Faka-Tonga (Tongan); online support through the LEAP (Language Enhancing the

Achievement of Pasifika) website (McComish *et al.*, 2008); language learning material for new learners of those languages, but not necessarily speakers or members of those speech communities (Ministry of Education, 2009a); and PLD provision for Pasifika bilingual teacher aides (Ministry of Education, 2007). Recently, Pasifika dual language texts for shared reading purposes in English medium classrooms have also been developed (Ministry of Education, 2016a); however, there is currently no further development of instructional reading material in Pasifika languages to enable biliteracy development within bilingual learning contexts within schools. It is necessary, therefore, to consider notions of ‘Pasifika success’ within English medium education, where the majority of Pasifika learners are schooled.

### **Biliteracy Development**

Pasifika bilingual learners are able to draw on language resources that include their receptive and productive capabilities in their Pasifika heritage languages, as well as a repertoire of sociolinguistic registers in their English language proficiency. When students are supported to access their common underlying proficiency (Cummins, 1980, 2000), their bilingualism, biliteracy and academic development can develop simultaneously rather than sequentially (Baker, 2011; García, 2009). The implications of the common underlying proficiency construct require teachers to actively *teach for transfer* of linguistic, meta-cognitive and meta-linguistic knowledge. The theoretical rationale for this teaching for crosslinguistic transfer originates from several sources. Hornberger (2003) proposed a ‘continua of biliteracy’ where both literacies are interconnected in the unconscious mind of the learner, cannot be separated and have to be viewed as a single biliteracy system. This means that rather than ignoring what students know in their heritage language, teachers in English medium contexts should draw on, make links to and build on students’ language, literacy and curriculum content knowledge in their heritage languages and show students how to transfer skills, strategies and content learned in English to their other language (Cummins, 2007, 2008, 2011).

In English medium and immersion/bilingual classrooms, the ‘monolingual principle’ has dominated, meaning that students’ first languages are often ignored and are kept rigidly separate from the learning of English and content (Cummins, 2008; Si’ilata, 2004) and, in immersion classrooms, students are prohibited from using their stronger language if it is not the medium of instruction of the immersion programme. Cummins (2008: 65) argues that when educators are freed ‘from exclusive reliance on monolingual instructional approaches, a wide variety of opportunities arise for teaching bilingual learners by means of bilingual instructional

strategies that acknowledge the reality of, and strongly promote, cross-language transfer'. Creative translation activities and 'translanguaging' have a role to play within communicative approaches to language and literacy learning, 'as a means of enabling learners to create multimedia texts that communicate in powerful and authentic ways with multiple audiences in both L1 and L2' (Cummins, 2008: 65). 'Translanguaging' originated with Williams (1996, 2000), who used it in Welsh medium education to name a pedagogical practice that switches the language mode – for example, reading is done in one language and writing in another. In essence, it teaches students to receive curriculum content input in one language and output it in another mode or genre in another language. It is not simply a translation of the same text form or mode of expression (García, 2009; García & Kleifgen, 2010):

Translanguaging is *multiple discursive practices* in which bilinguals engage in order to *make sense of their bilingual worlds*. Translanguaging therefore goes beyond what has been termed code switching although it includes it, as well as other kinds of bilingual language use and bilingual contact. (García, 2009: 45)

Translanguaging extends what Gutierrez and her colleagues have called 'hybrid language use', that is, a 'systematic, strategic, affiliative, and sense-making process' (Gutierrez *et al.*, 2001: 128). Creating opportunities for students to translanguage is one way to utilise the idea of teaching for transfer across languages. Cummins (2008) proposed five possible types of transfer across languages, including transfer of conceptual elements, transfer of meta-cognitive and meta-linguistic strategies, transfer of pragmatic aspects of language use, transfer of specific linguistic elements and transfer of phonological awareness. Research into the connection between transfer, translanguaging and the discourse practices of bilinguals, has been investigated by other researchers who argue that translanguaging as a pedagogic process can be used to develop the linguistic repertoire and academic identities of emergent bilinguals in a range of ways (Celic & Seltzer, 2011; Champlin, 2016; García & Kleyn, 2016; Hesson *et al.*, 2014; Lee *et al.*, 2011). In providing planned and deliberate translanguaging opportunities for these learners, emergent bilinguals are able to 'adapt their language practices to the particular communicative situation in which they find themselves in order to optimize communication and understanding. That is, bilinguals learn to self-regulate to maximize their language use' (Celic & Seltzer, 2011: 2). These authors argue further that translanguaging supports emergent bilinguals to develop and transfer their linguistic flexibility within additional language learning, while validating their home language practices and enabling the rigorous teaching of both content and language.

Many researchers in the area of language and literacy development emphasise the importance of utilising learners' linguistic and cultural resources in teaching and learning interactions in schools (Cummins, 2001; McCaffery, 2014; Ruíz, 1984; Si'ilata, 2014). Dickie (2010: 25), for example, described the 'out of school' literacy experiences of Samoan children 'reading passages of the Bible aloud with perfect accuracy; and *tauloto*, which are passages from the Bible to be memorised'. Dickie argued that Samoan church literacy practices maintained a strong focus on comprehension, as well as memorisation, and that being informed about these practices could enable teachers to link to and build on these strengths in their classrooms.

Subtractive bilingual contexts for Pasifika learners were identified by McComish *et al.* (2008) as being those where bilingualism is seen as a negative phenomenon in wider society; the learner's first language is not valued and encouraged, and is replaced by the dominant language (English). In these contexts, bilinguals will not learn to use both languages extensively and are unlikely to have high proficiency in both languages (McComish *et al.*, 2008: 17). These authors maintain that, regardless of the language skills of bilingual (and other) learners, teachers should build on those competencies as a basis for further teaching and learning. The need for teachers to utilise linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogies when teaching Pasifika learners is highlighted in Chu *et al.*'s (2013) summary of Pasifika education research literature. Despite the research and policy emphasis on the value of utilising linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogies, the NZ Ministry of Education has tended to provide systemic support for digital technology development in schools through the medium of English only, rather than promoting the utilisation of students' language resources in both English and their heritage languages.

## Digital Technologies for Teaching and Learning

A significant focus of the NZ Ministry of Education's work programme is concentrated on supporting schools to utilise digital technologies. The ministry's website states that by the end of 2016, 'all schools will have access to the technology available to provide high quality, high capacity, ultrafast internet access for teaching and learning' (Ministry of Education, 2016b: 1). The ministry's focus on the development of connected classrooms, utilisation of digital devices and connecting students with educational resources and 'subject-matter experts' over the internet, is premised on the default position of English medium digital teaching and learning. However, there is some evidence of strong connections being made between schools and families through the use of digital services such as social networks and websites and the development of digital

resources such as ebooks. Most of the ebook development to date has been in English, with some parallel development in Te Reo Māori, and more recently the production of 20 dual language early reading texts, mentioned above, in the five main Pasifika languages in school: Cook Islands Maori, Niuean, Samoan, Tokelauan and Tongan to support transition to English medium schooling (Ministry of Education, 2016a). Digital media are becoming increasingly relevant tools in multilingual classrooms in Aotearoa NZ, enabling students and families to access learning tools and digital storybooks outside of classroom hours, thus enabling digital 24/7 learning. Audio sound files of digital storybooks are of particular use to classroom teachers who may not be speakers of children's languages, and also for enabling children to read stories in their own languages independently, supported by a 'digital listening post'.

One network of schools: Manaiakalani (<http://www.manaiakalani.org/home>) has led the development in the digital learning space in NZ. An evaluation by University of Auckland researchers on the impact of these digital pedagogies on student learning revealed significant impact on student engagement, while also highlighting the possibility of extending instruction to incorporate language choice:

Vocabulary strategies and word consciousness are areas where there was less instruction and appears likely to be catalytic for supporting comprehension and thinking, supported by multimedia. Similarly, critical skills, perspective taking and language choices are all areas where there is opportunity to extend instruction. (Jesson *et al.*, 2016: 8f)

## Dimensions of Effective Practice for Pasifika Learners

The six 'dimensions of effective practice' for learners in general, are described in *Effective Literacy Practice in Years 1 to 4* (Ministry of Education, 2003: 12, 2005). These six generic dimensions of effective literacy practice were modified to make them more specific to Pasifika learners and to validate the utilisation of learners' linguistic and cultural resources within the NZ education space (Si'ilata, 2014). The 'Pasifika-specific' dimensions of effective practice for Pasifika learners were developed from the literature on linguistic and cultural responsiveness, and the findings of a prior PLD and research project (Si'ilata, 2014; Si'ilata *et al.*, 2012). The Va'atele framework, which incorporated the dimensions of effective practice for Pasifika learners, was developed by Si'ilata (2014), as a metaphor and model for Pasifika success within language and literacy teaching practices in primary schools. This set of six 'Pasifika-specific' dimensions of effective classroom practice for Pasifika learners, each elucidated by two indicators, was used as a

framework to consider all of the evidence collected (Table 12.1). The dimensions included:

- Knowledge of Pasifika learners.
- Expectations of Pasifika learners.
- Knowledge of Pasifika bilingualism, second language acquisition and literacy learning.
- Instructional strategies, including Pasifika languages as resources for learning.
- Pasifika connections with texts, world, language and literacy knowledge.
- Partnerships with Pasifika families/aiga and community knowledge holders (Si'ilata, 2014: 255–258).

**Table 12.1** Dimensions of effective practice for Pasifika learners (Si'ilata, 2014)

Dimensions of effective practice for Pasifika learners	Indicators
Knowledge of Pasifika learners	(1a) Teachers analyse and use English language and literacy data in their practice. (1b) Teachers analyse and use Pasifika home language data and family/cultural funds of knowledge.
Expectations of Pasifika learners	(2a) Teachers set high, informed expectations for student learning which build on Pasifika learners' aspirations and values. (2b) Teachers build effective teacher-student relationships that focus on learning and build Pasifika learner agency.
Knowledge of Pasifika bilingualism, second language acquisition, and literacy learning	(3a) Teachers know about Pasifika bilingualism, second language acquisition, and literacy learning. (3b) Teachers use evidence from student data and from practice to design learning sequences, and monitor progress in relation to Pasifika learners' language and literacy needs.
Use of instructional strategies including Pasifika languages as resources for learning	(4a) Teachers explicitly teach English language and vocabulary by building on Pasifika home languages and oral practices. (4b) Teachers explicitly teach strategies for written language, including use of Pasifika literacy practices.
Supporting Pasifika connections with text, world, language, and literacy knowledge	(5a) Teachers support Pasifika learners to make meaningful connections with Pasifika cultures, experiences, languages, literacies, texts and worldviews. (5b) Teachers provide opportunities for Pasifika learners to transfer knowledge, languages and literacies from one context to another.
Partnerships with Pasifika families/aiga and community knowledge holders	(6a) Teachers collaborate with Pasifika families/aiga in identifying student learning needs and valued outcomes. (6b) Teachers build reciprocal relationships with Pasifika families/aiga and community experts to utilise their knowledge at school.

