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English Language Learners (ELLs) are students who speak a language other than English; they are the fastest growing student population in United States’ (US) public schools and will include over 17 million students by the year 2020 (NCES, 2015). The dramatic increase in the ELL student population means that all mainstream classroom teachers will teach at least one ELL within their first year of graduating from a teacher preparation program. However, most US teachers hold misconceptions about ELLs and feel unprepared for ELL instruction (Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011). More empirical research is needed to inform teacher preparation programs on the practices that work best to prepare teachers for effective ELL instruction.

Video reflection and video annotation tools have become increasingly popular in teacher preparation (Calandra & Rich, 2015; Rich & Hannafin, 2009). Video annotation tools provide affordances to teacher candidates’ understanding of pedagogy and support teacher professional development (Borko et al., 2008). Still, most of the empirical research that has been done on teacher candidates’ use of video reflection reports on general education, English-speaking student learning contexts, and the research that has been done on teacher candidates use of video to reflect on ELL instruction is limited. This research aimed to fill the gap in what is known about video reflection for ELL teacher preparation, and examined how three, undergraduate, final semester teacher candidates used V-Note (a video annotation tool), and instructional coaching to reflect on instruction for elementary-aged ELLs.

Sociocultural Theory was used to answer the following research questions: (a) How does
video-elicited reflection shape undergraduate teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs? (b) How does video-elicited reflection affirm, challenge, or reconstruct teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs? Data included interviews, written reflections, and a researcher’s journal. A qualitative multiple-case study analysis (Stake, 2013) was used to generate case and cross case findings surrounding Taylor, Susan’s and Erica’s cases.

Taylor’s case revealed that as Taylor used video-elicited reflection, her instruction increasingly included more language accommodations and began to include student-centered learning, video-elicited reflection reconstructed Taylor’s beliefs about using one-on-one instruction with ELLs, and collaborative coaching behaviors influenced Taylor’s instruction of ELLs more than directive coaching behaviors did.

Susan’s case findings showed that video-elicited reflection challenged Susan’s misconceptions about ELLs’ language needs, Susan needed more explicit modeling to demonstrate how teachers can intentionally support ELLs’ language needs with accommodated instruction, and instructional coaching supported Susan’s understanding of ELLs’ English language proficiency levels and how these levels could be used to inform instruction.

Erica’s case findings revealed that video-elicited reflection reconstructed Erica’s beliefs about collaborative learning, video-elicited reflection created a space where Erica explored using accommodations to support ELL comprehension, and video-elicited reflection developed Erica’s beliefs about language.

Cross case findings reported on similarities across Taylor’s, Susan’s and Erica’s cases. The first cross case finding showed that video-elicited reflection challenged teacher candidates’ misconceptions about ELLs. The second cross case findings reported that video-elicited
reflection allowed teacher candidates to develop an understanding of language through appropriation, and the third cross case findings illustrated that video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ ELL pedagogical development.

Findings from this research led to a discussion on the continuous use of video annotation and instructional coaching as permanent scaffolds that promote teacher candidates’ understanding of ELL pedagogy. Additionally, a discussion surrounding a cyclic model of teacher professional development that employs video-elicited reflection is shared, and the use of video-elicited reflection to facilitate teacher candidates’ participatory appropriation is discussed.
CHAPTER ONE:
INTRODUCTION

Background

English Language Learners (ELLs) are the fastest growing student population in United States’ (US) public schools; by 2020 experts estimate over 17 million ELLs will be attending US public schools (National Center for Educational Statistics [NCES], 2016). The dramatic increase in the ELL student population raises questions about how teachers are prepared for ELLs.

An examination of the beliefs that teacher candidates have about ELLs is a principal component of ELL teacher preparation. Research describes a direct relationship between teacher’s views about ELLs and their effectiveness for teaching ELLs (Basturkmen, 2012; Basturkmen, Loewen & Ellis, 2004; Borg, 2003; 2011; Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011), and recommends that teacher preparation programs provide opportunities for teacher candidates to examine the beliefs they have about ELL teaching and learning while in teacher preparation.

The research on general education teacher preparation suggests that video reflection has the potential for challenging, changing, or affirming the beliefs teachers have about teaching and learning (Calandra & Rich, 2015). Video is described as a professional development tool (Borko et al., 2008) teacher candidates can use to analyze their own teaching (Tripp & Rich, 2012) to notice critical incidents of their instruction (Griffin, 2003; Tripp, 2011) for reflection and ideas for subsequent teaching. The increased use of video in teacher preparation has resulted in a new body of research surrounding video annotation tools (Rich & Hannafin, 2009). Video annotation tools are software that allow teacher candidates to select, code, and mark critical incidents of
their instruction for reflective practice. Still, despite the popularity of video for teacher education, few empirical studies have examined how teacher candidates can use video reflection and/or video annotation tools for ELL teacher education.

This research sought to fill the gap in the empirical literature surrounding video-elicited reflection. Video-elicited reflection was the term used in this research to describe teacher candidates’ use of V-Note (a video annotation tool) and discussions with an ELL instructional coach, to analyze and reflect on recorded ELL instruction. Specifically, this research studied how three, undergraduate, final semester teacher candidates used video-elicited reflection to analyze and reflect on three self-recorded episodes instruction delivered to elementary-aged ELLs.

**Statement of the Problem**

Teachers feel the least prepared when instructing ELLs because they hold misconceptions about ELLs and are unable to provide ELLs with intentional language instruction (Baecher, Farnsworth, & Ediger, 2013; De Angelis, 2011; Cheatham et al., 2013). Research on ELL teacher preparation argues that teacher candidates need comprehensive clinical experiences working with ELLs to understand how to design and implement the language support ELLs require for academic success (Banks et al., 205; Coady, Harper, & de Jong, 2011, 2014). US public schools have an urgent need for teachers who are prepared to teach ELLs, and teacher preparation programs shoulder this responsibility.

Currently, two types of ELL teacher education models are used in teacher preparation: (a) English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) “infused” models, or (b) “umbrella” models (Wheeler & Govoni, 2014; 2016). Infused ELL teacher preparation models instill ELL theory
and pedagogy throughout multiple courses while umbrella models include ELLs as a topic in diversity courses. While infused ELL teacher preparation models are the most prominent, little empirical research has been done to evidence whether ELL infused teacher preparation models adequately prepare teacher candidates for ELLs instruction (Coady, de Jong & Harper, 2011). Moreover, empirical research informing what practices work best to prepare teacher candidates for ELL instruction is limited.

Research on ELL teacher preparation suggests that teacher candidates need opportunities to reflect on their instruction to ELLs, so they can grapple with the uncovered beliefs they have about ELLs to process new ideas about what effective ELL instruction looks like (Kyles & Olafson, 2008). For example, Farrell’s text, *Promoting Teacher Reflection in Second Language Education* (2014) discussed the critical role reflection has in preparing teachers for ELL instruction. Farrell defined reflective practices as a “as a precursor to a more systematic and evidence-based reflective practices [that] help teachers become more aware of themselves human beings first” (p. 7). Farrell mentioned that a state of contemplation occurs in the ‘Philosophy’ stage of his reflection framework (2014). In the ‘Philosophy’ stage, teachers gain self-knowledge about teaching by exploring how influences from their past have developed their perspectives as teachers (2015). Reflective practices in ELL teacher education need to include opportunities for teacher candidates to examine the beliefs they have about ELLs inform their instruction to ELLs.

Empirical research on teacher education used video as a reflective tool to support teachers’ with noticing critical incidents (Griffin, 2003; Sherin & van Es, 2005; Tripp, 2011) of their (recorded) instruction and facilitate reflection on action (Schön, 1983). The term critical incident is used in the research to describe a teacher candidates’ selective attention to an instructional event that is used to elicit reflection and meaning-making (Griffin, 2003).
Reflection-on-action is the process of retrospective reflection, or a thinking back in time and is thought to be precursor to reflection-in-action; on the spot reflection (Schön, 1983).

The literature on teacher reflection suggests that video is a tool for promoting teacher candidates’ reflection on instruction because video makes implicit reflection in action (explicit (Rhine & Bryant, 2007). Video provides teachers with a student view of classroom action and supports teachers’ ability to notice pertinent classroom interaction (Sherin & van Es, 2002, 2005). Teacher candidates’ can use video to investigate what is taking place in the classroom, observe student behaviors to think about ways they can change instruction to improve students’ learning outcomes.

Studies on video reflection comment on the affordances video offers supervisors or content instructional coaches to promote dissonance and tension as they corefect with teacher candidates about their literacy instruction to general education students (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014) or ELLs (Baecher, McCormack, & Kung, 2014). For example, Gelfuso & Dennis met with teacher candidates individually to watch and discuss their recorded literacy instruction to elementary students. In their research Gelfuso and Dennis assumed the roles of Literacy Content Coaches; they watched teacher candidates’ recorded literacy instruction and took notes to create dialectic tension and dissonance around pertinent aspects of teaching and learning that were presented in videos (2014). Gelfuso and Dennis found that knowledgeable others supported teacher candidates’ reflection on instruction.

Baecher et al. (2014) used video as a supervision tool with graduate ELL teacher candidates to focus on supervision practices. Beacher at al’s research found that video allowed teacher candidates to focus on specific aspects of their instruction, supported teacher candidate reflection, and promoted teacher candidate autonomy in reflection (2014). Baecher et. al. (2014)
shed insight on the use of video for ELL teacher candidate supervision but did not investigate how video reflection supported teacher candidates’ understanding of ELL instruction.

Video reflection is heavily discussed in the research pertaining to teacher preparation for general education, English-only contexts. The body of literature surrounding video reflection for ELL teaching contexts is sparse. For example, one empirical study has been published on video for ELL university supervision (Baecher et al., 2014) and one empirical study has been published on graduate teacher candidates using video to reflection on their instruction to ELLs (Baecher et al., 2013b). No empirical studies have been done to examine how undergraduate teacher candidates can use video reflection and/or video annotation tools to reflect on their instruction to elementary-aged ELLs. The present gap in the literature is shocking considering the rise of the ELL student populations and need for more empirical research to examine what works best to prepare teacher candidates for ELL instruction.

This research argued that video-elicited reflection is a beneficial tool for ELL teacher preparation and aimed to fill the gap in what is known about the use of video annotation and instructional coaching as tools for ELL teacher preparation. This research examined how three, final semester, undergraduate teacher candidates used a video annotation tool (V-Note, 2014) and instructional coaching dialogue to reflect on their beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs, and sought to understand how video-elicited reflection, affirmed, challenged or reconstructed teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this research was to examine how video-elicited reflection (video annotation tool and content instructional coaching) mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about
and instruction for ELLs. V-Note and instructional coaching were regarded in this research as learning scaffolds that were used to support teacher candidates’ understanding of ELL pedagogy. The participants in this study recorded three episodes of their ELL instruction and analyzed their recorded videos using V-Note (2014). Then the participants met with an ELL instructional coach to share and discuss their V-Note analysis and recorded ELL instructional to collaboratively discuss what they noticed about their recorded instruction and the ideas they had for subsequent ELL instruction.

**Research Questions**

This research was informed by Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978) and addressed concepts of tools, scaffolding, mediation, internalization, and appropriation as they related to teacher candidates’ use of video-elicited reflection (V-Note and instructional coaching). The research was guided by the following research questions:

1. How does video-elicited reflection shape final semester, undergraduate teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs?

2. How does video-elicited reflection affirm, challenge, or reconstruct teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs?

A multiple-case study analysis (Stake, 2013), was used to examine interviews, participants’ written reflections, and a researcher’s journal to generate case and cross case findings.

**Personal Perspective**

I am a bilingual Cuban–American. I was briefly labeled ELL when I was a K–12 public school student because I spoke both Spanish and English at home. I grew up in a community
where most people spoke Spanish as a second or first language. When I started kindergarten, I was an ELL and was the lowest reader in my class. My first-grade teacher knew effective ELL instructional strategies and used language accommodations to support my development in reading. I went from being the lowest reader in my class to the highest reader in my class, and soon after I was placed in gifted classes.

My firsthand experiences as a K–12 student created images of how I viewed effective ELL teaching and learning. When I became a public school teacher, I used my lived experiences to shape and make sense of my instruction of ELLs. I worked with ELLs and their families to improve their academic experiences and used accommodated instruction to support ELLs’ unique language needs. My experiences as a public school teacher showed me that many teachers did not share my beliefs about ELLs. Many teachers had misconceptions about ELLs and referred to them as “low performing students.” I became interested in second language theory and decided to pursue an advanced degree in elementary education with a concentration in second language instruction because I wanted to prepare teachers for ELL instruction.

While completing my graduate degree in elementary education, I worked as a clinical (field) experience supervisor where I facilitated teacher candidates’ instruction of elementary students. The teacher candidates in our teacher preparation program used video to reflect on their instruction. I soon realized I could use video as a way for teacher candidates to examine their instruction to ELLs. A few months later, I attended the National Association of Professional Development Schools conference where I listened to a presentation about teacher candidates using a video annotation tool for video reflection. This tool allowed teacher candidates to mark and code their recorded videos to reflect on their instruction and student outcomes.
Inspired by my own experiences and the National Association of Professional Development Schools presentation, I engrossed myself in the literature on video reflection in teacher education (Calandra & Rich, 2015). I noticed that there was a gap in the literature because no empirical studies investigated how video reflection could be used for ELL teacher preparation. Likewise, no studies examined how ELL teacher candidates could use video annotation tools to reflect on their instruction to elementary-aged ELLs. Noticing a gap existed, I decided to conduct two pilot studies to test different video annotation tools with ELL teacher candidates. These pilot studies led me to methodology that was used in this dissertation.

Significance of the Study

The body of research on video reflection for ELL teacher education is limited when compared to the body of research on video reflection for general teacher education. A review of the literature on ELL teacher preparation revealed most research is theoretical in nature. This study aimed to fill a gap in the literature by offering an empirical study of how three undergraduate teacher candidates used video-elicited reflection to examine their beliefs about ELLs and the instruction of ELLs. Findings from this research offer new insights into how video, video annotation tools, and content instructional coaching can be used to support teacher candidates’ understanding of ELL pedagogy.

Definition of Key Terms

The terms used in this research are defined by the context in which they are understood.
**Clinical Experiences**

Clinical experiences provide teacher candidates with guided, hands-on, practical applications and demonstration of professional knowledge of theory to practice, skills, and dispositions through collaborative and facilitated learning in school-based assignments. Clinical experiences include, but are not limited to, culminating clinical practices such as student teaching or internship (CAEP, Glossary, 2016).

**Collaborating Teacher**

Collaborating teacher is the term used to identify the teachers in whose classrooms teacher education students work (Zeichner, 1995).

**Critical Incident**

A term used to describe an in-depth description of an instructional event that attracts teacher candidates’ attention and is a springboard for reflection. A critical incident involves teacher candidates’ search for meaning within the mundane (Tripp, 2011).

**English Language Learner (ELL)**

English language learners include students who are being served by public school’s language assistance program and are learning English as a second language. In the context of this study, ELLs were elementary students (United States Department of Education [USDOE]. 2015).
**English Language Learner Instructional Coach**

English language learner (ELL) instructional coach is referred to as cognitive coaching in the literature (Batt, 2010). ELL instructional coaches are individuals who mentor and coach teachers. They have knowledge of instruction, content area curricula, and an understanding of second language acquisition and literacy development for children who are English language learners.

**English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL)**

English for Speakers of Other Languages is a public school language assistance program for English language learners (USDOE, 2015).

**English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Endorsement**

The ESOL endorsement is an add-on certificate to a state-issued teaching certificate that is awarded after taking predetermined courses in ELL theory and pedagogy (Florida Department of Education, [FLDOE], 2016).

**ESOL Resource Teacher**

The ESOL Resource Teacher is an individual who is responsible for implementing and comprehensive English language assistance program to ELLs. (Pasco County Public Schools, 2009).

**Stated Beliefs**

A teacher’s stated beliefs are verbal expressions of their beliefs about teaching and learning (Farrell & Bennis, 2013) Teachers’ stated beliefs are also referred to as espoused beliefs (Basturkmen, 2012).
**Teachers’ Beliefs**

Teachers’ beliefs is a concept used to describe the important influences on the way teachers conceptualize tasks and learn from experience (Nespor, 1987). Teachers’ beliefs reflect their personal values, ideologies, and individual philosophy of teaching, influence their perceptions and judgments and affect their classroom behaviors.

**Teacher Candidate**

A teacher candidate is a student who is enrolled in a teacher preparation program (CAEP, 2016).

**Teacher Preparation Program**

A teacher preparation program is a university program that prepares future teachers with the skills they need to succeed as teachers (CAEP, 2016). The teacher preparation program involves methodology courses and teaching practicum field experiences where teacher candidates work in schools with a mentor (collaborating) teacher and student learners.

**Quintain**

The quintain is the term used in this research to describe the unit, phenomenon, or program under investigation in case study research (Stake, 2013).

**Video Analysis**

Video analysis refers to the codes, annotations, labels, and comments teacher candidates use to analyze their instructional videos (Calandra & Rich, 2015). In this research video analysis
specifically refers to teacher candidates’ use of V-Note to analyze their recorded instruction to ELLs.

**Video Annotation Tool**

Video annotation tool is any software that is used for video analysis. Video annotation tools allow users to code, mark, or comment on recorded video to notice patterns or critical incidents that elicit in-depth reflection (Rich & Hannafin, 2009).

**Video-Elicited Reflection (VER)**

Video elicited reflection is a practice that involves video analysis and discussion with another person such as a peer, supervisor or instructional coach to reflect on instruction to student learners (Sewall, 2009).

**University Supervisor**

The term university supervisor is used in this research to describe a university employee who is appointed to supervise teacher candidates who are working in school-based, internship field experiences.

**Summary**

In this chapter I introduced the background, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, researcher’s perspective, and significance of the study and described the key terms used in this study. In the background section I explained that the ELL student population is rapidly increasing. I also explained that teachers feel unprepared to teach ELLs. As
a result, ELLs lag behind their English-speaking peers academically, and US public schools are in urgent need of teachers who can effectively instruct ELLs. National attention has been placed on how teacher preparation programs prepare teacher candidates for ELL instruction. The statement of the problem explained that reflection is a central component of teacher preparation and explained that video reflection has become a popular teacher preparation reflective practice. Even though video was discussed in published, empirical research for the reflective affordances it offers teacher candidates, little is known about how video reflection, or video annotation tools can be used by ELL teacher preparation programs to prepare teacher candidates for effective ELL instruction.

Then, I discussed that the purpose of this research was to examine how video-elicited reflection (a video annotation tool and content instructional coaching) mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about and instruction of ELLs. I stated that the questions guiding this research, were: (1) How does video-elicited reflection shape final semester, undergraduate, teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs? (2) How does video elicited reflection affirm, challenge, or reconstruct teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs?

Next, I disclosed my connection to this research. I explained that my personal experience growing up as an ELL student, former ELL public school teaching experiences, and recent university supervisor experiences led me to design this research. To follow, I discussed the significance of the research and argued that that more empirical research is needed to fill a gap in the literature surrounding the use of video reflection, and video annotation tools for ELL teacher preparation. Finally, I listed and defined the key terms used in this research.
In the next chapter I will discuss the theoretical framework and relevant literature used to inform this research. To do so I will discuss sociocultural theory (Vygotsky, 1978) and concepts of mediation tools, scaffolding, mediation, internalization, and appropriation. Then, I will discuss the relevant literature on ELL teacher preparation, teacher’s beliefs, reflection and video reflection.
CHAPTER TWO:  
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter begins with a discussion of the sociocultural theory, the theoretical framework guiding this research, and follows with a review of the literature. First, I will address sociocultural theory and the concepts of mediation, tools, scaffolding, internalization, and appropriation. Next, I will share that video-elicited reflection was the tool used in this research. Then, I will follow with a description of the relevant literature on ELL teacher preparation, teachers’ beliefs, reflection, and video reflection. To conclude the chapter, I will highlight the gaps in the published literature to express why this research is needed to add new understanding to the field of ELL teacher preparation.

Sociocultural Theory

Sociocultural theory was used in this research to examine how three undergraduate, teacher candidates used video-elicited reflection (V-Note and instructional coaching) to analyze and reflect on their instruction of ELLs. Teacher candidates’ beliefs were collected in interviews and representations of these beliefs in action were documented in teacher candidates’ videotaped instruction to ELLs. Participants’ reflected on their instruction of ELLs with V-Note and discussed what they noticed about their ELL instruction with the researcher. This research sought to understand teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELL and how video-elicited reflection, affirmed, challenged, or reconstructed, teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs. This research examined
teacher candidates’ tool use (i.e.-Note and instructional coaching; discussions with the researcher, therefore, sociocultural theory was employed as the theoretical framework.

Vygotsky’s (1978) sociocultural theory proposed that the human mind is developed through interactions with culture and society. Sociocultural theory presumes that humans use tools to regulate the material world and their own mental activities. Sociocultural theory stipulates that culture and society directly influence human knowledge and mental development.

Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory described the process of mediation and internalization as processes where humans use tools to transform their natural mental thoughts into instrumental acts that develop higher mental functions (1978). Humans’ use tools to organize and control activity in the material world, through the use of culturally constructed tools that are both physical (e.g., hammer) and psychological (e.g., symbols, or language). Moreover, this study used sociocultural theory to propose that culture is an objective force that infuses social relationships and develops artifacts (tools) in concrete activity (Lantolf & Thorne, 2015). Therefore, sociocultural theory was used in this research to assume that teacher candidates’ mental activities (understanding of ELL instruction) developed because of tool use (V-Note), and social interactions (instructional coaching discussions). Following, I explain tools, mediation, internalization, and appropriation.

Mediation

In his book, Vygotsky (1978) explained, “Human labor relies on tool use as a means by which man changes nature and in doing so transforms himself” (p. 7). In this statement Vygotsky was describing the concept of mediation where humans use tools to support their acquisition of new knowledge, Vygotsky (1978) stated, “Human labor relies on tool use as a means by which
man changes nature and in doing so transforms himself” (p. 7). In this statement Vygotsky was describing mediation as a process where humans use tools to support their acquisition of new knowledge. In his discussion of mediation, Vygotsky depicted a mediating link between the subject and object (activity or behavior), using S-X-R to illustrate a mediated response, whereas S is the stimulus, R is the response, and X is the mediating tool. Vygotsky’s depiction of mediation suggested that both technical and psychological tools mediate human activity.

Beliefs about ELLs  Video-Elicited Reflection  Instruction for ELLs

V-Note  ELL Instructional Coaching

**Figure 1.** How mediation is used in this research.

In this research, as depicted in Figure 1, the stimulus is the ELL teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs, and the response is their instruction of ELLs. The dashed line indicates that the stimulus response relationship moves is bi-directional; therefore, ELL teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs can affect their instruction for ELLs, and teacher candidates’ instruction for ELLs can affect their beliefs about ELLs. In this research, participants’ instruction for ELLs is understood as a social action that is mediated by video-elicited reflection.

**Tools**

Vygotsky (1978) stated, “Human beings seldom interact with the world directly and use artifacts developed by humankind to mediate their relationships with the lived-in world” (p. 16). In this quote Vygotsky implied that tools mediate human activity and transform natural mental processes into instrumental acts. In this research V-Note is perceived as a technical tool and
discussion with an ESOL instructional coach is perceived as psychological tool. The
participants in this research used both physical (V-Note) and psychological tools (ELL
instructional coaching) to inform their beliefs about ELLs.

Vygotsky (1978) introduced psychological tools as supports people use to affect others or
themselves and technical tools as the supports people use to affect things. Kozulin (2002, 2003)
further discussed Vygotsky’s concept of psychological tools as artifacts that help humans master
their own natural mental functions, and Lantolf and Thorne (2015) referred to psychological
tools as symbolic artifacts or signs. Lantolf and Thorne discussed the differences between
physical and psychological tools (symbolic artifacts) saying,

Physical tools such as hammers, bulldozers and shovels are culturally constructed
artifacts that are inserted between our activity and an external object. Physical tools
extend the reach and power of our bodies and their use results in change in the object
toward which they are directed…. Symbolic artifacts are, in themselves, not able to effect
such changes; they do, however, have the power to radically reconstruct the whole mental
operation of others and ourselves. (p. 60)

Guided by Vygotsky (1978), Kouzlin (2003), Kouzlin et al.,(2002), and Lantolf and Thorne’s
discussion of Sociocultural Theory (2015), this research regarded V-Note as a physical tool and
the discussion participants had with an ELL instructional coach as a psychological tool.

**Scaffolding**

Sociocultural Theorists discuss scaffolding as a way to nudge a learner toward a higher
level of performance (Hill & Miller, 2013). Learning scaffolds are used in sociocultural research
to study the “zone of proximal development”; what a learner is capable of at the moment, and
what a learner can do when provided with support (Vygotsky, 1978). Researchers used Bruner’s concept of scaffolding (1985) to discuss social interaction as a crucial component for teacher learning.

For example, Manning and Payne used building construction as an analogy to discuss the use of scaffolds for teacher education stating,

The scaffold is the teacher education program itself. The “building” is the teacher at the completion of the formalized teacher preparation program…the verbal dialogue within the teacher education program is the crux of the scaffold. The building (teacher) is only as strong as the scaffold (teacher education program) itself (1993, p.364).

Manning and Payne defined a scaffold as the entire teacher education program but did not elaborate on the specific tools that can be used to scaffold teacher candidate learning in teacher preparation.

In other research, tools are used to discuss scaffolding (Budrova & Leong, 2007). Budrova and Leong discussed scaffolding as a process that involved an expert using learning tools such as math manipulatives as scaffolds to promote novices’ abilities to perform mathematical learning tasks independently. Budrova and Leong stated:

The expert provides scaffolding to enable the novice to perform at a higher level. Within scaffolding the task is not changed, but what the learner initially does is made easier with assistance. Gradually, the level of assistance decreases as the learner takes more responsibility for performance of the task, (2007, p. 42).

Budrova and Leong discussed scaffolding as a support that an expert gives to a novice to make a learning task easier, and also elaborated on scaffold removal as a way to promote novice learning
independence. Nonetheless, Budrova and Leong (2007) did not explain how experts will know when scaffolds should be removed from novice learners, and did not study the learning affordances a novice receives when different scaffolds are used, or a scaffold is used permanently.

**Internalization and Appropriation**

Internalization is a mechanism that controls natural mental endowments. Internalization occurs when external processes take place in the internal plane; meaning the social environment informs internal thought processes. Vygotsky described internalization: “Without man as a whole, the activity of his apparatus cannot be explained, that man controls his brain, and not the brain the man” (as cited in Lantolf & Thorne, 2015, p. 152). Therefore, internalization is a negotiated process of development between the social, external environment and the internal, personal environment. Through the process of internalization, human beings carry aspects of the social environment to reorganize internal thoughts in a bi-directional open system.

Vygotsky (1978) explained that internalization is not a removal of external processes from internal thoughts but rather a distribution of internal and external components within one mental function to form a mediated action or behavior. In the published research, mediated mental processes are called *higher mental functions* (Kaptelinin & Nardi, 2006). Higher mental functions are formed when humans use a mediational artifact to solve a task and then stop using the artifact, and their performance improves.

Wertsch (1998) added to Vygotsky’s discussion of internalization with the term *appropriation*. Appropriation is described in the research as a passing of control from the social to the individual level. Wertsch described appropriation as taking an idea that is shared socially
and making it your own (1998). Wertsch proposed that humans can determine what they will make their own and are unaware of the process of appropriation until different possibilities are made apparent (1998). Appropriation facilitates human thinking about new possibilities and courses of actions, and leads to human development and learning.

Barbara Rogoff discussed the social influence of appropriation using the term participatory appropriation (2008). Rogoff wrote, “the concept of participatory appropriation refers to the process and systems of involvement between people as they communicate and coordinate efforts while participating in culturally valued activity” (2008, p. 60). Rogoff’s description of participatory appropriation involved a process of individual change that is mediated by the social environment.

Similarly, other research used appropriation to study teacher professional development (Grossman, Smagorinsky, & Valencia, 1999); whereas appropriation was understood as a process that is directed by activity settings. For example, Grossman et al., proposed that teachers may work at the same school, but their classroom environments differ and proposed that different environments (activity settings) create a disjuncture when theories taught in university coursework are not seen in clinical practice (1999). Grossman et al., explained that appropriation is not the same across all social environments, and involves a “process through which a person adopts the pedagogical tools available for use in a particular social environment” (1999, p.15). Grossman et al’s research argued that the learner’s role within an activity setting is fundamental understanding different degrees of appropriation, and identified five degrees of appropriation:

(a) Appropriating a label. A person knows the name if a tool but does not know any of its features.
(b) *Lack of appropriation.* Learners do not appropriate a pedagogical tool either because the concept is too difficult to comprehend or may because the tool is too foreign to the learner’s prior frameworks,

(c) *Appropriating surface level features.* A person learns some or most of the features of a tool, but does not understand how the features contribute to a conceptual whole.

(d) *Appropriating conceptual underpinnings.* A teacher candidate who appropriates conceptual underpinnings of a pedagogical practice, but is not yet able implement the practice in their own classroom.

(e) *Achieving mastery.* Teachers are able to use the tool in different contexts to solve new problems and grasps the theoretical basis that inform and motivate the use of a tool.

Degrees of appropriation occur at different levels depending on the tools teachers use and the activity settings they are in; meaning it is not the tools alone that supports teacher leaning, but a combination of tool and social interaction within a given cultural setting.

Additionally, Grossman et al., warned that a lack of appropriation does not necessarily involve a lack of learning. A teacher candidate can understand the conceptual underpinnings of a tool, but may reject the premises that support it due to the beliefs they hold. For example, a teacher candidate may learn in their ELL university coursework that using an ELLs’ native language is a way to build on the English, but may have a belief that speaking another language interferes with an ELLs’ ability to learn English. The teacher candidate has learned a theory, but has chosen not to ascribe to it.

Grossman et al., (1999) found that teacher candidates were able to develop their own beliefs about teaching and learning when they experienced a conflict between what they learned
in university coursework and internships. Their research found that teacher candidates who faced conflicts between their beliefs and ELL instruction began to mirror learned university theory to resolve the conflicts they experienced when teaching ELLs. Additionally, teacher candidates felt the internship taught ELL instructional theory even though they had previously learned the theory in university coursework. Grossman et al.’s., (1999) research found that internships facilitated teacher candidates’ belief development and understanding of conceptual underpinnings.

Hung’s research used the work of Bakhtin (1986) to discuss the role of shared speech in appropriated environments. Hung wrote, “language is used in centers no one the isolated thinker manifesting thoughts, but on a dialogue in which the utterances react to each other and acquire meaning by mutual relation and conflict” (1999, p. 195). Individuals use appropriation to relate to one another within the context of social activities.

Hung explained that collaborative work is a rich environment for studying learning, and shared a three-step process of epistemological appropriation.

(a) *Growing into dependency* is seen when the novice teacher self-regulates to submit to the beliefs and rules of the community.

(b) *Dependency* is mirroring and is seen when the novice imitates strategies and/or practices that are acquired from coaching.

(c) *Growing out of dependency* involves the novice trying or experimenting new ideas independently, because they see that their beliefs are inherent in the community.

Hung’s research (1999) found that teachers need time to become dependent in their ideas about teaching and learning. Growing out of dependency, the last step in appropriation involved teacher candidates using new learning approaches with ELLs in clinical experience because they
had developed relationship with their school and felt comfortable to try innovative learning strategies with ELLs. Hung's research shed light on the supportive collaborative dialogue teacher candidates need to appropriate new knowledge about ELL instruction.

Wertsch (1998), Rogoff (2008,) Grossman et al., (1999) and Hung, (1999) studied appropriation using different perspectives of social learning. Wertsch (1998) examined how learners’ obtained knowledge from a more knowledgeable other; and described appropriation as a passing of knowledge from the social to the individual level. Rogoff (2008) examined the process of appropriation in collaborative contexts where learners worked together with others to engage in participatory appropriated learning. Grossman et al., (1999) used activity theory to argue that appropriation as a process that is directed by cultural settings, and argued that different cultural setting change how learning is appropriated. Hung, (1999) used the work of Bakhtin (1986) to investigate the role of language in appropriated environments. Hung’s research found that learners grow out of dependency when they implemented new ideas that were generated in discourse with a mentor then enacted in their own classrooms (1999).