Source: Adapted from 'The Dimensions of Effective Practice' Ministry of Education (2003: 12).



These six dimensions were utilised with teachers in a PLD and research project that focused on supporting teachers to employ dual language texts with Pasifika learners, including digital learning technologies (Si'ilata *et al.*, 2015a). Teachers were encouraged to support students and their families 'to story' in their own languages, using the digital and hard copy books as catalysts for the promotion of 'translanguaging storying' and the creation of their own multimedia texts. Teachers were encouraged to make links between learners' home and school contexts 'in ways that were visible and significant for the child' (Ministry of Education, 2003: 117). These Pasifika-specific dimensions were used as the overarching framework for the analysis of teaching practice, and form the lens through which the data from teachers and the observations of their practice have been analysed and the results articulated. The way in which teachers demonstrated aspects of these dimensions are described in two case studies below.

The first case study is situated within a research project that examined the language and literacy outcomes of Samoan children in the classes of 24 teachers who participated in the PLD pilot. The classroom practices of six teachers were investigated by gathering in-depth data based on audio-recorded and transcribed classroom lessons and post-observation interviews with each teacher. The design team of early literacy, *English for speakers of other languages* (ESOL) and bilingual experts had been contracted by the Ministry of Education to design and deliver a six-month teacher PLD and family meeting pilot programme to a cluster of seven schools (including 24 Year 1–2 teachers). These schools had significant numbers of Samoan bilingual children, with the pilot's focus being on the development of continuity between home and school language/literacy practices. The ministry's goal for the pilot was to support the development of smooth transitions between home/early-childhood contexts and schooling by supporting teachers and parents to utilise dual language Samoan–English texts with their students/children. Through the PLD programme, teachers were supported to use communicative translanguaging approaches to language and literacy learning, and to foster connections between children's Samoan and English language and literacy resources. They were encouraged to incorporate the trialling of dual language text utilisation within their existing language, literacy and digital programmes. Through the family meeting programme, parents were encouraged to 'talanoa' (talk) with their children, to maintain their Samoan language in the home and to 'story around the text' by connecting their own stories with the schema of the book. Teachers participating in the PLD programme attended four full-day workshops over four months, and the parents of the Samoan children in the teachers' classes attended three parent meetings/fono over the same time period. Teachers were also visited by PLD facilitators

who observed their practice and engaged in co-constructed learning conversations following their lessons. Meetings with senior managers were held prior to, and following the PLD workshop programme in order to provide information, share outcomes, present opportunities for feedback and support systemic change within schools. Data were based on audio recordings and transcriptions from the pilot workshops; from the observations of the teacher lessons; and from the lead facilitator's post-observation interviews with the teachers. The participating teachers were drawn from seven schools with significant numbers of Samoan children. The pilot preceded subsequent development in the four other Pasifika languages afforded with resource development by the Ministry of Education (Te Reo Māori Kuki Airani/Cook Islands Maori, Vagahau Niue/Niuean, Lea Faka Tonga/Tongan and Gagana Tokelau/Tokelauan). A case methodology was utilised, supported by both quantitative and qualitative research methods in order to answer the research questions. The questions were:

- (1) What is the impact on classroom teachers' practice following participation in a PLD pilot programme focused on the utilisation of Samoan dual language texts?
- (2) What is the impact of teacher utilisation of dual language texts on Samoan children and their families?
- (3) What does effective teaching that is focused on the development of bilingual, translanguaging and biliteracy pedagogies with Pasifika children look like?
- (4) Within multilingual classrooms, how might teachers synthesise translanguaging pedagogies with students' production of bilingual multimedia products?

The PLD pilot took a co-constructed approach with teachers to enable them to connect new professional learning with their existing classroom practice. They had opportunity to consider classroom implications for ongoing bilingual and biliteracy development; they learnt about utilising students' prior linguistic and literacy knowledge through employing translanguaging pedagogies; they learnt how to integrate receptive and productive modes, accelerate vocabulary acquisition and synthesise dual language text utilisation with existing classroom digital tools.

Case Study 1 highlights the beliefs and practices of effective teachers who demonstrated dimension (4a) within the digital learning space: Teachers explicitly teach English language and vocabulary by building on Pasifika home languages and oral practices. It is drawn from research undertaken with Years 1–2 teachers of Samoan learners who participated in a Ministry of Education PLD pilot programme that was focused on

the utilisation of Samoan dual language texts to support language and literacy learning at school (Si'ilata *et al.*, 2015a, 2015b). The second case study provides a brief account of an exemplary teacher, Teacher K, who worked within Manaiakalani (the digital learning network of schools), where teachers taught in digital classrooms, and supported their Pasifika learners to create multimedia digital products. Only a few of these teachers, however, were synthesising translanguaging and digital pedagogies in systematic ways. Case Study 2 highlights the practice of Teacher K, who demonstrated dimension (4b): Teachers explicitly teach strategies for written language, including use of Pasifika literacy practices. Her work was shared with teachers who participated in the dual language text PLD programme described in Case Study 1, to provide them with actual examples of translanguaging pedagogies being used within digital learning spaces.

Through these cases, illustrative narratives of the Va'atele dimension: Instructional strategies, including Pasifika languages as resources for learning, are presented.

## Case Study 1

### *Dimension 4: Instructional strategies, including Pasifika languages as resources for learning*

#### *Indicator (4a) Teachers explicitly teach English language and vocabulary by building on Pasifika home languages and oral practices*

This case illustrates the importance of surfacing and changing teacher beliefs before endeavouring to change teacher practice. It includes the voice of Teacher A who talked about what enabled her to change her beliefs and practices in relation to the use of Pasifika languages as resources for learning. It also includes a short classroom excerpt from Teacher D that provides an example of a teacher endeavouring to synthesise translanguaging pedagogies with multimedia digital product production by her Pasifika learners.

The pre-eminence of the role of pre-existing knowledge as a foundation for learning has been well documented by Bransford *et al.* (2000) who emphasise three requirements for effective learning: (a) engaging prior understandings, (b) integrating factual knowledge with conceptual frameworks and (c) taking active control over the learning process through meta-cognitive strategies. The inquiry and knowledge building cycle from the best evidence synthesis on teacher PLD (Timperley *et al.*, 2007) connects strongly with Bransford *et al.*'s thinking about how people learn. The synthesis identified how cycles of teacher inquiry and knowledge building can improve learners' engagement, learning and well-being. The stages of the inquiry cycle focus on teacher inquiry in order to meet student learning

needs: identifying valued outcomes and student learning needs; identifying professional learning needs; engaging in professional learning to deepen knowledge and refine skills; engaging in new learning experiences and assessing the impact and re-engagement in the next cycle.

In order for teachers to learn effectively, it is vital that their existing beliefs in relation to their students' learning are surfaced and engaged (Bransford *et al.*, 2000). If teachers' existing beliefs about their students' ability to learn, and about what is important for their students' learning are not surfaced and challenged, it is unlikely that they will engage in the next stage of deepening their pedagogical content knowledge because their existing beliefs may prevent them from doing so. In relation to their Pasifika learners, this would mean surfacing existing teacher beliefs and assumptions about the ways in which Pasifika learners learn, about what helps them to learn, about their families' aspirations for their learning, about their abilities and experiences outside of school and particularly about their languages, family and cultural backgrounds.

The overarching principle of the PLD programme, encapsulated in each of the workshop underpinning principles and outcomes, was the integration of home and school 'funds of knowledge' and the utilisation of Samoan children's language and literacy resources. This focus on utilising Samoan children's funds of knowledge, rather than maintaining a focus solely on student needs as a basis for effective teacher PLD, meant that teachers were supported to view their Samoan (and other linguistically diverse learners) through an appreciative lens. Teachers were encouraged to engage in communicative bilingual approaches to language and literacy learning within the digital learning space, throughout the PLD programme, which prompted reflection on their current practice and classroom environment.

#### *Teachers' existing beliefs*

Before endeavouring to change teacher practice, it was first necessary to surface teachers' existing beliefs about how Pasifika bilingual children learn, and about what it means to 'tap into students' funds of knowledge'. Teachers needed to surface and understand their own tacit beliefs about the perceived value of making connections with bilingual students' funds of knowledge to support teaching and learning in the classroom. Through conversations with teachers during workshops, there was evidence that some teachers knew little about the out-of-school lives and experiences of Pasifika children and their families. Some teachers expressed that they had previously taken a deficit view of Pasifika children's and families' lives and experiences, primarily their language/s, dialects, registers of English and their particular literacy practices (for example, church literacy knowledge and practices). They were provided with opportunities to discuss how their beliefs about what works in

classrooms for bilingual learners had been challenged, the impact on their practice and the changed outcomes:

Teacher A:

The bottom line is I failed this child and I have changed. Now I am really emotional about this because if I failed him how many other children have I? And I've noticed that every single one of my children is now moving... I was given two children that haven't moved at all in another class, and then I got them. They are now moving. And this has all taken part in the last month or so... It's happened. I am proof of that and I am such a happy person because of that... And often we think we know it all. Actually we don't. I used to think I was a damn good teacher and you woke me up on that day. I had to have a really good check of myself and my teaching practices and what was working and what wasn't, and how I could change it and to this day it has affected me so greatly...

Many teachers expressed that they already made connections with students' prior knowledge, but the connections made were often limited to a brief discussion about children's prior 'world knowledge' prior to reading. Few monolingual teachers were making connections with children's existing linguistic or first language knowledge. Some teachers expressed the belief that it was better to keep the first language separate from the learning of English and that five-year-olds would get confused if teachers tried to teach more than one language at a time, especially while endeavouring also to teach mastery of digital tools.

*Utilising digital tools to promote language and literacy learning*

A number of (non-Samoan) teachers read Samoan texts with their students using digital sound files of the texts that provided models of correct pronunciation. Teacher D supported her learners to connect their own schema with the schema in the book, and enabled them to utilise the text structure to tell and write their own bilingual digital stories using iPads:

[Teacher with new entrant five-year-olds creating their own digital stories about themselves using the dual language Samoan text as a structure]:

**Teacher:** Off you go, you guys carry on.

**Children:** Yay! (Reading the story they have written on their iPad): 'O la'u 'ato ā'oga lea. Here is my school bag.

**Teacher:** Okay do you maybe need to record that one again if you can't really hear it?

**Child 1:** You need to delete it.

- Teacher:** Okay so delete that one. You guys have another go at the sound file.
- Teacher and child together:** ‘O la’u ‘ato ā’oga lea. (Here is my school bag).
- Teacher:** Want to play it and see what it sounds like?
- Children play their sound recording:** ‘O la’u ‘ato ā’oga lea. Here is my school bag. ‘O la’u pusa mea’ai lea. Here is my lunch box. ‘O la’u tusi lea. Here is my book.
- Teacher:** Let’s see if they’ve got their sound file (plays the file). Awesome. You guys are way ahead. Let’s read it together (uses the digital text on the interactive whiteboard to read with students):
- Teacher and children:** What’s this one? We can read this one; we’re clever. ‘O la’u tusi lea. And what does that one mean? Here is my book.
- Child:** How do you know how to do it?
- Teacher:** Because Mrs R\_\_\_\_\_ has been practising at home!
- Child:** Are you Samoan?
- Teacher:** No sweetie, but I’m learning.
- Child 2:** She’s English. She’s from England...
- Teacher:** Yes, cos even though I’m a teacher, I never stop learning either. I have to go home and do homework too.
- Child:** Cos you’re a English. You’re from England.
- Teacher:** I am from England, yes.

It was evident that the teacher’s willingness to put herself in the position of the learner, to privilege the linguistic knowledge of the children and to create opportunities for them to connect their Samoan linguistic and conceptual knowledge with their English language and literacy acquisition had a major impact on the children’s willingness to utilise their linguistic resources at school. The use of their linguistic resources had a direct impact on their English language acquisition, their biliteracy development and their meaningful use of digital tools for multilingual storytelling within the translanguaging space. They were also prompted to consider their teacher’s and their own linguistic and cultural identities as a result of reading digital dual language texts together. The teacher’s deliberate use of translanguaging as a pedagogical tool enabled the Samoan children in her class to develop greater bilingual and biliterate capability.

Another junior school teacher (Teacher N) who participated in the same PLD programme, decided to call on the older siblings of the children in her class to record their own bilingual versions of the digital storybooks because their younger siblings struggled to keep up with the speed of

the commercially produced sound files. The outcome of this choice by the teacher resulted in the younger children exhibiting greater reading engagement, evidence of accelerated achievement in English and enhanced maintenance and production of their heritage language (Samoan).

## Case Study 2

*Dimension 4: Instructional strategies, including Pasifika languages as resources for learning*

*Indicator (4b) Teachers explicitly teach strategies for written language, including use of Pasifika literacy practices*

This case study draws on the work of an exemplary teacher within the translanguaging/digital teaching and learning space. Teacher K's work and personal reflection were provided via her online blog. As one of the lead teachers in the digital learning community, her online blog described her professional inquiry into her own practice. She sought to combine the Manaikalani digital learning community's approach of *Learn, Create, Share* with translanguaging pedagogical approaches to enable her Tongan learners to create multimedia digital texts in both English and Tongan. Teacher K had recently completed studies in teaching English in schools to speakers of other languages (TESSOL), and having learnt about translanguaging pedagogies, she endeavoured to utilise these approaches with the Tongan children in her class. The children engaged in bilingual reading and discussion about an ancient Tongan story that was familiar to them, and which was then used as a basis for bilingual multimedia text production. The following example demonstrates the children negotiating their understandings of the Tongan text using both Tongan and English. Teacher K supported them to read a text about the heilala flower, and to find out how it was created, according to an ancient Tongan love story. The children worked collaboratively and bilingually to make connections to the text using all of their language resources to do so. Teacher K explains:

This is a quick post about another example of translanguaging I have tried. The setting was Reading. Students needed to read a Tongan text and make connections to the text to infer what was happening in the pictures... I hope that when completing this, they use some of the key Tongan language phrases that we learned/discussed while reading this today. This text was very simple and prompted a lot of discussion. I did not need any prior translating of the text before teaching, so this could be an ideal text for any teacher wanting to begin this journey, or a teacher who has a student new from Tonga and who needs support from texts written in their first language.

Tongan children reading together:

Kakala faka'ofu'ofa! Ko e heilala, ko e huni, pea mo e fa'. 'Oku faka'ofu'ofa 'aupito. 'Oku ou sa'ia hono lanu'. Lanu kulokula lelei.

English translation:

What beautiful flowers! They're heilala, huni, and fa'. The flowers are really beautiful. I love the colour. It's a great red.

Teacher K described this as the 'learn' stage of '*Learn, Create, Share*', connecting it with 'linguistic input in one language', where students were receiving and negotiating input in Tongan and producing oral 'output' in English, using a Tongan medium text. At the 'create' stage, she linked this with 'linguistic and cognitive processing', aimed at extending learners' oral and written output using a range of digital tools, including Google apps, Google images and the children's independent online research about the heilala flower. The following is an example of their written output:

What types of Heilala are there? There is more than one colour of Heilala. The colours of the heilala are red and yellow. They wear heilala flowers to weddings, birthdays and funerals.

The children used these input and cognitive processing modes to create their own digital multimedia texts using a movie app to tell their audience about the origins of the heilala flower. It was apparent that the students were drawing on prior learning by making connections to a story they had explored before. They also utilised Pasifika literacy practices including oratory techniques such as memorisation, recitation, choral reading, music and song to create their version of the Tongan myth in a digital format using both Tongan and English. At the 'share' stage, the children posted their digital products on their class blog to share with others.

#### *Understanding the Va'atele metaphor*

The dimensions of effective practice for Pasifika learners were applied to the metaphor or model for Pasifika learner success: the *va'atele*, or double-hulled canoe. The analogy of the Va'atele framework may be applied to Pasifika learners as they navigate their way through the education system, enabled by teachers and leaders who employ the dimensions of effective practice for Pasifika learners in their practice. To understand the metaphor in relation to Pasifika learners and their experiences at school, the double hulls and the voyaging of the deep-sea canoe are compared with Pasifika learners' passage or journey through the schooling system as bilingual/bicultural people. Ideally, Pasifika learners would be in school settings that support the development of their bilingualism, biliteracy and biculturalism, enabling success not only in the world of school, but also in the world of home and community. One hull may be seen to represent the language, literacy, culture and world view of home, while the second hull is representative of the language, literacy, culture and world view of school. The platform/fata built



over the two hulls is a bridge that helps to hold the whole *va'atele* together, thus enabling the hulls/va'a to move through the water as one vessel, while also providing the stability needed to sail through any storm.

For Pasifika learners at school in Aotearoa NZ or throughout the Pacific, enacting the metaphorical double-hulled canoe (or linguistically and culturally responsive environment that privileges bilingual and biliterate goals over monolingual ones), is more likely to elicit effective outcomes than the single-hull metaphor – whether the single-hull be ‘English-only’ language, literacy and cultural knowledge, or single-hulled Pasifika-only language, literacy and cultural knowledge. In order for Pasifika learners to be successful in these two worlds, they need to strengthen and build capacity and capability in both, and to have opportunity to use their full linguistic resource within the digital learning space.

## Conclusion

This chapter began by providing an overview of the educational landscape for Pasifika learners in Aotearoa NZ, followed by an explanation of the *Va'atele* framework and two case studies that illustrate one of the dimensions, as a suggested way to modify practice to incorporate multilingual approaches with Pasifika learners in digital language and literacy teaching spaces at school. The case study illustrates two principles in relation to Pasifika learners' success at school. Through the development of inquiry-focused, collaborative and success-oriented relationships, the following are possible:

- (1) Pasifika learners can be highly successful at school. Their utilisation of language and literacy as interactive learning tools within the digital space is fundamental to that success.
- (2) Teachers can teach Pasifika learners effectively, and in particular ways that connect with and build on their specific languages, cultures and identities, to meet the demands of the curriculum, and to create bilingual/multilingual digital products.

## Future directions

Successfully enacting each of these dimensions and their indicators in the classroom with Pasifika learners was not solely the province of Pasifika teachers. These indicators were enacted in classrooms to varying degrees by the teachers involved in the research studies, with only 2 of the 24 teachers being of Pasifika ethnicity (Samoan). The findings of this research illustrate that any teacher, regardless of ethnicity, can improve their practice in creating opportunities for Pasifika learners to make the timely, meaningful connections that build on their languages, cultures and identities within the digital learning space, in order to master the

linguistic and cognitive demands of school. From the case studies, it was evident that the teachers who were effective at supporting children to create bilingual digital products, were those who held specific pedagogical content knowledge in bilingual/translanguaging pedagogies. They also were willing to experiment in the digital learning space, to synthesise translanguaging pedagogies with the children's use of digital tools, thus enabling them to create bi/multilingual digital products. Further research into the systemic structures and effective classroom practices that enable English medium teachers to work in linguistically and culturally responsive ways to enable their Pasifika (and other) linguistically diverse learners to utilise their bilingual and bicultural resources at school, particularly with digital tools, is urgently needed.