**Video-Elicited Reflection**

Video-elicited reflection was used in this research to examine sociocultural concepts pertaining to teacher candidates’ tool mediation, scaffolding, internalization, and appropriation. V-Note was used is a physical tool the participants used to analyze recordings of their ELL instruction, and ELL instructional coaching was regarded as a psychological tool the participants used to discuss their ELL instruction and make sense of their V-Note analysis for reflection. In this research, the term video-elicited reflection (Sewall, 2009) was used to describe a process involving both physical and psychological tool use (V-Note and ELL instructional coaching). The
participants in this research used V-Note to analyze recorded episodes of their instruction of ELLs, and elicit reflective discussion with an instructional coach.

The research on reflection for teacher education argued that teacher candidates need a space to reflect on their own practice with a lens of language teaching (Farrell, 2015). Video annotation tools allow teachers to assume a lens while examining their recorded instruction and allows teacher candidates to notice patterns for reflection on teaching. Zeichner and Liston (2013), explained that reflection on teaching should promote the ability for teachers to use tools to analyze and initiate changes in their instruction. Reflection tools such as video annotation support the teachers is seeing why changes to instruction are needed to better support student learning outcomes.

Video-elicited reflection includes video annotation and social dialogue with peers or experienced others, and offers teacher candidates affordances for self-analysis and self-evaluation. Video-elicited reflection promotes teacher candidate professional development because video evidence allows teacher candidates to notice relationships between their beliefs, classroom interaction, and student outcome (Borko et al., 2008; Snoeyink, 2014; Zhang et al., 2011). Additionally, Video-elicited reflection is a powerful tool for instructional coaches of teacher candidate supervisors. Instructional coaches can use video to provide teacher candidates with evidence-based feedback on their teaching, and discuss ideas about pedagogical growth, or new instructional strategies that can be used to improve classroom instruction.

**Research on ELL Teacher Education**

The research on ELL teacher preparation argued that teacher candidates need to be provided with coursework on language acquisition theory and clinical experiences working with
ELLs to make connections between theory and practice (de Jong, 2013; Harper & de Jong, 2004, 2009). Other research on ELL teacher preparation discussed a linguistically responsive ELL teacher education model that allowed teacher candidates to draw upon principles of second language theory for use in classroom field experiences (Lucas & Villegas, 2013; Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). In addition to being linguistically responsive, the literature on ELL teacher education suggested that teacher candidates must face the entering beliefs and the assumptions they have about ELLs because most teacher teachers are white, monolingual native English speakers (Sleeter, 2001). Because most teachers, differ from ELL student populations culturally and linguistically, teacher candidates need to be prepared for, and provided with opportunities to work with ELLs while in teacher preparation.

When considering the policy, standards, and research surrounding ELL teacher preparation, one cannot help but notice that there is a need for ELL teacher preparation programs to incorporate strategies that allow teacher candidates to examine the beliefs they have about ELLs. By understanding teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs, ELL teacher preparation programs can teach the theoretical frameworks and instructional skills teacher candidates need to be effective ELL educators. As noted by Peacock, “if teacher candidates have negative beliefs about ELLs it is important for program instructors to change them, (2001, p. 189). ELL teacher preparation programs need to consider the strategies they can use to correct the misconceptions teacher candidates’ have about ELLs, so teacher candidates can be more receptive to trying learned second language theories to instruct ELLs.

ELL teacher education is guided by the TESOL/CAEP PK-12 Teacher Preparation Program Standards. The creation of the TESOL/CAEP Teacher Preparation Program Standards
have historical implications that began in 2001 with ‘No Child Left Behind’ [NCLB] and were revisited in the reauthorization of NCLB in the ‘Every Student Succeeds Act’ [ESSA] (2015).

**No Child Left Behind**

NCLB (2001) ushered in a new era of education reform aimed at improving the education of ELLs by addressing the ways in which teachers are prepared for instructing ELLs. NCLB required school compliance in setting high expectations for all students, including those students who were learning to speak English for the first time as ELLs. NCLB’s inclusive language held school districts accountable to ensure all students met grade-level expectations in reading and math. To comply with these requirements, schools placed ELLs in mainstream classrooms where teachers taught the bulk of instruction in English and required ELLs to take the same academic content assessments as those taken by native English speakers. In addition, NCLB required all students to be taught by highly qualified teachers who held a bachelor’s degree and state teaching license and provided evidence of proficiency in the content areas they taught (Menken, 2006, 2009, 2010). Therefore, teachers who teach at least one ELL are required to be ELL endorsed or credentialed; albeit, the majority of US teachers have not had ELL teacher preparation (Education Commission of the State, 2014; Genesee et al., 2005). Over 16 years have passed since NCLB was introduced and ELLs are still being taught by teachers who lack the certifications needed to provided them with effective instruction.

**Every Student Succeeds Act**

ESSA (2015) recognized that universal assessment requirements failed to meet the unique learning needs of ELLs. Therefore, ESSA, a reauthorization of NCLB (2001), was
written to give states greater responsibility for designing and building their own accountability systems to determine what supports schools’ and districts’ need for improving ELL student learning. New ESSA (2015) mandates that all states use:

- Multiple measures of student achievement,
- State accountability systems for ELL learning,
- Federal funding to support ELL learning, and
- Academic supports to assist new, long-term ELLs, and ELLs with special needs.

While ESSA focused more on ELLs than did NCLB, ELL teacher education specifications are still missing from the policy’s mandates (Breiseth, 2016). Additionally, because ESSA gives more control to the States and less control to the federal government, some states have chosen to not require teachers to be certified in ELL instruction.

**TESOL/CAEP Teacher Education Program Standards**

The Association for Childhood Education International, a Specialized Professional Association within the CAEP K-6 Elementary Teacher Standards (2015), outline the skills elementary teacher candidates should know, understand, and be able to do upon graduating from an ELL teacher preparation program. Standards pertaining to the instruction and professionalism categories indicate that teacher candidates need experiences working with diverse student populations and opportunities to engage in reflection on these experiences. For example, Standard 3.2 Adaptation to Diverse Students stipulates, “Candidates understand how elementary students differ in their development and approaches to learning, and create instructional opportunities that are adapted to diverse students” (2015, p. 2), and Standard 5.1 Professional Growth, Reflection, and Evaluation states, “Candidates are aware of and reflect on their
practice…. They continually evaluate the effects of their professional decisions and actions on students … and actively seek out opportunities to grow professionally (p. 2). The Elementary Education Standards underscore the importance of providing teacher candidates with clinically rich field experiences and opportunities to work and reflect on classroom experiences with diverse student populations. However, these standards use the term *diversity* and neglect to address the skills teacher candidates’ need to effectively design and implement instruction for ELLs.

The TESOL/CAEP Teacher Education Program Standards (2010) were created to include the specific ELL skills teacher candidates need. TESOL/CAEP standards include four domains: language, culture, instruction, and assessment, and state that teacher candidates must be “committed to continue to learn through reflective practice and classroom inquiry and able and willing to contribute to the professional development of their colleagues and actively serve as advocates for ELLs” (p. 19). The TESOL/CAEP Teacher Education Program Standards indicate that reflective practice is a precursor to teachers’ ELL professional development. Reflective practice should occur in all four domains so teacher candidates can develop an understanding of language, culture, instruction and assessment. Reflective practice surrounding these domains facilitate teacher candidates’ ELL professional development.
Conversely, not all teacher preparation programs use the TESOL/CAEP teacher education program standards because these standards are an optional guide and not a requirement for all ELL teacher preparation programs in the US. In fact, a recent report conducted by the Education Commission of the States (2014) revealed that only eighteen US states (i.e., Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Texas, Virginia, and Washington) have ELL teacher education requirements, and only three of these states require teachers to take university-level ELL courses (i.e., Florida, California, and New York) about language acquisition theory and ELL pedagogy. This differences in States’ ELL teacher requirements is alarming considering the reports indicating the ELL student population is on the rise (NCES, 2015), ELLs are in all US states (Education Commission of the States, 2014) and teachers need more clinical experiences working with ELLs (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Coady et al., 2011).
Research on Teachers’ Beliefs

The beliefs with which teacher candidates enter teacher preparation are central to their pedagogical development because teachers’ beliefs inform their instructional actions and behaviors (Basturkmen, 2012). For example, Zeichner and Liston stated,

The experiences we have before we enter teacher education programs, those encountered within programs and our subsequent work experiences as teachers provide a background of episodes and events that inform who we are and how we think, feel and plan as teachers. (2013, p. 37)

Teachers’ beliefs inform how teachers “think, feel and plan”; however, teachers’ beliefs are difficult to study due to definitional problems.

In other research teachers’ beliefs have been described as concept associated with teachers’ attitudes, values, perceptions, dispositions, feelings, emotions, and images (Kagan, 1992; Pajares, 1992, 1996; Richardson, 1996, 2003). Other researchers described teachers’ beliefs as the evaluative propositions teachers hold consciously or unconsciously while recognizing that other teachers may hold alternative beliefs on the same issue (Basturkmen, 2012; Borg, 2011). The research on teachers’ beliefs showed that teachers’ beliefs is a difficult construct to study because of definitional issues.

The lack of a universal definition for teachers’ beliefs was discussed in Frank Pajares’ (1992) seminal research. In his article Pajares stated, “The difficulty in studying teachers’ beliefs has been caused by definitional problems, poor conceptualization and differing understandings of beliefs and belief structures” (p. 307). Kagan (1992) also wrote about definitional issues, saying, “Teacher belief is not used consistently with some researchers referring to teacher beliefs as ‘principles of practice,’ ‘personal epistemologies,’ ‘perspectives,’ ‘practical knowledge,’ or
‘orientations’” (p. 66). The definitional issues surrounding the concept teachers’ beliefs means that researchers need to be explicit when they define how teachers’ beliefs will be perceived in their study.

To study teachers’ beliefs, researchers created typologies to examine the types of beliefs teachers have. For example, Nespor’s (1987) created the categories: existential existence, alternative, affective and evaluative, and episodic types. Borg (2003, 2011) categorized teachers’ beliefs types according to those brought on by schooling experiences, professional coursework, contextual factors, and classroom practices. Richardson’s (2003) categorized teachers’ beliefs types as personal experiences, experiences with schooling and instruction, and experiences with formal knowledge. Borg (2003, 2011), Nespor (1987), and Richardson (1996, 2003) sought to uncover the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and their instructional actions, and agreed that teachers’ beliefs about teaching students and learning are derived from teachers’ own experiences as classroom students in what Lortie (1975) referred to as the “apprenticeship of observation”.

**Stated Beliefs and Classroom Action**

Teachers’ stated beliefs are defined as the beliefs teachers can readily articulate, verbalize, and are fully aware of (Farrell & Bennis, 2013). In the published literature surrounding teachers’ beliefs, teachers’ stated beliefs are studied in interview or survey data and are understood for being a determinant for understanding teachers’ instructional practices (Basturkmen, 2014; Basturkmen et al., 2004). Teachers’ stated beliefs are and used to study how teachers’ beliefs inform their classroom actions and/or behaviors.

ELL teachers’ stated beliefs are discussed as a concept that influences teachers’ ELL instructional (Horowitz 1988; Johnson 1992; Peacock, 2001). Teachers' stated beliefs about
ELLs are believed to inform their perceptions and judgments of classroom actions. Researchers who studied ELL teachers’ verbalized beliefs used the term *explicit beliefs* (Basturkmen, 2012) or *espoused beliefs* (Johnson, 1992) to examine how beliefs inform ELL teaching actions. Classroom observations or self-report data were gathered to discern how teachers make sense of their classroom practices (Basturkmen et al., 2004). Researchers used classroom observations of ELL instruction and asked teachers or teacher candidates to use self-reporting methods such as written reflections (Borg, 2011) or metaphors (Farrell, 2006; Munby & Russell, 1990) to describe what they saw and felt when analyzing recordings of their instruction.

Observations of teachers’ ELL classroom practices were used to examine the beliefs teachers verbalize but are not generally aware of (Basturkmen, 2012; Farrell & Bennis, 2013). Teachers’ stated beliefs about ELLs are held unconsciously and can only be inferred by examining how verbally stated beliefs are practiced in observable teaching actions.

To study ELL teachers’ beliefs, researchers compared teachers’ instructional practices to their beliefs to examine how stated beliefs converge or diverge with classroom actions (Basturkmen et al., 2004; Farrell & Bennis, 2013). A mismatch between ELL teachers’ stated beliefs and ELL instruction indicated a conflicting belief pattern that had been challenged or reconstructed. A match between teachers’ stated beliefs and ELL classroom instruction indicated a belief had been affirmed.

Basturkmen, (2012) argued that teachers’ beliefs do not always converge with their classroom practices, and explained that divergence is more apparent in novice teachers when compared to experienced teachers’ instruction. The relationship between teachers’ stated beliefs is an interactive one; beliefs drive action, but experience and reflection can lead to changed or
reconstructed beliefs that inform new instructional actions (Basturkmen, 2012). The interactive relationship between beliefs, instruction, and reflection is depicted in Figure 3.
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**Figure 3.** Teachers’ beliefs, instruction, and reflection.

The left side of the dashed line in Figure 3 illustrate the interactive process among beliefs, instruction, and reflection when beliefs are affirmed. Affirmed beliefs precede feelings of success and confidence. For example, teachers use instructional strategies they will work well to promote student learning. Teachers see evidence of student learning when the strategy is used, thereby continuing to use this instructional strategy for future instruction. The right side of Figure 3 depicts challenged or reconstructed beliefs. For example, if teachers use instructional strategies they believe will work well to promote student learning and see evidence that the strategy did not work well, their prior beliefs about the strategies will be challenged or reconstructed to form a new belief they put into action. Teachers’ beliefs are changed or reconstructed when they see evidence indicating otherwise. However, the change and
reconstruction process does not happen easily, and research argued that content area instructional coaches may need to probe teacher candidates to examine critically episodes of their instruction because teacher candidates are novices to reflection and may not know what to look for or how to problematize their instruction (Beacher et al., 2009; Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014).

Emotions are thought to energize teachers’ belief change. In their chapter called the “Role of Emotion in Changing Teachers’ Beliefs,” Ashton and Gregoire-Gill (2003) wrote, “Without an understanding of the critical role of emotion in motivating belief change efforts to foster change in teachers’ beliefs are likely to remain ineffectual” (p. 107). When classroom actions are enacted and student outcomes diverge from teachers’ images of teaching and learning, tension and dissatisfaction create feelings of dissonance. This dissonance facilitates a changing or reconstruction of teachers’ beliefs. When classroom actions are enacted and student outcomes converge with teachers’ images of teaching and learning, success and confidence are felt. This agreement facilitates the affirmation of teachers’ previously held beliefs. Therefore, reflective practices should be used in teacher preparation to unearth teacher candidates’ emotions about their instruction to ELLs.

**Research on Teacher Reflection**

Education reform efforts emphasized the need for in-service teachers and teacher candidates to reflect on their practice (Calderhead 1993). Reflection is a critical component of teacher preparation and provides a vehicle for teacher candidates to examine the beliefs they have about teaching and learning. Dewey’s research (1933) stated that reflection is the “active persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends” (p. 9). Dewey defined reflection as an ongoing process where problems are posed and solutions are developed and
tried, and stated that the cycle of reflection is an “ongoing process where teachers develop as instructional professionals” (1933, p. 10). Dewey’s definition of reflection argues that teacher candidates need to consider the beliefs they have about teaching and learning by engaging in ongoing reflective practices where they can look back on their teaching to generate ideas for future pedagogical development. Thus, reflection can be used to facilitate teacher candidates’ professional development.

Examining teachers’ beliefs with reflective practices is a principal component in discussions of ELL teacher education. For example, Richards and Lockhart’s book, *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms* (1992) described reflection as “teachers collecting data about their teaching, examining their attitudes, beliefs, assumptions and teaching practices and use of information obtained as a basis for critical reflection about teaching” (p. 1). Additionally, Farrell’s (2014) text, *Promoting Teacher Reflection in Second Language Education: A Framework for TESOL Professionals* argued that reflection is a critical component of ELL teacher preparation because reflection allows “teachers to consciously examine what they believe about their practice … and compare these beliefs to their actual classroom practices to see if there is convergence or divergence” (p. 32). Reflection in ELL teacher preparation is thought to elicit a bottom-up approach to teachers’ pedagogical development because it allows teachers to reflect on their practice to serve students better instead of a top-down approach where teachers use district curriculum models to teach all students in the same way.

Schön’s (1983) work discussed the benefits reflection has on teacher pedagogical development. Schön used the term *reflection-in-action* to describe reflective processes individuals use when they frame and reframe their actions, looking for problems to test out various interpretations to modify their actions. *Reflection-on-action* describes reflection that
occurs after instruction has taken place. Teachers use reflection-in-action to frame their instructional actions and question the assumptions they have about teaching and learning. They also use reflection-on-action to consider pedagogical developments to improve student learning. Zeichner and Liston (2013) discussed reflection as practice teachers use to evaluate their beliefs:

If a teacher never questions the goals and values that guide his or her own work, the context in which he or she teaches, or never examines his or her assumptions, then it is our belief that this individual is not engaged in reflection. (p. 1)

Purposeful reflection occurs when teacher candidates are provided with opportunities to uncover their personally held beliefs about instruction and student learning.

Dewey (1933) and Richards and Lockhart (1992) described reflection as deliberate thoughts about teaching beliefs and practices. Other researchers who study teacher reflection defined reflection as a retrospective process or looking back on teaching (Schön, 1983). Other researchers who studied reflection warned that looking back does not mean that teachers need to consider the past but instead should examine how their past experiences create a lens for reflecting on anticipatory teaching actions. To reiterate, Conway (2001) described the process of anticipatory reflection as follows:

I argue that is what is meant by “looking back” is turning inward, examining one’s own remembered experiences and/or anticipated experiences, not exclusively looking back in time. Looking back in the reflective sense is about gaining some reflective distance to understand better the meaning of lived experience, one’s relationship with the world. (p. 90).

Teacher candidates need to be supported in their reflective practices so they can look back on their instructional experiences in order to look forward and make informed decisions about
future instruction.

To study teacher reflection, researchers used interviews and observation data (Farrell, 2007, 2015; Conway, 2001), metaphors (Farrell 2006, 2007) and reflective writing samples (Alger, 2006; Davis, 2006) to uncover candidates’ beliefs about teaching and learning. In other research, collections of personal narratives (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), journals, or interviews helped researchers make sense of teacher candidates’ individual and collective beliefs about students and instruction. In these studies, the structure and content of the participants’ narratives reflected personal beliefs about students and teaching. For example, in Kagan and Tippins’ (1992) research, four narrative qualities—logical structures, order of narrative components, point of view, and focus—were used to evaluate the narratives of 46 in-service and preservice teachers. Findings revealed teachers exhibited ethical or moral concerns that were highly sensitive to classroom struggles, but written solutions and responses to these struggles did not relate to personal beliefs because reflective responses were constrained. Kagan and Tippins’ (1992) research suggested that teacher preparation programs allow teachers to reflect freely about their classroom experiences because constraints inherent in the task and wording of directions may limit the chances that teachers will express their own beliefs.

If teacher education programs are to influence the future working lives of teacher candidates, they must consider how reflective processes can be used to examine teacher candidates’ past experiences, life histories, and instructional contexts in which they work as teachers (Calderhead, 1993). Still, researchers warn that reflection is not a skill with which teacher candidates are born. Teacher candidates are novitiates to reflection and need to be guided in how to reflect and on what to reflect.
Guided Reflection

To create guided reflection models, researchers examined candidates’ reflective writing samples and generated typologies (Jay & Johnson, 2002; Ward & McCotter, 2004). The reflection typologies used Jay’s and Johnson’s research (2002) and Ward’s and McCotter’s research (2004) indicated that beginning teacher candidates are more technical and descriptive in their reflective writing and develop more critical, dialectical reflection types with prolonged exposure to teaching and reflective practices. Similarly, Hatton and Smith’s (1995) research found that most teacher candidates used descriptive reflection, discussing classroom settings, and later become more critical, asking how and why questions about their teaching and student learners. In addition to using typologies to categorize candidate reflection, researchers also wrote about what the things on which teachers should reflect. Likewise, Zeichner and Liston (2013) discussed three levels of reflection: the pedagogical and curricular means used to attain educational aims, the underlying assumptions and consequences of pedagogical action, and the moral implications of pedagogical actions and the structure of schooling.

In Griffin’s (2003) research teacher candidates’ instructional goals were contrived by using guided reflection protocols. The reflection guides asked teachers to assume a lens for analysis to examine their instruction. For instance, in one study, teacher candidates used a personal instructional goal as a lens to examine recordings of their instructional experiences (Ash & Clayton, 2004). Guided reflection formats offered affordances to teacher candidates because it allowed teacher candidates to examine their instruction through the lens of a personal instructional goal and critically reflect on their teaching to student learners.
Research On Video Reflection

Video is used as a tool for reflection. Teacher preparation programs use video as a cost-effective way for teacher candidates to connect theory to practice (Calandra & Rich, 2015). Digital video recordings of teaching play an integral role in developing teacher candidates’ understanding of the relationship between their instructional actions and student outcome.

Empirical studies on video reflection triangulate data collected from participants’ questionnaire responses about processes taken when planning instruction for students (Baecher, McCormack, & Kung, 2014; Coffey, 2014), written reflections (Bower, Cavanaugh, Moloney, & Dao, 2011), video analysis (Calandra Brantley–Dias, & Dias, 2006), and interviews (Maclean & White, 2007; Rosaen et al., 2008). Also, case studies were frequently used and researchers asked a small group of participants (less than 10) to record short episodes of their instruction (Rich & Hannafin, 2008; Rosaen et al., 2008; Sewall, 2009). Participants were then asked to view their videos more than once to gain new insight about their instruction (Calandra & Rich, 2015; Sharpe et al., 2003; Tripp & Rich, 2012). In sum, guided reflection forms (Griffin, 2003; Tripp, 2011), shorter videos that focus on an instructional goal (Coffey 2014; Rosaen et al., 2008; Sewall, 2009), and repetitive viewing (Calandra et al., 2014; Prusak et. al., 2010; Sewall, 2009) are methods researchers used to examine how video-elicited reflection supports teacher candidates’ knowledge of instruction. However, no empirical studies have examined how teacher candidates use video-elicited reflection to reaffirm or challenge previously held beliefs about ELLs.

The research on video reflection shared that video can be used as a tool for teacher candidates or in-service teacher professional development (Borko et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2011). In these studies, guided reflection formats were used to support teacher candidates or in-
service teachers with selecting and noticing critical incidents of their instruction to reflect on future instructional actions and student learning outcomes.

**Video for Teacher Professional Development**

In other research, video was used as a professional development tool. Professional development is described as a program that increases teachers’ knowledge and classroom practices and fosters student learning and achievement gains (Borko et al., 2006). Research on the use of video for professional development explained the affordances of using video to promote teacher knowledge of teaching and learning through collaborative video discussions. For example, Zhang et al.’s (2011) research examined how 26 in-service, K–12 science teachers used three types of videos for reflection: published video, teacher video, and peer video. Their study found that teachers preferred using their own video for professional development because it provided an unbiased account of their teaching, allowed for multiple private viewings, and facilitated peer discussion. Zhang et al.’s research also found that teachers’ enjoyed discussing their videos with others and highlighted the importance of providing teachers with collaborative discussion opportunities when they use video reflection.

Borko et al.’s research (2008) examined the discourse used in professional learning communities from a situated perspective. Eight middle school math teachers engaged in a two-year-long workshop where they taught math content to middle school students. Two cameras were used to tape the teachers’ instruction; one followed the teacher’s instruction and the other camera followed a group of students. Borko et al.’s research found that teachers’ conversations around video became more productive and focused on issues related to teaching and learning due to the ongoing professional community discussions (2008). Their research offered insight on the affordance of using video reflection with collaborative conversation.
**Guided Video Reflection**

Video can be used as a reflective tool to provide teacher candidates with a deeper view of their instructional actions, leading to critical reflection on how to improve instruction for student learning. Still, the research suggested that teacher preparation programs should accompany video reflection with guides because teacher candidates are new to reflection and may have trouble when asked to reflect on their instruction (Rich & Hannafin, 2009). Further, guided video reflection was used to give participants a focus (or lens) for viewing and analyzing their recorded instruction (Brantley-Dias, Calandra & Fox, 2007). For example, Brophy (2004) discussed the need for guided reflection with teacher candidates:

Novices in particular do not gain many new insights or ideas about improving their teaching from simply watching classroom videos. If they do not have a clear purpose or agenda for watching the video, they are likely to watch it passively, much as they might watch a television program. (p. x).

Teacher candidates need guided reflection to support their noticing of critical incidents.

**Critical Incidents**

Teacher candidates can use video to examine segmented recordings of their instructions to analyze cause–effect relationships between instruction and student outcome. Deep reflection is referred to as critical reflection and is characterized by teacher candidates’ noticing of critical incidents of their instruction (Calandra, Brantley–Dias, Lee, & Fox, 2004). Critical incidents are recorded instructional instances that teacher candidates select from video to classify the incident, examine the general meaning of the incident, and describe future actions to be taken (Griffin, 2003). Teacher candidates who examine critical incidents in their video recordings focus on the
meaning of the incident rather than on the experience. The selection and analysis of critical incidents allow teacher candidates to exercise their external voice of reflection and assume their responsibility in the incident instead of blaming the incident on students or the situation.

**Instructional Coaching**

Instructional coaches play a critical role in supporting teacher candidates’ video-elicited reflections. Teacher candidates are novices using video for reflection and, need to be supported by instructional coaches or university supervisors who can shepherd teacher candidates’ noticing of the critical incidences of their instruction for deeper reflection (Baecher, et al., 2014). Instructional coaches or university supervisors should collaborate with teachers in post-observation conferences to explore, critique, and reflect with teacher candidates as they work to transform teacher candidates’ teaching practices.

Instructional coaching (Knight, 2007) or cognitive coaching (Batt, 2010; Costa & Garmston, 1994) is described as process that involves mentors supporting teacher candidates’ reflection with collaborative discussion. Instructional coaching differs from clinical supervision because instructional coaches help teachers improve, whereas clinical supervisors aspire to change teachers’ behaviors (Batt, 2010). An instructional coach, serves as mediator who assists teacher candidates (or teachers) with their reflection and self-evaluations that lead to changes in teachers’ instructional behaviors.

Instructional coaching consists of a three-phase cycle that is similar to clinical supervision: preconference, observation, and post conference (Costa & Garmston, 1994). While collaborating with teachers to reflect on their instructional practices, instructional coaches use description rather than judgment, and exploration rather than evaluation to support teachers as
they work to transform their teaching practices. Researchers who study instructional coaching argue that instructional coaches are an essential component for teacher reflection (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014) and reflection on instruction to ELLs (Batt, 2010; McIntyre et al., 2010).

Despite the overwhelming body of research that supports instructional coaching for improving ELLs’ academic conditions, few studies have been done to describe how instructional coaching supports teacher candidates’ use of video to reflect on instruction of ELLs. For example, published studies focused on supervisors’ use of video for evaluation instead of instructional coaches and only reported on graduate students (Baecher et al., 2013, 2014; Baecher, Rorimer, & Smith, 2012).

Similarly, a body of literature identifies the pedagogical skills (Burns & Badiali, 2016) or behaviors (Glickman, 1985) supervisors use in their clinical supervision. For example, Burns and Badiali (2016) identified six pedagogical skills that are frequently used by clinical supervisors: (a) noticing, (b) ignoring, (c) intervening, (d) pointing, (e) unpacking, and (f) processing. Noticing is the supervisor’s ability to distinguish some incidents from other incidents in practice. Ignoring is the intentional selection of inaction. Intervening involves stepping in to support the teacher candidate. Pointing is drawing the teacher candidate’s attention to a critical incident. Unpacking is breaking down a critical incident into simpler components, and unpacking is either supervisor-centered through telling or supervisor-facilitated through questioning.

Glickman’s (1985) seminal research discussed clinical supervision behaviors. She explained that supervisors used either directive or collaborative behaviors in their supervision. Directive behaviors are seen when the supervisor produces information for the teacher candidate to use. Glickman’s description of directive supervision behaviors would include Burns and Badiali’s (2016) supervisor-centered processing pedagogical skill because the supervisor tells the
teacher candidate how to reflect on his or her instruction. Glickman (1985) also refers to collaborative supervision behaviors as those that involve listening and the sharing of ideas between supervisor and teacher candidate. Collaborative coaching behaviors would agree with Burns and Badiali’s (2016) supervisor-facilitated pedagogical skills where supervisors use questioning to evoke coreflection with teacher candidates.

Research has been published in supervision skills and behaviors but little is known about ELL instructional coaching skills and behaviors. Using knowledge of the research on instructional coaching and supervision, I defined my role in this research as an ELL instructional coach because I was not evaluating teacher candidates’ instruction to change their instructional behaviors; instead I aimed to support teacher candidates’ instruction for ELLs with co-reflection. This research aimed to discuss how V-Note and ELL instructional coaching scaffolds supported teacher candidates’ knowledge of ELL pedagogy.

To define and describe my role in this research, I used Knight’s (2007) text “Instructional Coaching,” and two articles on ELL instructional cognitive coaching (Batt, 2010; Sherris, 2010; Sherris et al., 2007). First, I used Sherris et al.’s (2007) article to define ELL instructional coaching as a “collaborative process between two people in which they explore, critique and reflect on instruction to transform one’s teaching practices” (p. 3). Then I used Knight’s (2007) text and Batt’s (2010) articles to describe the type of ELL instructional coaching I provided teacher candidates in this research. For example, Knight (2007) stated, “Instructional coaches help guide teachers … and must know state standards and how to translate these standards into lesson plans” (p. 23). Knight also explained that instructional coaches build emotional connections with teacher candidates that foster equality, choice, voice, praxis, reciprocity, and reflection. Knight’s description of instructional coaching described a collaborative process where
the coach and teacher work together and learn from each other as they think about ideas to improve student instruction. Batt’s (2010) article focused on the non-evaluative characteristics of instructional coaching, and explained:

The coach should not be in a formal evaluative role, which could inhibit teachers from taking risks and trying new instructional strategies. Throughout the coaching process each person should be able to trust the other’s motives with the mutual goal of positive change in teaching practice. (p. 999)

Both Knight (2007) and Batt (2010) highlighted a collaborative instructional coaching approach where instructional coaches mentor, guide, to support teacher candidates’ with coreflection and collaborative dialogue to generate new ideas about teaching and leaning.

**Gaps in the Literature**

ELLs are the fastest growing student population, but empirical research on what strategies work best to prepare teachers for ELLs’ instruction is limited. As a result, most teachers feel unprepared to instruct ELLs, and nation reports categorize ELLs as students who are performing below grade level expectations in all academic areas (August et al., 2009; Fry, 2007, 2008).

New policies and standards aimed at improving ELL teacher education fail to provide specific details on ELL teacher preparation curriculum and practices. Policy and standard ambiguity have resulted in states using infused ELL teacher preparation models or having no ELL teacher preparation requirements. Consequently, only 29% of US teachers have the necessary credentials to teach ELLs, and most teachers have deficit views about ELLs because they lack the knowledge, skills, and dispositions needed to provide effective instruction for ELLs.
(Cheatham et al., 2013). U.S. public schools are in dire need of teachers who can provide effective instruction to ELLs.

A review of the literature revealed the empirical research suggesting that what works best to prepare teacher candidates for ELL instruction is lacking. The empirical research that has been published on ELL teacher education argued that teacher candidates need opportunities to reflect on their beliefs about teaching and learning and the experiences they have working with ELLs (Farrell, 2006, 2007, 2014, 2015). Research also suggested that video reflection and instructional coaching have the potential for improving teacher candidates’ instruction of student learners (Baecher at al., 2009; Calandra & Rich, 2015; Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014).

Only a few research studies have been published on video reflection and instructional coaching or supervision in teacher preparation (Gelfuso, 2016; Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014; Sewall, 2009), and the body of literature on teacher candidates’ use of video for reflection on instruction of ELLs is even more limited (Baecher et al., 2013, 2014). My review of the literature revealed that no studies have explored how teacher candidates use video reflection or video annotation as a tool for teacher candidate reflection to examine the relationship between their beliefs and instruction of ELLs. Likewise, teacher preparation programs may be unaware of the potential benefits video-elicited reflection has in preparing teacher candidates for instruction of ELLs and may not be aware of the affordance instructional coaching and video annotation have for teacher candidate development of ELL instruction. In this research, I explored how teacher candidates used V-Note and instructional coaching to reflect on their instruction of ELLs.