## References

- Baker, C. (2011) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* (5th edn). Bristol: Multilingual Matters.
- Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L. and Cocking, R.R. (2000) *How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Celic, C. and Seltzer, K. (2011) *Translanguaging: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. New York: The Graduate Center, The City University of New York.
- Champlin, M. (2016) Translanguaging and bilingual learners: A study of how translanguaging promotes literacy skills in bilingual students. Unpublished master's dissertation, St. John Fisher College. See [http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1326&context=education\\_ETD\\_masters](http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1326&context=education_ETD_masters) (accessed 17 April 2016).
- Chu, C., Glasgow, A., Rimoni, F., Hodis, M. and Meyer, L. (2013) *An Analysis of Recent Pasifika Education Research Literature to Inform and Improve Outcomes for Pasifika learners*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education. See [http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/121773/An-analysis-of-recent-Pasifika-Education-research-literature-to-inform-improve-outcomes-for-Pasifika-learners.pdf](http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/121773/An-analysis-of-recent-Pasifika-Education-research-literature-to-inform-improve-outcomes-for-Pasifika-learners.pdf) (accessed 13 March 2016).
- Cummins, J. (1980) The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. *NABE Journal* 4 (3), 25–59.
- Cummins, J. (2000) *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2001) Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. In C. Baker and N. Hornberger (eds) *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins* (pp. 175–194). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (2007) Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 10 (2), 221–240.
- Cummins, J. (2008) Teaching for transfer: Challenging the two solitudes assumption in bilingual education. In J. Cummins and N.H. Hornberger (eds) *Encyclopaedia of Language and Education* (pp. 65–75). New York: Springer.
- Cummins, J. (2011) *The Intersection of Cognitive and Sociocultural Factors in the Development of Reading Comprehension among Migrant Students*. New York: Springer Science and Business Media. See <http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2F978-1-145-010-9290-7> (accessed 25 April 2018).
- Dickie, J. (2010) Proclaiming the good news: Samoan children, church literacy, and comprehension. *Set* 2, 25–31.
- Garcia, O. (2009) *Bilingual Education in the 21st Century: A Global Perspective*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

- García, O. and Kleifgen, J. (2010) *Educating Emergent Bilinguals: Policies, Programs, and Practices for English Language Learners*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- García, O. and Kleyn, T. (2016) Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García and T. Kleyn (eds) *Translanguaging with Multilingual Students: Learning from Classroom Moments* (pp. 9–33). New York: Routledge.
- Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. and Amanti, C. (eds) (2005) *Funds of Knowledge, Theorizing Practices in Households, Communities, and Classrooms*. New York: Routledge.
- Gutierrez, K., Baquedano-Lopez, P. and Alvarez, H.H. (2001) Literacy as hybridity: Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. Reyes and J.J. Halcon (eds) *The Best for Our Children: Critical Perspectives on Literacy for Latino Students* (pp. 122–141). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hesson, S., Sletzer, K. and Woodley, H. (2014) *Translanguaging in Curriculum and Instruction: A CUNY-NYSIEB Guide for Educators*. New York: The Graduate Center, The City University of New York
- Hornberger, N. (2003) *Continua of Biliteracy: An Ecological Framework for Educational Policy, Research, and Practice in Multilingual Settings*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Jesson, R., McNaughton, S., Rosedale, N., Zhu, T., Meredith, M. and Kegel, A. (2016) Manaiakalani whānau Capability Building and Classroom Instruction: Final Report – executive summary. Report to Manaiakalani Education Trust. Auckland UniServices, Auckland.
- Lee, J.S., Hill-Bonnet, L. and Raley, J. (2011) Examining the effects of language brokering on student identities and learning opportunities in dual immersion classrooms. *Journal of Language, Identity, and Education* 10 (5), 306–326.
- McCaffery, J. (2014) Simultaneous biliteracy at Richmond Road School. Unpublished PhD draft, University of Auckland.
- McComish, J., May, S. and Franken, M. (2008) *Language Enhancing the Achievement of Pasifika*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (2003) *Effective Literacy Practice in Years 1 to 4*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (2005) *Effective Literacy Practice in Years 5 to 8*. Wellington, NZ: Learning Media.
- Ministry of Education (2007) *The Pasifika Teacher Aide Handbook: Supporting Pasifika Teacher Aides in Mainstream Classrooms*. Auckland, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2009a) *Mua O! An Introduction to Gagana Samoa. Teachers' Guide and Support Materials: Learning Languages Series*. Auckland, NZ: Teuila. See <http://pasifika.tki.org.nz/Media/Files/Mua-O!-An-Introduction-to-Gagana-Samoa> (accessed 13 March 2016).
- Ministry of Education (2009b) The Pasifika Education Plan 2009–2012. See <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/~media/MinEdu/Files/EducationSectors/PasifikaEducation/PEPKeyMessages2011.pdf> (accessed 12 November 2012).
- Ministry of Education (2014) *Request for Proposals – Pasifika New Entrant Pilot: The Design and Implementation of a Pilot Plan to Support New Entrant Pasifika Children into English Medium Schooling*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education (2016a) Pasifika dual language books. See <http://literacyonline.tki.org.nz/Literacy-Online/Planning-for-my-students-needs/Pasifika-dual-language-books> (accessed 11 Feb 2017).
- Ministry of Education (2016b) Digital technologies for teaching and learning. See <http://www.education.govt.nz/ministry-of-education/specific-initiatives/digital-technologies-for-teaching-and-learning/> (accessed 13 April 2018).
- Post Primary Teachers' Association (2010) *'Mind Your Language': Our Responsibility to Protect and Promote Pacific Islands Languages in New Zealand as Part of a National*

- Languages Policy*. Wellington, New Zealand: PPTA Annual Conference Papers. See <http://ppta.org.nz/dmsdocument/302> (accessed 13 April 2018).
- Ruiz, R. (1984) Orientations in language planning. *NABE: The Journal for the National Association for Bilingual Education* 8 (2), 15–34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464>
- Si'ilata, R. (2004) Tala'aga o gagana a tamaiti mai le Pasifika: Language stories of children from the Pacific. Unpublished master's dissertation, University of Auckland.
- Si'ilata, R. (2014) Va'a Tele: Pasifika learners riding the success wave on linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogies. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Auckland. See <http://hdl.handle.net/2292/23402> (accessed 1 Feb 2015).
- Si'ilata, R., Dreaver, K., Parr, J., Timperley, H. and Meissel, K. (2012) *Tula'i Mai! Making a Difference to Pasifika Student Achievement in Literacy: Final Research Report on the Pasifika Literacy Professional Development Project 2009–2010*. Auckland: Auckland UniServices Ltd. <http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/pasifika/literacy-professional-development-project-2009-2010> (accessed 9 June 2015).
- Si'ilata, R., Gaffney, J., Stephenson, J. and McCaffery, J. (2015a) Scaffolding New Entrant Pasifika Children into English Medium Schooling – Design and Implementation of New Entrant Pilot Programme (PNEP) Gālulue Fa'atasi: Final Milestone. Report to the Ministry of Education. Auckland UniServices, Auckland.
- Si'ilata, R., Le Fevre, D.M., Ell, F., Timperley, H., Twyford, K. and Mayo, S. (2015b) Adaptive Expertise in the Facilitation of Linguistic and Cultural Responsiveness. Commissioned report to the Consortium of Professional Learning.
- Statistics NZ (2013) Quickstats about culture and identity. See <http://www.stats.govt.nz/Census/2013-census/profile-and-summary-reports/quickstats-culture-identity/ethnic-groups-NZ.aspx>
- Timperley, H., Wilson, A., Barrar, H. and Fung, A. (2007) *Teacher Professional Learning and Development: Best Evidence Synthesis Iteration*. Wellington, NZ: Ministry of Education.
- Williams, C. (1996) Secondary education: Teaching in the bilingual situation. In C. Williams, G. Lewis and C. Baker (eds) *The Language Policy: Taking Stock* (pp. 39–78). Llangefni, Wales: Cai.
- Williams, C. (2000) Welsh-medium and bilingual teaching in the further education sector. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 3 (2), 129–148.

# 13 The Use of Teacher Trainees' Own and Peer Videos for the Introduction of Multilingual-Sensitive Teaching Approaches in Pre-Service Teacher Training Classes

Heike Niesen

## Introduction

Pupils' increasing heterogeneity in school contexts and, more specifically, multilingualism as one dimension/aspect of that diversity highly challenges current teacher education (Trautmann, 2010; Trautmann & Wischer, 2011; Ziegler, 2013). To best enable teachers to meet this challenge, it does not come as a surprise that teacher education programmes rely on well-proven and efficient tools such as teaching videos. The merits that videos as 'artifacts of practice' (Borko *et al.*, 2008: 418) can have on teachers' education have been portrayed extensively (e.g. Brophy, 2003; Calandra & Rich, 2015; Rossi & Fedeli, 2016). In the course of various video-based professional development (PD) programmes, studies have typically investigated the effects that different video analysis settings, i.e. individual or collaborative analysis, have on the development of teachers' PD (e.g. Lefstein & Snell, 2011), and whether and how teachers' discourse about videos in collaborative settings changes over time (e.g. Borko *et al.*, 2008; Sherin & Han, 2004). The question whether the implementation of videos outperforms that of alternative presentations of teaching, such as written lesson descriptions to foster teachers' PD, has been subject to inquiry as well (Baecher *et al.*, 2013; Rosaen *et al.*, 2008). Further, an impressive number of studies have addressed the impact teachers' own and other teachers' teaching videos have on practitioners' PD (e.g. Hellermann

*et al.*, 2015; Kleinknecht & Schneider, 2013; Krammer & Hugener, 2014; Zhang *et al.*, 2011).

In many of these studies, PD and ‘professional vision’ (Goodwin, 1994) are frequently mentioned in the same breath, since the latter is generally acknowledged as a constitutive part of the former (Lefstein & Snell, 2011; Sherin, 2007). Virtually all of these studies employ a notion of ‘professional vision’ (PV), which has been defined as ‘the ability to see and interpret critical features of classroom events’ (Sherin & Han, 2004: 179), i.e. the ability to be engaged in ‘selective attention’ or ‘noticing’ and ‘knowledge-based reasoning’ (Sherin & van Es, 2009; van Es & Sherin, 2008). Whereas ‘noticing’ refers to the ‘process by which teachers identify what is relevant in a classroom’, ‘knowledge-based reasoning’ is associated with teachers’ ability to ‘describe precisely what has been noticed’, to ‘link (observed classroom situations) to prior knowledge’ and, finally, to ‘evaluate and predict what might happen as a result of the observed situation’ (Seidel *et al.*, 2011: 261).

Although the studies outlined above offer valuable insights into how teachers’ PD/PV may be fostered via video analyses, it is important to note here that, besides a few notable exceptions (e.g. Baecher *et al.*, 2013; Zafer, 2015), these studies have been conducted almost exclusively in the context of science and mathematics teaching and learning. Of course, the implementation of videos is by no means an unrecognised issue in foreign language teaching and learning (cf. e.g. Maclean & White, 2007; Orlova, 2009; Wallace, 1979, 1981). However, none of these studies has investigated the effects different video types can have specifically on pre-service English as a foreign language (EFL) teachers’ multilingual-sensitive PV development. The present chapter aims to address this gap. More precisely, it reports on the use of different types of video analysis within two university classes with a focus on teaching EFL in multilingual settings, conducted and assessed at Goethe University Frankfurt/Main. Given this focus, the two classes are henceforth referred to as ‘Multilingual-sensitive-Teaching-approaches’ (MsTa) classes. An overview of current findings regarding the integration of videos in teacher training will provide the theoretical background. On the basis of the latter, the conceptual design and the objectives of the courses are described, followed by a description of the in-depth course evaluations and their findings.

### **‘Own’, ‘Peer’ and ‘Other’ Videos: Possibilities and Downfalls**

The majority of research on videos and their effects on teachers’ PD distinguishes between ‘own’ and ‘other’ videos. In most cases, ‘own’ videos are those in which teachers see and analyse their own teaching, whereas ‘other’ videos show performances of teachers unknown to the analysts (cf. Seidel *et al.*, 2011). A more fine-grained differentiation of video types is

used by Zhang *et al.* (2011: 454ff) who subdivide ‘other’ videos into ‘video from published resources’ and ‘video of teachers’ colleagues’, also referred to as ‘peer videos’.

A solid amount of research has investigated the effects ‘own’, ‘peer’ and ‘other’ videos have on teachers’ PD. Examining the effects teaching videos have on in-service mathematics teachers’ PV, Sherin and Han (2004) found that all the teachers who participated in their ‘video club meetings’ benefited from the fact that the videos could be analysed without the urgent demands of teaching (cf. Kleinknecht & Schneider, 2013; Sherin & Han, 2004; Sherin & van Es, 2009), no matter whether they investigated their own teaching or that of their colleagues. Not only did video discussions become increasingly complex over time, a finding similar to the one made by Borko *et al.* (2008), teachers also gradually shifted their focus of analysis from being primarily teacher-centred to more pupil-related issues (Sherin & Han, 2004).

### ‘Own’ videos

Their investigation of the effects ‘own’ and ‘peer’ videos have on middle school mathematics teachers’ PD led Borko *et al.* (2008: 434) to conclude that teachers’ own videos ‘allowed teachers to see what they were doing well and to identify areas of improvement’. This finding is similar to the ones made by Zhang *et al.* (2011, 2015) who explored the effects of ‘published’, ‘peer’ and ‘own’ video analyses on in-service science teachers’ PD. The authors argue that their own videos helped teachers to ‘(...) observe themselves from a distance’, and to ‘(...) see things you normally don’t see’, thereby enabling them to ‘identify their strengths and weaknesses’ (Zhang *et al.*, 2015: 156).

In their experimental study on the development of German and Swiss science teachers’ noticing and knowledge-based reasoning, Seidel *et al.* (2011) report higher levels of immersion and resonance for teachers watching their own videos. They further showed that teachers reacted to critical incidents in their own teaching less critically (Seidel *et al.*, 2011: 266). This corresponds to Kleinknecht and Schneider (2013: 19), who, in exploring in-service mathematics teachers’ PD, state that ‘the teachers observing videos of other teachers’ classrooms analysed negative events in greater depth, whereas teachers in the Own Video Group often described or evaluated negative events in a more superficial way’. Interestingly, this contradicts insights gained by Borko *et al.* (2008) who found that teachers rather criticised their own teaching than their colleagues’.

Baecher *et al.* (2013: 189, 196) found ‘own’ videos to be powerful tools to train pre-service teachers of English to speakers of other languages (TESOL) ‘self-evaluation capabilities’, provided that analysis is supported by observation rubrics. The implementation of ‘other’ videos prior to ‘own’ videos counters possible dangers accompanied by the analysis of the latter, namely leniency and modesty bias, i.e. teacher training students’ tendency

to under- or overrate their own teaching performance, respectively (Baecher *et al.*, 2013: 191).

### 'Peer'/'colleagues' video

One of the possibilities offered by 'peer' videos lies in their potential to offer teachers the opportunity to 'see different teaching styles and learn new ideas for their own teaching' (Zhang *et al.*, 2015: 158) or to 'learn new pedagogical strategies (...) and realize that they all struggle with similar issues' (Borko *et al.*, 2008: 434). Another advantage of 'peer' videos lies in the fact that, in contrast to 'other' videos, the teachers who perform in the video are usually present during the process of analysis and can therefore comment on their teaching, and have it evaluated by the observers (cf. Zhang *et al.*, 2015). In spite of these merits, the implementation of 'peer' videos can also be demanding in terms of cooperative video analyses and discussions. As Zhang *et al.* (2015: 159) conclude, 'for some teachers it was unclear whether the point was to support one another, (...), to encourage and improve good teaching, to be nice, or to be critical in a constructive way'. Teachers' behaviour in group discussions is a sensitive matter not to be underestimated, which is why it is addressed further in the fourth section.

### 'Other'/'published video'

Biaggi *et al.* (2013: 26, trans.) showed that the implementation of 'other' videos serves well to provide novice teachers with illustrative examples of how to apply 'teaching features relevant to learning'. What is more, 'published videos' can also trigger teachers' 'comparative reflection' (Zhang *et al.*, 2011: 461), i.e. they lend themselves well to teachers' comparison of their own performances with that of others. Put differently, this kind of video offers teachers the opportunity to study aspects associated with their own teaching (cf. Seago, 2004). This kind of 'social comparison' is often seen as a 'motivator for performance' (e.g. Baecher *et al.*, 2013: 191).

A downfall of this video type, namely the frequent lack of contextual information such as background knowledge about the class, the lesson plan or learning materials, has been acknowledged by a number of researchers (e.g. Seidel *et al.*, 2011; Zhang *et al.*, 2011). Needless to say, a shortcoming like this may seriously hamper in-depth video analyses. Approaches to overcome this difficulty are outlined in the section titled 'Digital Features'.

### 'Own', 'peer' and 'other' videos: Emotions involved

No matter whether teachers observe their own teaching videos, their peers'/colleagues' performances or that of complete strangers, they do so individually or in cooperative settings. For the latter, researchers have continuously highlighted the importance of creating a respectful and



appreciative discourse atmosphere that allows for ‘critical collegiality’ (Lord, 1994, as cited in Sherin & Han, 2004: 164). Borko *et al.* (2008) clearly state that for video-based discussions among colleagues to become fearless, open and productive, a strong professional community of mutual trust needs to be created. This demand is primarily based on their finding that teachers tended to be ‘cautious and hesitant to explore pedagogical issues in great depth’ (Borko *et al.*, 2008: 432), especially at the beginning of their video-based PD programme. Moreover, feelings of embarrassment occurred among teachers who would rather criticise their own than their colleagues’ teaching until a professional and safe discourse atmosphere emerged. Lefstein and Snell (2011) noticed qualitative differences between preceding individual written analyses by in-service literacy primary school teachers and the comments teachers made during collaborative video analyses. Teachers hesitated to share their insights in a collaborative discourse setting as they were engaged in face-saving acts and frequently defended their own or their peers’ performance against ‘perceived attacks’ (Lefstein & Snell, 2011: 510). This finding is somewhat contradictory to the one made by Krammer and Hugener (2014: 29, translation H.N.), who state that pre-service teachers ‘experienced the work with their own videos as motivating (...), resulting in curious, open, honest and respectful analytical discourse’. Quite interestingly, however, students tended to become less interested in ‘other’ videos towards the end of the semester. In an attempt to explain this, the authors assume that the decline in interest might be due to students being less personally affected by ‘other’ than their own videos (Krammer & Hugener, 2014: 30). In fact, this view is shared by Seago (2004: 263) who defines ‘other’ videos as ‘teaching that is emotionally distant’. Although this argument seems reasonable in a specific context, it loses some of its explanatory power when confronted with findings made by Kleinknecht and Schneider (2013: 19) who reveal that teachers who watched ‘other videos’ experienced more negative (disappointment or anger) and positive feelings (enjoyment or well-being) than teachers who observed their own videos.

### Digital features

A number of suggestions of how to add value to video-supported PD via digital features have been made. Goeze (2010) argues that computer-assisted learning environments help to enrich teaching videos as learning sources, a position shared by Digel (2013: 3) who further emphasises that ‘Online Case Laboratories’ enable viewers to interactively work on video cases in ‘formal, nonformal and self-directed learning processes’. The inclusion of hyperlinks not only offers the viewer insights into the performing actors’ perceptions derived from interviews conducted prior to teaching, but it also provides theoretical knowledge, thereby offering

the analyst a more profound understanding of the teacher's behaviour and creating a 'multiple-perspective' video perception (Goeze, 2010: 140, trans.). Hyperlink information may be used to increase or decrease video analyses tasks in terms of difficulty. An increase in demand follows from the complexity that hyperlink information adds to a 'case', whereas their guiding function might simplify video analysis (Goeze, 2010: 140). Overall, findings indicate that digital video enrichment through hyperlinks positively influences pre-service teachers' 'diagnosis of teaching and learning situations' (Goeze, 2010: 140, trans.).

The employment of digital features to enhance teachers' PD via video has been taken one step further by Zhang *et al.* (2015) who assign teachers an active role in creating their own videos for analysis. Drawing on Yerrick *et al.* (2005: 359) and their concept of 'digital video editing' with a program called iMovie, Zhang *et al.* (2015: 156) emphasise the importance of having teachers autonomously select and upload their own videos, as this approach offers them 'active control (...) by selecting and editing clips for others to view'. They further argue that this kind of control leads teachers to engage in 'deeper reflection on their practice' (Zhang *et al.*, 2015: 161).

Teacher agency is also stressed by Hannafin *et al.* (2015: 164) who introduce the 'Video Analysis Tool' as a digital means for 'teachers and supervisors to assess as well as to compare and contrast identical video excerpts from different, unique perspectives'. The strength of the 'Video Analysis Tool' is that it puts analysts in the position to synchronise and compare their observations by coding relevant teaching situations, for instance those in which desired teaching practices occur. Coding also plays a significant role in a 'digital video analysis tool called Studiocode' (Prusak, 2015: 193). Here, teachers code teaching videos according to predefined categories (e.g. specific teacher behaviour). These categories are then marked on a timeline. A coded video may then be further analysed using Studiocode (Prusak, 2015: 194). Similarly, the tool 'Edthema' puts analysts in the position to 'code segments of uploaded video to highlight areas of pedagogical strengths or points of growth' (Parsons *et al.*, 2015: 272).