**Summary**

This chapter discussed sociocultural theory and the concepts related to tool mediation,
scaffolding internalization and appropriation. To follow, video-elicited reflection was discussed as the tool used in this research that included V-Note and ELL instructional coaching scaffolds. Next, the policies and standards guiding ELL teacher education were reviewed. First, I discussed NCLB (2001) and ESSA (2015) and explained how these policies provided informed ELL education in the US. Then I shared the TESOL/CAEP teacher preparation program standards and discussed that these standards guide ELL teacher preparation program curriculum. To follow the relevant literature on teachers’ beliefs was addressed. In this section I explained that teachers’ beliefs is a difficult construct to define. I shared that this research used a combination of the research (Farrell & Bennis, 2013; Basturkmen, 2014; Nespor, 1987) to explicitly define teachers’ beliefs as the personal values, ideologies, and individual philosophies of teaching that influences teachers’ perceptions and judgments, and the way they conceptualize tasks and learn from experience to affect their classroom behaviors. The section on teachers’ beliefs also explained that teachers’ beliefs come from their past lived experiences and classroom experiences in what Lortie (1975) called the “apprenticeship of observation”.

Additionally, I discussed teachers’ stated beliefs and classroom actions. The section of teacher reflection explained that reflection is studied as a way to elicit teachers’ emotions and facilitate feelings of dissonance, dissatisfaction, or confidence and success that challenge, reconstruct, or affirm teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning. When beliefs are challenge or reconstructed teachers develop professionally and may dispel the misconceptions they have about ELLs (Johnson, 1992). In the teacher reflection section, I also discussed reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action and shared that video reflection is widely used in teacher preparation to meditate teacher candidates’ reflection on their instruction. This section revealed that teacher reflection looks back to look forward and shared that researchers’ use guided o
reflection to mediate teachers’ goal-setting noticing of critical incidents (Griffin, 2003). Also the literature on video reflection and instructional coaching were discussed. I discussed Knight’s (2007) and Batt’s (2010) research to describe the ELL instructional coaching that was used in this research. A gap in the literature was presented and showed that more research is needed to inform how video reflection, video annotation tools, and instructional coaching can be used for ELL teacher preparation.

In the following chapter I present the methodology used in this research. Chapter three will discuss why a case study research design was chosen and will elaborate on the participants, data collection and data analysis used to generate the findings for this research.
CHAPTER THREE:
METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides the methodology used to conduct this research. First, it presents the purpose of the research and research questions. Then I discuss the research design, setting, participants, research instruments and tools, data collection, and data analysis. Following come the limitations of the methodology used, then the chapter ends by addressing issues of trustworthiness, ethics, credibility, and generalizability.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this research was to examine how video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about and instruction to ELLs. This research was informed by sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2015; Vygotsky, 1978) and was guided by the following research questions:

1. How does video-elicited reflection shape final semester, undergraduate, teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and their instruction for ELLs?
2. How does video-elicited reflection affirm, challenge, or reconstruct teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs?

This dissertation research employed a sociocultural approach to emphasize the interdependence of social and individual processes in teacher candidates’ construction of beliefs about ELLs. In doing so, four tenets of Sociocultural Theory (Vygotsky, 1978) were used:
tool mediation, scaffolding, internalization and appropriation, to examine how teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs were mediated by video-elicited reflection (V-Note and discussion with an ESOL instructional coach).

**Research Design: Case Study**

Teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs was the unit of analysis in this research, therefore, a multiple case study was chosen to design this study. Additionally, most researchers who study teachers’ beliefs employ case study methodologies to examine the correspondence, or lack of correspondence, between teachers’ beliefs and their practices (Basturkmen, 2012; Farrell, 2006; Farrell & Bennis, 2013). Likewise, when conducting my review of the literature, I noticed that researchers who studies teachers’ beliefs aimed to minimize the limitations of drawing generalizations from case study research by examining findings from multiple cases to make stronger conclusions, thus, I sought to used multiple data sources in this study to generate research findings.

To gain a better understanding of case study, I reviewed the three foundational methodologists of case study research: Yin (2013), Merriam (1998), and Stake (2006), and paid attention to their definitions of multiple case study research. Yin (2013) stated, “Case studies can cover multiple cases, and then draw on a single set of cross case conclusions” (p. 18). In his description of multiple case research, Yin used several quantitative terms, such as using power analysis to decide on the number of cases to be conducted and setting a criterion for the significant effect size.

While I found Yin to be helpful in his description of multiple case study analysis, I did not agree with his definition of multiple case study because my study involved qualitative
research. In my review of the literature, I found other researchers who agreed with my thoughts about Yin’s outlook on case study as leading towards positivism or established facts (Baxter & Jack, 2008; Yazan, 2015). Yin’s (2013) description of case study was not chosen to guide this research design, but it does reference Yin for data analysis.

Stake (2013) described the attributes of case study research by defining the case as a complex, functional, integrated system, which has a boundary and working parts. Stake comments that case study research is most suitable to study programs and people and less suitable to study events and processes. Stake (2013) used three terms to describe case study research: intrinsic, instrumental, and collective. Stake’s perspective on case study also includes constructivism or existentialism epistemologies regarding case study researchers as interpreters and gathers of knowledge (Yazan, 2015), and discussed how to collect and analyze multiple cases (Stake, 2013). For example, Stake described multiple case study research saying,

The cases need to be similar in some ways…. A case is a noun, a thing, an entity; it is seldom a verb, a participle, a functioning. To study a case, we carefully examine its functioning and activities…. We need to find out how the case gets things done. (pp.1–2)

Stake’s description of multiple case study analysis agreed with the aim of this research and, therefore, was used to guide the methodology for the research design and data analysis.

Additionally, I studied Merriam’s (1988) approach to case study. Merriam’s definition of case research was described from the perspective of qualitative or naturalistic research. Merriam stated, “A qualitative case study is an intensive holistic description and analysis of a single instance, phenomenon, or social unit” (p. 21). However, Merriam’s description of case research did not mention multiple-case research. Nevertheless, in another description of case research, Merriam said, “A case is a single-entity, a unit around which there are boundaries. I can fence in
what I’m going to study” (p. 27). This definition seemed to align better with the aims of this research that Yin’s definition of case research (2014). While I did not wholeheartedly agree with Merriam’s definition of case research, I did use her description of the descriptive case study as being “a study of the complexities of a situation done to show the influence of personalities on issues” (p. 30). I employed Merriam’s description of the semi-structured interview to guide the methodology needed to create the interviews used in this research. Merriam recommended that the interview questions be crafted to include topics that need to be addressed but “do not need to be asked in order and can be flexibly worded to allow the respondent to share stories about the situation at hand” (p. 74). Merriam’s description of interview methodology allowed me to use a combination of open and semi-structured interview question for this research.

In my review of case study methodology, I noted that Merriam (1988) and Stake (2013) differed in their descriptions of case research in two ways: (a) Merriam did not mention multiple case study analysis and Stake did, and (b) Merriam focused on the end product of the case study while Stake focused on studying the unit of analysis within each case. These differences led me to use Stake’s (2013) multiple case study analysis for my research design because Stake’s approach to case study allowed me to focus on multiple cases to examine teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs.

**The Quintain**

This research studied three cases (i.e., participants) that were interning at three different school sites. To gain a better understanding of the condition being studied, I used Stake’s (2013) description of the quintain: “an object or phenomenon to be studied; a target, but not a bulls’ eye” (p. 6). To understand how I would study the quintain (i.e., teacher candidates’ beliefs about
ELLs) in this research, I used Worksheet 1 from Stake’s text *Multiple Case Study Analysis*, Stake stated, “In order to understand the quintain better, we must study some of its single cases, but it is the quintain we seek to understand” (2013, p. 6). Stake recommended that researchers study how the quintain appears in different contexts or activities. Therefore, I used Worksheet 1 to brainstorm the contexts and the data collections I should study and to consider issues that needed to be addressed. This worksheet helped me draft and revise the research questions that guided this research.
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**Figure 4.** Planning the quintain.

Figure 4 shows issues the that I considered when planning this research would study teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs (the quintain). In doing so, I acknowledged the social
relationships and cultures that may influence teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs, such as: their former ELL teacher preparation coursework, the internship school’s culture, classroom culture, their personal K-12 schooling experiences with ELLs, teacher candidates’ relationships with their collaborating teacher, and their observations of the ESOL resource teacher. These social contexts were regarded as experiences that could influence teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs. I used these social contexts to create initial, prelesson and postlesson interview questions where I probed participants to discuss the affects these experiences had on their beliefs about, or instruction to ELLs.

**Research Context**

This research took place in a large research university in the southeastern United States. The university was in a culturally diverse area and partnered with the eighth largest school district in the nation for teacher preparation clinical experiences. According to the US Department of Education (2015), the student population for the school district was 206,841. Student demographics were 40% White, 29% Latina/o, 21% Black, and 3% Asian. In addition, 12% of students in the district were ELL and were in the English for Speakers of Other Languages program.

The participants included in this research were undergraduates in the university’s elementary education teacher preparation program. Each participant was assigned to a different school in the same school district for their final internship clinical experience. A total of three elementary schools were included in this research: Jefferson, Mills, and Coldwater (pseudonyms). These schools were in three different cities within the school district and had ELL student populations that were at least 7% of the total school body.
**Teacher Preparation Program**

At the time when this research occurred, the undergraduate, Elementary Cohort Program consisted of 300 teacher candidates. This program included coursework, field experience in specifically selected partnership sites, and 15 credits of online ESOL coursework. Students who were interested in the Elementary Cohort Program needed to complete two years of prerequisite coursework prior to applying or have an associate’s degree in education. Once accepted, teacher candidates completed field experiences for two academic semesters: fall, spring and summer, then fall and spring, to graduate.

**ELL Teacher Preparation Program**

The ESOL courses (ESOL 1, 2, and 3) were taken in the teacher candidates’ first year in the program fall, spring, and summer and were taught exclusively online. The online ESOL courses did not include clinical experience, but did include assignments such as a case study that teacher candidates needed to complete by referring to their internship. However, it was not a guarantee that teacher candidates would have experiences working with ELLs, or that they would be able to design instruction for ELLs who were at different levels of English language proficiency. Therefore, some teacher candidates had to seek other opportunities to work with ELLs in after school care programs or other classrooms in their internship school. Additionally, because the ESOL courses were taught exclusively online, instructors who taught ESOL courses and supervised teacher candidates differed and there was no co-planning between ESOL and internship courses to bridge theory and practice.
To be eligible for the ESOL endorsement add-on to the state’s professional teaching certificate, teacher candidates needed to pass the three required ESOL courses, and the ESOL comprehensive exam (a section of this exam was administered in each of the three ESOL courses), with a 70% or higher, and complete at least 20 hours of ESOL field experience. The participants included in this research took their ESOL Endorsement courses within their first year of the teacher preparation program and did not take any ELL university coursework during their final semester. As a result of online, infrequent instruction, the teacher candidates included in this research commented that they had forgotten the information that was learned in their ESOL coursework because they did not have opportunities to apply learned theory to ELL classroom instruction.

Participants

Purposeful sampling (Patton, 2015) was used to locate and select participants who were in the final semester of the elementary education teacher preparation program at the university where this research occurred. In the first week of the spring 2017 semester, 127 final semester teacher candidates enrolled in Final Internship: EDE 4940 were e-mailed an invitation to participate in the research (see Appendix A). To participate in this research, the participants had to meet the following inclusion criteria: (a) The participant was in the final semester of the undergraduate elementary education cohort program at the university where this research was being conducted; (b) the participant was completing a full-time field experience in a K–5 classroom; and, (c) the participant was instructing at least two ELLs. A total of four participants voluntarily joined this research and were given informed consent (see Appendix B); however, only three cases are reported in this research.
Giselle’s case was not included in this research because she interned in the same school as Erica. I wanted each case included in this research to represent a different social context (school) and chose to exclude Giselle’s case from the research. Moreover, Giselle’s, interview responses lacked the detail that the other three participants gave when discussing their instruction to ELLs. I often had to probed Giselle to be more descriptive in her interview responses, but she continued to provided generic answers that lacked detail.

Table 1

*Summary of Participants Included in This Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Field Experience School</th>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Number of ELLs in Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Coldwater Elementary</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mills Elementary</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Giselle</em></td>
<td>Latina</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Mills Elementary</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Case was not included in this dissertation.

Moreover, the decision to include three participants (Taylor, Susan, and Erica) was made after reviewing the literature on teachers’ beliefs, reflection, and video reflection where other case studies recruited between one to three participants (Calandra, Brantley–Dias, & Dias, 2006; Farrell 206; Freese, 2006; Rosaen et al., 2008). I wanted this report to represent one case from three different schools within the county to avoid having biased findings that represented one school culture.
Research Procedure

This research spanned a five-month period, January–May. In January 2017, participants were recruited and given an independent V-Note training and an initial interview. Then each participant taught one lesson per month (February, March, and April). Each month I conducted prelesson and postlesson interviews and collected participants’ written reflections. In May 2017, I concluded the data collection with a final exit interview with each participant where I used member checking to validate my initial findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; see Figure 5).

![Research Procedure Timeline]

Figure 5. Research timeline that was used in this study.

The data collected included interviews, participants’ written reflections, and a researcher’s journal. Each participant was required to plan, record, and analyze three episodes of instruction they delivered to ELLs. Then, participants analyzed recorded videos of their instruction using V-Note (2014), and facilitated a postlesson interview with me. Table 2 lists how the data collections were used to answer the research questions.
Table 2

Overview of Data Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Construct Examined</th>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Unit of Analysis</th>
<th>Data Analysis Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ 1</strong></td>
<td>Relationship between beliefs and classroom actions</td>
<td>Prelesson interview</td>
<td>Initial interview</td>
<td>Teacher candidates’ stated beliefs in each lesson before using video-elicited reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Postlesson interview</td>
<td>Researcher’s journal</td>
<td>Stated beliefs across lessons after using video-elicited reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RQ 2</strong></td>
<td>Tool mediation</td>
<td>Postlesson interview, Written reflection</td>
<td>Researcher’s journal, Exit interviews</td>
<td>Stated beliefs about each lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To answer the first research question, I examined the relationship between teacher candidates’ stated beliefs and their classroom actions. To study this construct, I analyzed initial interviews, prelesson interviews, and written reflections. This data elicited an emic perspective of the participants’ stated beliefs about ELLs before they used V-Note to analyze their instruction. Then I used my researcher’s journal to validate my findings and created a table where I listed the participants’ initial stated beliefs with examples of their statements. I also used this data to create a table that represented the participants’ beliefs about each lesson.
To answer the second research question, I examined how video-elicited reflection (i.e., V-Note and instructional coaching) mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs. To examine tool mediation, I analyzed postlesson interviews and participants’ written reflections. My researcher’s journal and exit interviews were used as minor data sources to add to or create additional findings. The second research question was answered using participants’ prelesson and postlesson interviews. In the prelesson interviews, participants stated their beliefs about the lesson, what they anticipated, the plans they had for instructing ELLs, and the focus (i.e., instructional goal) they wanted to capture with video (e.g., I want to see if the visual I use in this lesson help the three ELLs in my class with comprehension). In the postlesson interview, participants discussed with me how they analyzed their instruction. Therefore, these interviews were reviewed to understand the relationship between participants’ stated beliefs about the lesson (i.e., what I think will happen and why I am designing my instruction this way) and instructional actions (i.e., what I actually do). The second research question was answered by using all collected data to examine if the participants’ stated beliefs about the lessons were affirmed, challenged, or reconstructed after they analyzed their videos with V-Note (2014) and discussed their instruction with an ELL instructional coach.

**Role of the Researcher**

In this research, I was both researcher and ELL instructional coach. My role in this study was to support participants’ reflection on their instruction to ELLs. In doing so I met with participants before and after their lessons to discuss lesson plans, listen to participants’ analysis of their instruction, and watch recorded videos of participants instructing ELLs.
In the prelesson interview, participants shared their lesson plans with me, and I offered suggestions and ideas for instructing ELLs based on the lesson topic and what I knew about the ELLs’ language proficiency levels. Additionally, I also provided participants with ELL resources to assist their ideas for ELL lessons. For example, in once instance I gave Susan a copy of ELL’s English language proficiency levels when she shared that she did not have knowledge about the English language proficiency levels for the ELLs in her class.

In the postlesson interview, participants shared their V-Note (2014) coding timelines with me and played their video recordings for me to watch. As we watched the video together, I took notes to create questions that I used to probe teacher candidates’ reflection or elicit tension. For example, in one instance Erica stated that her instruction went well, but when viewing this lesson, I noticed an ELL was not participating. I paused the video and asked Erica to focus on the student so she could see that her instruction did not support the ELL’s language needs. Thus, I used my coaching to create a tension or dissonance around pertinent aspects in the video and supported teacher candidates in unpacking important instances of their instruction.

Research Tools

This research used video-elicited reflection as a tool (Sewall, 2009) the included participants’ physical and psychological tool use. V-Note (a video annotation tool) was a physical tool and instructional coaching dialogue was a psychological tool. Below I will discuss the components of V-Note and instructional coaching tools used in this research in more detail.
**V-Note**

V-Note (2014) is a free video annotation tool. The free version allows participants to analyze up to thirty minutes of their instruction at a time. The participants in this research downloaded V-Note to their personal laptops and were trained in how to use the software in V-Note training conducted independently with each participant prior to the initial interview. In this training participants used V-Note to analyze a practice video and practiced recording and uploading videos from their laptop or cell phone to V-Note. An initial V-Note training was done to ensure that the participants knew how to use V-Note before the study began. Providing participants with an initial V-Note training was also made to support literature that recommended that participants engage in “viewing and evaluating authentic video of other teachers as a prelude to analyzing their own video” (Fadde, Aude & Gilbert., 2009, p. 82). Additionally, this research employed a participatory video approach (Jewitt, 2012), meaning that the participants in this study chose the device they would use to record their instruction, and what instructional episodes they would record for V-Note analysis.

**Video reflection guide.** A video reflection guide was created to guide participants in watching and analyzing their videos (see Appendix C). This guide included directions for repeated viewing of instruction, note taking, and analysis. The guide was given to all participants during the V-Note training.

**V-Note timeline.** V-Note (2014) allowed participants to create their own labels (codes) to analyze their instruction. Participants used these labels to notice instances in their instruction for reflection. All labels were displayed on a timeline. Participants used their timelines to facilitate the postlesson interviews with me. Figure 6 shows a video that was analyzed with V-Note. The colors on the timeline represent different labels. These labels were the critical
instances participants played when they shared their video recording with me and were used to elicit postlesson interview dialogue.

Figure 6. V-Note timeline.

**ELL Instructional Coaching**

I conducted prelesson interviews with each participant before she taught her lesson. In these interviews participants shared their lesson plans with me and discussed the beliefs they had about the ELLs in their class (i.e., what they would struggle with or what they would be able to accomplish in the lesson). In the prelesson interview, I coached participants on their instruction of ELLs. I offered suggestions for accommodations or provided information about ELLs’ English language proficiency levels.

I also conducted postlesson interviews with each participant. Participants facilitated the postlesson conversation with V-Note; they showed me how they analyzed their instruction and discussed the patterns they noticed in their analysis. Then participants shared their video recording with me. As we watched the video together, I would pause instances on the video that
the participant missed in their V-Note analysis. I used questions to probe participants’ reflection on these instances and offered ideas for instructional strategies they could use to improve their subsequent instruction of ELLs.

**Data Collection**

In this research I conducted initial interviews, prelesson interviews, and postlesson interviews and collected participants’ written reflections and artifacts. I also held exit interviews and used a researcher’s journal.

**Belief Data**

Interviews were conducted with participants to get an understanding of the beliefs they had about ELLs and ELL instruction. Initial interviews were conducted with each participant before she began using video-elicited reflection. Prelesson interviews were held before each lesson was recorded to get an understanding of the participants’ beliefs about ELL instruction.

**Initial interview.** An initial 45-minute independent interview was conducted with each participant to gather data on their life stories and experiences with working with ELLs (see Appendix D). The purpose of this interview was to understand participants’ beliefs about ELLs before they began using V-Note to analyze their instruction. This interview used semi-structured and unstructured approaches (Byrne, 2012). I listed main topics that I wanted to discuss with each participant, but they were not discussed in any order, and follow-up interview questions were used to explore ideas or themes that surfaced as participants shared their personal stories.

**Prelesson interview.** I conducted a 45-minute prelesson interview with each participant before she taught each lesson (see Appendix E). These interviews were recorded using a smart
phone and the i-Movie application. This interview used a semi-structured approach (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Questions in this interview addressed three topics: planning instruction, accommodations used to support ELLs, and assessment. This interview was semi-structured because questions were flexibly worded and were not said in a predetermined order. During this interview, I used coaching skills and behaviors to suggest or discuss instructional accommodations that could be used to support ELLs’ language needs.

**V-Note Data**

Postlesson interviews and written reflections were collected to examine how the participants analyzed recorded videos of their ELL instruction for reflection. Participants were asked to analyze their video with V-Note prior to the postlesson interviews and bring their V-Note timelines and video to the interview to facilitate discussion with an ESOL instructional coach. Following the postlesson interview, participants wrote a reflection on their perceptions of their instruction of ELLs and the discussion they had with an ESOL instructional coach.

**Postlesson interview.** I conducted a 45-minute postlesson interview with each participant after each lesson (see Appendix F). These interviews were recorded using smartphone and the i-Movie application. This interview used semi-structured and unstructured (i.e., open-ended) approaches (Merriam & Tisdell, 2012). For example, I planned the topics I wanted to address in the interview—planning, video analysis, and future instruction, but because I did not know about participants’ analysis or instruction, this interview was more like a conversation. Therefore, the participants in this interview had narrative power (Goldman et al., 2007) because they used segments from their recordings to tell their instructional stories. In these interviews participants discussed their V-Note analysis and shared their videos with me. I used coaching
skills and behaviors to support their reflection and unpack important instances of their instruction.

**Written reflections.** After the postlesson interview, the participants wrote a reflection to share their feelings and perceptions about their instruction of ELLs and our postlesson interview discussion. Participants were directed to use their video reflection guide to write reflections, but they were given no explicit format for these reflections. For example, some participants chose to include artifacts in their written reflections, even though artifacts were not a stated requirement in the video reflection guide used. Once completed, participants sent their written reflections to me electronically via e-mail.

**Artifacts.** Some participants decided to include artifacts as part of their written reflections. These artifacts were often pictures of ELL instructional strategies or accommodations that the participants used in their lessons. These artifacts were not analyzed as a separate data collection category in this research, nor were they used to generate findings, but they were uploaded to HyperRESEARCH (2016) because they were included in the participants’ written reflection files that were sent to me. Some of these artifacts are included in this report to provide examples of participants’ instruction of ELLs in the findings.

**Exit interview.** At the end of the study (May 2017), participants were interviewed independently to discuss their experiences using video-elicited reflection to analyze their instruction of ELLs in independent 60-minute exit interviews (see Appendix G). These interviews were recorded on a smartphone using a voice recording application. The questions were reflective in nature and asked the participants to share their experiences participating in this research. This interview also used semi-structured and unstructured approaches (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) because I planned the
topics I wanted to address—belief and reflection, but these questions were flexible and were not used in any predetermined order.

Researcher’s journal. A researcher journal was kept throughout the course of this research using Microsoft Word on my laptop. In qualitative methodology research journaling is discussed as a method that researchers can use to enhance the validity of their research (Janesick, 1998, 1999). I used a researcher’s journal to document my ideas, feelings, and summaries of the meeting and correspondence I had with the participants in this research. I often wrote in my journal in my car before leaving the interview and wrote in my journal at home after I had analyzed participants’ data. This journal helped me keep track of any ideas I had throughout the data analysis process and allowed me to reflect on my role in the research.

Table 3

Data Collection Totals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Collection</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Interview</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prelesson Interview</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postlesson Interview</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Reflection</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Interview</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher Journal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34 data sources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research report included three participants: Taylor, Susan, and Erica. Therefore, three initial interviews and exit interviews were collected (one per participant). In addition, since each participant was asked to provide three lessons for ELLs, nine pre- and postlesson interviews
were conducted and written reflections were collected (three per participant and one per lesson). In addition, I kept a researcher’s journal throughout the course of this study.

**Data Analysis**

Findings for this research were made by inductive analysis, using detailed readings of raw data to arrive at concepts or themes (Thomas, 2006). To do so, I first conducted a case analysis to tell each participant’s individual story and present assertions related to her case. Then, I conducted a cross-case analysis to share the commonalities among cases (Stake, 2013).

**Case Analysis**

A Case analysis was used to present findings that were pertinent to each case Stake, 2006). Stake recommended that researchers complete a case analysis before completing a cross-case analysis because “each case needs to be studied to gain an understanding of that particular entity as it is situated” (2013, p. 40). Stake’s description of the *case* was the term used to identify the participants in this research. Stake explained that case study research examines the case or cases while being engaged in various situated activities. Therefore, case study research studies cases in action.

To complete a case analysis of the data, I first transcribed, read, then coded the participants’ initial interviews using HyperRESEARCH. I coded the participants’ belief statements using eclectic coding, also referred to as open coding (Saldaña, 2016) and employed a combination of descriptive and in vivo codes. I used descriptive coding, also known as topic coding, to note the main idea or topic of the participants’ interview responses and used in vivo coding, also known as literal or emic coding, to create words or short phrases from the
participants’ actual language. An example of descriptive and in vivo coding is provided in Figure 7.

Figure 7. Example of Descriptive and In Vivo coding.

Figure 7 shows an example of coding I used to analyze an excerpt from Taylor’s initial interview transcripts in HyperRESEARCH. The in vivo codes used were any other student, same, and they just don’t know how. These codes used Taylor’s exact language. The descriptive code lack of preparation was used to note the main idea of this excerpt.

I analyzed the participants’ initial interview transcripts independently using eclectic coding. Then I looked for patterns to create categories to organize codes that expressed related topics or meanings (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011). A total of five initial categories emerged to identify participants’ initial beliefs about ELLs: ELL students as learners, instructional expectations, accuracy, accommodations, and the role of the teacher. These codes were listed on a table for member checking (see Appendix F). In member checking participants reduced the five belief categories to three overall categories: beliefs about the self, beliefs about ELLs, and beliefs about ELL instruction. Then I created three initial belief tables with these categories (one per case) to conduct a case analysis of Taylor’s, Susan’s, and Erica’s initial beliefs about ELLs participants.
After I had coded each participant’s initial beliefs, I created separate studies for each participant in HyperRESEARCH to analyze her classroom actions. To do so, I analyzed the prelesson interview, postlesson interview, and the written reflection collected from each lesson and created a table for each lesson with its salient points (see Figure 8).
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**Figure 8.** Case analysis used in HyperRESEARCH to create lesson tables.

Three lesson tables were created per participant (one per lesson). This table listed details about each lesson (e.g., topic, grade level, and goal of the lesson), belief categories, stated beliefs, and classroom practices (see Appendix I). Lesson tables were shared with participants in member checking to validate findings. Then a summarized table was created for each participant that listed pertinent details about the three lessons they taught to ELLs. The summarized lesson table listed participant’s beliefs about ELLs, instruction of ELLs, video-elicited reflection (V-Note and coaching), and the participant’s ideas for future ELL instruction for each lesson (see Table 4).
Table 4

Example of Lesson Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Beliefs about ELLs</th>
<th>Instruction to ELLs</th>
<th>Video-Elicited Reflection</th>
<th>Participants’ Ideas for Future ELL Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>(1) “ELLs will struggle with independent reading.”</td>
<td>One-on-one writing conferences with ELLs.</td>
<td>(1) “There was a lack of authentic conversation because Lucía barely spoke. I don’t think she understood what I was asking her.”</td>
<td>“I want to use a rubric next time to help guide our conversation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) “ELLs work slow.”</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1) “Did Lucía not understand your question because of language, or she just didn’t get it cognitively?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two columns that listed the participant’s beliefs about ELLs and instruction of ELLs were used to understand the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and instruction of ELLs; research question one (RQ1). The columns listing video-elicited reflection and the participant’s ideas for future ELL instruction were used to examine how video-elicited reflection affirmed, challenged, or reconstructed each participant’s beliefs about ELLs; research question two (RQ2).

**Cross-Case Analysis**

A cross-case analysis was conducted to share findings that were prominent in all cases. Findings from the cross-case analysis emphasized the similarities across participants’ stories. As Stake (2013) noted, “The cross-case analysis is used to find what is common across the cases, not what is unique to each” (p. 29). To conduct the cross-case analysis, I copied and pasted the research questions on the Stickies application on my Mac™ computer. The research questions were my lens for analysis as I read each of the participant’s lesson tables. Then I created a Microsoft Word document where I complied all the participants’ lesson tables and uploaded the file to HyperRESEARCH for analysis. I used the research questions as my lens for analysis while coding. First, I coded all stated beliefs using eclectic and descriptive coding (i.e., the first
column from each lesson table). Then I coded future ELL instruction using eclectic coding.

Finally, I added the category groups challenged, reconstructed, and affirmed and placed beliefs and future instruction of ELLs in one of the three belief categories. Affirmed beliefs were those teacher candidates kept throughout the course of the study. Reconstructed beliefs were those teacher candidates developed or changed, and challenged beliefs were those teacher candidates no longer held as a result of video-elicited reflection. For example, when I coded Susan’s table, I coded the belief *ELLs do not need additional accommodations because they can speak English* as a stated belief. This belief was later grouped in the challenged beliefs category because Susan’s future ideas for instruction of ELLs included stated beliefs about using accommodations because Susan stated that she had realized “ELLs include students who can speak English well” (Exit interview).
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*Figure 9. Codebook used for cross-case analysis.*

After I had coded participants’ lesson tables, I looked for patterns (Bogdan & Bilken, 2011) across lessons and used these patterns to create themes. For example, when I looked at the challenged category, I noticed that the codes listed misconceptions that the participants had about ELLs (e.g., ELLs are all the same). Coded instances showed me that all cases used video-elicited
reflection to challenge the misconceptions they had about ELLs. To create themes, I used Worksheet 2 from Stake’s (2013) text *Multiple Case Study Analysis* (p. 43; see Appendix J). At first, a total of six themes emerged from the data: (a) Misconceptions about ELLs were challenged; (b) language was seen as being critical to instruction of ELLs; (c) teacher candidates practiced using new accommodations; (d) video was used for teacher candidates’ ELL pedagogical development; (e) video-elicited reflection challenged teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs, and (f) video-elicited reflection teacher candidates’ knowledge of ELLs’ different language needs.

Next, I reexamined each of the participant’s lesson tables separately to check for the prominence of each of the themes. I look for cross case prominence to make sure all participants displayed activities that represented each theme. I printed three copies of Worksheet 3 (Stake, 2013, p. 45) for each participant and noted the uniqueness of the case, prominence of each theme in the case, and utility (i.e., factors) the case had for developing each theme (see Appendix K). For example, Taylor’s case had prominence of Theme1: misconceptions about ELLs being challenged because she had initially stated, “ELLs can speak English and do not need support.” The expected utility or factor contributing to this theme developing was seen in Taylor’s understandings of ELLs’ different language proficiency levels, and issues related to this theme were Taylor’s lack of differentiated instruction to address ELLs different English language proficiency levels.

Afterwards, I looked across the three copies of Worksheet 3 to notice themes that were prominent in all three cases. This step of the analysis led me to reduce the initial six themes on Worksheet 2 to four themes: video-elicited reflection for ELL pedagogical development, language as critical to ELL instruction, video-elicited reflection to practice using accommodation
for instruction to ELLs, and challenged misconceptions about ELLs. These themes were then reduced to create three cross-case findings: (a) video-elicited reflection challenged teacher candidates’ misconceptions about ELLs; (b) teacher candidates developed an understanding of language through appropriation; and, (c) video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ ELL pedagogical developments.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

This research had several limitations. First, the participants included in this research used V-Note to analyze recordings of their ELL instruction, and V-Note is just one type of video annotation tool. I acknowledge that there are a plethora of annotation tools available for teacher preparation programs to use with teacher candidates that may or may not support reflection on ELL instruction in the same way. In addition, this research was a small-scale qualitative investigation that only included three participants. Findings from this study cannot be used to make generalizations about all teaching preparation programs or teacher candidates, but can be used to offer insight on how teacher candidates can use video-elicited reflection to develop an understanding of ELL pedagogy.

Likewise, this research did not include observations of participants’ classroom instruction. This presents a limitation to the study because an examination of the classroom context could have been beneficial to examine the teaching actions teacher candidates did not record in their own video recordings of ELL instruction. For example, I could have assisted teacher candidates with their recording their ELL instruction and follow them throughout the classroom with the camera. An assisted recording methodology would have provided a more detailed view of all classroom interactions rather than interactions that were captured by a stationary recording device that captured one frame of instruction. Participants’ videos only
included an episode of ELL instruction and the video was limited to the lens of the recording device used; therefore, findings from this case study research cannot be generalized to all ELL teacher preparation programs. Finding from this case study can only be transferred to inform similar contexts and situations.

The participants included in this research completed three semesters of ELL university coursework and were working in clinical experiences where they were instructing at least two ELLs. I acknowledge that these contextual factors are not universal to all ELL teacher preparation programs; thus, findings from research may differ if the same methodology used in this research is applied elsewhere. This research studied teacher candidates’ beliefs about elementary-aged ELLs; more research is needed to determine if V-Note can be used in the same way to understand teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs in other types of educational contexts (e.g., English as a Foreign Language contexts).

The delimitations of this study are that this research examined three teacher candidates at three different schools in three different cities within the county. Each location had a different school and classroom culture, and all three teachers worked with different ELLs and collaborating teachers in different grade levels. In addition, the participants included in this research were in different cohorts in the teacher preparation program and did not take any of their teacher preparation courses together.

Additionally, a variety of data were collected in this research to provide opportunities for participants to discuss their beliefs and instruction of ELLs in different ways (e.g., interviews, reflection, V-Note analysis). The data were triangulated (combined) to generate findings that were present across all data types. Likewise, data were collected at different time periods to
examine how teacher candidates’ beliefs were affirmed, challenged or reconstructed by vide-elicited reflection during the five-month period.

Furthermore, this research was collected over a five-month period to study participants’ emic perspectives of their instruction to ELLs. As previously mentioned, a lack of classroom observations may be regarded as a limitation to the research but may also be regarded as a delimitation because participants’ instruction of ELLs, recording, and V-Note analysis were not influenced by the researcher. Participants were responsible for recording their ELL instruction, and chose what they wanted to focus on when analyzing their video recording.

**Ethical Considerations**

To address ethical considerations, I gave each participant one copy of the approved Institutional Review Board (IRB) consent form (see Appendix I) and another form to sign and turn in to me. The consent form included a description of the purpose of the study, stated that participants had the option to withdraw from the research at any time, and promised that their identities would be kept confidential. Confidentiality is an ethical standard that is included in the *International Visual Sociology Association’s (IVSA) Code of Research Ethics and Guidelines* (Papademas, 2009). Papademas stated, “It is the researcher’s obligation to take reasonable precautions to protect the confidentiality rights of research participants” (p. 253). In doing so, I asked each participant to provide the pseudonym they wanted me to use to identify them in this research and made sure this pseudonym was used on all initial and final data analysis documents. Additionally, I did not share or discuss participants’ recorded videos of their instruction of ELLs with others.

I also adhered to standards of competence and made sure I was trained and knowledgeable in V-Note (2014) so I could provide support to participants when they needed
assistance with the video annotation tool used in this research. Papademas (2009) stated, “Professionals who engage in visual research and practice maintain awareness of the information in their field of activity and undertake continuing efforts maintain competence and the skills they have, with support for expanding knowledge and skills” (p. 253). In adhering to ethical standards related to competence, I also conducted independent V-Note trainings with all participants and let them analyze their instruction with me so participants could trust me and seek my assistance when they needed help with the tool.

**Trustworthiness**

To evaluate the trustworthiness of this qualitative research, I used Lincoln and Guba’s (1985) text, *Naturalist Inquiry*, and Krefting’s (1991) article “Rigor in Qualitative Research: The Assessment of Trustworthiness.” Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated that trustworthiness is achieved by examining the truth value and applicability, consistency, and neutrality of the research findings. Krefting (1991) discussed truth value, saying, “Truth value is usually obtained from the discovery of human experiences as they are lived and perceived by informants” (p. 215). In this research participants were asked to record three episodes of their instruction of ELLs; participants’ recordings captured the reality of the classroom and were not scripted or rehearsed. Thus, participants’ decided what to record and how they would record it.

Additionally, I conducted two pilot studies to refine the research questions and methodology used in this formal research. Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated that it is important for the researcher to “determine whether the findings of an inquiry would be consistently repeated if the inquiry were replicated with the same or similar respondents” (p. 218). The pilot studies I
conducted were done using similar participants and addressed issues related to applicability and consistency of findings.

I also acknowledged the limited view of the camera lens and participants’ only showing me the good parts of their instruction. Therefore, I collected other types of data that showcased participants’ emic perceptions of their instruction. This data was triangulated (analyzed together) to give me a better understanding of teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs. For example, I collected interviews and teacher candidates written reflection about their ELL instruction and V-Note video analysis.

Jewitt (2012) recommended that researchers who use video data consider using unobtrusive videos that capture lived reality. After reviewing Jewitt’s recommendations, I examined the methodology I planned to use in this research. First, I asked participants to record at least ten minutes of uninterrupted instruction that they provided for ELLs. This stipulation the formal research methodology allowed participants to collect unobtrusive data that captured a slice of their instructional realities. I also used and watched participants’ recorded videos to elicit instructional coaching dialogue used in post-lesson interviews.

Member Checking

Member checking addressed Lincoln and Guba’s description of research neutrality and was used to minimize my biases and perceptions of the data (1985). After the final exit interview, participants were given four tables: one that summarized their initial interview statements and three that summarized each lesson they taught and listed their pre- and postlesson interview statements. Each participant was given the “power of pen” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985,
p.202) and could remove or modify the findings and categories listed on each table (see Appendix L for an example of member checking).

In addition, the cases presented in this research are not meant to represent all ELL teacher candidates or ELL teacher preparation programs, but rather provide a research that could be used to inform ELL teacher education. Merriam (1988) stated, “In qualitative research, a single case, or small nonrandom sample is selected precisely because the researcher wishes to understand the particular in-depth, not find out what is generally true of the many” (p. 208). Thus, this research was conducted to understand the beliefs and experiences of teacher candidates who teach to ELLs and not to make generalization about all ELL teacher education programs. As noted by Stake (2013), “Case research is not used to generalize, case research is used to understand the factors and procedures that can be used to guide policy and program design (p. 89). Findings from this research can be used to suggest the affordances of using video-elicited reflection for ELL teacher preparation.

**Summary**

Chapter three discussed the methodology used in this research. First, the chapter began with a description of the research design and explained why a case study was chosen. In doing so Yin’s (2013), Merriam’s (1988), and Stake’s (2006) descriptions of case study research was shared. I revealed that Stake’s (2006) the multiple case study approach was used to guide the research design and data analysis while Merriam’s approach to case study was used to design the interviews used in this research.

Next, the researcher’s role in the study was disclosed to explain my role in this study as an ELL instructional coach. My instructional coaching role was informed by the research on ELL instructional supervision (Baecher et al., 2013b, 2014), general education instructional
coaching (Knight, 2007), and ELL cognitive coaching (Batt, 2010). Additionally, the literature on supervision skills (Burns & Badiali, 2016) and supervision behaviors (Glickman, 1985) was examined to analyze the instructional coaching dialog that occurred between participants and myself. Thus, instructional coaching dialogue and participants’ V-Note analysis were studied to examine participants’ video-elicited reflection because this study sought to understand how both V-Note (physical tool) and instructional coaching (psychological tool) mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction of ELLs.

To follow, the tools used in this research were shared; V-Note, the V-Note timeline, and the video reflection guide. Next, I shared how instructional coaching was used to support participants’ instruction for ELLs in prelesson and postlesson interviews. Then I disclosed contextual information about the teacher preparation program and ELL teacher preparation program where this research took place. To follow, I discussed the four participants who were studied and explained why Giselle’s case was not reported in this research.

Next, the data collection used in this research were discussed, and the data analysis methods were shared. First, a table was presented that showed how data were collected to answer both research questions. The data analysis section discussed eclectic coding (Saldaña, 2016) and shared that In Vivo and descriptive codes were used to analyze participants’ interview transcripts, and written reflections. After the case analysis was completed, lesson tables were created for each participant. The lesson table shared the participants’ beliefs about the lesson, what was noticed when using V-Note for analysis, instructional coaching topics used, and the participant’s ideas for subsequent ELL instruction. To follow, the cross-case analysis shared how I looked for findings that were prominent in all cases.
The chapter concluded my addressing limitations of the research and discussed ethical considerations and issues related to trustworthiness. Limitations were that the study only reported on three teacher candidates, therefore findings from this research cannot be generalized. In addition, this research only examined one type of video annotation tool and more research is needed to examine if other types of video annotation tools may or may not be used with teacher candidates in the same way for ELL teacher preparation. Lastly, this research did not include classroom observations.

The delimitations discussed participants’ emic voice, because he participants in this research were able to record their own uninterrupted ELL instruction and choose how they analyze their recorded video with V-Note (e.g. the labels they would use for analysis). Likewise, the research studied three teacher candidates who taught different grades levels at different schools. Moreover, various data collections were used to collect the participants’ perceptions about ELL and instruction for ELLs and member checking was used to validate research findings.

In the next chapter of this research, I will present the case findings. To do so I will share each case separately. First, I will discuss the participants’ initial beliefs about ELLs, then I will share the three lessons each participant taught. I will conclude each participant’s’ section of the chapter with a description of the findings that were made from the case analysis.
CHAPTER FOUR:
CASE FINDINGS

The purpose of this research was to examine how video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about and instruction to ELLs. This research was informed by sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2015; Vygotsky, 1978) and was guided by the following research questions:

1. How does video-elicited reflection shape final semester, undergraduate, teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and their instruction for ELLs?

2. How does video-elicited reflection affirm, challenge, or reconstruct teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and their instruction for ELLs?

This chapter presents findings from Taylor’s, Susan’s, and Erica’s cases. To do so, I share each participant’s story, her initial beliefs about ELLs, and each of the three lessons the participants taught separately, highlighting their beliefs about ELLs and how their beliefs were affirmed, challenged, or reconstructed by video-elicited reflection. This chapter presents a table that summarizes each lesson and concludes with each participant’s findings about her case.

Taylor’s Case

Taylor, a US born, White female and native English speaker, was born and raised in the city and state where this research took place. Taylor grew up in a predominately White, middle-class neighborhood and was an only child. Taylor’s parents divorced when she was young, and
Taylor lived with her father. As a K–12 student, Taylor went to public schools with very little diversity: “Schools today are very different from what I remember when I was a kid. Most of the kids I went to school with were White and spoke English. I never heard other languages spoken at school” (initial interview). In high school Taylor took two years of Spanish classes to fulfill her foreign language requirement: “I learned Spanish in school, but I wouldn’t say that I speak Spanish. I forgot everything I learned in high school and would not be able to have a conversation in Spanish” (initial interview). Taylor did not consider herself to be fluent in a second language and referred to herself as a monolingual.

After graduating from high school, Taylor attended a nearby community college: “I worked part-time at an after-school care program and realized that I wanted to be a teacher” (initial interview). After earning an associate’s degree in education, Taylor began the elementary education teacher preparation program at the university where this research occurred. In the first year of teacher preparation, Taylor interned in third and second grade classrooms. In the final semester of internship, Taylor left the teacher preparation due to personal reasons and had to work two part-time jobs to pay her bills. One of these jobs was at Jefferson Elementary School’s after-school care program. Two years later, Taylor returned to the teacher preparation program.

Taylor was afraid that starting school again would be difficult for her, so she requested to complete the last two semesters of internship at Jefferson. Jefferson was not one of the university’s partnership schools, so Jefferson’s principal, Mrs. Mack (pseudonym), wrote the university to request Taylor as an intern. Soon after, Taylor was assigned to a first-grade classroom at Jefferson for her internship. Jefferson Elementary School was a K–5, public, International Baccalaureate school located at the east end of the county in a lower-middle class,
predominately Black neighborhood. Jefferson Elementary had 432 students\(^1\) and an 11% ESOL population. Mrs. Perez (pseudonym) was Jefferson’s ESOL resource teacher.

Taylor’s collaborating teacher, Ms. Clark (pseudonym), had been teaching at Jefferson for over 11 years and was also an ESOL endorsed teacher. Taylor and Ms. Clark got along well and frequently had bagels and coffee together in the mornings as they planned their lessons: “She’s [Ms. Clark] someone I deeply admire and respect. She’s a teaching guru” (initial interview).

Taylor’s first grade internship class was comprised of 16 first grade students; five of these students were ELLs. The five ELLs in Taylor’s class all spoke Spanish as a first language (L1) and had LYB\(^2\) proficiency levels. Table 5 describes the ELLs in Taylor’s class.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELLs in Taylor’s Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Approximately 35% of the students at Jefferson were Black, 25% were White, 24% were Hispanic, 10% were Asian, and 6% were multiracial.

\(^2\) LYB is a district label used to denote an ELL at a middle level of English language proficiency. LYA refers to an ELL with little English proficiency, and LYC refers to an ELL with high English proficiency.

\(^3\) ELLs’ proficiency levels were derived from their scores on the WIDA Access 2.0 test. This test was administered annually to place a student in the ESOL program.
David, Lucila, and Jennifer (pseudonyms) were labeled ELL, and Sophia and Christopher were labeled ELL and ESE\(^4\). David and Sophia were born in Mexico, and Lucila, Jennifer, and Christopher were born in the US. All five ELLs received language support from Mrs. Perez during English Language Arts.

**Taylor’s Initial Beliefs about ELLs**

In January 2017, Taylor and I met for a 45-minute, open-ended interview in her school’s computer lab. I used my cell phone’s voice recorder and the i-Movie application on my MacBook Pro™ to record audio and visual of our interview. I asked Taylor questions about her feelings, perceptions, and instruction to ELLs but also let her share stories about any experiences she had with ELLs. Once the interview ended, I transcribed then analyzed the transcripts using HyperRESEARCH. I coded the main idea of Taylor’s belief statements then grouped similar main ideas together to create phrases. The coded phrases became the categories I used to organize Taylor’s beliefs in my codebook (Bogdan & Biklen, 2006). A total of six belief categories emerged: role as teacher, self as teacher, ELLs as student learners, accuracy, parents and families, and instruction to ELLs. These categories were then simplified into three belief categories: beliefs about the self, beliefs about ELLs, and beliefs about ELL instruction. The codebook I used to understand Taylor’s initial beliefs about ELLs is shared in Table 6.

---

\(^4\) Exceptional Student Education (ESE) was used to denote a student who had a special need and was receiving learning services from the school’s ESE program.
Table 6

Taylor’s Initial Beliefs About ELLs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Category</th>
<th>Stated Belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Beliefs about the self| • “I’m a teacher to all students, it’s not a pick or choose.”  
|                       | • “I am not ready to teach ELLs who cannot speak English.”  
| Beliefs about ELLs    | • “ELLs take too long to do their work. I’m not sure if it’s because of a language issue or an academic issue that they are having.”  
| Beliefs about ELL instruction | • “I differentiate instruction based on students’ need as learners, not geared to them being ELLs.”  
|                       | • Other teachers inform my instruction of ELLs.  

Beliefs about the self. Taylor made statements where she used I or my to talk about her ESOL instructional abilities. In one instance Taylor said, “I’m a teacher to all students, including ELLs. It’s not a pick or choose.” Taylor believed she had the responsibility to teach all the students in her class regardless of the label they had: “Just because they’re ELL, it doesn’t mean that they’re not my responsibility.” Taylor explained that ELLs had two teachers since they also worked with the ESOL resource teacher but believed that she was the main classroom teacher because she was responsible for the student learning and standardized test scores: “What happens to them [ELLs] reflects on me and my teaching.” Taylor then told me a story about the first time she taught an ELL:

The first time I taught an ELL was when I was substitute teaching in a third grade classroom. I had a student who spoke Spanish and no English at all; she had no idea what I was saying, so we couldn’t communicate. When we did communicate, it was through other students, so who knows how that got lost in translation. The school had Rosetta Stone, for her to get on, but you could tell she [ELL] hated it. She had to talk into the microphone because the system checked her speaking. It was awkward and I could tell
she felt self-conscious about trying to speak a new language in front of her peers. I don’t think I’m prepared enough because I am not ready to teach ELLs who cannot speak English.

This excerpt shows that Taylor did not feel confident about her ability to teach ELLs and that these feelings came from her experiences working with ELLs.

**Beliefs about ELLs.** Taylor made statements about ELLs’ home life or learning characteristics. For example, Taylor highlighted the issues ELLs brought to the classroom rather than the cultural assets they brought with them. This misconception was revealed in Taylor’s description of ELLs as students when she said, “They take too long to do their work. I’m not sure if it’s because of a language issue or an academic issue that they are having.” Taylor was not sure if ELLs learning struggles originated from language or cognitive issues. Taylor might have felt this confusion because some ELLs in her class were also ESE.

**Beliefs about ELL instruction.** Taylor’s beliefs about ELL instruction included statements that she made about her teaching, classroom management, or use of reflection to analyze her ESOL instruction. Taylor spoke about her ESOL instruction, saying, “I differentiate for students based on what they need as learners, not geared to them being an ELL.” This instance suggested that Taylor was not differentiating instruction to ELLs based on their language needs.
Table 7

Taylor’s Classroom Actions and Use of Video-Elicited Reflection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Beliefs about ELLs</th>
<th>Instruction to ELLs</th>
<th>Video-Elicited Reflection</th>
<th>Participants’ Ideas for Future ELL Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) ELLs will struggle with independent writing. &quot;They work slow.&quot;</td>
<td>One-on-one writing conferences with ELLs.</td>
<td>(1) “There was a lack of authentic conversation because Lucila barely spoke. I don’t think she understood what I was asking her.”</td>
<td>“I want to use a rubric to next time to help guide our conversation”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1) “Lucila will struggle with the rubric.”</td>
<td>(1) Rubric was given to all students so they could self-assess their writing sample.</td>
<td>(1) “I had more authentic conversation labels. I only had to repeat myself once.”</td>
<td>“I need to think about all of the vocabulary words in the lesson and how I am going to support Lucila comprehension of these terms”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1) “I think there are a few [ELLs] that need to focus on how their writing looks, but there are some [ELLs] that don’t need that support anymore.”</td>
<td>(1) Students used the rubric to self-assess their writing samples</td>
<td>(1) “Lucila was more comfortable using the rubric for conversation than Jennifer was.”</td>
<td>“I’m thinking of other accommodations I can use to support Lucila’s vocabulary needs, and Jennifer’s oral fluency needs when I use on-on-one instruction with them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) “A lot of their struggles are due to the ESE aspect.”</td>
<td>(2) ELLs worked with a peer to discuss their self-assessment</td>
<td>(2) “Lucila and Jennifer are supposed to be at same proficiency level, but they perform differently”.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) “I don’t think ELLs are ready for peer writing conferences.”</td>
<td>(3) “Lucila needs vocabulary support, Jennifer needs oral fluency support.”</td>
<td>(3) “How come you only conferenced with Jennifer once before?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classroom Actions

In this section I discuss Taylor’s classroom actions. To do so I present a table that summarizes the three lessons Taylor taught. Table 6 shares Taylor’s beliefs about ELLs, instruction of ELLs, her use of video-elicited reflection on the lesson (V-Note and discussed coaching topics), and the ideas she had for future ELL instruction.

One-on-one instruction. The topic of Taylor’s first lesson was comparing and contrasting. The objective of the lesson was for students to compare and contrast animals from texts read in class. She assessed this lesson by having the students write a compare-and-contrast
paragraph about animals. Taylor shared the steps she was going to take to teach her lesson:

*Taylor:* I’m going to pull the ELLs for one-on-one writing conferences…. What’s nice is that we have two teachers in here and at some point, we’ll also get the ESOL resource teacher, so we’ll have a smaller class to work with.

*Researcher:* Will you use any other accommodations in the writing conference?

*Taylor:* I like giving them [ELLs] sentence stems, but this is not a lesson where they will get sentence stems.

*Researcher:* Do you think the ELLs will have difficulty with understanding the terms *compare* and *contrast*?

*Taylor:* *It will be the independent writing they [ELLs] will struggle with. They [ELLs] work slow* [sic; emphasis added]. I don’t know if it’s them as a person, or they just don’t want to do it [the work]. (Prelesson interview 1)

In this excerpt Taylor stated that she believed one-on-one conferences would support ELLs because they were slow working, struggling writers. I used questions to prompt Taylor to consider using accommodations to support ELLs’ understanding of the content area vocabulary terms *compare* and *contrast*; however, she decided not to make additional accommodations at the time.

Taylor recorded the one-on-one writing conference with Lucila and used V-Note (2014) to facilitate our postlesson interview. Taylor explained why she only recorded Lucila: “I wanted to meet with all five of the ELLs in this class, but Ms. Perez [the ESOL resource teacher] did not come [to my class] to assist me, so I was only able to meet with her [Lucila] and not the others [ELLs]” (Postlesson interview 1). Taylor shared her V-Note timeline with me:

90
Taylor: I analyzed my video using *Introduction*, me explaining what we are going to do. *Authentic conversation*, when I ask her [Lucila] a question and she gives me a correct response and can elaborate. *Confused response*, when she has no idea what I’m talking about and there is a lack of understanding between the both of us, and *redirecting* when I have having to restate my questions again.

Researcher: What did you notice after you did your coding? Did you see any patterns?

Taylor: The big pattern was a lack of authentic conversation because she barely spoke. I don’t think she [Lucila] understood what I was asking her. (Postlesson interview 1)

After analyzing her video, Taylor noticed that the number of instances where she had to redirect Lucila dominated. Taylor reasoned that Lucila was confused because she barely spoke in the writing conference.

As I watched Taylor’s video, I noticed an instance where Taylor asked Lucila what she liked about mechanics and punctuation, and Lucila said, “I like that I wrote about turtles.” I paused the video, replayed it again, and unpacked this incident with Taylor.

Researcher: Do you think she [Lucila] didn’t understand your question because of the language or she just didn’t get it cognitively?

Taylor: I know the language barrier is an issue. *I am considering making a script or a list she can pick from and having the script so she feels comfortable using the language I am using in my questions* [sic; emphasis added].

Researcher: Do you mean a rubric?

Taylor: Yes, similar to one I’ve seen my CT use. It says, “Did I reread? Do I have correct punctuation? Do I have capitals?” I think something like that will work because it’s familiar to them [ELLs]. (Postlesson interview 1)
In this excerpt I unpacked a critical incident with Taylor. Our discussion helped Taylor make sense of the incident and led Taylor to consider using a rubric for future instruction.

In lesson one, V-Note (2014) analysis showed Taylor that one-on-one instruction did not support Lucila’s writing the way she thought it would. As Taylor analyzed her video with V-Note, she noticed that Lucila barely spoke in the writing conference. This V-Note analysis led Taylor to believe that Lucila was confused by the questions she asked. Taylor reflected on her beliefs about one-on-one instruction, writing,

I thought a one-on-one writing conference would help her [Lucila] better than it did. It was clear in the video that the writing conference did absolutely nothing to help her. I want to use a rubric next time to help guide our conversation,” (Written reflection 1).

Taylor was beginning to reconsider her beliefs about on-on-one instruction but did not think of an alternative strategy she could use to support Lucila’s language needs better.

I reflected on the conversation I had with Taylor writing,

I watched Taylor’s video, then I rewound her video, and I paused the instance where Taylor asked Lucila a question about mechanics and punctuation. I asked Taylor if Lucila comprehended the terms mechanics and punctuation. This question probed Taylor to think critically about language and led her to think about using a script to support Lucila’s language needs. Taylor is starting to think about other ideas for the types of accommodations she can use with ELLs. She and I discussed rubrics.

(Researcher’s journal)

In Taylor’s first lesson she noticed that Lucila barely spoke in the writing conference. Taylor’s V-Note analysis led her to believe that Lucila was confused. Taylor wrote, “I thought a one-on-one writing conference would help her [Lucila] better than it did,” (Written Reflection).
After analyzing her video Taylor, could see a problem but was unable to think about a solution. Our conversation led Taylor to think about ideas for using a rubric to support Lucila’s language needs.

**One-on-one instruction and rubric.** The topic of this lesson was mechanics and punctuation. The objective of this lesson was for first grade students to write a complete paragraph about their favorite sport, holiday, or family using correct punctuation and mechanics. Taylor gave all students a rubric to use to self-evaluate their writing. Taylor wanted to see if the rubric supported Lucila’s ability to speak about her writing.

Taylor shared the steps she would take in teaching her lesson in our prelesson interview, saying, “I’ll model a paragraph for the class. Then she [Lucila] will write and use the rubric for self-assessment. Then, I will have a writing conference with her so she can share her writing with me (Prelesson interview 2). Taylor wanted Lucila to use the rubric on her own before she met with Taylor. I wanted to know if Taylor was going to model how she wanted Lucila to use the rubric.

*Researcher:* Do you anticipate that Lucila will have any struggles?

*Taylor:* I think she [Lucila] will struggle with the rubric [sic; emphasis added]. It’s a new strategy we are using, so I am pretty sure she’ll [Lucila] need time to adjust, but I think a lot of the issue is her vocabulary. (Prelesson interview 2)

In her first lesson, Taylor stated that ELLs struggled with writing, but in this lesson Taylor stated that Lucila struggled with vocabulary.

I used questions to probe Taylor to discuss her beliefs about Lucila’s vocabulary with me:

*Researcher:* What vocabulary accommodations will you provide her with?
Taylor: *I think having one-on-one conversation is really going to build on her [Lucila’s] vocabulary* [sic; emphasis added] *because I’m introducing a rubric this time to support her comprehension of content vocabulary terms.* (Prelesson interview 2)

Taylor noticed that Lucila struggled during the writing conference because she needed more oral language support and not because she was a slow learner. Taylor was seeing that Lucila’s instructional outcomes were influenced by the support she language support she provided and realized that it was her job to provide ELLs with the language accommodations they needed for academic success.

Next, Taylor shared her V-Note (2014) timeline with me:

I used the same labels to analyze this lesson because I wanted to see if the rubric helped her [Lucila]. I had more authentic conversation labels. I only had to repeat myself once this time. This lesson was an improvement from my last lesson because the rubric helped her [Lucila] talk more.

Taylor shared her video with me. I took notes in my researcher’s journal, writing, “There was an instance in Taylor’s video where she asked Lucila a question about topic sentence and supporting details but these terms were not on the rubric” (Researcher’s journal). After watching Taylor’s video, I said,

*Researcher:* Let’s replay the instance where and you marked that you had to repeat yourself.

*Taylor:* Ok

*Researcher:* I wonder if these topic sentence and supporting details were on the rubric you gave her [Lucila]?
Figure 10. Rubric used in Taylor’s second lesson.

Taylor pulled out a copy of the rubric she used in this lesson (see Figure 8). Then I asked her,

*Researcher: Were topic sentence or supporting details on the rubric?

*Taylor: They weren’t, but we spoke about them in class. I didn’t even think to include them on here [the rubric]. I just used a rubric my CT already had.

(Postlesson interview 2)

This instance illustrated how my coaching facilitated a dialectical tension and Taylor’s selective attention to a critical incident of her instruction that she had missed. Through our conversation I probed Taylor to examine the one instance where she had to repeat herself. Taylor realized that Lucila was confused by her question about topic sentence and supporting details because these terms were not on the rubric. When asked about the rubric, Taylor explained that she used a rubric that her CT already had. Taylor’s use of a pre-created rubric agreed with research that found most teachers use incidental rather than intentional language accommodations to instruct ELLs (Baecher et al., 2013a).
Taylor discussed the future steps she would take in her next lessons: “I need to think about all of the vocabulary words in the lesson and how I am going to support her [Lucila] comprehension of these terms [sic; emphasis added]. The rubric said on topic but this is different from topic sentence” (Written reflection 2). In her second lesson, Taylor used incidental language accommodations. Through our conversation, Taylor began to understand Lucila’s language needs. This realization led Taylor to decide that she needed to be intentional about the language support she provided to ELLs.

**Rubric and peer discussion.** Taylors’ third lesson was a writing activity. For this lesson Taylor explicitly taught students about topic sentences and supporting details. Taylor wanted students to write another paragraph about their favorite holiday or family and include a topic sentence and three supporting details in the paragraph. Taylor planned to use a rubric that she intentionally created to support ELLs one-on-one writing conference discussion. Taylor discussed her plans for the lesson with me in our prelesson interview, saying,

> I want the rubric to be based more on the actual writing content rather than mechanical issues and their writing and spacing or neatness. I think there are a few [ELLs] that need to focus on how their writing looks, but there are some [ELLs] that don’t need that support anymore [sic; emphasis added]. (Prelesson interview 3)

Taylor noticed that the ELLs in her class had different writing needs and was beginning to think about differentiating the rubric.

> I used follow-up questions to prompt thinking about the ways she could differentiate instruction for the ELLs in her class:

> **Researcher:** Do you think you should differentiate the rubric at all?
Taylor: Well, the two ELLs that are also ESE, I think a lot of their struggles are due to the ESE aspect [sic; emphasis added]. (Prelesson interview 3)

Taylor noticed that she had ELLs in her class who also has special needs (i.e., ESE) but did not consider ways to differentiate the rubric or her instruction to them. I chose to be more directive in my coaching:

Researcher: You should let the ELLs who are ready conduct peer writing conferences together. Then you can conduct one-on-one writing conferences with the ELLs who are ESE.

Taylor: I don’t think the ELLs are ready for peer writing conferences [sic; emphasis added]. They have never done that before. (Prelesson interview 3)

In this instance Taylor was hesitant to try a language accommodation that did not include one-on-one instruction. I reflected on our conversation in my journal writing:

Today I sent Taylor an email with a link to a YouTube video showing ELLs working in peer writing conferences. I am trying to get her to notice that she needs to differentiate instruction for ELLs based on their English Language Proficiency levels. I am starting to think that she has reservations about teaching ELLs who have special needs. Right now, she is providing all students with the same language accommodations.

(Researcher journal)

Three days later, I met with Taylor for a prelesson interview. Taylor said, “I watched the video you sent me. The peer conferences didn’t seem too hard for me to do, so I decided to try it out” (Postlesson interview 3). Taylor recorded Lucia and Jennifer’s peer writing conference. She showed me her V-Note (2014) timeline and said, “She [Lucila] was more comfortable using the rubric for conversation than she [Jennifer] was. I think it’s because I only met with her [Jennifer]
once before” (Postlesson interview 3). I wanted to know why Taylor kept working with Lucila in all the videos she recorded. I asked,

*Researcher*: How come you only conferenced with Jennifer once before?

*Taylor*: I thought I would have more time to meet with all of them [ELLs]. I recorded my instruction to Lucila because I wanted to compare lessons two and three to my first video to see if I made any improvement [sic; emphasis added]. (Postlesson interview 3)

This excerpt showed that Taylor was using video to document her pre–post gains (Star & Strickland, 2007). Star and Strickland’s research found that teachers used videos of their earlier classroom instruction to document their improvement over time.

Next, Taylor discussed how she analyzed the video: “I used one label this time called *the look* to notice any time they looked at me with an *I don’t know face*. Taylor analyzed the facial gestures Lucila and Jennifer made rather than the language they used to conduct their peer writing conference. Taylor played her video for me to watch and said,

They [Lucila and Jennifer] are both labeled ELL, LYB, but you can see in the video that they [ELLs] are not performing at the same [language] level. She [Lucila] needs more vocabulary support, and she [Jennifer] needs more oral fluency, speaking support. She [Jennifer] got a lot more of ‘The Look’ labels than she [Lucila] did.

(Postlesson interview 3)

Taylor was beginning to see that ELLs had different language needs even though they were in the same English language proficiency level. I discussed language modalities with her to coreflect with her about Lucila and Jennifer’s unique language needs.
Researcher: There are four ways to measure proficiency, listening, reading, speaking, and writing. I’m wondering if you think you should differentiate the rubric at all now? Do they [ELLs] all need the same type of rubric?