## Summary

It has been shown in the previous sections that various challenges and opportunities are put forward by different kinds of videos, the former of which may be compensated for by digital features. In a negative sense, this complexity is further aggravated by the fact that research findings are far from consistent (cf. Sherin *et al.*, 2011). In a positive sense, videos pave the way towards multiple learning opportunities, provided they are embedded within a carefully designed learning environment with clear goals and adjusted to learners' needs. The ways the theoretical insights just

outlined have informed the design of the aforementioned MsTa seminars (introduction) are illuminated in the next two sections.

## Using Videos in Multilingual-Sensitive Professional Development Classes

### Outline and objectives of the courses

During the winter term of 2015/2016, two seminars aiming at the development of EFL pre-service teachers' PV were offered at Goethe University Frankfurt/Main. The seminars were located in the second module of the EFL teaching curriculum and ran for 13 weeks (weekly 90-minute sessions).

They were based on an understanding of PV as outlined in the introduction of this chapter, albeit with a specific focus on heterogeneous EFL classrooms. Students were supposed to identify and describe heterogeneity-relevant teaching situations, i.e. instances that uncover pupils' diversity. Further, students were to evaluate teachers' performances in terms of whether they qualify as heterogeneous-sensitive. For example, students' ability to spot situations where the teacher offers pictures for visual learners, or creates spaces for multilingual language work for pupils with various native tongues serves as an indicator of their developing PV.

In both classes, special emphasis was put on EFL learners' linguistic backgrounds as a pivotal dimension of heterogeneity in EFL classrooms. More precisely, EFL learners' language (learning) biographies were treated as both a prerequisite for and goal of EFL teaching. Owing to the inconsistency of findings in terms of the effects different kinds of videos may have on PD, the analyses of 'own' and 'peer' videos were preceded by the provision and discussion of theoretical texts on heterogeneous-multilingual foreign language teaching and learning. This theoretical foundation helped to pave the way for students to apply their theoretical knowledge to the videos implemented, a deductive approach termed 'recognition of the paradigmatic' (Goeze, 2010). The theoretical input primarily served to direct students' attention during video analyses and to maximise the potential benefits videos can have on PD. During later sessions, students learned about EFL learners' different cognitive styles, learning styles and learning strategies (cf. e.g. Dörnyei, 2005; Lightbown & Spada, 2013) and about differing levels of motivation, anxiety or willingness to communicate (cf. e.g. Pawlak, 2012) as further aspects of heterogeneity.

After this theoretical introduction, students were introduced to the notion of PV and the attempt to propel it with different kinds of videos in the fifth session. After this session, videos of different types were used. Details will be discussed in the next section.

## Video types implemented

At the onset of both MsTa seminars, the author of this text taught two microteaching lessons herself, which were both videotaped and used for critical analysis in class. Both microteachings were conducted in simulated, highly heterogeneous EFL learning groups. While the teacher performed a structured lesson, she by no means considered her ‘pupils’ (enacted by seminar participants) heterogeneity, i.e. she neither included heterogeneous-sensitive materials nor did she make any attempt to make use of her pupils’ linguistic backgrounds as resources for EFL learning. The decision to offer students a rather unfavourable example of teaching taught by the author of this chapter was based on the rather negative emotions often associated with the analysis of ‘own’ videos. The attempt here was to create a learning environment within which students could contribute their thoughts openly, and to show students how to criticise lessons in a respectful and constructive manner.

In the subsequent sessions of the classes, ‘own’ and ‘peer’ videos were used. As for the former, students were asked to prepare mini lessons of 20 minutes in groups of four to five students. The task was to design lessons in such a way as to take into consideration the heterogeneity of an imaginary learning group the composition of which was concretised with the help of ‘role cards’. Role cards included information about each ‘pupil’, his or her learning profile and language background to help students elaborate heterogeneous-multilingual-sensitive lessons. The role cards remained the same throughout the entire seminar to offer students the possibility to adjust their lesson plans and accompanying materials such as worksheets to a learning group characterised by stable, theory-informed heterogeneity features. The lessons were then performed in the course of sessions 6–13 by one or two group members who acted as ‘teachers’, while 10 of their peers acted as EFL learners, i.e. pupils. Note here that the role cards helped ‘pupils’ play their roles. Whereas all students had access to the role cards prior to teaching, this was not true for the lesson plans designed by the students (for organisational reasons). The remaining students were observers of the lessons. All mini lessons were video-recorded and put on the seminars’ digital learning platform for analysis. To guide and facilitate video analyses, observation sheets to be filled out in the course of teaching by the observers and reflection tasks to be worked on after teaching were provided, both of which included items that addressed the question as to what extent the teacher’s behaviour is to be considered heterogeneous-sensitive. After recording, students first analysed the video individually at home as a preparatory task for the upcoming session, at which the same video was analysed collaboratively. Hence, the overall design of the seminars was influenced both by instructional and problem-based concepts (Kleinknecht & Schneider, 2013: 212).

## Participants

A total of 54 students (11 male, 43 female) participated in the two seminars. Their EFL teaching experiences ranged from none to several lessons a month as substitute teachers in local schools. Participants were preparing to become teachers in diverse school types and by the time they participated in the courses, they had either recently begun their studies (second to third semester) or were more advanced students (fourth to tenth semester).

## Course evaluation

The two seminars were evaluated in order to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of ‘own’ and ‘peer’ videos specifically for the development of PV in the context of EFL MsTas. In this contribution, I will focus on three aspects that can inform future teaching practice:

- (1) How do pre-service EFL teachers evaluate their own and their peers’ teaching videos, especially regarding developing their multilingual-sensitive PV?
- (2) What emotions are evoked by ‘own’ and ‘peer’ videos in MsTa seminars?
- (3) Which digital features further strengthen the merits and compensate for the weaknesses of video-based PV, according to pre-service EFL teachers?

To answer these questions, a post-seminar questionnaire with five open-ended questions was distributed. Items elicited students’ free text responses as to whether and to what extent ‘own’ and ‘peer’ videos lend themselves to support their PD and what kind of digital features they considered helpful for this purpose. Students’ comments were collected and identified as ‘positive’, ‘mixed’ or ‘negative’, and then structured based on their content. The exact wording of each questionnaire item is included at the beginning of the following sections.

## Evaluation of ‘own’ videos in the MsTa seminars

The questionnaire item that addresses students’ learning experiences with ‘own’ videos reads as follows: ‘Please describe as precisely as possible what you learn when you analyze your own video’. Out of 42 respondents, 30 (71.4%) reported positive learning effects followed by 9 students (21.4%) who explained that they had experienced mixed effects and 3 students (7.1%) who reported negative effects.

The opportunity to compare their self-designed lesson plans with the actual teaching performance turned out to be the most prominent

merit of ‘own’ videos in the MsTa seminars, as the following comments show:

- (1) ‘Since I knew how the lesson was planned, I could analyse whether my performance actually corresponded to our plan’
- (2) ‘I was surprised that our plan was not as good as we thought. It is the teaching which tells you how complicated the entire matter is’
- (3) ‘I was deeply involved in preparing the lesson plan, so while teaching I knew immediately that I should have acted differently in specific situations. When I watched the video again later, I clearly saw the reasons behind my mistakes, so I can avoid them in the future’

While in the first statement the lesson plan qualifies as a basis for comparison with actual teaching, the second one indicates that teaching also functioned as a touchstone for the quality of the lesson plans. The last comment reveals that through the implementation of ‘own’ videos, slippery thoughts that occurred in the process of teaching could be pinned-down and became subject to post-teaching analysis. This finding is supported by students who became more ‘self-confident’ as they noticed a discrepancy between the way they felt while teaching and their appearance on video:

- (4) ‘It was very interesting to see that the way you feel when teaching appears very differently from the outer perspective’
- (5) ‘I saw that I looked much more confident on the video than I actually was. This is a very positive learning effect’

Many students agreed that ‘own’ videos enabled them to get a fuller picture of classroom situations:

- (6) ‘It was new and eye-opening to see how much was going on in the classroom, things I didn’t notice when I was performing’

Further, they stated that they learned a lot about themselves as future teachers when observing their own videos:

- (7) ‘I learned a lot about my habits and the way I appear. The video helps me to preserve the good things and avoid the bad ones later’

The vast majority of students stressed that they were much more critical with their own teaching (no matter whether they performed as teachers or not) than with their peers’, especially since they were well aware of their ‘strengths and weaknesses’. Interestingly, their critical perspective almost exclusively focused on their physical appearance and related issues, and not on didactic decisions associated with heterogeneous-sensitive teaching:

- (8) ‘I evaluate myself much more critical than my peers do, I know about my weaknesses (posture, intonation, pronunciation)’
- (9) ‘My speaking pace was too fast, some words were too complicated for the pupils and my eyes were half-closed. It might have looked as if I was tired or arrogant’

While Comment 9 shows that students were highly concentrating on their appearance as teachers at the expense of didactic considerations, Statement 10 indicates that this student related her observations to pupils’ perspectives as well. Similar comments support the assumption that, though firmly rooted in a focus on the teacher, some students evaluated teacher behaviour from pupils’ perspectives:

- (10) ‘I learned a lot about the effects my appearance had on the pupils’
- (11) ‘It was interesting to examine teacher–pupil interactions’

Somewhat paradoxically, some of the features that made ‘own’ videos valuable tools for learning also turned out to account for their challenges. More precisely, students highlighted that it was difficult for them to analyse ‘own’ videos objectively, especially since they were absorbed by their own (physical) appearance:

- (12) ‘I was always looking at my moves, not on my teaching skills’
- (13) ‘I cannot separate self-reflection from reflection on teaching’
- (14) ‘I tried to analyse the teaching, but I was distracted by my outer appearance’ (fT)

Despite these limitations, it is argued here that students’ awareness of the fact that ‘subjective’ self-reflections cannot replace in-depth analyses of didactic issues, is in itself a PV learning success. In this regard, work with ‘own’ videos was successful. Importantly, though, the students’ responses did not provide evidence that specific skills related to multilingual-sensitive teaching were developed while working with ‘own’ videos.

### Evaluation of ‘peer’ videos in the MsTa seminars

As for students’ analyses of their peers’ videos, the following item was included in the questionnaire: ‘Please describe as precisely as possible what you learn when you analyse your peers’ videos’.