Taylor: I’m starting to think about ways I can differentiate instruction with them one-on-one but haven’t thought about using different rubrics. So maybe giving them instruction based on their listening, reading, speaking or writing needs. (Prelesson interview 3)

Taylor’s written reflection discussed the ideas she had for future instruction: “I’m thinking of other accommodations I can use to support Lucila’s vocabulary needs, and Jennifer’s oral fluency needs when I use on-on-one instruction with them [sic; emphasis added]” (Written reflection 3). This instance showed that Taylor held on to her beliefs about using one-on-one instruction to teach ELLs even though she had evidence that ELLs could conduct peer writing conferences.

Taylor did not describe the accommodations she would use to support Lucila and Jennifer in future instruction. This instance showed that Taylor needed help with generating ideas for different strategies she could use to support ELLs’ vocabulary and oral fluency needs.

In Taylor’s third lesson, she used a suggestion I gave her for peer writing conferences. When analyzing her video, Taylor noticed that Lucila and Jennifer had different language needs even though they were in the same English language proficiency level. Taylor and I coreflected on Lucila’s and Jennifer’s different language needs and discussed differentiation. After our discussion Taylor started to realize that ELLs have unique language needs and require differentiated language accommodations.
Findings About Taylor’s Case

I read over Taylor’s data and used the table I created to analyze Taylor’s beliefs about ELLs, instruction of ELLs, use of video-elicited reflection, and future ideas for ELL instruction. To do so, I uploaded the table I made that highlighted Taylors’ ELL instruction to HyperRESEARCH and used eclectic coding (Saldaña, 2016) to analyze the table. Then, I looked for similarities to create patterns (Bogdan & Biklen, 2011), and these patterns created three findings: (a) As Taylor used video-elicited reflection, her instruction increasingly included more language accommodations and began to include student-centered learning; (b) video-elicited reflection reconstructed Taylor’s beliefs about using one-on-one instruction with ELLs; and, (c) collaborative coaching behaviors influenced Taylor’s instruction of ELLs more than directive coaching behaviors. Below I will discuss each of these findings in detail.

As Taylor Used Video-Elicited Reflection Her Lessons Increasingly Included More Language Accommodations and Began to Include Student-Centered Instruction

Taylor’s lessons increasingly included more ESOL accommodations. In Taylor’s first lesson, she conducted a one-on-one writing conference with Lucila. Using V-Note (2014) to analyze and then discuss her instruction with me, Taylor realized that Lucila needed more explicit oral language support. Taylor decided to use rubrics to guide Lucila’s one-on-one writing conference conversations for her next lesson. For example, in lesson two, Taylor realized the rubric allowed Lucila to facilitate writing conference conversation with Taylor. Through our discussion, Taylor realized that she did not include the terms topic sentence and supporting details on the rubric. This omission led Taylor to decide on using a more detailed rubric for her
third lesson. These examples illustrated that Taylor increased the accommodations she used as she transitioned from one lesson to another.

In addition, Taylor’s ELL instruction began to shift to a student-centered approach. For example, in Taylor’s first lesson, Taylor facilitated a one-on-one writing conference and focused on her conversation with Lucila as the lens for her analysis. When analyzing her V-Note (2014) timeline, Taylor noticed that she dominated the writing conference conversation and gave Lucila limited responsibility in her own learning. In her second lesson, Taylor used a rubric to support Lucila’s oral language needs for a writing conference discussion. This rubric gave Lucila more control over her learning and allowed her to speak more. In this lesson Lucila did most of the talking. In Taylor’s third lesson, Lucila and Jennifer used a more detailed rubric to facilitate their own peer writing conference. In this lesson Lucila and Jennifer were responsible for their own learning and Taylor facilitated their learning.

**Video-Elicited Reflection Reconstructed Taylor’s Beliefs About Using One-On-One Instruction with ELLs**

Taylor began her first lesson with the belief that one-on-one writing conferences would support ELLs’ language needs. Taylor’s beliefs about one-on-one instruction were reconstructed when she noticed that Lucila did not understand the questions asked in the first one-on-one writing conference. Taylor focused on the writing conference conversation as an area needing improvement and started to think about using a rubric to support Lucila’s oral fluency needs for her second lesson.

In her second lesson, Taylor gave Lucila a rubric and conducted a one-on-one writing conference with her. Taylor used V-Note (2014) to analyze her instruction and noticed that the
rubric supported Lucila’s oral fluency needs because Lucila dominated the writing conference conversation. Taylor also noticed that she had to repeat a question once but did not unpack this incident further. I asked Taylor to replay the instance where she repeated her question to Lucila. Our conversation led Taylor to notice that the rubric she used did not contain the vocabulary words *topic sentence* and *supporting details*. In this lesson Taylor realized that ELLs need rubrics that include all content area vocabulary terms used for instruction.

In Taylor’s third lesson, she recorded Lucila’s and Jennifer’s peer writing conference. Taylor’s video showed Lucila and Jennifer using a rubric to facilitate peer discussion about writing. After Taylor analyzed her video, she realized that Lucila and Jennifer had different language needs even though they were both at the same level of English language proficiency. Our discussion led Taylor to consider ways she could differentiate her future one-on-one instruction with ELLs.

In summary, video-elicited reflection reconstructed Taylor’s beliefs about using one-on-one instruction with ELLs. In her first lesson, Taylor noticed that Lucila barely spoke in the writing conference and Taylor realized that one-on-one instruction was an area that needed improvement. In her second lesson, Taylor used a rubric to support the writing conference conversation, and in her third lesson, Taylor used a more detailed rubric and social interaction to support ELLs’ writing needs. Taylor’s case showed that her beliefs about one-on-one instruction evolved to include ideas about language accommodations.
Collaborative Coaching Behaviors Influenced Taylor’s Instruction to ELLs More Than Directive Coaching Behaviors

Taylor’s instruction to ELLs developed when collaborative coaching behaviors were used. Collaborative coaching behaviors involved instances where I used questioning to facilitate coreflection. For example, in Taylor’s first lesson, she noticed that Lucila barely spoke. I asked Taylor if she believed Lucila was confused by the terms used in the writing conference questions or if Lucia just did not understand the questions cognitively. This inquiry prompted Taylor to consider Lucila’s language needs and led her to think about using a rubric in her next lesson to support Lucila’s oral fluency needs.

In Taylor’s second lesson, I used collaborative coaching behaviors to unpack an incident of Taylor’s instruction. I asked Taylor to replay the incident where she had to repeat her question to Lucila. Through our conversation Taylor realized she did not include the terms topic sentence and supporting details on the rubric. This realization facilitated Taylor’s future-oriented comments about using content-specific vocabulary terms on rubrics.

Taylor’s instruction of ELLs was unaffected when directive coaching behaviors were used. Directive coaching behaviors involved instances where I told Taylor what to do when instructing ELLs. For example, in Taylors’ third lesson, I told her to use peer writing conferences with ELLs and sent her an e-mail with an example after she said she believed ELLs were not ready for peer writing conferences. Taylor used peer conferences for instruction but stated she would go back to using one-on-one instruction for future instruction to ELLs.

Taylor’s case showed that collaborative coaching behaviors influenced Taylor’s instruction of ELLs. When collaborative discussion was used to elicit ideas for subsequent instruction Taylor felt that she owned what was being discussed, “I was able to discuss ideas I
had further with you, and feel that you really helped me make sense of what I was thinking when we watched my video together” (Taylor, Exit Interview). Therefore, Taylor was taking ideas from our collaborative discussion and making them her own through the process of appropriation as described by Wertsch (1998) where an expert gives knowledge to a novice.

In contrast, when directive coaching behaviors were used, Taylor’s instruction of ELLs was unaffected. Because the ideas discussed during instructional coaching were not her own, they did not move between a social and internal plane of understanding to facilitate internalization (Vygotsky, 1978). For instance, Taylor had ideas about differentiation in her third lesson but did not adopt peer writing conferences as a strategy she would use for future ELL instruction. Taylor said, “I don’t think they [ELLs] are ready for peer writing conferences, they have never done that before” (Prelesson interview 3). This instance showed that when telling was used as an instructional coaching skill, Taylor’s beliefs about ELLs instruction were unchanged. Directive coaching also led Taylor to remain at the conceptual underpinnings degree of appropriation discussed by Grossman et al. (1999). Taylor understood peer writing as a social learning theory that may support ELLs acquisition of the English language but was not able to implement the practice in their own classroom because she did not believe the ELLs in her class were ready for peer writing conferences.

Summary of Findings from Taylor’s Case

Taylor’s case generated three findings: (a) As Taylor used video-elicited reflection, her lessons increasingly included more language accommodations and began to include student-centered instruction; (b) video-elicited reflection reconstructed Taylor’s beliefs about using one-on-one instruction with ELLs, (c) collaborative coaching behaviors influenced Taylor’s
instruction of ELLs more than directive coaching behaviors. Taylor’s case shed light on how video analysis and instructional coaching can be used to mediate teacher candidates’ reflection on ELL instruction for ELL teacher preparation.

Taylor’s case showed that video-elicited reflection supported her understanding of ELLs’ language needs, and this knowledge led her to begin to use student-centered instruction. Taylor’s beliefs about one-on-one instruction were reconstructed when she realized that she needed to use different accommodations to support Lucila’s writing needs. Taylor transitioned from general beliefs about one-on-one instruction to beliefs that included the used of content specific rubrics. Also, the collaborative coaching behaviors I used helped Taylor think about ideas to develop her instruction of ELLs, while directive coaching behaviors did not affect Taylor’s instruction for ELLs. Taylor’s preference for collaborative instructional coaching behaviors supports the research surrounding participatory appropriation (Rogoff, 2008), and the use social scaffolds for teacher learning (Manning & Payne, 1993). Taylor’s case revealed that video annotation tools are more powerful when instructional coaches reflect with teacher candidates collaboratively.

In the section of this chapter I discuss Susan’s case. First I will share student’s initial beliefs by discussing the beliefs Susan had about herself as an ELL teacher, the beliefs she had about and ELLs as student learners, and the beliefs she had about instruction. Then I will present a table that highlights the three ELL lessons Susan taught. I will explain each lesson in detail and will end by sharing Susan’s case findings.

Susan’s Case

Susan, a US born, native English speaker, was born and raised in the city and state where this research took place. Susan came from a White, lower-middle class family and was the
younger of two children. As a K–12 student Susan attended public schools in lower income areas: The public elementary school I went to was in what people would consider to be the rougher, poorer side of town” (Initial interview). Susan went to school with students who were culturally and linguistically diverse: “As a White, I was the minority at my school” (Initial interview).

Susan did not speak a second language but knew how to say a few words in German, Spanish, French, and American sign language: “I learned a few phrases in other languages because I was around so much diversity growing up” (Initial interview). In the first grade, Susan was placed in the gifted program, and in the fourth grade she was also diagnosed with special needs and was placed in the ESE program: “I had Attention Deficit Disorder, so I was gifted but also ESE” (Initial interview). Susan had the same gifted teacher from first through fifth grade: “I had to combat a lot of challenges because I was dual label. She [gifted teacher] believed in me and made me want to be a teacher so I could help kids the way she helped me” (Initial interview).

In high school Susan took dual enrollment courses at a nearby community college. After earning an associate’s degree in education, Susan registered for the teacher preparation program at the university where this research occurred. As an intern teacher, Susan worked in kindergarten, second, and fifth grade classrooms. In her senior year of the program, Susan had to take time off from school because her parents lost their jobs and she needed to help pay the bills: “I had to work full-time so we wouldn’t lose our home” (Initial interview). Susan returned to the teacher preparation program two years later.
When this research took place, Susan was a final semester, second grade intern teacher at Coldwater Elementary School (pseudonym). Coldwater had 625 students and a 14% ESOL population. Mrs. Sandoval (pseudonym) was Coldwater’s ESOL resource teacher. She provided instructional support and proficiency testing to all of ELLs at the school. Mrs. Sandoval frequently used pullout instruction to teach the ELLs in the school: “She [Mrs. Sandoval] comes to classrooms and pulls the ELLs out so she can work with a larger group of students at the same time” (Initial interview). Susan’s CT, Ms. Floyd (pseudonym), had been teaching at Coldwater for eight years, and was an ESOL Endorsed teacher. Ms. Floyd and Susan did not get along well: “I mostly sit at the reading desk and watch her teach; she just recently started letting me teach one subject a day” (Initial interview). Susan’s second grade internship class had 17 students. Included in this number were ELLs. Two students were ELL, and one was ELL and ESE (see Table 7). Julia was an ELL who was ESE. Julia was an LYC and spoke Spanish as a first language (L1). Julia received ESE support for speech. Julia had recently transferred to Coldwater from another school in Florida. Susan did not know about Julia’s educational background but knew that Julia was born in Columbia. Diego and Stephen were ELLs who were LYB. Diego spoke Spanish and was born in the US. He had been in the school’s ESOL program since kindergarten. Stephen spoke Chinese as an L1 and had also been in the school’s ESOL program since kindergarten. Stephen was born in the US, and his parents spoke Chinese at home.

5 Approximately 40% of the students at Coldwater were White, 31% were Hispanic, 21% were Black, 4% were Asian, and 4% were multiracial.

6 LYC is a district label used to denote an ELL with a high level of English language proficiency.
Table 8

**ELLs in Susan’s Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>LYB</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diego</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>LYB</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>ELL, ESE</td>
<td>LYC</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Susan’s Initial Beliefs About ELLs**

Susan and I met for an initial interview after school in her classroom. I asked Susan questions about her feelings, perceptions, and instruction of ELLs. After our interview, I transcribed the interview then analyzed the transcripts using HyperRESEARCH. Table 8 outlines the three belief categories that emerged from Susan’s initial interview: beliefs about the self, beliefs about ELLs, and beliefs about ESOL instruction. Following, I define each of the belief categories listed and highlight and discuss Susan’s belief statements as they pertain to each category.

Table 9

**Susan’s Initial Beliefs About ELLs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Category</th>
<th>Stated Belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self as ELL teacher</td>
<td>• “I wouldn’t say that I’m an ELL teacher.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “It’s my job to need to communicate with ELLs to find out to find how to make learning work for them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about ELLs</td>
<td>• “ELLs are usually dual labeled ELL and ESE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I don’t even think that he should have been an ELL. He spoke perfect.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about ELL</td>
<td>• “Visuals work best.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction</td>
<td>• “I use group discussion to learn about ELLs’ language needs.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “ELLs need more help with vocabulary.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beliefs about the self. The beliefs about the self category included statements Susan made about her role as an ELL teacher, including those using the first-person pronouns I or my. For example, in one instance, Susan said, “I’m certified to teach ELLs, but I wouldn’t say that I’m an ELL teacher.” Then, Susan stated,

It’s my job to communicate with them [ELLs] to find out how to make learning work for them. I learned about learning surveys in one of my classes. I’ve never used them on ELLs, but I think it could work to find out what type of learner they are.

Susan believed that she could use strategies that she had learned in teaching preparation to get to know more about the ELLs in her class.

Beliefs about ELLs. The belief about ELLs category included statements Susan made to describe ELLs. Susan said, “They [ELLs] are usually dual labeled ELL and ESE.” Susan had ELLs in her class who also had special needs. Then Susan shared a story about the first time she taught an ELL:

I was interning in a kindergarten class that had two ELLs in it, but one was only ELL because his parents spoke Spanish, but he spoke perfect English. I don’t even think that he should have been an ELL. He spoke perfect English. Then I had a little girl who spoke Spanish and English as second language, but even still her English was at the higher end. I never really experienced that true ELL interaction.

This quotation showed that Susan believed that ELLs were students who could not speak English.

Beliefs about ELL instruction. Susan made belief statements to discuss how she planned for and/or taught ELLs. Susan explained, “Right now visuals work best. I have not had to use other accommodations because they all speak English.” Susan then explained how she
gathered data on the three ELLs in her class for instruction: “I use group discussion to learn about their [ELLs] language needs. Yesterday one ELL said that his faced burned when meant to say that he blushed; ELLs need more help with vocabulary.” Susan used classroom observations to gather information about ELLs’ language needs. In the next section I discuss the three ESOL lessons Susan taught to the ELLs in her second-grade class.

**Classroom Actions**

Table 10 lists Susan’s beliefs about ELLs, her instruction of ELLs, her use of video-elicited reflection, and her ideas for future ELL instruction. Then, I will discuss each lesson in detail and highlight instances of Susan’s instructional story as presented in the table.

Table 10

*Susan’s Classroom Actions and use of Video-Elicited Reflection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Beliefs about ELLs</th>
<th>Instruction to ELLs</th>
<th>Video-Elicited Reflection</th>
<th>Participants’ Ideas for Future ELL Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) “The ELLs scored low on vocabulary.”&lt;br&gt;(2) “I’m not sure, what their proficiency levels are. I just know that they all can speak English well.”</td>
<td>Small group instruction with ELLs using vocabulary dominoes to teach ELLs new vocabulary words.</td>
<td>(1) “I noticed I used more praise with the ELLs who were at lower proficiency levels and more checking for understanding questions with the ELLs who is an LYC.”&lt;br&gt;(2) “Stephen was really shy.”&lt;br&gt;(1) “I thought you were going to let them share their vocabulary connections with each other.”&lt;br&gt;(2) “I wonder if Stephen’s proficiency was high enough to perform the task you wanted him to complete? Maybe thinking about tasks that align to his language proficiency level?”</td>
<td>“I’m planning on using more peer discussion in my next lesson so ELLs can practice language together.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Beliefs about ELLs</td>
<td>Instruction to ELLs</td>
<td>Video-Elicited Reflection</td>
<td>Participants’ Ideas for Future ELL Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1) ELLs have trouble understanding instructions.” (2) “The language in our textbook does not consider ELLs’ language needs.”</td>
<td>(1) Students wore paper watches that had a time on them and read each other’s time. (2) Small group instruction with ELLs using visuals for quarter till, quarter pass and half past to accommodate the textbook worksheet.</td>
<td>(1) “I noticed when I would use visuals and modeling there was a nice gap where I didn’t have to repeat myself or check for understanding.” (1) “I can see that ELLs’ papers have some blanks. Why is that?”</td>
<td>(1) “Next time I teach this lesson I am going to put the numbers one through twelve on the side of their paper with the increments of five going down so they can refer to it to tell time.” (2) “I want to use a lot more visuals and accommodations, not just for the book instruction, but for the lesson itself.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1) “Visuals support ELLs’ comprehension.” (2) “I don’t think ELLs will be able to explain what they see [when using the visuals] because of their limited vocabularies.”</td>
<td>(1) Students did movements to learn about muscle and bone functions. (2) Handout with a visual that showed muscle connected to bone.</td>
<td>(1) “I found that visuals, movement, and modeling were beneficial for the ELLs because they started using content language, flexed, bent and move. (2) “I noticed that I didn’t have to repeat myself when I used an accommodation.”</td>
<td>(1) Why do you think Diego was confused here? (2) “Did you make this handout?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Understanding WIDA English language proficiency levels.** Susan’s first lesson involved vocabulary. She taught this lesson on the carpet to the three ELLs during directed reading time. The objective of this lesson was for ELLs to learn new vocabulary words. Susan used small group instruction and visuals to accommodate instruction for the ELLs. The assessment used in the lesson required students to share their vocabulary connections orally. Susan shared her lesson plan in our prelesson interview, saying, “They [ELLs] scored low on vocabulary according to I-Stations⁷, so I’m going to do a vocabulary lesson with them”

---

⁷ *I-Stations* was a computer application the students in Susan’s class used once a week to complete reading and math drills. This program was purchased by the district and was used by the entire school.
Susan explained she was going to use vocabulary dominoes to teach the lesson. Each domino had a vocabulary word on it with a picture (see Figure 9). Susan showed how the ELLs would use the dominoes: “Here’s ‘bathing suit.’ You might connect that to fall and say, ‘fall and bathing suit because in Florida I can still go to the beach in the fall’” (Prelesson interview 1).

Susan wanted the ELLs to use a sentence to explain why they connected two vocabulary dominoes. I noticed that Susan was focusing on ELLs’ oral fluency and wondered if Susan knew the ELLs’ English language proficiency levels. I asked,

*Researcher*: Do you know [what] their [ELLs] English language proficiency levels are?

*Susan*: No, I’m not sure what their proficiency levels are. I just know that they all can speak English well. (Prelesson Interview 1)

Susan did not know ELLs’ English language proficiency levels. I pulled out a copy of WIDA’s Performance Definitions for Speaking (WIDAa, 2015) and Writing and Listening and Speaking (WIDA, 2015b) and went over the English language proficiency levels with Susan:

*Researcher*: If you look at this rubric, under *emerging* it says that an ELL who in the emerging level of English proficiency can speak using phrases or short sentences. As the
student develops proficiency, they can start to complete more complex tasks. In this school district, they would use the term *LYB* for a student who is at an emerging level. *LYC* would be an ELL who would be at the *reaching* proficiency level, and *LYA* would be a low level like *entering*.

*Susan*: Can I keep this?

*Researcher*: Yes.

This excerpt illustrated how I supported Susan’s instruction of ELLs with my content area knowledge. I provided Susan with resources that she could use to generate ideas for her instruction to ELLs.

I reflected on the prelesson interview I had with Susan writing, “I gave Susan a copy of the *WIDA Listening and Speaking Language Proficiency Levels* to Susan and let her know that this could help her with her instruction and plans for assessment” (Researcher’s journal).

Susan facilitated a postlesson interview with me using her V-Note (2014) timeline, saying, “I found out that one student is an *LYC*, but the other two are *LYB*” (Postlesson interview 1). This quotation showed that our conversation led Susan to find out more about the ELLs’ English language proficiency levels. Susan played her video. As I watched, I noticed that Susan was calling on ELLs individually to share their vocabulary connections with her. I paused the video and asked,

*Researcher*: For some reason, I thought you were going to let them [ELLs] share their vocabulary connections with each other.

*Susan*: I didn’t, but now I’m thinking I should have because he [Stephen] *was really shy*. *I don’t think he wanted to speak to me* [sic; emphasis added], or he just didn’t care about the lesson.
Researcher: He’s LYB. so, he’s at a middle level of English language proficiency?

Susan: Yeah, he’s LYB, so at an emerging level I would say.

Researcher: I wonder if his proficiency was high enough to perform the task you wanted him to complete? Maybe thinking about tasks that align to his language proficiency level?

Susan: Yeah, now I’m thinking about that, too.

Our conversation led Susan to consider the ELLs’ language needs and to examine if her instructional task aligned to ELLs’ proficiency levels.

Susan then discussed the patterns she saw in her V-Note timeline, saying, “I noticed I used more praise with the ELLs who were at lower proficiency levels and more checking for understanding questions with the ELLs who is an LYC [sic; emphasis added]” (Postlesson interview 1). V-Note supported Susan in recognizing that her instruction of ELLs differed. This analysis led Susan to consider using peer discussion in her next lesson. Susan reflected on her lesson, writing, “I need to make sure I am introducing new vocabulary words to them [ELLs] with support. I’m planning on using more peer discussion in my next lesson so they can practice language together [sic; emphasis added]” (Written reflection 1).

Examining the language of instruction. Susan’s second lesson involved math instruction. The objective of this lesson was for students to tell time. Susan taught this lesson using whole group instruction and peer discussion, then small group instruction with just the ELLs. Susan first taught the students how to tell time then let them break into groups. She gave each student a wearable paper watch that had a time on it and used enlarged visuals to accommodate instruction for ELLs. Susan discussed her plans for the lesson in our prelesson interview:
I want to make sure they [ELLS] understand the lesson. *I’ve noticed they’re [ELLS] having trouble understanding instructions* [sic; emphasis added]. Yesterday we were doing a math word problem on the board that said, “Eric takes nine pictures. Sarah takes two. How many do they have altogether? An ELL thought that the word *take* meant to *take away.* *I noticed that the language in our textbooks does not consider ELLs’ language needs* [sic; emphasis added]. (Prelesson interview 2)

This excerpt showed that Susan was starting to think about language more critically about the language used for instruction.

Then Susan went over the steps she was going to take to teach her lesson: “They [students] are going to wear paper watches that have a premade time on it. Then they are going to read the time on the other person’s watch and write it down next to the person’s name on a handout” (Prelesson interview 2; see Figure 10). Susan was going to use peer discussion in this lesson as a way for students to practice telling time. I wanted to know how what Susan would use for assessment:

*Researcher:* So is the assessment some type of observations?

*Susan:* The students are supposed to do a worksheet afterwards, but *I don’t think the ELLs will get the directions on it* [sic; emphasis added]. I’m going to work with the ELLs on the same thing that’s on the handout, but I’ll use visuals to teach them [ELLS]: quarter till, quarter past, and half past instead of the worksheet. (Prelesson interview 2)

Susan ended our prelesson interview, explaining that she wanted to record the students’ peer discussion and the small group instruction she had with ELLs using the visuals: “I want to see if the visual and peer discussion help the ELLs understand directions” (Prelesson interview 2).
Susan facilitated our postlesson interview with her V-note timeline. She opened her laptop and showed me her timeline, saying, “I noticed when I would use visuals and modeling there was a nice gap where I didn’t have to repeat myself or check for understanding” (Postlesson interview 2). V-Note helped Susan see that visuals worked to improve ELLs’ comprehension. I watched Susan’s video recording of the ELLs in her class working together using the visual she created. Then I paused the recording to ask Susan questions:

**Researcher:** I can see ELLs’ papers from the group discussion have some blanks. Why is that?

**Susan:** Some of the students had a tough time understanding that the numbers on the clock represented increments of five. *I think next time I teach this lesson I am going to put the numbers one through twelve on the side of their paper with the increments of five [sic; emphasis added] going down so they can refer to it to tell time.*

The questions I used to unpack the incident led Susan to decide that she needed to assist students better with understanding multiples of five.

I realized that Susan’s analysis of the lesson described a content knowledge issue and not a language issue, so I wanted to know Susan’s feelings about her instruction of ELLs:
Researcher: So now that you have seen that the visuals helped ELLs’ comprehension, what are your next steps?

Susan: I want use a lot more visuals and accommodations [sic; emphasis added], not just for the book instruction but for the lesson itself” (Postlesson interview 2).

This instance illustrated that our conversation led Susan to begin to think about how she could use accommodations to support ELLs in other ways. Susan reflected on this, saying, “I want to provide accommodations for ELLs without doing it to blatantly” (Written reflection). This instance showed that Susan established a professional vision; she had a vision that her future ELL instruction would include language accommodations as a standard part of her teaching repertoire.

**Visuals and movement.** For her third lesson, Susan taught a science lesson about the human body focused on bones and muscles. Susan explained that she wanted to use visuals in this lesson: “In the last lesson, I saw how much visuals helped the ELLs with comprehending time. Now I want to try to incorporate visuals in science” (Prelesson interview 3). In this quotation Susan revealed that improvements she made in her second lesson were informing her instruction in other content areas.

Susan found a visual on Pinterest™ that she wanted to use for the lesson and showed it to me, explaining, “You attach the bones to a string so it bends like your finger does. But, *I don’t think ELLs will be able to explain what they see [when using the visual] because of their limited vocabularies* [sic; emphasis added]” (Prelesson interview 3). Hearing this statement, I asked Susan:

Researcher: So, what are you going do to help them explain?
Susan: I tell them to explain it the best they can [sic; emphasis added], and I’ll say can you explain it another way? Then I’ll go do you mean this word? So, I’ll give them synonyms. (Prelesson interview 3)

Susan did not think about the vocabulary supports she could provide ELLs for speaking. I asked Susan if she had thought about using any other accommodations other than the visuals:

Researcher: In your last lesson, you learned that visuals aided ELLs’ comprehension. I’m wondering if you have thought about ways to support their oral vocabulary?

Susan: We do a lot of group conversation….

Researcher: That can help vocabulary. But I’m wondering when you think of this lesson, how will you can support their vocabulary for discussing what see.

Susan: I guess I need to think about it more. I need some time.

In this instance, I prompted Susan to consider how her accommodations aligned to the lesson activity. The questions I used created dialectic tension when Susan realized that the visuals did support ELLs’ oral fluency. After realizing this Susan stated, “I need to think about it more.”

I reflected on our prelesson conversation in writing: “Susan wants to use visuals in her math lesson, but her assessment is a fluency activity. I probed her to consider accommodations to support ELLs’ vocabulary needs” (Researcher’s journal).

Susan and I met for our postlesson interview. Susan explained the lens she used for her V-Note analysis: “I wanted to make sure that they [ELLs] were able to communicate their thoughts with one another and how I can I use modeling to enhance their vocabulary. I had them [students] do movements to learn about muscle and bone functions” (Postlesson interview 3).

Susan explained that she also used visuals in her lesson: “I gave students a handout with a visual. It [handout] showed the muscle and how it connects to the bone. The muscle was bent, but the
bone was straight and it said, ‘the muscle is elastic like the rubber band’” (Postlesson interview 3).

Susan played an episode of her instruction where she flexed her arm then asked students to wiggle their finger around. Susan paused the video then said,

I used visuals and modeling so I analyzed those instances. *I found that visuals, movement, and modeling were beneficial for the ELLs because they started using the content language* [sic; emphasis added]: flexed, bent, and move. I also noticed that I didn’t have to repeat myself when I used an accommodation. (Postlesson interview 3)

Susan then played a segment where she asked group discussion questions. In one instance Diego [an ELL] said, “Muscles break.” Susan immediately corrected Diego and said, “Muscles are flexible and bend.” I paused Susan’s video so we could unpack the instance together:

*Researcher:* Let’s look at the handout you used in this lesson. Why do you think Diego was confused here?

*Susan:* I think it was because of the analogy used on the handout. I think this analogy was confusing for him because a rubber band can break.

*Researcher:* Did you make this handout?

*Susan:* No, it came with the curriculum.

*Researcher:* So, you didn’t think that the phrase *muscles are elastic like a rubber band* would confuse the ELLs?

*Susan:* No, I completely missed that.

In her second lesson, Susan noticed that textbook language did not consider ELLs’ language needs; however, Susan did not consider the textbook language in the third lesson. Susan used a
handout and did not review the language used on the handout until I reflected on the incident in her video with her.

The handout Susan used in this lesson was an example of what Beacher et al. (2013) refer to as an *incidental accommodation*. Susan used a premade handout and did not think about the language instruction ELLs needed to understand the terms on the handout. I reflected on this: “Susan sees that she needs to better support ELLs’ language needs when she uses the textbook, but needs explicit modeling on how this is done” (Researcher’s journal).

Susan reflected on the lesson and our conversation writing, “I didn’t think the about the figurative langue used on the handout, until after our discussion [sic; emphasis added]. Next time I’m going to review photocopied handouts more carefully, and go over important terms with them [ELLs]” (Written reflection 3). This quotation illustrated that instructional coaching facilitated Susan’s ability to discuss critical incidents of her instruction that led Susan to develop an understanding of ELLs’ language needs.

**Findings Across Susan’s Case**

I used the table I created to analyze Susan’s beliefs about ELLs, instruction of ELLs, use of video-elicited reflection, and future ideas for ELL instruction across all lessons. Three findings emerged: (a) Video-elicited reflection challenged Susan’s beliefs about ELLs; (b) Susan needed more explicit modeling to demonstrate how teachers can intentionally support ELLs’ language needs with accommodated instruction; and, (c) instructional coaching supported Susan’s understanding of ELLs’ English language proficiency levels and how these levels could be used to inform instruction.
Video-Elicited Reflection Challenged Susan’s Misconceptions About ELLs’ Language Needs

In Susan’s initial interview, she stated that the ELLs she taught were not really ELLs because they all spoke English well. Susan believed that a true ELL was a student who spoke no English at all. She did not think that ELLs who spoke English needed additional language supports. Research states that this belief is a common misconception among teachers. For example, Harper and de Jong (2008) found that most teachers believe that good teaching for native English speakers equals good teaching for ELLs. Susan’s misconceptions about ELLs’ language needs were challenged when she used video-elicited reflection to analyze and discuss her instruction of ELLs with me. The V-Note (2014) timeline showed Susan a pattern: When she used language accommodations, ELLs comprehended her instruction.

The realizations Susan had about ELLs’ language needs allowed her to be more critical of the language of instruction. When Susan stated that an ELL in her class was shyer than the other ELLs, our discussions led Susan to consider using peer discussion to support his speaking proficiency. In her second lesson, Susan realized the math textbook used language that confused the ELLs. This realization led Susan to create her own visuals to accommodate ELLs’ understanding of the content specific terms quarter past, half past, and quarter till. Susan reflected on how her initial beliefs about ELLs’ language needs were challenged in the exit interview:

I noticed now that they [ELLs] aren’t the same and they do need extra support. You may not always see that they [ELLs] need it but they definitely do. On tests, they all will miss certain questions, and I can understand why they do now. It’s the language. I now realize things about language that I never thought about or noticed before. (Exit interview)
Susan’s case showed that her beliefs about ELLs language needs were challenged. Susan initially believed that ELLs who spoke English did not need support; however, her beliefs were challenged when she realized ELLs need accommodations for comprehension and vocabulary support.