Forty-one students answered the question, 28 of whom (68.3%) revealed positive and 3 (7.3%) mixed learning effects. Ten students (24.4%) ascribed rather negative effects to their peers’ videos.

Students generally agreed that working with ‘peer’ videos was much more ‘distanced’ and ‘objective’ than working with their ‘own’ videos. They emphasised that with ‘peer’ videos, they could ‘really concentrate

on the lesson content’ and that they ‘felt free to look out for the main structure of the lesson, as well as the comprehensibility of instructions’. Further, students’ remarks strongly suggest that their focus shifted from being highly teacher-centred to a more pupil-oriented one:

- (1) ‘My focus shifted towards pupils. I tried to find situations in which pupils created a heterogeneous classroom. But there was no focus on teacher appearance’
- (2) ‘I really looked at how pupils reacted to the teaching method. The teacher’s physical appearance was not important any more, I concentrated on teacher–pupil interaction (which is far more important)’

Not only did pupils become the main target of observation, the same is true for didactic issues. Students frequently mentioned that seeing ‘peer’ videos offered them opportunities to ‘see different styles of teaching and problem solutions’ and ‘learn about new methods’. ‘Peer’ videos were even described as a ‘treasure trove for teaching approaches which lend themselves to multilingual-sensitive teaching’ that ‘serve as a valuable orientation for future teaching’.

Beyond providing a pool of didactic and methodological approaches, ‘peer’ videos triggered in-depth didactic reasoning. Students were eager to stress that this kind of video made them ponder questions such as ‘why did the teacher act the way he did’ or ‘are there better ways to deal with this problem?’. It is important to note here that the implementation of ‘peer’ videos seemed to bridge the gap between merely self-related and didactic-oriented reflections, which was often perceived when students analysed their ‘own’ videos:

- (3) ‘When I watched the video I asked myself questions like “Would I have acted differently in this situation? Does the way the teacher behaved correspond to my criteria of appropriateness?”’
- (4) ‘I can adapt the teacher’s positive sides. I would have been overstrained with some situations, so it is helpful to see how my peers dealt with it’

As with ‘own’ videos, one of the aspects associated with ‘peer’ videos qualified as an advantage and a disadvantage simultaneously, namely the fact that students did not have access to lesson plans before analyses. One student stated that this assisted him in ‘concentrating on the actual lesson progress’. However, he was clearly outnumbered by those students who criticised the absence of contextual information. Students’ comments show that this limitation to an ‘outer perspective’ impeded their analyses in various ways: first, they stressed that while observing, they were forced to solely rely on ‘visible teacher performance’ which, in turn, prevented



them from putting what the teachers did in relation to his or her initial intentions. Many students pointed out that this led them to ‘evaluate teachers’ mistakes equally strict’. Put differently, a more fine-grained evaluation would have been possible if ‘the genesis of mistakes had been traceable’.

Based on the findings presented in this and the preceding section, it can be stated that, according to the students involved, ‘peer’ videos, especially if complemented by rich contextual data (information about ‘pupils’, lesson plans), might be better suited for the purpose outlined above than ‘own’ videos.

### ‘Own’ videos in the MStA seminars: Emotions involved

To gain insights into students’ emotions when watching their own videos, the following item was included in the questionnaire: ‘Please describe as precisely as possible how you feel when you analyse your own video’.

Out of 29 respondents, 19 (65.5%) clearly stated that this experience was accompanied by highly negative feelings such as fear, nervousness, shame, anger and embarrassment:

Students primarily ascribed their negative emotions to the fact that they were afraid of not appearing self-confident while teaching. Many were concerned about ‘what my peers might think’ of them, especially since they found that ‘the others seemed to be much more self-confident’. One student even explained that he could not prevent himself from feeling ‘awkward’ and ‘inhibited’ although he was aware that the reasons behind these feelings were unfounded.

Another emotion frequently mentioned was ‘disappointment’, particularly when students were unsatisfied with their teaching. As strong as the emotions described are, students indicated that they disappeared when their video was watched repeatedly.

The remaining students stated that they had mixed or positive feelings when their own videos were analysed (4 and 6 respondents, i.e. 13.8% and 20.7%, respectively). Positive feelings included ‘excitement’, ‘interest’ and ‘fun’ but were not explicated further.

### ‘Peer’ videos in the MStA seminars: Emotions involved

A total of 25 students responded to the item: ‘Please describe as precisely as possible how you feel when you analyse your peers’ videos’.

Contrary to the feelings associated with the analysis of ‘own’ videos, a majority of 12 students (48%) mentioned positive emotions when observing ‘peer’ videos, followed by those who had mixed, negative or no feelings at all (6, 4 and 3, i.e. 24%, 16% and 12%, in order).

Positive emotions mainly resulted from not having to ‘overcome a personal barrier’ and included being ‘relaxed’, ‘motivated’ and ‘excited’. Others pointed out that their positive feelings stemmed from the ‘absence of mental pressure’ and ‘timidity’. It is also worth mentioning that many students expressed their ‘utmost respect’ for their peers and they were ‘pleased’ when their peers performed well. However, their peers’ performances caused negative feelings as well. Some felt ‘embarrassed’ or ‘angry’ on account of ‘bad’ teacher behaviour, others felt like ‘judges’ and ‘very uncomfortable’ during discussions because they did not want to ‘expose’ or ‘discredit’ their peers’ efforts.

Interestingly, a number of students indicated that they felt ‘neutral’ when observing ‘peer’ videos, or that they did not have ‘any specific emotions’. Note that this case is absent in the context of ‘own’ video analyses.

Negative emotions as observed with ‘own’ videos are not necessarily a hindrance to developing PV, but these emotions potentially constitute a challenge absent in the case of ‘peer’ videos. This should be reflected by any didactic design using ‘own’ videos to develop PV as it relates to multilingual-sensitive teaching.

### MsTa and digital features

To gain insights into what kinds of digital features students find useful for further PD seminars, they were offered the subsequent questionnaire item: ‘Imagine you had the opportunity to embed teaching videos in a web-based learning module without any technical limitations to foster students’ PV. What kind of digital features would you implement and how could they be used?’.

To begin with, students opted for a preservation of the general seminar structure, i.e. the provision of theoretical input by the instructor, followed by an alternation of lesson development and guided video analyses. Students’ additional proposals can be grouped into three main categories, namely the attempt to integrate commentaries, to provide differing analysis options and, finally, to segment videos.

As for the integration of commentaries, students recommended comment links that offer teachers’ thoughts about their lesson plans and a justification of the way they acted while teaching. Similarly, it was suggested to include a time line or subtitle bar to provide space for the analysts’ comments. It was argued that it is important to be able to turn the commentaries off or on as required, to allow for both a ‘first and unbiased observation’ as well as ‘fine-tuned analyses’. It was also suggested to include bookmarks and to create an account for each user so the bookmarks can be commented on any time.

The request to provide commentaries was closely interwoven with the attempt to offer different analysis options. First, students highlighted the

importance of selecting and uploading a selection of ‘own’ videos they consider worth discussing. Second, these videos should be analysed from multiple perspectives, i.e. by themselves, their peers and ‘expert analysts’ to trigger self- and peer reflection and to permit analyses comparison. To ensure in-depth analyses, they further suggested adding a feature that captures classrooms from various camera perspectives. Lessons should then be watched from distinct perspectives either simultaneously or separately. By far the most progressive proposition was made by a student who stated that

- (1) ‘it would be interesting to display the teacher’s and pupils’ attention. If we had a digital feature for this, very much like an infrared camera, we could capture eye-tracking movements and analyse what captured pupils’ attention when and why. So we could find ways of how to direct their attention better’

Most students were well aware of the cognitive load involved in a task such as observing various classroom perspectives at the same time. Students’ general desire to divide videos into parts supports this assumption. In this context, students’ recommendations ranged from straightforward ideas as in Comment 2 to sophisticated proposals as in Comment 3.

- (2) ‘Videos should be divided into sequences to be analysed in chronological order. Each sequence should lend itself to the analysis of different aspects such as classroom management or heterogeneous-sensitive teaching approaches’
- (3) ‘It would be useful to insert a section which provides the lesson plan as a kind of “table of contents”. Users could then jump from “chapter” to “chapter”, so they are not forced to analyse the entire video chronologically’

Overall, students seem to be well aware of the opportunities digital features can add to work with videos, expecting similar functionalities as offered by commercial video platforms.

## Summary and Discussion of Findings

Students’ questionnaire-based responses allow for tentative answers to the questions posed in the section titled ‘Course Evaluation’, thereby illuminating the usefulness of ‘own’ and ‘peer’ videos in terms of the influence they might have on pre-service teachers’ ability to reflect on the multilingual-sensitivity of teaching as a constitutive part of the general heterogeneity these future teachers will more than likely meet in their future teaching careers.

As for Question 1, it is safe to say that the majority of students found both 'own' and 'peer' videos to be valuable learning resources. 'Own' videos not only offered opportunities to compare lesson plans and teaching, they also enabled students to get a fuller picture of classroom events, a finding in line with Zhang *et al.* (2011). Students frequently stated that they were absorbed by their appearance as teachers, which indicates a high level of 'immersion' (Seidel *et al.*, 2011: 262). Whereas being deeply involved helped students to spot their strengths and weaknesses, or 'areas of improvement' (Borko *et al.*, 2008: 434), it also led them to underrate their performance, an indicator of 'leniency bias' (Baecher *et al.*, 2013: 191) and to sharply criticise themselves. This clearly runs counter to Kleinknecht and Schneider's (2013) findings and rather supports Borko *et al.* (2008: 428) who found that while teachers 'criticised their own lessons (...) they were rarely critical of their colleagues'. As for 'peer' videos, findings are largely consistent with existing studies: students not only pointed out that 'peer' video analyses were much more distanced and objective (cf. Zhang *et al.*, 2015), they also stressed the fact that 'peer' videos provided numerous didactic and methodological approaches (Baecher *et al.*, 2013; Biaggi *et al.*, 2013). Another phenomenon that fits well into earlier insights is the fact that students' foci of analyses shifted gradually from being teacher-centred (as with 'own' videos) to being more pupil-related, although this shift is rather associated with discourse development than with video type in the research literature (cf. e.g. Sherin & Han, 2004). In sum, 'own' videos seem to have outperformed 'peer' videos in terms of their perceived positive influence on PV development (71.4% and 68.3%, respectively). However, this finding has to be interpreted cautiously: A number of students not to be underestimated (24.4%) deny 'peer' videos positive influences due to the absence of contextual information only, whereas more negative and mixed 'own' video influences may be traced back to an array of reasons. This encourages the interpretation that if students had had access to lesson plans prior to teaching, they would have evaluated 'peer' videos even more positively than they actually did. What is more, 'peer' videos triggered many more positive emotions among viewers than did 'own' videos. Hence, it is assumed here that 'peer' videos may serve slightly better than 'own' videos to foster PV through in-depth didactic analyses, at least as long as necessary conditions such as the provision of contextual information are met.