**Video-Elicited Reflection Showed That Susan Needed a Better Understanding of Intentional Language Instruction**

In each lesson, Susan used visuals to support ELL language needs. For example, Susan used visuals on dominoes to teach ELLs new vocabulary words during English Language Arts. She then used visuals in math to teach students how to tell time and then used visuals for science instruction to teach students about muscles and bones.

The vocabulary dominoes Susan used in lesson one was an incidental accommodation. In lesson one Susan used vocabulary dominoes to teach ELLs vocabulary after she noticed they had scored poorly on a vocabulary computer activity. However, Susan instructed all ELLs the same way and did not know ELLs’ language proficiency level when she planned this lesson. In our exit interview, Susan said, “I used the dominoes because I thought the ELLs would enjoy them.”

Susan did not review the vocabulary words on the cards prior to her instruction: “On another day I used the cards again and Stephen was confused about the word cleat, because it showed a picture of a shoe. I had to explain that they were sports shoes” (Exit interview). This quotation showed that Susan did not consider the instruction ELLs needed to comprehend the vocabulary words listed on the cards.

Susan used intentional accommodations in her second lesson. She used paper watches and peer discussion to support ELLs’ oral language fluency and knowledge of time. Susan also
created a visual to accommodate assessment for ELSL. She used small group instruction and visuals showing half past, quarter past, and quarter till to teach ELLs the same content that was on the workbook pages. Susan used intentional visuals that depicted time because she realized ELLs would be confused by the language used in the textbook.

In her third lesson, Susan used a combination of incidental and intentional accommodations. Susan photocopied a premade handout and did not consider the instruction she needed to provide ELLs so they would understand the figurative language used to describe a muscle. This handout was an incidental accommodation. However, Susan used movement and modeling in this lesson with the intention of teaching ELLs the differences between bone and muscle functions. Susan reflected on her use of language accommodations for instructing ELLs:

I still feel like I have a ton of room where I can grow as an ELL teacher. I am now better able to provide the language support that they need because I have a better understanding of what they need as learners, but I need more practice. (Exit interview)

Susan had gained a better understanding about ELLs’ language proficiency levels but shows that teachers need more clinical experiences working with ELLs with the support of an ELL instructional coach in order to learn how to plan and use intentional language accommodations.

**Instructional Coaching Mediated Susan’s Understanding of ELLs’ English Language Proficiency Levels.**

Susan began this research saying that she did not believe that she was an ESOL teacher. However, this research challenged her beliefs. For example, Susan stated,

I am beginning to look deeper at the curriculum and notice the lack of language support offered by the textbooks we use in class. Having a conversation with someone who
specializes in ELLs helped me make sense of my thoughts about language. *Our talks gave me the specific ideas I needed help me to grow in the areas I needed improvement* in to strengthen my ELL instruction. I definitely feel better about my ability to instruct ELLs now. (Written reflection 3)

This quotation implied that Susan found my instructional expertise beneficial to her teaching needs and showed that instructional coaching dialog made feel more confident about her ELL instructional abilities. Susan’s feelings about the benefits instructional coaching discussions had on her ELL instruction agree with Manning and Payne’s research (1993) who found that social contexts were critical for teacher candidate appropriation.

Additionally, supervisor expertise during post observation conferences were the subject of Baecher et al.’s (2013b) research. Their study found that supervisors with expertise in ELL pedagogy supported teacher candidates in noticing critical instances of their recorded ELL instruction that were missed when teacher candidates viewed their recorded instruction alone. Supervisors were needed to unpack critical incidents of ELL instruction that were missed so teacher candidates could collaborative discuss ideas they had for improving their instruction to ELLs. Similarly, I supported Susan’s noticing of critical incidents in each lesson when I listened to her lesson plans and watched her recorded videos of ELL instruction, then asked her to pause and rewind instances of her ELL instruction that needed further unpacking. For example, in lesson one, I watched Susan’s video and led her to reexamine the beliefs she had about Stephen being shy and not wanting to speak to her. This conversation supported Susan in her reflection on ELLs’ language proficiency levels. I discussed these levels with Susan, and Susan noticed that her instruction of ELLs differed according to their proficiency. She found that she used more praise with ELLs who had lower language proficiency levels and used more clarifying questions
with ELLs who had higher language proficiency levels. This difference showed that Susan was using our discussions to make sense of ELLs’ language proficiency needs.

Susan explored language proficiency in her second lesson when she began to reflect on the language used in textbooks. This reflection led Susan to create visuals to accommodate assessment for ELLs. In her third lesson, Susan used movement to support ELLs’ knowledge of vocabulary. This change came after our postlesson discussion when she realized visuals would not be enough to support ELLs’ vocabulary needs for the lesson. Susan’s knowledge of ELLs’ proficiency levels was developing but still needed support. Susan reflected on her the areas of ELL instruction she felt that she needed to improve on in our exit interview: “I feel more confident now because I know how I can help them, but as far as differentiating my instruction to them based on their different proficiency levels, that is something I need to learn how to do” (Exit interview). Susan’s case showed that while she learned about ELLs language proficiency levels, her ability to differentiate instruction for ELLs based on these levels needed more support.

**Summary of Findings from Susan’s Case**

Susan’s case generated three research findings: (a) Video-elicited reflection challenged Susan’s misconceptions about ELLs’ language needs; (b) video-elicited reflection showed that Susan needed a better understanding of intentional language instruction; and, (c) instructional coaching mediated Susan’s understanding of ELLs’ English language proficiency levels.

Susan’s case findings showed that her misconceptions about ELLs’ language needs were challenged. Prior to using video-elicited reflection, Susan said she had “never worked with a true ELL before” and that the ELLs she taught “didn’t really need language support because they could speak English well.” Susan used video to examine her instruction of ELLS and noticed that
she differed her instruction according to ELLs’ language needs and that accommodations improved ELLs’ comprehension of her instruction.

As Susan shared her videos with me, we discussed English language proficiency levels, ideas she had for aligning instruction to ELLs’ language needs, and the use of intentional language accommodations. Susan began to examine language more critically and started to understand the difference between incidental versus intentional language instruction but never fully transitioned to the use of intentional language instruction. Susan’s case showed that teacher candidates need more explicit critical experiences and time working with ELLs and that ELL instructional coaching has the potential for improving teacher candidates’ understanding of language for instructing ELLs.

Erica’s Case

Erica was born in New Jersey to Cuban and Argentinean parents and grew up in a home where English and Spanish were spoken. Erica had one younger sister. She and her sister spoke English as a first language and had some proficiency in Spanish: “My parents only speak English to us, but they speak Spanish to each other and my grandmother. We lived with my grandmother when we were little” (Initial interview).

Erica and her family moved to Florida when she was in the third grade: “They sent me home with memos in Spanish. The school thought I only spoke Spanish because of my last name” (Initial interview). Erica’s parents did not attend college and always worked full-time jobs: “My parents taught me to work hard. I always had college on my mind. It was not an option” (Initial interview).
In high school Erica discovered that she wanted to be a teacher: “I had a debate teacher, and I loved the way she taught. I remember thinking I want to be a teacher like her. I also took four years of sign language, so I initially wanted to be a teacher for the deaf” (Initial interview). After graduating from high school, Erica attended a nearby community college where she earned an associate’s degree in education. Then Erica applied to begin the secondary education program at the university where this research occurred. She wanted to concentrate on special education and hoped to become a teacher for deaf high school students.

In her first semester of teacher preparation, Erica observed a fourth-grade class for a course assignment: “I loved fourth graders and decided to change to the elementary education program” (Initial interview). Erica began the elementary education teacher preparation program and was assigned to Mills Elementary School (pseudonym). Erica completed a total of four internship semesters at Mills. In her first and second semesters, she interned in fourth- and first-grade classes, and in her third and fourth semesters she interned in a second grade.

When this research occurred, Erica was in the final semester of internship at Mills elementary and was assigned to Ms. Andrews (pseudonym) second grade class. Ms. Andrews was an ESOL-endorsed teacher who had over ten years of teaching experience. Ms. Andrews did not speak another language and had son who attended Mills: “He’s in the third grade. He just got placed in the ESE program last month” (Initial interview). Ms. Andrews and Erica got along well, but Erica believed that her teaching style differed from Ms. Andrews’: “She [Ms. Andrews] uses whole-group instruction, and I prefer collaborative instruction” (Initial interview).
Mills elementary had 554 students and an 11% ELL population. Ms. Barbara was Mills’ ESOL resource teacher. Ms. Barbara oversaw all ELLs in Mills’ ESOL program and visited Ms. Andrews’ class for 30 minutes every day during reading time to support the two ELLs in the class: Oscar and Mya. Mya was an ELL, LYC. Mya spoke Portuguese as a first language and English as a second language. Oscar was an ELL, LYB. Oscar was learning to speak both Spanish and English at home (see Table 11).

Table 11

**ELLs in Erica’s Class**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Proficiency</th>
<th>L1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mya</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>LYC</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>LYB</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Erica’s Initial Beliefs About ELLs**

I conducted a 45-minute, open-ended initial interview with Erica. In this interview, I asked Erica to share stories about her experiences working with ELLs. Erica’s initial beliefs are presented in Table 12. This table lists the belief categories: beliefs about the self, beliefs about ELLs, beliefs about ELL instruction. Unlike Taylor and Susan who made general belief statements about ELLs, Erica made statements about Mya and Oscar specifically. Therefore, the beliefs about ELLs category in Erica’s table is divided into two columns: One column represents

---

8 Approximately 45% of students at Mills were White, 26% were Hispanic, 5% were Black, 6% were multiracial, and 4% were Asian.

9 LYC meant that Mya had a high English language proficiency level.

10 LYB meant that Oscar was at a middle level in English language proficiency.
Erica’s initial stated beliefs about Mya, and the other column represents Erica’s initial stated beliefs about Oscar.

Table 12

_Erica’s Initial Beliefs About ELLs_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Category</th>
<th>Belief Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about the Self</td>
<td>“I don’t have enough experience to teach a brand new, ‘I don’t speak any English,’ ELL student.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about ELLs (Mya and Oscar)</td>
<td>Mya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It’s just her attention and focusing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oscar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “I don’t really think he’s ELL. He might be ESE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “He struggles a lot in writing.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “We told his mother to only speak English at home.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs about ELL Instruction</td>
<td>• “Teachers need to make sure ELLs comprehend the lesson.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “The ELL resource teacher translates for them.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beliefs about the self.** The _beliefs about the self_ category included statements Erica made about instructing ELLs. These statements included beliefs she made using first person pronouns. Erica said, “I don’t have enough experience to teach a brand new, ‘I don’t speak any English’ ELL student. I feel I do not to know the strategies to use to help them [ELLs] learn English.” Erica did not feel confident about her ability to provide instruction to ELLs and worried that she did not have the knowledge she needed to teach ELLs who did not know English.

**Beliefs about ELLs.** The _beliefs about ELLs_ category included statements Erica made about Mya or Oscar. Erica first addressed Mya, saying, “I don’t think that [Mya] has any learning issues. It’s just her attention and focusing that keep her from passing out of the ELL
program.” Erica also mentioned the phrase *passing out* when she spoke about Oscar: “He can’t pass out of the test that they give to ELLs. That’s why he still has the ELL label. I don’t think he’s really ELL.” In this quote Erica was referring to the English language proficiency tests ELLs took each year. Then Erica said, “He [Oscar] struggles a lot in writing. We’re [Erica and Ms. Andrews] starting to think he might be ESE. In a parent–teacher conference, we told his mother to speak more English and less Spanish at home” (Initial interview). Erica believed learning another language at home would interfere with Oscar’s developments in English and believed his academic struggles were due to a special need.

**Beliefs about ELL instruction.** The *beliefs about ESOL instruction* category included statements that Erica made to discuss her planning and instruction of ELLs. Erica said, “Teachers needed to make sure ELLs comprehend the lesson. I think that visuals and guiding them [ELLs] with one-on-one instruction help.” This quote showed that Erica believed that accommodations could be used to support ELLs’ comprehension of instruction. Erica also discussed translations, saying, “The ELL resource teacher comes in during reading and translates for them [Mya and Oscar].” Erica believed that the ELL resource teacher was also responsible for providing ELLs with language support.

**Classroom Actions**

This section provides a discussion of Erica’s classroom actions. Table 12 summarizes the three lessons Erica taught and shares Erica’s beliefs about ELLs, instruction of ELLs, use of video-elicited reflection in the lesson (V-Note and discussed coaching topics), and the ideas she for future ELL instruction. Following the table is a discussion of each lesson in detail, highlighting instances of Erica’s lesson presented in the table.
Table 13

*Erica’s Classroom Actions and use of Video-Elicited Reflection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson</th>
<th>Beliefs about ELLs</th>
<th>Instruction to ELLs</th>
<th>Video-Elicited Reflection</th>
<th>Participants’ Ideas for Future ELL Instruction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1) “Oscar will struggle with writing. Mya will not struggle.”</td>
<td>(1) I will give Oscar sentence starters.</td>
<td>(1) Oscar did not comprehend the lesson and did not use the sentence starters.</td>
<td>(1) “I want to try to use sentence starters with Oscar again.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Mya performed better in this lesson</td>
<td>(2) “Was Oscar only working with students who have special needs?”</td>
<td>(2) “I want to consider the types of questions I am asking Oscar to see if they are at a language level he can comprehend.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>than Oscar did.</td>
<td>(3) “Is Mya in the same proficiency level as Oscar?”</td>
<td>(3) “I want to pace my lesson better.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1) Erica used sentence starters to support Oscar’s comprehension of main idea and author’s purpose</td>
<td>(1) I gave all students the option to either work independently or talk to their shoulder partner.</td>
<td>(1) Sentence starters helped Oscar comprehend the lesson and supported his peer discussion.</td>
<td>(1) “I want to see how I can use more peer instruction to improve ELLs’ participation in the lesson.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) “I gave Oscar sentence starters.”</td>
<td>(2) The native English speakers spoke more than the ELLs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1) “The teacher edition doesn’t support ELL language needs. That’s why I want to have students act out the vocabulary terms.” (2) “Oscar is ashy kid.”</td>
<td>(2) ELLs worked with a peer</td>
<td>(1) Oscar was not participating.</td>
<td>(1) “I want to use modeling to support ELLs comprehension of instruction.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2) ELLs were asked to act out the vocabulary terms.</td>
<td>(1) “Maybe you need to use larger student groupings?”</td>
<td>(2) “I need think about other ways I can design student groups.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group work.** Erica taught a science lesson about energy. The objective of this lesson was for students to read, research, and then write about a source of energy. Erica used peer discussion, visuals, and sentence starters to accommodate instruction for ELLs. She assessed this
lesson by having the students write about a source of energy, draw a picture of it, and present their work orally. Erica entered our prelesson interview and shared her lesson plan to discuss how she would teach her lesson:

*Erica:* I want the student to rotate between reading and computer centers. In the reading center, they will read about different energy sources. Then they will select one energy source and they will research it on the computer with their group. Then they will write about it and draw a picture.

*Researcher:* Will you be expecting Mya and Oscar to write complete sentences?

*Erica:* Yeah, he’ll [Oscar] struggle with writing. I can give him sentence starters, but I don’t think she’ll [Mya] struggle with writing.

*Researcher:* I think sentence starters are a great idea. (Prelesson interview 1)

In this instance, my coaching led Erica to consider using sentence starters to support Oscar’s writing so he would be able to complete the lesson assignment.

After sharing her idea about sentence starters with me, Erica explained, “I want to focus on how he [Oscar] uses the sentence starters in this lesson for comprehension because this will be the first time he is using them” (Prelesson interview 1). Erica was using video to examine how an accommodation supported Oscar’s comprehension of instruction.

Erica used her V-Note (2014) timeline to facilitate a postlesson interview with me. First, she showed me her V-Note timeline, saying, “I coded the questions I asked and the responses he [Oscar] gave me” (Postlesson interview 1). Then Erica played her video. As we watched the video, I saw that Erica was calling on students individually. Then she asked them to come up to the projector in order to show their work, read their sentences, and present their drawings to the class. Erica paused the video as soon as it was Oscar’s turn to present his work and said, “He’s a
quieter person, so he was hiding behind me instead of going up to the projector” (Postlesson interview 1). In the video Oscar stood up and then hid behind Erica. Erica turned around to face Oscar and told him that he could go sit down and wait until he was ready to share later. After seeing this interchange, I asked Erica,

Researcher: Do you think that he [Oscar] was shy about speaking English in front of his classmates [sic; emphasis added]?

Erica: No, because when we are in class and he’ll raise his hand and he’ll have no problem speaking out loud. *I think it’s because he did not comprehend the lesson. I don’t think the sentence starters I used worked as well as I would have hoped* [sic; emphasis added].

Researcher: Why?

Erica: He was too busy drawing. I think I gave him too much to do all at once, so he didn’t even use the sentence starters or complete his writing. (Postlesson interview 1)

Erica was reflecting on the pacing of her lesson. This analysis agreed with research that found that teacher candidates who used video to reflect on their instruction developed an enhanced understanding of the need to pace their lessons more carefully for optimal student learning (Harford, MacRuaiirc, & McCartan, 2010). Erica used her first V-Note analysis to discuss ideas she had for pacing her instruction to ELLs better; allowing Oscar to finish the task-at-hand before moving on to another task.

I watched Erica’s video again and noticed that Oscar was sitting at a table with two other students and that all students at the table had the same sentence starters on their desk. I paused the video and asked:
Researcher: I notice there are other students with sentence starters on their desk. Did you
give sentence starters to the entire class?

Erica: He [Oscar] was the only ELL student in that group, but I also have a student who
has cerebral palsy, so I gave him the sentence starter, too, and then I gave a student who
has short-term memory loss the sentence starters.

Researcher: Oscar was only working with two students who have special needs [sic;
emphasis added]?  

Erica: Yes. (Postlesson interview 1)

In the initial interview, Erica stated that she thought Oscar had a special need, and in this lesson
Erica grouped Oscar with two ESE students. In this instance Erica’s classroom actions aligned
with her initial beliefs about Oscar.

After I saw that Erica group Oscar with other ESE students, I made the following
suggestion,

Researcher: Maybe you should mix it up so he isn’t only working with students who
have special needs.

Erica: Yeah, he [Oscar] was super quiet in this group, but she [Mya] took the initiative in
her group.

Researcher: Is she [Mya] in the same proficiency level as him [Oscar]?

Erica: No, she’s [Mya] LYC and he’s [Oscar] LYB.

Researcher: But you expect them to perform the same way?

Erica: Yeah, you’re right, it’s like teaching two different students.

(Postlesson interview 1).
The questions I used in this excerpt prompted Erica to consider Oscar and Mya’s proficiency levels as being different. As Erica began to consider their difference, she realized Oscar and Mya were “two different students.” Erica reflected on this new idea:

I’m seeing that they [Oscar and Mya] are different even though they are both in the ELLs. I want to try to use sentence starters with him [Oscar] again and want to consider the types of questions I am asking him; if they are at a language level he can comprehend. I also want to pace my lesson better [sic; emphasis added] to keep him on track with what’s going on.” (Written reflection 1)

Erica was starting to think about ELLs as students who have unique language needs and was beginning to explore ideas for accommodating instruction for Oscar. In her first lesson, Erica recorded her instruction and noticed that Oscar did not comprehend the lesson or use sentence starters. This analysis led her to compare Oscar’s performance with Mya’s. As Erica discussed her analysis with me, I led her to consider Oscar’s language proficiency level as being different from Mya’s. Our collaborative discussion led Erica to realize that Oscar and Mya had unique language needs.

**Sentence starters and peer discussion.** Erica’s second lesson was about author’s purpose and main idea. In this lesson Erica read a nonfiction story about recycling with the class and wanted students to locate the author’s purpose and main idea of the text. Erica used sentence starters, peer discussion, and visuals to accommodate instruction for Oscar and Mya. She assessed this lesson by having the students write about and then discuss the author’s purpose and main idea of the text.

Erica began our prelesson interview, saying,
Today, I taught sequence of events. I gave him [Oscar] premade strips that listed the main events of the story. I gave them to him and he put them all in the correct order and he finished the assignment on time. I was proud of him!” (Prelesson interview 2)

Erica was practicing the use of sentence starters as an accommodation for Oscar. *Oscar’s success with sentence starters led Erica to develop a belief that sentence starters supported Oscar’s comprehension of instruction* [sic; emphasis added].

Next, Erica shared the steps she would take to teach her lesson with me: “First, I’m going to read the story. Then they [the students] will look at how the pictures relate to the text. Last, we’re looking for the author’s purpose for the main idea and how the pictures relating to the text” (Prelesson interview 2). Erica’s decision to scaffold the instruction in this lesson coincided with what she noticed in her first lesson when she noticed that she needed to improve the pacing of the lesson.

Upon hearing Erica’s step-by-step plan, I noticed that Erica did not mention that she would use sentence starters in this lesson, so I asked,

*Researcher*: How will you be teaching the ELLs about author’s purpose and main idea?

*Erica*: I don’t know yet.

*Researcher*: What about giving him [Oscar] a sentence starter, saying, “The author’s purpose of this passage is” and he just has to fill in the blank? You can give Mya one with more blanks, so, “The author’s purpose is…. I know this because…."

*Erica*: Oh, I like that idea. *I can give them [Mya and Oscar] sentence starters. Then I will also ask the class to discuss the author’s purpose with their shoulder partner* [sic; emphasis added].
The question I asked Erica elicited our collaborative discussion about language accommodations and Erica began to explore using the sentence starters to facilitate peer discussion.

To follow, Erica shared the idea she had for recording and analyzing her lesson: “I want to record the whole lesson. Then I want to focus on the ELLs’ comprehension of author’s purpose and main idea” (Prelesson interview 2). After recording and analyzing her instruction, Erica brought her video V-Note (2014) timeline to our postlesson interview, saying, “I used ‘ELL student response’ and ‘other student response’ as my labels to analyze my instruction. Other student means that the student who responded was a native English speaker” (Postlesson interview 2). Erica played her video segment and gave me a description of the context: “I gave all students the option to either work independently or talk to their shoulder partner. In this segment Oscar has the sentence starters [sic; emphasis added]” (Postlesson interview 2).

As I watched the video, I noticed that Oscar had the sentence starters on his desk that Erica and I discussed in our prelesson interview (i.e., “The author’s purpose is”). Oscar had to select an answer from a list of words on the sentence strip (e.g., persuade, inform, entertain, or share) and write his answer on the blank line. In the segment Erica showed me, Oscar and a female native English speaker were discussing the author’s purpose. Oscar used the sentence starter to guide his discussion: “The author’s purpose is to inform.”

Erica paused the video and pointed to the female student with whom Oscar was working: “Here she was noticing that he [Oscar] had sentence starters, so she started copying his [Oscar] answer” (Postlesson interview 2). Erica noticed that the sentence starters helped Oscar understand the author’s purpose and supported the conversation he had with his peer.

Erica played her video and then shared her V-Note (2014) timeline with me: “If you look at patterns in the labels I used, you can see that the native English speakers spoke more than the
ELLs [sic; emphasis added], especially when I started asking comprehension questions to the entire class” (Postlesson interview 2). Erica played her video again to show me the instance to which she was referring.

As I watched Erica’s recorded video of her second ELL lesson, I noticed that Oscar and Mya were participating during the discussion but then disengaged from the lesson as soon as Erica began using whole group comprehension questions. I paused the video and asked,

*Researcher:* What about when you used peer discussion. Were they [Oscar and Mya] participating?

*Erica:* Yes, they were. Now, *I’m thinking I want to use turn and talks after every question I ask* [sic; emphasis added].

Our conversation supported Erica’s reflection on her lesson. Erica was beginning to see that ELLs needed opportunities to practice academic English socially. I reflected on the discussion I had with Erica, writing, “Erica’s is working to accommodate instruction for Oscar. She is starting to see that language affects ELLs’ comprehension and sees that social interaction helps ELLs understand language” (Researcher’s journal).

Erica also reflected on our conversation: “*I want to see how I can use more peer interaction to improve ELLs’ participation in the lesson* [sic; emphasis added]” (Written reflection 2). In this excerpt Erica was beginning to think about ways she could use social interaction to support ELLs’ language needs.

In her second lesson, Erica used sentence starters to support Oscar’s and Mya’s comprehension of the main idea and author’s purpose. Erica recorded Oscar using the sentence starters and noticed they supported his comprehension and guided the conversation he had with his peer about the author’s purpose. When Erica played her whole group instruction, she noticed
that the native English speakers dominated the conversation. This analysis led us to discuss the differences between ELLs’ participation when peer discussion was used for instruction versus when whole discussion was used for instruction. Erica noticed ELLs were more engaged during peer discussion, and this realization led her to explore ideas for including more peer discussion opportunities in subsequent lessons for ELLs.

Movement and visuals. Erica’s third lesson concerning science was about severe weather conditions. In this lesson Erica wanted students to work in pairs to act out a severe weather condition (e.g., tornado) that was listed in their textbook. Erica used peer discussion, visuals, and acting out (i.e., movement) to accommodate ELLs’ comprehension of the lesson. She assessed this lesson by having each pair of students present a skit to the class on the properties of a severe weather condition or how to prepare for a type of a severe weather condition.

Erica brought her lesson plan and the teacher’s edition to our prelesson interview and explained how she would teach the lesson: “I’m going to give each pair of students a card. The card will list a severe weather condition or how to prepare for a severe weather condition. The students will read about the topic on their card and will act out in front of the class” (Prelesson interview 3).

Then Erica showed me the extra support excerpt of the differentiated instruction section of the teacher’s edition of the science text. This section suggested that students write down the words thunderstorm, blizzard, hurricane, and tornado on separate cards and then list words that describe the storms. For example, under thunderstorm students might write lightening and rain. Erica showed me the teacher’s edition and said, “It [teacher’s edition] doesn’t support ELLs’ language needs. Writing words down on a paper won’t help them [ELLs] understand what the
words mean. That’s why I want to have the students act out the vocabulary terms [sic; emphasis added]” (Prelesson interview 3). In this instance Erica was thinking of ways to modify the lesson to make instruction equitable for Oscar’s and Mya’s language needs.

I coreflected with Erica about her reasons for including movement in the lesson:

*Researcher:* It sounds like you’re using movement as a language accommodation.

*Erica:* Yes, in my last lesson they [Oscar and Mya] didn’t participate during whole group instruction. Acting will let them be more involved in the lesson. (Prelesson interview 3)

This instance showed that video-elicited reflection was creating a domino effect. Erica was using the analysis from her second lesson to support ideas for instruction in her third lesson.

Erica shared that she wanted to focus on ELLs’ participation in the lesson as her lens for analysis when viewing her video recording: “I’m going to position the camera close to the ELLs. That way, I can record them talking to their peers to see if they [Oscar and Mya] are comprehending the lesson” (Prelesson interview 3). I questioned Erica about the intent of her video recording:

*Researcher:* So, you are wanting to see if peer discussion and acting will support their [Oscar’s and Mya’s] comprehension of the lesson?

*Erica:* Yes.

In his instance Erica was shifting from a focus on a specific aspect of an accommodation (i.e., acting) to the broader implications of the accommodation (i.e., ELL engagement and comprehension).

Erica brought her video to our postlesson interview but did not have time to analyze her instruction: “I wanted to analyze my video together. I feel really good about this lesson. *They [students] were all engaged* [sic; emphasis added], but I didn’t have time to analyze my video. I
had a lot of work to do last night” (Postlesson interview 3). I sat with Erica to watch her analyze her video. I asked her what her focus of analysis was. Erica said, “I wanted to see how peer discussion and acting supported their [Oscar’s and Mya’s] comprehension of the lesson” (Postlesson interview 3).

Erica played her video as I watched. I noticed that Oscar was not participating in the lesson. I asked Erica to play her lesson a second time. This time we both wrote down words or phrases that came to mind as we watched her video. After our second view of the video, I said,

Researcher: Ok, share what you wrote down. Then I’ll share what I wrote down.

Erica: I wrote “shy” and “teacher assistance.”

Researcher: I have “not participating” and “participating.”

Erica: I think shy can go with not participating. So I’ll use participating, not participating, and teacher assistance as the labels to analyze the video since my focus was how acting improves ELL comprehension.

Researcher: That sounds good to me.

Erica played her video for a third time and used the labels to analyze her instruction. I sat at another side of the room so I wouldn’t influence her analysis. When Erica had finished her analysis, she called on me and then turned her laptop around so I could see the V-Note (2014) timeline with her labels. Erica explained,

Erica: Ok, so this is not how I thought the lesson went. He [Oscar] and his partner were not working together [sic; emphasis added].

Researcher: I noticed that as well. What patterns did you see?

Erica: I noticed that she [Mya] did well, but he [Oscar] didn’t [sic; emphasis added].
Researcher: Maybe one partner is not enough? Or maybe Oscar didn’t know what acting meant?

Erica: Oh wow, yeah. I didn’t explain what acting is. I thought he knew what I meant. I should have been a third member of his group. I also could have given him prompts to guide him in how to act it out, so that way he was not coming up with ideas on his own.

Researcher: Do you mean modeling?

Erica: Yes, showing him what acting means.

In this instance Erica was resolving a perceived dissonance between her recollections of the lesson and what she observed on video. Erica reflected on how this experienced dissonance led her to explore ideas for pedagogical improvement, writing,

My lesson didn’t go as well as I thought it did. In the video, I saw that Oscar was not participating [sic; emphasis added] because I had a lot of labels that showed not participating. I should have worked with him and modeled what I meant when I said, “act it out.” (Written reflection 3)

The dissonance Erica felt facilitated our conversation about Oscar’s comprehension of acting. This discussion led Erica to explore ideas about using modeling to accommodate instruction for ELLs.

In her third lesson, Erica supported ELLs’ comprehension of instruction with peer discussion and movement (i.e., acting). When reflecting on her lesson before watching the video, Erica believed that her lesson was a success because all students were engaged. After watching her video, Erica noticed that her recollection of the lesson was different from what the recording captured. This disequilibrium facilitated Erica’s feelings of dissonance. Through our conversation Erica realized that she did not provide Oscar with enough support to understand
what acting meant. Erica’s established a goal to improve Oscar’s comprehension of instruction and this led her to explore ideas about using modeling as a language accommodation.

Findings Across Erica’s Case

Erica’s case included the following findings: (a) Video-elicited reflection reconstructed Erica’s beliefs about collaborative learning; (b) video-elicited reflection created a space where Erica explored using accommodations to support ELL comprehension; and, (c) video-elicited reflection developed Erica’s beliefs about language.

Video-Elicited Reflection Reconstructed Erica’s Beliefs About Collaborative Learning

When Erica began this research, she stated that she preferred using collaborative learning while Ms. Andrews preferred whole group instruction. In Erica’s’ first lesson, she used a combination of collaborative and whole group instruction. Erica had students work in groups on the computer and at their seats to discuss sources of energy. Then Erica shifted to whole group instruction and asked students to come up individually to present their work. When analyzing her video, Erica noticed that Oscar did not use the sentence starters with which she provided him and did not discuss energy sources with his group members. This analysis led us to discuss student group selection. Erica and I discussed that Oscar was paired with two students who had special needs. In this lesson Erica’s beliefs about collaborative discussion began to include ideas about intentional student grouping.

In her second lesson, Erica paired Oscar with a native English speaker and gave Oscar sentence starters. When analyzing her video, Erica noticed that Oscar did not interact with the
two special needs students that were in his group, and realized that Oscar did not have time to use the sentence starters. Erica’s V-Note (2014) analysis led her to believe that Oscar had compression problems because he did not perform as well as Mya did, and made Erica feel that she needed to improve her pacing of the lesson so Oscar would have time to use sentence starters for the next lesson. *Through our conversation, Erica began to explore other ideas for student group pairings, and realized that Oscar’s lack of engagement may have been because he was paired with two special needs students* [sic; emphasis added].

During our instructional coaching conversation Erica and I also discussed Oscar’s and Mya’s English language proficiency levels. *Our discussion about language proficiency led Erica to realize that Oscar and Mya had unique learning needs that required different language accommodations* [sic; emphasis added]. In this lesson Erica’s beliefs about collaborative group learning began to include ideas about intentionally assigning students to groups based on their language needs.

In Erica’s third lesson, she paired Oscar with a native English speaker to act out a type of severe weather condition. Erica originally thought her lesson was a success because she remembered that all students were engaged. However, after viewing her lesson, Erica noticed that Oscar was not engaged and did not interact with his peer. Erica’s experienced dissonance led her and I to discuss how she taught Oscar about acting. Erica then realized Oscar did not know what acting was. *Our conversation also led Erica to explore ideas for guiding ELLs’ group discussion with modeling and teacher support* [sic; emphasis added]. In this lesson Erica’s beliefs about collaborative learning developed to include teacher support and modeling. As Erica used video-elicited reflection, her beliefs about collaborative learning were reconstructed to include accommodations that can be used to support ELLs’ collaborative
learning processes. Erica had a general belief about collaborative learning and noticed that this
general belief was not enough. Erica began to reconstruct her general beliefs about collaborative
learning to include ideas about using sentence starters, peer discussion, and movement as
strategies that could accommodate language instruction for ELLs.

**Video-Elicited Reflection Created a Space Where Erica Explored Using Language
Accommodations for ELL Instruction.**

Erica used video-elicited reflection to practice different accommodations with ELLs. In
her first lesson, Erica used sentence starters for the first time. After analyzing her instruction,
Erica noticed that Oscar did not use the sentence starters. Erica reasoned that Oscar neglected to
use the sentence starters because she did not pace her lesson properly. Erica decided she wanted
to continue to explore the use of sentence starters for supporting Oscar’s comprehension of
instruction and started to think about intention group pairings.
In her second lesson, Erica explored sentence starters and peer group discussion as ways to
accommodate instruction for ELLs. Erica paired Oscar with a native English speaker. She gave
Oscar sentence starters and noticed that these sentence starters supported Oscar’s comprehension
of the lesson and his peer discussion.

In her third lesson, Erica explored the use of movement. She planned for students to work
with a partner to act out a severe weather condition. Erica realized Oscar was not participating in
the lesson. This analysis led her to explore ideas about modeling instruction for ELLS before she
releases them to work interpedently with their peer.
In each lesson Erica used video-elicited reflection to explore ideas for using accommodations to
support ELLs’ comprehension. Erica used V-Note (2014) to examine how well or not an
accommodation worked in supporting ELLs. Erica’s analysis of her recorded instruction facilitated our discussion topics and ideas for other accommodations that Erica explored in subsequent lessons.

**Video-Elicited Reflection Developed Erica’s Beliefs About Language**

In Erica’s initial interview, she stated that she believed ELLs just could not pass the test and were not really ELLs because they could speak English. Erica believed that Oscar might be ESE (i.e., special needs) because he spoke English well but had issues with comprehension. As Erica examined her instruction, her beliefs about Oscar’s language needs changed from thinking Oscar had learning needs to realizing Oscar had language needs.

In her first lesson, Erica realized Oscar did not speak to his group members. She also realized he did not use sentence starters. Erica initially associated Oscar’s lack of participation with a learning disability because Mya performed better than Oscar. After our discussion Erica began to think that Oscar’s language needs were not with instruction because he did not have opportunities to use the sentence starters or speak to other students. In this lesson video-elicited reflection led Erica to develop beliefs about Oscar’s language needs as being unique from Mya’s.

In Erica’s second lesson, she used sentence starters and peer discussion to support Oscar’s language needs. When analyzing her instruction, Erica noticed that Oscar comprehended the lesson and spoke to his peer. Erica also noticed that ELLs disengaged when she used whole group instruction. Through our conversation Erica noticed ELLs were more engaged in peer discussion when compared to group instruction. In this lesson Erica developed beliefs about ELLs’ language needs to include opportunities for practicing the use of academic English socially.
In her third lesson, Erica used movement and peer discussion as ways to keep ELLs engaged in instruction. When analyzing her instruction, Erica realized Oscar did not participate in the lesson. This analysis facilitated our conversation about the directions Erica used in the lesson and led Erica to realize that Oscar did not understand the phrase *act it out*. Our conversation led Erica to develop pedagogical goals about intentional language accommodations; she realized she needed to include modeling and teacher support to show ELLs what to do when completing instructional activities.

As Erica used video-elicited reflection to analyze and discuss her instruction of ELLs, her understanding about language developed. Erica began this research with a lack of knowledge about ELLs’ language needs, expressing that as ELSL spoke English well they were not ELL. However, as Erica taught, recorded, analyzed, and discussed her instruction of ELLS, she noticed that ELSL had unique language needs, and that when accommodations were provided, ELLs could accomplish instructional tasks with accuracy. This realization led Erica to develop an understanding about ELLs’ language needs that included more than oral fluency. She started seeing that ELLs’ needed language support for comprehension, writing, and peer discussion. Erica reflected on this realization, saying, “I thought they [Mya and Oscar] weren’t really ELL because they speak English, but now I can see they both have different language needs that I need to support (Exit interview).

**Summary of Findings from Erica’s Case**

Erica’s case analysis resulted in three findings: (a) Video-elicited reflection reconstructed Erica’s beliefs about collaborative learning; (b) video-elicited reflection created a space where Erica explored using language accommodations for ELL instruction; and, (c) video-elicited
reflection developed Erica’s beliefs about language. Erica’s case highlighted the potential benefits of using video-elicited reflection with ELL teacher candidates to challenged misconceptions about ELLS, created a space to explore accommodated instruction, and reconstructed beliefs about language. Erica’s case showed that her misconceptions about Oscar being ESE were challenged when she used video-elicited reflection and noticed Oscar had unique language needs.

Video-elicited reflection also created a space for Erica to explore using different accommodations to support ELLs’ comprehension needs. When Erica began this research, she stated she had never used sentence starters before. Her instruction of ELLs developed to include pedagogical goals about using sentence starters, peer discussion, movement, and modeling for future ELL instruction. Erica’s case showed that video-elicited reflection supported and motivated her future-oriented reflection and development of a professional vision (i.e., how I envision my ELL instruction will look like in the future).

Additionally, Erica began to understand language. At the onset of this research, Erica stated that ELLs spoke English well. She did not use accommodated instruction and believed Oscar’s struggles were due to a special need. However, as Erica participated in this research, her beliefs about language developed to include knowledge of ELLs’ language proficiency levels for planning intentional language supports.

The next chapter of this dissertation presents the cross-case findings. The cross case findings presented in this Chapter Five were prominent across all cases and addressed both research questions.
CHAPTER FIVE:
CROSS-CASE FINDINGS

The purpose of this research was to examine how video-elicited reflection, a video annotation tool and content instructional coaching, mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about and instruction of ELLs. This research was informed by sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2015; Vygotsky, 1978) and was guided by the following research questions:

1. How does video-elicited reflection shape final semester, undergraduate, teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and their instruction for ELLs?
2. How does video-elicited reflection affirm, challenge, or reconstruct teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs?

This chapter provides a discussion of the cross-case findings. The findings presented in this chapter were prominent across all cases and addressed both research questions. These findings include the following: (a) Video-elicited reflection challenged teacher candidates’ misconceptions about ELLs; (b) teacher candidates developed an understanding of language through appropriation; and, (c) video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ ELL pedagogical developments.

Video-Elicited Reflection Challenged Teacher Candidates’ Misconceptions About ELLs

In all three cases, participants expressed that they held misconceptions about ELLs and explained that these misconceptions were challenged when they used video-elicited reflection.
Table 14 lists each case, the misconceptions they had about ELLs, and the new belief that emerged when participants used video-elicited reflection.

**Table 14**

*Participants’ Misconceptions About ELLs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Challenged Misconception</th>
<th>New Belief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>• “ELLs work too slow and don’t want to do their work.”</td>
<td>• “ELLs have language needs that require support”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Lucila and Jennifer are both LYB and will need the same language support”.</td>
<td>• “ELLs who are categorized as being the same are not the same.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>• “If an ELL can speak English they are not really an ELL”</td>
<td>• “ELLs include students who can speak English.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica</td>
<td>• “They aren’t true ELLs because they speak English.”</td>
<td>• “Just because they speak English it doesn’t mean that they don’t need language support.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• “Mya performed better than Oscar.”</td>
<td>• Mya and Oscar have unique language needs.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taylor initially believed that ELLs struggled with motivation. She stated, “The ELLs work too slow [sic] or don’t want to do their work. I don’t know if it’s a language issue or a learning issue” (Initial interview). As Taylor used video-elicited reflection, her beliefs about ELLs were challenged. Taylor realized that ELLs worked slowly because they needed language support. Taylor used one-on-one instruction, rubrics, and peer writing conferences to support ELLs’ language needs and noticed that these accommodations supported ELLs because they completed their assignments accurately and on time. Taylor noticed that the rubric guided Lucila’s writing conference conversation and supported her while evaluating her writing sample. When Taylor analyzed Lucila and Jennifer’s peer writing conference in lesson three, she noticed that Lucila and Jennifer had unique language needs even though they were both classified as
being in the same English language proficiency level (LYB). Taylor’s misconceptions about ELLs were challenged. She began to understand that ELLs had language needs and noticed that ELLs have different language needs even if they are at the same English language proficiency level.

Susan’s misconceptions about ELLs were also challenged. Susan believed ELLs were students who did not speak any English, stating she had not had any experiences working with “true ELLs” (Initial interview). When using video-elicited reflection, Susan began noticing ELLs’ language needs. She realized ELLs needed comprehension support, saying, “A student thought the phrase take a picture meant subtraction because he thought of the literal meaning of the word take. I realized I needed to support language more” (Postlesson interview 1). This realization led us to discuss that proficiency is measured by assessing speaking, reading, and writing fluency. Susan also developed knowledge of ELLs’ English language proficiency levels. This new undertaking challenged Susan’s misconceptions about ELLs. Susan said, “When I started this study, I thought a student was not ELL if they could speak English. Now I see there is much more to language proficiency than speaking and that they [ELLs] do need support” (Exit interview).

Erica’s misconceptions about ELLs were challenged when she used video-elicited reflection. Erica also began this study with the misconception that ELLs who spoke English did not need language support. Erica also compared ELLs: “Mya performed better than Oscar” (Postlesson interview 1). Through our conversation Erica and I discussed ELLs’ language proficiency levels. Erica realized Oscar and Mya had unique learning needs because Oscar and Mya were at distinct levels of English language proficiency. Erica’s misconceptions about ELLs
were challenged. She realized ELLs have unique language needs and need language support even if they can speak English well.

**Teacher Candidates Developed an Understanding of Language Through Appropriation.**

As teacher candidates used video-elicited reflection to analyze and discuss their ELL instruction, they developed beliefs about language instruction through appropriation. Wertsch (1998) described appropriation as the passing of control from the social to the individual level, stating, “Many forms of mediated activity are carried out externally rather than internally” (p. 51). Figure 13 illustrates how the participants in this research developed an understanding of language through appropriation.

![Diagram of mediated environments and appropriation](image)

*Figure 13. Mediated environments and appropriation.*

As mentioned in Chapter Two of this dissertation, Wertsch (1998) defined appropriation as “taking something that belongs to others and making it your own. (p. 53). Therefore, appropriation is the passing of control from the social setting to the individual. The participants in this research developed an understanding about language through social conversations;
dialogue with an ELL instructional coach. This collaborative appropriation is referred to as *participatory appropriation* by Rogoff (2008), because it involves a learner’s participation in a cultural group where they are being guided by a mentor (instructional coach). In this research, the participants’ instructional goals were processed at the individual level then enacted in classroom instruction. Therefore, participants were taking ideas we discussed in our social conversations, making them their own, then redistributing these ideas to engage in subsequent social action.

An example of participatory appropriation was seen in Erica’s second lesson when I suggested that she should use the sentence starter, “The author’s purpose is _____.“ Erica took this idea as her own and enacted it, adding on to my idea by using a list of words for Oscar to circle and then write in the blank (e.g., persuade, inform, entertain, share). Erica’s case showed that she used an idea that was given to her by an instructional coach then customized according to the needs of her student learners and classroom environment.

Additionally, Taylor had ideas about using a script to support ELLs’ language needs. As we collaboratively discussed her ideas, I asked Taylor if she meant a rubric instead of a script. The idea to use a rubric with ELLs for subsequent writing conferences was initiated by Taylor’s idea for using a script. Therefore, appropriation involved a taking and giving between instructional coach and teacher candidate and agreed with Rogoff’s (2008) discussion of participatory appropriation instead of Wertsch’s discussion of appropriation as a process that involves a novice taking knowledge from an expert (1998). Taylor took an idea from the participatory level to the internal level, then enacted classroom instruction using an idea for a rubric that was collaboratively discussed.
To add, I discussed ELLs’ English language proficiency levels with Susan, expressing that ELLs had different learning needs. Susan applied our discussed understanding of language to her instruction. She used paper watches and social interaction to accommodate instruction for ELLs who had different language needs. Susan was taking an idea from the social level and passing the ideas to the internal level to perform a mediated action (i.e., classroom instruction). In Susan’s case I did not tell her what to do, but instead gave her resources that she could use to customize her ELL instruction accordingly.

The participants in this research all used social interactions to develop an underacting of language through appropriation. Ideas about ELLs’ language needs were discussed socially, were passed to the individual level, then were enacted in ELL instruction.

**Video-Elicited Reflection Mediated Teacher Candidates’ ELL Pedagogical Developments.**

Taylor, Susan, and Erica developed in their ability to instruct to ELLs as they transitioned from one lesson to the next. ELL Pedagogical development was initiated when participants compared their V-Note (2014) timelines to a previous lesson to notice improvements or changes in their initial V-Note timeline patterns. For example, when Taylor analyzed her first and second lessons, she used the same labels and noticed that her second lesson was an improvement from her first because she had fewer instances where she had to repeat her directions. V-Note showed Taylor that her instruction to Lucila improved because Lucila spoke more in the second lesson. The participants used the recorded ELL instructions as connected lessons to document their ELL pedagogical development. It is important to note, that participants were not told that they needed to compare their lessons and did this on their own. This observation showed that video-elicited reflection facilitated ELL teacher candidates’ professional development. McCullagh (2012)
described how video facilitates teachers’ pedagogical development, stating, “Video empowers teachers to take greater control of their progress and offers learner centered professional development…. Video technology provides the learner with the motivation and the means to direct and monitor their own progress” (p. 137–138). Taylor, Susan and Erica used video to provide a detailed account of what took place in their classrooms when they instructed ELLs, and enabled them to relive instructional episodes, and discuss their ideas for improvement with an instructional coach. The video-elicited reflection methodology used in this research highlighted the affordances video-elicited reflection has for teacher self-evaluation, reflection, collaborative discussion and pedagogical goal-setting. Taylor, Susan, and Erica used video-elicited reflection to learn how to instruct ELLs, and used video evidence to document the steps they took to achieve ELL instructional progress. In one instance Taylor discussed how she used V-Note (2014) to evidence her ELL instructional improvement, saying:

In my first lesson I had a lost of coded instances for ELL confused response. I can use lessons two and three to see the progress I’ve made in ELL instruction. I was able to minimize the number times I coded ELLs’ as being confused in lesson two and three. I can see that my instruction to ELLs is better than when I first started (Exit Interview). Taylor’s statement about her use of video to analyze her ELL instruction converges with McCullagh’s research (2012) that found that teachers used video to document their pedagogical improvements over time. Taylor used video to work towards a goal of having fewer instances of ELL confused responses, and used evidence to showcase this goal being met.
ELL Pedagogical Goal-Setting

The participants included in this research established pedagogical goals to show evidence of development in ELL instruction. For example, Taylor developed the one-on-one writing conferences she conducted with ELLs. Her goal-setting centered on finding strategies that would improve ELLs’ oral and writing fluencies. In her first lesson, Taylor conducted a writing conference with Lucila and noticed that she did not speak because Taylor dominated the conversation. This analysis led Taylor to think of instructional strategies she could use to promote Lucila’s oral fluency. Taylor and I discussed a rubric, and Taylor explained that her instructional goal was to have Lucila speak more in her second lesson and have less confused responses. Taylor used video to observe her goal in action and counted the number of occurrences Lucila spoke in relation to the number of occurrences she spoke. This observation let Taylor see that she had met her pedagogical goal. In Taylor’s third lesson, she established another goal to have students use a more detailed rubric to discuss their writing together. As Taylor used video to analyze this pedagogical goal in action, she noticed that Lucila and Jennifer had different language learning needs, and this analysis led Taylor to reflect on future goals for differentiating instruction of ELLs.

Susan established an instructional goal to document her ELL professional development. In Susan’s first lesson, she realized ELLs need more social interactions and comprehension support. She developed a lesson where students wore watches and spoke to their peers to learn about time. In this lesson Susan also used small group instruction and visuals to aid ELLs’ comprehension of academic language: half past, quarter till, and quarter past. Thus, Susan’s first lesson led her to develop a goal to support ELLs’ comprehension of academic vocabulary with visuals and peer discussion. When analyzing this lesson, Susan noticed that visuals supported
ELLs with comprehension. This observation led Susan to establish a goal for using visuals in other content area instruction. In her third lesson, Susan used visuals and movement to teach students about muscles and bones. In this lesson Susan realized the handout she used contained figurative language that confused ELLs. This observation led Susan to establish a goal for critically examining the language used for instruction to ELLs.

Similarly, Erica established goals with each lesson she taught. In her first lesson, Erica realized Oscar needed more language support for comprehension. She established a goal in her second lesson to use better pacing in her instruction so Oscar would have more time to use sentence starters. Erica recorded Oscar’s interactions with his peer and noticed the sentence starters supported Oscar’s compression and facilitated the conversation he had with his peer. This analysis led Erica to realize peer interactions kept ELLs engaged. Erica sought to create more opportunities for ELLs to interact with their peers. In her third lesson, Erica designed a learning activity that was centered on peer interaction (i.e., acting). Analysis of this lesson led Erica to establish a goal for critically examining the language she used in the directions she gave ELLs. Erica was arrived at future-oriented goals about intentional language accommodation though our conversations. For example, Erica realized Oscar did not understand what acting meant and thought that she needed to provide explicit modeling of directions for ELLs in her next lesson.

Taylor’s, Susan’s, and Erica’s cases showed that teacher candidates can use video-elicited reflection to establish personal pedagogical goals. Ell teacher preparation programs currently use course objectives to outline specific pedagogical tasks teacher candidates need to master to pass a given course. The video-elicited reflection methodology presented in this research showed that teacher candidates used V-Note and instructional coaching to establish
unique goals that pertained to their own teaching contexts. Therefore, each participant established goals that were needed to achieve a professional vision of what effective ELL instruction looked like. Taylor worked to create student-led writing conferences with ELLs, Susan aimed to improve student comprehension of directions, and Erica sought to improve Oscar’s class participation.

**Professional Vision of Future ELL Instruction**

A professional vision is characterized as the specialized way members of a professional group look at a phenomenon of interest to them (Goodwin, 1994; Sherin et al., 2008). Video is used to study teachers’ professional visions because it presents classroom interactions that can be paused to elicit a teacher’s perspectives of his or her instruction, reflection, and ideas for future instruction. Each case included in this research used video-elicited reflection to discuss her perspectives and ideas for future instruction. For example, Taylor said,

Video allowed me to see things firsthand in a way I didn’t see my instruction before. Having someone to talk to about what I was seeing on video helped me make sense of my thoughts so I could go deeper in my instruction than I would have on my own. (Exit interview)

Video-elicited reflection enhanced Taylor’s understanding of critical incidents of her instruction that led to idea formation. Taylor used video to problematize her instruction and used instructional coaching to go deeper and generate ideas for improvement.

In the literature on teacher professional development, a professional vision is described as being developed from the inside-out as much as it is developed from the outside-in (McCullagh, 2012; Munby & Russell, 1992). A professional vision begins with an examination of one’s beliefs and involves commitment to improvement through reflection on teaching.

Erica discussed the inside-out and outside-in development of her instruction to ELLs:
The ideas I had about language weren’t reality. I saw that ELLs who speak English have language needs that you may not see. When I watched videos of my instruction, I saw that I needed to improve the support I gave them [ELLs]. I was able to use sentence starters, and now that I’m comfortable with them, I’m working on using other strategies like movement. (Exit interview)

Erica’s quote showed that the development of her professional vision began with an examination of her beliefs about ELLs: “The ideas I had about language weren’t reality.” Video-elicited reflection allowed Erica to see that improvement in how she instructed ELLs was needed because what she saw on video did not align with what she believed ELL instruction should look like. Erica created pedagogical goals surrounding the support ELLs’ needed to comprehend academic English and improve Oscar’s participation in class. Erica’s professional development involved a cycle of constant growth; Erica stated that even though she felt comfortable with sentence starters she was still working to use other strategies with ELLs.

A professional vision mediates teachers’ ideas for future instruction. Teachers reflect to make sense of what is happening in the classroom and this sense-making “drives where and how the teacher will look in the future” (Sherin, 2007, p. 384). Susan reflected on the image she had of her future teaching: “As I taught each lesson I tried to notice more things I could improve on. I was looking for problems I could fix. I viewed my role as teacher as someone who needs to resolve their [ELLs’] language struggles” (Exit interview). Susan’s statement showed that she was using video-elicited reflection to problematize instruction to inform revisions of teaching ELLs. Susan’s professional vision was centered on resolving ELLs’ language struggles. Susan used video-elicited reflection to seek improvement and remove complacency.
A cross-case analysis showed that video-elicited reflection gave birth to participants’ professional visions. Taylor, Susan, and Erica used video to notice critical incidents of their instruction that did not align with their beliefs and perspectives of what ELL instruction looks like. At times, instructional coaching was needed to draw participants’ attention to critical incidents that were missed. Discussion of these critical incidents allowed participants to consider future alternatives and strategies to improve their instruction of ELLs. This research showed that video reflection and instructional coaching have the potential to inform understanding of teachers’ professional visions and the goals they establish to reach these visions.

**Summary of Cross Case Findings**

The findings presented in this chapter were seen in all cases and addressed both research questions. The findings included the following: (a) Video-elicited reflection challenged teacher candidates’ misconceptions about ELLs; (b) teacher candidates developed an understanding of language through appropriation; and, (c) video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ ELL pedagogical developments.

Video-elicited reflection challenged the misconception Taylor, Susan, and Erica had about ELLs. For example, Taylor initially believed that ELLs worked too slowly because they did not care about assignments. After using video-elicited reflection, Taylor noticed that ELLs needed language support to complete their assignments in a timely manner. Susan had a misconception that ELLs who spoke English well were not really ELLs. When using video-elicited reflection, Susan noticed that ELLs struggled with comprehension regardless of how well they spoke English. Susan’s initial beliefs about ELLs were challenged. She noticed ELLs include students who can speak English well. Erica initially believed that ELLs who spoke
English were not really ELLs and compared ELLs’ academic performance. After using video-elicted reflection, Erica noticed that ELLs have unique needs and should not be compared to one another. She also noticed that ELLs need language assistance even if they can speak English well.

Taylor, Susan, and Erica also developed an understanding of language through appropriation. Wertsch’s (1998) definition of appropriation was used in this research to describe a process that involved a passing of control from the social to the individual level to inform higher mental activity. Additionally, Rogoff’s (2008) reference to participatory appropriation was used to discuss the passing of knowledge from mentor to learner in a cultural group or community of practice where knowledge is obtained as a result of group discussion.

In this research, all participants gained knowledge about language through V-Note analysis, and instruction with a coach; new knowledge about ELL instruction was redistributed to create action in the classroom. For example, Taylor believed one-on-one instruction would be enough to support ELLs’ writing needs. As she taught her lesson and discussed her instruction with an ELL instructional coach, Taylor began to understand that ELLs needed explicit language support. She began using rubrics and developed rubrics to include content vocabulary terms and peer support. Susan used instruction of ELLs and discussion with an ELL instructional coach to develop a better understanding of ELLs’ comprehension needs. She used visuals to support ELLs’ understanding of direction and began to examine textbook language critically, realizing that the textbook did not properly address ELLs’ language learning needs. Erica began to develop a better understanding through her instruction to ELL and discussion with an instructional coach. She used sentence starters and realized Oscar’s comprehension of the lesson improved, and he could engage in conversation with a peer. As Erica transitioned from one
lesson to another, she began to examine ELLs’ language needs critically, deciding that she needed to include more peer support and instruction to promote ELLs’ understanding of the English language through engagement.

Overall, video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ ELL pedagogical developments. Participants compared their V-Note (2014) timelines to one another to show improvements in their V-Note labeling patterns. This comparison allowed teacher candidates to establish goals for their subsequent lessons and led to the creation of a pedagogical vision, “What I think ELL instruction should look like.” Chapter Six of this dissertation presents the discussion, implications, and conclusion of the research.
CHAPTER SIX:
DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this research was to examine how video-elicited reflection, a video annotation tool and content instructional coaching, mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about and instruction to ELLs. This research was informed by sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2015; Vygotsky, 1978) and was guided by the following research questions:

1. How does video-elicited reflection shape final semester, undergraduate, teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs?

2. How does video-elicited reflection affirm, challenge, or reconstruct teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction for ELLs?

This research provided insight on the relationship between teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs and instruction of ELLs and examined how three final semester, undergraduate, teacher candidates used video-elicited reflection to affirm, challenge, or reconstruct their beliefs about ELLs.

Findings from the cross-case analysis revealed that (a) video-elicited reflection challenged teacher candidates’ misconceptions about ELLs, (b) video-elicited reflection led teacher candidates to develop an understanding of language though appropriation, and (c) video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ ELL pedagogical developments. In this chapter I discuss how the research findings offer new insight to the field. Then I share the implications these findings have on ELL teacher preparation and future research. To end, I conclude with a
summary of this research, the significance this research offers to the field, and my personal reflection of the research.

Discussion

The case stories and cross-case findings included in this research provided insights on tool mediation for ELL teacher preparation and offered a new understanding of the uses of video-elicited reflection for ELL teacher professional development. Additionally, findings from this research add to an understanding of how teacher candidates use video to learn about instruction for ELLs through the process of appropriation.

Tool Mediation

Tool mediation is a central component of sociocultural theory. Mediation is seen when humans use signs or symbols (i.e., tools) in mental processing (Bodrova & Leong, 2007; Lantolf & Thorne, 2015). Vygotsky (1978) claimed that humans reside in two worlds; one comprised of signs and symbols, managed through language, and one comprised of tangible objects controlled through our hands. Under a sociocultural perspective (Vygotsky, 1978), human development is the product of both individual and social systems, and higher forms of human thinking incorporate external symbolic forms that become internal mental processes.

Tool mediation supports internal and external human behaviors. Internalized behaviors
exist in a person’s mind and cannot be seen, while external behaviors are actions humans perform on the world with physical tools. A tool mediates human actions and is placed between the individual and the social environment to facilitate human development.

In this research video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ development of ELL pedagogy. Therefore, video-elicited reflection was placed between teacher candidates and their instruction of ELLs to mediate their development in ELL pedagogy. This mediation is seen in Figure 14.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 14.** Video-elicited reflection for ELL teacher preparation

The tools used in this research—V-Note (2014) and instructional coaching—mediated teacher candidates’ abilities to instruct ELLs as depicted in the solid lines in Figure 14. The solid lines represent voluntary mental or physical human actions that have been learned or developed because of human tool use.

For example, Taylor used V-Note, a physical tool, to analyze her instruction and noticed that Lucila barely spoke, a mental action. Taylor then discussed her analysis with an ELL instructional coach and was led to an idea about using rubrics for her second lesson, a physical action. Taylor’s ELL instruction was mediated by tool use and showed that her higher mental
thinking was supported by a physical tool, and this tool support led to Taylor developing higher mental thought processes (e.g., Lucila barely spoke).

Sociocultural theory proposes that external, physical tools need to be provided to humans with scaffolding so humans can transition from maximum tool assistance to independent performance with no tool support (Budrova & Leong, 2007). Findings from this research provided a counterexample to scaffolding that includes constant scaffold use to promote independent learning instead of scaffold removal to promote independent learning. The use of permanent scaffolds disagrees with Budrova’s and Leong’s (2007) description of scaffold removal and adds on to Manning and Payne’s (1993) description of social dialogue as a critical scaffold for teacher learning. Findings from this research offer a discussion surrounding teacher candidates constant use of video annotation and instructional coaching as scaffolds that support their understanding and development in ELL pedagogy.

Budrova and Leong (2007) argued that scaffolds make learning activities easier for novices, however, this research showed that V-Note and instructional coaching did not make reflection easier but instead made anticipatory (future-oriented) reflection possible. The participants included in this research shared that video-elicited reflection allowed them to notice and use classroom evidence to plan for subsequent instruction for ELLs, “What I liked about V-Note and the conversation I had with you [an ELL instructional coach] was that I was able to see what I needed to change to improve my next lesson to ELL’ (Susan, Exit Interview).

Findings from this research can be used to suggest the use of permanent scaffolds for ELL teacher preparation. The teacher candidates included in this research developed higher mental functions about ELL instruction when scaffolds (V-Note and ELL instructional coaching)
were ongoing, and remained constant without removal. For instance, Taylor expressed how the continued use of video-elicited reflection allowed her to develop her ELL instruction, saying:

I feel better about instructing them now [ELLs]. I can look back at my first video and see the progress I have made as far as the accommodations I am now able to provide that I didn’t provide to them [ELLs] before. I feel the video and coaching helped me track my development as an ELL teacher” (Taylor, Exit Interview).

The permanent use of V-Note and instructional coaching allowed the participants in this research to document their pedagogical growth as ELL educators and facilitated learning that occurred in increments to develop higher mental actions (Vygotsky, 1978, 1997).

When teacher candidates did not use video-elicited reflection, they were unable to achieve higher thought processes. For instance, in Erica’s third lesson, she came to the postlesson interview saying that she did not have time to analyze her video with V-Note (2014) but believed that her lesson went well because she recalled that “all students were engaged and participating in the lesson” (Postlesson interview 3). After using video-elicited reflection, Erica noticed that Oscar was not participating in the lesson. Erica discussed her analysis with an ELL instructional coach, and this social interaction led Erica to develop higher mental thought processes about ELL instruction. Erica said, “I need to think about ways I can better group students together and use modeling to support Oscar’s comprehension” (Postlesson interview 3). Erica’s case demonstrated that teacher candidates needed to use video-elicited reflection for ELL teacher preparation.

Manning and Payne (1993) commented on social dialogue as a critical scaffold for teacher preparation, however when Erica used social conversation alone, the analysis of her lesson was one of success. When Erica used V-Note to analyze her instruction she experienced
This research showed that a combination of video and collaborative discussion worked in harmony to facilitate teacher candidates’ higher mental thoughts and converge with Vygotsky’s statement about high mental functioning explaining that “higher forms of human thinking incorporate external symbolic forms that are peripheral and accessory to internal mental processes” (as cited in Lantolf & Thorne, 2015, p. 59). The cases included in this research developed higher mental functioning because they supported by physical and psychological tools that acted as scaffolds to support their understanding of ELL pedagogy. Findings from this research add to an understanding of scaffolding for ELL teacher preparation that includes physical and psychological tools acting as permanent scaffolds to facilitate ELL teacher candidate learning about ELL pedagogy. This research argues that teacher candidates need
prolonged use of video-elicited reflection rather than short-term use of video-elicited reflection. The participants included in this research used video-elicited reflection for incremental professional development; whereas, participants’ first ELL lessons informed their second ELL lessons, and so on. Thus, each time participants used video-elicited reflection they were reflecting on a previously taught lesson to inform the actions they would use in future instruction for ELLs.

**ELL Teacher Professional Development**

Teacher professional development is viewed as being situated in authentic classroom activities and includes social and distributed forms of knowledge about teaching and learning (Putnam & Borko, 2000). Teacher professional development programs seek to increase teacher knowledge, improve classroom practices, and foster student learning and achievement gains (Borko et al., 2008). Scholars argue that professional development programs for teachers need to be ongoing, and long-term (Feiman–Nemser, 2001). Likewise, even less is known about ELL teacher professional development programs.