Regarding Question 2, it has become obvious that both types of video evoked differing emotions among students. Since more negative emotions were associated with 'own' than with 'peer' videos, researchers' call for discourse criteria such as openness and trust (cf. e.g. Sherin & Han, 2004) is underlined. Students were much more emotionally involved with their own teaching than with their peers', which runs counter to Borko *et al.* (2008), although single emotions such as 'anger' also occurred when

observing their peers' teaching. Further, some students reported 'neutral' or 'no specific feelings' when viewing their peers' video, a circumstance that might explain the perceived increase in distance when analysing these videos (cf. e.g. Krammer & Hugener, 2014).

Concerning Question 3, students' answers to the relevant questionnaire item largely mirror digital tools used in current research projects (cf. e.g. Digel, 2013; Goeze, 2010). Students' desire to analyse videos from various perspectives and to receive a 'correct' solution to analysis tasks has been frequently mentioned. The question arises here whether digital features might also help fight the major disadvantage of 'own' videos, i.e. students' focus on their outer appearance while teaching and the negative emotions associated with 'own' video analysis. For example, it might be thinkable to transform the student teacher into a kind of avatar – the underlying assumption here is that an avatar prevents students from being entrenched in self-critical subjectivity at the expense of didactic analyses. Owing to the fact that the MsTa seminar participants were all rather inexperienced teachers and video observers, a circumstance that clearly accounts for some of the negative emotions associated with 'own' video analyses since they were perceived as 'very unfamiliar', a second questionnaire was distributed, the analysis of which is beyond the scope of this chapter. Suffice it to say that students indicated that, being novices, they would prefer to analyse 'peer' before their own videos as this approach offers them 'more safety' and 'orientation'.

The seminar reflection at hand allows for a tentative answer to the overall question raised in the title. Both 'own' and 'peer' videos seem to lend themselves to the development of multilingual-sensitive PV in pre-service teacher training classes. Needless to say, the preliminary findings made on the basis of the MsTa seminars are highly context specific and, therefore, lack external validity. Further, the questionnaire employed asked for students' self-evaluation and estimations, i.e. it did not 'measure' video-triggered PV growth in an empirical sense. To obtain more reliable insights into the impact 'own' and 'peer' videos can have on PV development, students' estimations need to be categorised in an empirical manner, and complementary tools such as vignettes and PV analysis tasks that are then accompanied by post-seminar questionnaires need to be implemented. The insights provided in this chapter might trigger such future research.

## References

- Baecher, L., Kung, S.-C., Jewkes, A.M. and Rosalia, C. (2013) The role of video for self-evaluation in early field experiences. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 36, 189–197.
- Biaggi, S., Krammer, K. and Hugener, I. (2013) Vorgehen zur Förderung der Analysekompetenz in der Lehrerbildung mit Hilfe von Unterrichtsvideos: Erfahrungen aus dem ersten Studienjahr. *Seminar* 19 (2), 26–34.

- Borko, H., Jacobs, J., Eiteljorg, E. and Pittman, M.E. (2008) Video as a tool for fostering productive discussions in mathematics professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24, 417–436.
- Brophy, J.E. (ed.) (2003) *Using Video in Teacher Education*. Amsterdam: JAI.
- Calandra, B. and Rich, P. (eds) (2015) *Digital Video for Teacher Education*. New York: Routledge.
- Digel, S. (2013) Netzwerkgestützte Videofallarbeit: Ein didaktisches Konzept zur Kompetenzentwicklung von Lehrenden. *Magazin Erwachsenenbildung.at* 20, 2–9.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005) *The Psychology of the Language Learner: Individual Differences in Second Language Acquisition*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Goeze, A. (2010) Was ist ein guter Fall? Kriterien zur Entwicklung und Auswahl von Fällen für den Einsatz in der Aus- und Weiterbildung. In J. Schrader, R. Hohmann and S. Hartz (eds) *Mediengestützte Fallarbeit: Konzepte, Erfahrungen und Befunde zur Kompetenzentwicklung von Erwachsenenbildnern* (pp. 125–145). Bielefeld: Bertelsmann.
- Goodwin, C. (1994) Professional vision. *American Anthropologist* 96 (3), 606–655.
- Hannafin, M., Recesso, A., Polly, D. and Jung, J.W. (2015) Video analysis and teacher assessment: Research, practice, and implications. In B. Calandra and P. Rich (eds) *Digital Video for Teacher Education: Research and Practice* (pp. 164–180). New York: Routledge.
- Hellermann, C., Gold, B. and Holodynski, M. (2015) Förderung von Klassenführungsfähigkeiten im Lehramtsstudium. *Zeitschrift für Entwicklungspsychologie und Pädagogische Psychologie* 47 (2), 97–109.
- Kleinknecht, M. and Schneider, J. (2013) What do teachers think and feel when analysing videos of themselves and other teachers teaching? *Teaching and Teacher Education* 33, 13–23.
- Krammer, K. and Hugener, I. (2014) Förderung der Analysekompetenz angehender Lehrpersonen anhand von eigenen und fremden Unterrichtsvideos. *Journal für Lehrerinnenbildung* 1, 25–32.
- Lefstein, A. and Snell, J. (2011) Professional vision and the politics of teacher learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27, 505–514.
- Lightbown, P.M. and Spada, N. (2013) *How Languages are Learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lord, B. (1994) Teachers' professional development: Critical collegueship and the role of professional communities. In N. Cobb (ed.) *The Future of Education: Perspectives on National Standards in America* (pp. 175–203). New York: College Board.
- Maclean, R. and White, S. (2007) Video reflection and the formation of teacher identity. *Reflective Practice* 8 (1), 47–60.
- Orlova, N. (2009) Video recording as a stimulus for reflection in pre-service EFL teacher training. *English Teaching Forum* 2, 30–35.
- Parsons, S.A., Parker, A.K., Zenkov, K., DeGregory, C., Taylor, L., Kye, D. and Haury, S. (2015) Exploring the use of video coding in literacy and English teacher preparation. In E. Ortlieb, L.E. Shanahan and M.B. McVee (eds) *Video Research in Disciplinary Literacies* (Vol. 6; pp. 269–285). Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Pawlak, M. (ed.) (2012) *New Perspectives on Individual Differences in Language Learning and Teaching*. Berlin: Springer.
- Prusak, K. (2015) Generating expertise through the use of digital video. In B. Calandra and P. Rich (eds) *Digital Video for Teacher Education: Research and Practice* (pp. 181–199). New York: Routledge.
- Rosaen, C.L., Lundeberg, M., Cooper, M., Fritzen, A. and Terpstra, M. (2008) Noticing noticing. How does investigation of video records change how teachers reflect on their experience? *Journal of Teacher Education* 59 (4), 347–360.

- Rossi, P.G. and Fedeli, L. (eds) (2016) *Integrating Video into Pre-Service and In-Service Teacher Training*. Hershey, PA: Information Science Reference.
- Seago, N. (2004) Using video as an object of inquiry for mathematics teaching and learning. In J. Brophy (ed.) *Using Video in Teacher Education* (Vol. 10; pp. 259–286). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Seidel, T., Stürmer, K., Blomberg, G., Kobarg, M. and Schwindt, K. (2011) Teacher learning from analysis of videotaped classroom situations: Does it make a difference whether teachers observe their own teaching or that of others? *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27, 259–267.
- Sherin, M.G. (2007) The development of teachers' professional vision in video clubs. In R. Goldman, R. Pea, B. Barron and S. Derry (eds) *Video Research in the Learning Sciences* (pp. 383–395). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sherin, M.G. and Han, S.Y. (2004) Teacher learning in the context of a video club. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20, 163–183.
- Sherin, M.G. and van Es, E.A. (2009) Effects of video club participation on teachers' professional vision. *Journal of Teacher Education* 60 (1), 20–37.
- Trautmann, M. (2010) Heterogenität: (k)ein Thema der Fremdsprachendidaktik? In A. Köker, S. Romahn and A. Textor (eds) *Herausforderung Heterogenität: Ansätze und Weichenstellungen* (pp. 52–64). Bad Heilbrunn: Klinkhardt.
- Trautmann, M. and Wischer, B. (2011) *Heterogenität in der Schule: Eine kritische Einführung*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Van Es, E.A. and Sherin, M.G. (2008) Mathematics teachers' 'learning to notice' in the context of a video club. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24 (2), 244–276.
- Wallace, M.J. (1979) *Microteaching and the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language in Teacher Training Institutions*. Edinburgh: Scottish Centre of Education Overseas.
- Wallace, M.J. (1981) The use of video in EFL teacher training. In *ELT Documents 110 – Focus on the Teacher: Communicative Approaches to Teacher Training* (pp. 7–21). London: British Council.
- Yerrick, R., Ross, D. and Molesbash, P. (2005) Too close for comfort: Real-time science teaching reflections via digital video editing. *Journal of Science Teacher Education* 16 (4), 351–375.
- Zafer, S. (2015) Watch your teaching: A reflection strategy for EFL pre-service teachers through video recordings. *Procedia: Social and Behavioural Sciences* 199, 163–171.
- Zhang, M., Lundeberg, M., Koehler, M.J. and Eberhardt, J. (2011) Understanding affordances and challenges of three types of video for teacher professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27, 454–462.
- Zhang, M., Koehler, M. and Lundeberg, M. (2015) Affordances and challenges of different types of video for teachers' professional development. In B. Calandra and P. Rich (eds) *Digital Video for Teacher Education: Research and Practice* (pp. 147–163). New York: Routledge.
- Ziegler, G. (2013) Multilingualism and the language education landscape: Challenges for teacher training in Europe. *Multilingual Education* 3 (1), 1–23.





# Concluding Remarks