Teacher candidates learn from the interactions they have with others and distribute socially acquired knowledge to make use of physical and psychological tools (Borko et al., 2008). Engaging in reflective practice is a core standard of teacher professional development. Video reflection is discussed as a tool for fostering teachers’ productive conversations about teaching and learning because it allows teachers to re-live teaching episodes (McCullagh, 2012). Video-elicited reflection can be used for ELL teacher preparation. This research showed that video-elicited reflection facilitated teacher candidates’ new insights about ELL instructional ideas and lead to ELL professional development because the participants established goal-setting
and developed a professional vision about future ELL instruction. Video recordings of instruction can be viewed repeatedly and shared with others to elicit reflection on teaching and learning, and can be used to support collaborative models of professional development where teacher candidates learn from one another by viewing and commenting on each other’s recorded ELL instruction.

Video reflection provides several affordances to teacher professional development and facilitates both individual and collaborative ELL professional development. (Borko et al., 2008; Calandra, Brantley–Dias, & Dias, 2006; Zhang et al., 2011). After reading the research on the use of video for teacher professional development, I reflected on the findings from this research to create a model that illustrated how video-elicited reflection can be used for ELL teacher, or teacher candidate, professional development (see Figure 15).

The research on video for professional development discussed situated learning (Borko et al., 2008), to explain that teachers should learn about new ways of instructing student learners by studying their own classroom contexts. Borko et. al’s, research (2008) and findings from this study, were used to create an ELL teacher and/or teacher candidate professional development model that used video-elicited reflection as a way for teachers to examine the beliefs they have about ELLs and examine how these beliefs are enacted in ELL classroom instruction. Then, teachers use video to reflect on their ELL instruction with peer or ELL instructional coaches. Then, collaborative reflection elicits teachers’ goal-setting and ELL professional development that is enacted in subsequent ELL instruction.
In Figure 15, mediated action is depicted with a red straight arrow. Instruction is mediated by video-elicited reflection, and teacher candidates’ goals for future instruction create a professional vision of what ELL instruction should look like. Thus, goal-setting and a professional vision mediate teacher candidates’ changed or reconstructed beliefs about ELL instruction. The professional development cycle above is characterized by a passing of knowledge from experienced mentors to teacher candidates. This passing of information refers to a process of participatory appropriation where teachers participate in a community of practice within a cultural group; taking information that they receive from the social context to transform their internal higher mental thought processes and subsequent instructional actions. This cyclic model of professional development leads to a new understanding of video-elicited appropriation for ELL teacher candidate professional development.
ELL teacher candidate professional development needs to begin with an examination of the beliefs teachers have about ELLs. Then teacher candidates need to instruct ELLs and examine their instruction using video-elicited reflection as while being supported by instructional coaches or professional development leaders. This mediated support allows teachers to develop a professional vision about their teaching to ELLs and supports a cyclical process of professional development that is ongoing and long-term.

For example, Susan believed that ELLs needed vocabulary support because they scored low on a vocabulary exam. This belief was enacted in her classroom instruction when she used vocabulary dominoes to teach ELLs new vocabulary words. Susan used video to record and reflect on her instruction, saying, “Stephen was too shy.” Collaborative discussion with an instructional coach allowed Susan to engage in dialog about Stephen’s unique language needs and proficiency levels. The collaborative instructional coaching conversation led Susan to develop ideas for using more peer discussion to support Stephen’s oral fluency needs as a goal for future instruction. Susan’s professional vision included images of ELLs leaning vocabulary through social interaction, and this vision mediated Susan to construct new beliefs about ELLs as social learners.

Susan’s case showed that she was unable to notice the critical incidents of her instruction until her thoughts about ELL instruction were mediated by video and social discussion. The model I designed argues that teachers who use videos of their instruction for professional development will gain new insights about their teaching of ELLs. When teachers analyze their instructional recordings, they need to be supported by professional leaders or instructional coaches who can assist teachers in selecting and noticing critical incidents in their recordings. Research cautions that teachers do not gain insights about their teaching from watching video
alone and need support with viewing, selecting, and noticing (Beacher et al., 2013; Sherin, 2007). ELL professional development should provide teacher candidates with access to instructional coaches who can support teacher candidates’ purpose for watching recorded videos of their instruction (i.e., noticing) (Borko et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2011). This purpose becomes the lens for analysis and can be used to support teacher candidates in understanding and applying professional development curriculum for subsequent ELL instruction.

ELL teacher candidates can use video evidence and instructional coaching discussions to plan and decide on ideas they will enact for future ELL instruction. Teacher candidates who enact new ideas about ELL instruction will be able to bridge perceived theory to practice gaps. For example, if teacher candidates are learning about using writing accommodations with ELLs in ELL university coursework, they can record ELLs classroom writing actions to plan ideas for using university learned writing accommodations to support ELLs’ writing needs. Video-elicited reflection supports teacher candidates meaning-making for professional development. Teacher candidates can use video to record their internship experiences to see how they can apply theory to design instructional to ELLs.

Instructional coaches can support ELL teacher candidates with theoretical applications of ELL instruction by providing teacher candidates with additional resources, creating dissonance when teacher candidates fail to notice critical incidents of their recorded instruction, and providing ideas on how ELL learning can be designed to support theory. An example of how instructional coaching supported teacher candidates’ convergence of theory and practice was seen in Susan’s case. I provided Susan with a handout that listed and described ELL’ English language proficiency levels. Susan used this handout to facilitate ideas about differentiating instruction for ELL in subsequent lessons. For instance, Susan used small group instruction and
visuals to accommodate the textbook math lesson with visuals to teach ELLs about half past, quarter till and quarter past. Additionally, Susan began to think critically about the language used in textbooks, and realized that ELLs needed intentional language supports to comprehend the language used for instruction. Findings from this research offer a new understanding of teacher candidate ELL professional development that includes video and instructional coaching to support teacher candidates’ instructional applications of second language acquisition theory for classroom instruction for ELLs.

The professional development cycle presented in Figure 16 offers a new way to conceptualize ELL teacher professional development that includes video annotation tools and instructional coaching. Video annotation tools allow teacher candidates to share their perceptions of their ELL instruction with others and facilitate teacher candidates’ sense-making of noticed critical incidents. Noticed critical incidents lead teacher candidates to consider how theoretical applications of second language instruction leaner din university coursework apply to their internship experiences with ELLs.

Instructional coaches are needed to support teacher candidates’ in noticing critical incidents that are missed. Teacher candidates may not have enough experience to notice pertinent critical incidents of their instruction to ELLs because they are novices to ELL pedagogy. Instructional coaches can shepherd teacher candidates’ reflection on ELL instruction as they watch recorded videos of teacher candidates' instruction to ELLs to assist teacher candidates in selecting critical incidents that need further examination. Instructional coaches can unpack noticed critical incidents with teacher candidates to create a dialogical tension and can offer teacher candidates emotional support when recordings of ELL instruction diverge with teacher candidates’ recollections of the lesson. Findings from this research showed that teacher
candidates who use video annotation tools and instructional coaching were able make connections between theory that was learned in ELL university coursework and clinical experiences working with ELLs to decide on ideas for subsequent ELL instruction.

**Appropriation**

Appropriation is a process of constructing knowledge from social and cultural sources. Appropriation involves socially formed, goals that are directed by tool-mediated actions that work to elicit a passing of knowledge and control from the social to the individual level (Wertsch, 1998). Appropriation treats thinking as an active process where guided participation characterizes the ways in which people communicate with each other and coordinate their efforts to take part in activity that is culturally valued (Lantolf & Thorne, 2015; Vygotsky, 1997).

Findings from this dissertation research can be used to enhance the field with a model of how video-elicited reflection informs teacher candidate appropriation. For example, when participants met with an instructional coach, they were using ideas that are discussed socially to inform their subsequent instruction of ELLs. This appropriated learning environment is illustrated in Figure 16.

*Figure 16. Video-elicited reflection and appropriation.*
In Figure 16, the arrow between the coach and the teacher candidate is labeled as dependency and mirroring. This social communication informs the construction of new ideas that are enacted in the classroom. Video allows teachers to notice critical incidents of their instructions that are brought to the instructional coach for collaborative discussion, and the process of appropriation ensues.

Hung’s (1999) research on appropriation explained that it involves dependency when students (i.e., teacher candidates) recognize the differences between their beliefs and a knowledgeable other, such as a coach or mentor. As example of dependency was seen in Susan’s first lesson:

*Researcher*: Do you know the English language proficiency levels for the ELLS in your class?

*Susan*: I do not.

*Researcher*: Let me give you this listening, speaking, and writing rubric. It explains the different language proficiency levels and the tasks ELLs can accomplish in each lesson.

*Susan*: Can I keep this?

Susan’s case showed that she was dependent on the instructional coach’s knowledge of ELLs’ English language proficiency levels. Susan received knowledge that was given about ELLs’ language proficiency levels to construct ideas that were enacted in subsequent ELL instruction.

Susan used video to record her instruction and noticed that she gave praise to ELLs who were LYB and used checking for understanding questions with ELLs who were LYC. Grossman et al., (1999) referred to this action as an *appropriation of surface features*, which refers to instances where teacher candidates know about a concept but do not understand how the concept contributes to a conceptual whole. Susan understood that ELLs had different language needs but
did not realize that she needed to differentiate the types of language instruction she gave ELLs. Therefore, Susan did not fully understand what ELL language instruction meant.

This noticed incident was discussed with an instructional coach, and the process of appropriation was revisited. Susan became dependent on the instructional coach’s knowledge as she shared her video. Through social conversation Susan learned about then enacted the ideas she had about ELLs’ language needs.

In her second lesson, Susan noticed that the textbook language did not support ELLs’ comprehension needs. Susan used the knowledge she had gained from her conversations with an ELL instructional coach to create visuals to accommodate instruction for ELLs. In this instance Susan moved to an appropriated conceptual underpinning level of understanding (Grossman et al., 1999). Appropriating conceptual underpinnings is described as instances where students bridge theory and practice. Susan used theoretical knowledge of English language proficiency to design a language accommodation.

Video-elicited reflection can be used by researchers to study how knowledge is passed from social, or culturally mediated, environments to inform teacher candidates’ internal thoughts and subsequent external actions. The model shared in Figure 17 showed that appropriation involves a giving and taking between instructional coach and student. The student takes new knowledge given in social discussion to inform internal mental actions that lead to external classroom action.

Similarly, the instructional coach receives new ideas because they are learning about the teacher candidate’s classroom context. Classroom actions are analyzed then brought back to discussion with an instructional coach and appropriation ensues. This passing of knowledge from the social level, to the internal level, to the classroom adds on to Rogoff’s (2008) description of
participatory appropriation that describes how learning occurs in communities of practice.

Findings from this research show that there are two social communities of practice that inform teacher candidate appropriation: instructional coaching dialogue, and the classroom context.

Video-elicited reflection allowed the participants included in this research to be actively involved in their own learning outcomes. Participants choose the lens they wanted to use to analyze their recorded ELL instructional videos and used their V-Note timelines and recorded videos to facilitate reflective discussion with an ELL instructional coach about how their lesson went and the next steps they would take to improve ELL instruction. With each use of video-elicited reflection, teacher candidates moved to higher degrees of appropriation (Grossman et al., 1999); as they transitioned from one lesson to another they gained new insights about ELL instruction.

**Implications for ELL Teacher Preparation**

This research has several implications on ELL teacher education. First, teacher candidates need to be provided with a knowledge of language before they can instruct ELLs. Additionally, culture needs to be explicitly taught in ELL university coursework. Suggestions are to combine university coursework with clinical experiences where teacher candidates can work with ELLs to apply what they have learned about cultural to implement differentiated instruction for ELLs that acknowledges ELLs’ diverse cultural needs. In addition, teacher candidates need to be supported by ELL instructional coaches who can shepherd feelings of dissonance and select critical incidents of ELL instruction that can be used to facilitate teacher candidates understanding of language and accommodated instruction. Lastly, teacher candidates need ELL
university coursework that includes clinical experiences with ELLs to bridge experienced theory to practice gaps.

**Understanding English Language Acquisition Before Instructing ELLs**

The cases included in this research used incidental language instruction (Baecher et al., 2013a) to teach ELLs. These incidental accommodations were a part of the regular teaching repertoire used to teach general education students and included classroom materials (e.g., rubrics and handouts) that were reprinted without an examination or consideration of ELLs’ unique language needs. Findings from this research showed that teacher candidates need to understand language modalities, English language proficiency levels, assessment data from English language proficiency tests, and formative assessments for English language proficiency, before being assigned to work in clinical experiences with ELLs. This does not mean that ELL university coursework should occur in isolation form clinical experiences with ELs, but rather should be used to provide a foundation before ELL teacher candidates design ELL instruction. Once in the field, teacher candidates need to receive ELL coursework that is centered on differentiated instruction, culture, and assessment so they can apply the strategies they are learning about in their ELL classes to work with ELLs in classroom settings.

The participants included in this research completed four semesters of clinical experience working with ELLs and still did not develop an understanding of language. This observation showed that teacher candidates need to learn about language with coursework and then need to be placed in clinical experiences where they can interact with ELLs to connect theory to practice. ELL coursework should be taught using scaffolding. For example, teacher candidates learn about a language accommodation and use video-elicited reflection to practice using the
accommodation with ELLs. Once teacher candidates practice a language accommodation and feel comfortable using it to instruct ELLs, they can learn about another accommodation and go through the same process where they use video-elicited reflection to practice and discuss how they used the accommodation to instruct ELLs. ELL teacher education that is taught in increments allows teacher candidates to learn and apply new instructional strategies to teach ELLs instead of the currently used ELL teacher preparation models that teach teacher candidates all of the ELL strategies at once and provide no opportunity for classroom practice.

In addition, this research showed that teacher candidates need a better understanding of how they can use accommodations to support ELLs’ language needs. The participants in this research did not know the differences between ELLs’ speaking, reading, listening, and writing proficiencies and continued to use the same accommodations to instruct for all ELLs in the same way. For instance, Taylor extended the use one-on-one instruction to teach Lucile writing and never thought about using other accommodations such as sentence starters, visuals, or peer support to aid scaffold Lucile’s language needs until I prompted her to do so in her third lesson. Erica continued to use sentence starters, and Susan continued to use visuals. Taylor’s, Susan’s, and Erica’s cases illustrated that teachers may become comfortable with using one type of language accommodation because they do not know about other strategies available for supporting ELLs’ language needs. ELL teacher preparation programs need to create assignments where teacher candidates learn about and apply different language accommodations to support ELL language needs in reading, speaking, listening, and writing.

Video-elicited reflection provides physical and psychological tool mediation that can transform teacher candidates’ instruction of ELLs. For example, teacher candidates can learn about a language accommodation in coursework, see a model of this language accommodation in
action, then use video-elicited reflection to practice and reflect on how they used the accommodation to teach ELLs. This approach would allow teacher candidates to use appropriation to develop a teaching repertoire that includes different ELL instructional strategies.

Additionally, teacher preparation programs need to consider clinical experiences where teacher candidates can work with ELLs who are in various levels of English language proficiency. Internship experiences with diverse ELL populations would allow teacher candidates to practice the theory-based ideas they have for ELL instruction and learn from the situated experiences they have working with ELLs. The model shared for professional development should be used to guide ELL teacher clinical experiences. Teacher candidates need to examine the beliefs they have about the ELLs in their internship classrooms before they can design ELL instruction. To reiterate, the participants in this research stated that they felt the least prepared to instruct ELLs who could not speak English and also thought that ELLs who were at higher levels of English language proficiency no longer needed language instruction or accommodations. After teacher candidates uncovered their beliefs about ELLs, they were able to analyze recorded instances of their instruction to challenge and reconstruct the misconceptions they had about ELLs.

After proving teacher candidates with opportunities to examine their beliefs about ELLs, ELL teacher preparation programs can ask teacher candidates to use video-elicited reflection to record instances where they are using language accommodation to teach to ELLs who are in distinct levels of English language proficiency. Then teacher candidates can examine their instruction from a student perspective to consider ways they can differentiate accommodations to support ELLs’ unique language needs.
Cultural Applications for ELL Instruction

The participants included in this research did not comment on ELLs’ unique cultural backgrounds even when they were probed to discuss student culture in interview sessions. For instance, Taylor stated that she knew that the ELLs in her class were “Hispanic, but I don’t know the specific countries they come from or much about their home life” (Initial Interview). Taylor’s CT did model differentiated instruction for ELLs, but did not aggregate data surrounding ELLs’ cultural backgrounds. Additionally, Taylor did not see data surrounding ELLs’ prior schooling experiences, or years in the country.

Likewise, Susan stated, “I honestly don’t know much about their [ELLs] home lives, I don’t even know their [ELLs] English language proficiency levels” (Initial Interview). Susan had not seen data surrounding ELL’s culture or language backgrounds, and explained that she had not seen her CT collecting or using cultural data to inform ELL instruction. Susan’s quote supported Sleeter’s research who found that the overwhelming presence of whiteness in teacher education hinders the efficacy of multicultural teacher education coursework. Bother Susan and her CT were White females who differed culturally from the ELL students in the class.

Similarly, Erica did not see her CT collect or use ELL’s cultural knowledge to design instruction for ELLs, “I don’t even think my CT is ELL Endorsed. I haven’t seen her use any of the strategies I learned about in my ELL coursework” (Initial Interview). Erica’s case showed a disconnect between what teacher candidates learned in ELL university coursework and what is observed in internship. Erica’s case sowed that teacher preparation programs to consider ways they can include CTs in ELL teacher candidates learning experiences. In our exit interview Erica expanded on the cultural disconnect her CT had from the ELL students in the class saying:
Oscar’s mother told me she felt Ms. Andrews was racist against Latino students. She said, I she feels that I understand Oscar because I’m also a Latina. I never thought that I had a connection to Latino students because I don’t speak Spanish fluently. Now, I can see that I do understand them [Latino ELLs] more than Mrs. Andrews does. I wouldn’t call her [Mrs. Andrews a racist though, she just doesn’t understand the Latino culture the way I do. (Exit Interview)

This quote showed that Erica was suppressing her Latina identity perhaps because she was teaching in a school where all teacher where White. In addition, the teacher preparation program she attended was majority White. Erica’s use of video-elicited reflection allowed her to culturally identify with Latino ELL students. She felt a cultural connection to them, and wanted to help them succeed academically. Erica’s case agrees with Sleeter’s research (2001) that argued that teacher preparation programs need to consider ways that they can recruit more teachers’ of color.

Moreover, it is important to mention that culture is one of the four domains of the TESOL/CAEP PK-12 Teacher Education Program Standards but was the standard participants addressed the least in their interviews. The participants included in this research took ELL coursework where they learned about the importance of addressing ELLs’ cultural needs when designing ELL instruction, but did not see their CTs practice cultural awareness to instruct ELLs. It is important tot note that all of the CTs who mentored the teacher candidates included in this research ere White females who were not fluency in a second language. Additionally, the CTs took their ELL Endorsement coursework online.

The disconnects between how culture was taught in ELL teacher preparation coursework and observed in CT instruction for ELLs may have been the reason why the participants in this research did not acknowledge ELLs’ culture for instruction. For example, Erica stated, “She
[CT], teaches all students the same way. I have not seen her do anything different for the ELLs in my class” (Initial Interview). This observation may mean that teacher candidates did not feel cultural was important when teaching ELLs because they did not observe their CT’s addressing ELL’s cultural needs. Thus, it is recommended that ELL teacher preparation programs consider ways to include CTs in ELL teacher assignments related to addressing ELLs’ culture for instruction. CTs can be effective role models of ELL instruction for teacher candidates, and can model strategies that teacher candidates can mirror to develop as ELL educators.

Additionally, ELL teacher preparation programs should consider assignments that include practical applications of culture in real-life classroom contexts that require ELL teacher candidates to use knowledge of ELLs’ culture to design instruction. One idea is to require ELL teacher candidates to use formative and summative data to design differentiated instruction for ELLs’ based on their family life, home language and/or cultural traditions. This type of assignments should require video-elicited reflection show EL teacher candidates can show their culturally responsive instruction to their peers for feedback and idea-gathering.

Moreover, the cases included in this research demonstrated that their ELL instruction was informed by their CTs even though they had learned otherwise in their ELL university coursework. In one instance Susan stated, “I know very little about his [Stephen’s] home life. I know he is Asian but I don’t know what language he speaks at home” (Initial Interview). Susan’s case showed that ELL teacher preparation programs need to consider ways to include explicit models teacher candidates can use to apply knowledge of ELL culture for ELL instruction. An idea for making culture more explicit is to use microteaching where teacher candidates watch videos of in-service teachers using cultural knowledge to design ELL instruction. Then, Ell teacher preparation programs should require ELL teacher candidates to use ideas from the video
to customize their own instruction to ELLs and reflect on their instructional experiences using video-elicited reflection. Likewise, teacher candidates can record their instruction and share their video with a peer or ELL instructional coach to analyze how they used culture to design ELL instruction and how their interpretation of the microteaching video worked or needs to be improvement.

Another suggestion is to create assignments where teacher candidates collaborate with their CT to design and implement differentiated instruction that addresses ELL unique cultural needs. Collaborative assignments surrounding the use of ELL culture for instruction would create a space where teacher candidates can share and use the information they have learned from university coursework with their CT. This type of assignment would use a participatory appropriated approach to teacher candidate learning and create a collaborative learning context between CTs and ELL teacher candidates to learn from one another.

**More Supervisors, Coaches, and Mentors with ELL Expertise**

All three of the participants included in this research reported that they found instructional coaching to be beneficial to their understating of language and ideas for the strategies they used to teach ELLs. Additionally, the appropriation model shared in the discussion showed that the participants included in this research developed higher mental thoughts about ELL instruction through a process of continuous appropriation as a result of collaborative discussions with an ELL instructional coach. This finding has implications for the type of support teacher candidates need when learning about ELL instruction and recommends that teacher candidates need to be supported by ELL instructional coaches when they are working in clinical experiences with ELLs.
While I acknowledge that it may not possible to provide teacher candidates with ELL instructional coaches throughout the entire teacher preparation program, considerations need to be made for teacher candidates who are in clinical experiences with ELLs. Teacher instruction for ELLs is discussed in the literature surrounding teacher preparation for ELL instruction for being the area where teachers struggle the most (Coady et al., 2011). An idea is to create a semester course that provides ELL clinical experiences and instructional coaching. Courses that include clinical experiences with ELLs should include assignments that require teacher candidates to apply theory to plan for and instruct ELLs. Teacher candidates should be required to record their instruction to ELLs at least three times and discuss their reflection with an ELL instructional coach who can unpack critical incidents that were missed to provide teacher candidates with ideas and resources that can support subsequent ELL instruction.

Moreover, if ELL content coaches cannot be found to design an ELL teacher preparation program that includes video annotation tools and ELL instructional coaching, teacher preparation programs consider ELL teacher professional development for collaborating teachers. Collaborating teacher professional development should use the cyclic model of ELL professional development discussed so collaborating teachers can use video-elicited reflection to engage in ELL professional development. Collaborating teacher ELL professional development programs should include an examination of collaborating teachers’ beliefs about ELLs and should provide collaborating teachers with an extensive video-elicited reflection training that requires teacher candidates to use a video annotation tool to analyze a recording of a teacher’s instruction to ELLs. Video annotation tool training is essential to collaborating teachers’ knowledge of video annotation for ELL professional development and ability to support teacher candidates with their own video-elicited reflection efforts. Collaborating teacher ELL professional development
programs should also consider assignments that require teacher candidates to engage in video-elicited reflection discussions with the collaborating teacher to facilitate coreflection.

Conversely, collaborating teachers should be asked to take routine ELL professional developments so they can support teacher candidates with their instruction of ELLs. The participants included in this research stated that they had never seen their collaborating teachers using language accommodations with ELLs. While this observation was not studied further in this research, the model of appropriation used in this research showed that teacher candidates learn by mirroring their mentors as apprentices. If routine collaborating teacher professional development is not possible, it is recommended that assignments be created to allow teacher candidates to shadow and coteach with ELL resource teachers. This collaborative effort will support teacher candidate understanding of language accommodations for ELL instruction and will give teacher candidates a way to mirror ELL resource teachers’ ELL instruction for their own instruction to ELLs.

**Bridging Experienced Theory to Practice Gaps**

As before mentioned in Chapter Three, the participants included in this research completed three ELL Endorsement courses that were taught exclusively online. These three courses were taken within the first year of teacher preparation and information was forgotten by the time participants entered their final semester of teacher preparation. Online ELL classes offered *limited* opportunities for teacher candidates to apply learned theory to clinical experience. As a result, learned theory about second language acquisition was forgotten because teacher candidates did not have opportunities to enact learned theory in situated classroom contexts. In one instance Erica stated,
I vaguely remember learning about using visuals and sentence starters with ELLs, but I never tried using them [visuals and sentence starters] to teach ELLs. So, I wouldn’t say I felt comfortable using these strategies [visuals or sentence starters] for ELL instruction because I have never done it before; they aren’t practices that are a part of my teaching” (Prelesson Interview 1).

Erica’s statement showed that online ELL classes did not support her ability to use learned theory for ELL instruction because she did not have opportunities to practice using language strategies to accommodate instruction for ELLs. ELL teacher candidates need to learn about ELL pedagogy while working in classroom contexts with ELLs (Hutchinson, 2013). Erica’s case also showed that online ESOL courses did not support teacher candidates comfort in teaching ELLs. Online ELL instruction kept teacher candidates a lower degrees of appropriations (Grossman et al., 1999) because they did not exercise theory to design ELL instruction.

Similarly, Taylor reflected on a perceived experienced theory to practice gap saying, “It’s feels like I took those ESOL classes online ages ago. To be honest, I’d be lying if I told you I remembered a single thing” (Initial Interview). Taylor statement showed that on-shot ELL teacher preparation models are not effective in preparing teacher candidates for ELL instruction and on-going ELL teacher education models need to be considered.

Research on teacher learning argued that situated learning is best for teacher professional development (Borko et. al., 2008), but a plethora of ELL teacher education models are taught exclusively online with little consideration for theory to practice connections. Findings from this research illustrated that video-elicited reflection facilitated teacher candidates’ applications of second language acquisition theory to inform the use of language accommodations for ELL instruction.
ELL teacher preparation programs need to consider ways they can bridge experienced theory to practice gap. One suggestion is to pace ELL coursework in increments corresponding to learned theory. For example, teacher candidates learn a given theory and are given time to instruct ELLs according to this theory and use video-elicited reflection to reflect on a second language acquisition theory in practice. This approach to ELL teacher preparation coursework would allow teacher candidates to create real-life classroom representations of a theory learned in coursework to share with peers, supervisors of ELL instructional coaches.

Implications for Future Research

Findings from this study have implications for future research. First, more research is needed to study ELL teacher candidates’ use video-elicited reflection. Additionally, research should be done on teacher candidate and in-service teachers professional development using the cyclic model of ELL professional development discussed in this research, and more research is needed to study ELL teacher candidates’ use of video-elicited reflection for appropriation in collaborative contexts.

Research on ELL Teacher Candidate Tool Mediation

As mentioned previously, this research provided insight on physical and psychological tool use for ELL teacher preparation. Findings from this research argued that teacher candidates needed to be supported by both physical and psychological tools used in a synergistic process. This finding supported an idea of using tools in ELL teacher preparation as constant learning scaffolds. As mentioned in Chapter Two, this research was a small-scale qualitative research;
therefore, more research is needed to determine if the same findings result from a large-scale research.

An idea for future research includes an experimental design where some teacher candidates use video-elicited reflection as a learning scaffold and another group of teacher candidates reflect on ELL instruction without scaffolds to examine the types of reflective practices scaffolds support. This type of study could offer a better understanding of the critical components teacher candidates need assistance when using video-elicited reflection and could provide a better understanding of the intensity and duration of scaffold support teacher candidates need.

Another idea is for future research to explore how other guided video annotation tools can be used to support teacher selection and noticing of critical incidents of their recorded ELL instruction. Ideas for this type of research include designs that study what teachers notice about their ELL instruction when different types of video annotation tools are used. This research would provide an understanding of what components of video annotation tools are more beneficial for ELL teacher candidate reflection and can help ELL teacher preparation programs decided on the video annotation tools they will use to support teacher candidates.

**Research on ELL Teacher Professional Development**

As mentioned previously in this chapter, the body of research surrounding ELL teacher professional developments is very limited. Research on teacher professional development argues that reflection is a critical component because reflection allows teachers to continue to develop their practical knowledge (Bousted, 2011). However, reflective practices that rely on memory alone are not reliable. The cyclic model shared in this chapter recommends a way to design ELL
teacher professional development programs using video-elicited reflection so teachers can produce evidence-based reflections of their instruction.

Future research can use this cyclic model of ELL teacher professional development to design a teacher candidate or in-service ELL teacher professional development programs. This research would provide better insight on the benefits of using video-elicited reflection for ELL teacher professional development and can inform ELL teacher preparation program curricula or partnership school in-service ELL teacher professional development for collaborating teachers. Suggestions for this research include action inquiries where the ELL teacher professional development cycle is used as an intervention that supports teacher candidates with mentor or expert teacher guidance for ELL pedagogy. This research can examine teacher candidates’ goal-setting and development of a professional vision about ELL instruction before and after using video-elicited reflection.

Another idea is to use the cyclic ELL teacher professional development model as a partnership school action research where teacher candidates and their collaborating teachers use video-elicited reflection to corefect on their instruction to ELLs. This research could examine how teacher candidates and collaborating teachers notice critical incidents in their ELL instruction together to examine why these critical incidents were chosen for reflective discussion and how coreflection facilitated a professional vision and instructional goal-setting.

**Research on ELL Teacher Candidate Appropriation**

Moreover, future research can be conducted on video-elicited reflection and teacher candidate appropriation. As mentioned, Wertsch (1998) defined appropriation as the process of taking something that belongs to others and making it one’s own. The research surrounding
teacher candidates’ use of tools for appropriation is limited, and most of the research that has been done is outdated. Additionally, no research studies have examined how ELL teacher candidates use video-elicited reflection for appropriation. Future research is needed to understand how teacher candidates take ideas from social contexts to inform ELL instruction. Ideas for future research include a combination of classroom observations, video recordings and interviews where teacher candidates are discussing their recorded ELL instruction with an ELL instructional coach. As previously mentioned in Chapter Three, this dissertation research did not include classroom observations. Classroom observations can add an additional layer of data that may be useful in examining teacher candidate participatory appropriation.

Additionally, research can be done to investigate how teacher candidates use ideas that are discussed with an ELL instructional coach for ELL instruction, and can study teacher candidates’ appropriation by conducting a discourse analysis of instructional coaching conversations using Bakhtin as a theoretical framework to analyze speech genres (1986). This research would offer insight on how ELL instructional coaching supports teacher candidates who are working in clinical experiences with ELLs as they make sense of theoretical applications to design ELL instruction.

Conclusion

The purpose of this research was to examine how video-elicited reflection, a video annotation tool and content instructional coaching, mediated teacher candidates’ beliefs about and instruction of ELLs. This research was informed by sociocultural theory (Lantolf & Thorne, 2015; Vygotsky, 1978) and was guided by the following research questions: (a) How does video-elicited reflection shape final semester, undergraduate, teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs
and instruction for ELLs and, (b) how does video-elicited reflection affirm, challenge, or reconstruct teacher candidates’ beliefs about ELLs?

This research began with a discussion of the dramatic increase in the ELL student population in US public schools and is urgent for teachers who can effectively teach ELLs. The research stated that most teachers feel unprepared to instruct ELLs (Coady et al., 2011) and argued that more empirical research is needed to inform ELL teacher preparation programs on the strategies that work best to prepare teacher candidates for effective instruction of ELLs. A review of the literature surrounding ELL teacher preparation, teachers’ beliefs, reflection, and video reflection was shared. The research on ELL teacher preparation discussed the No Child Left Behind Act (2001), Every Student Succeeds Act (2015), and the TESOL/CAEP Teacher Education Program Standards (2012) as the policies and standards used to guide ELL teacher preparation coursework: culture, instruction, assessment, language. The policies and standards discussed showed that reflection is an integral component of ELL teacher preparation and teacher candidates need to be supported by guides or mentors when reflecting on their instruction because they are novices to reflection.

The literature on ELL teacher education revealed that only eighteen states require ELL teacher preparation even though ELLs reside in all US states. The teachers’ belief literature revealed that teachers’ beliefs are difficult to define as a construct (Pajares, 1992) and explained that teachers’ beliefs come from past lived experiences and classroom experiences in what Lortie (1975) referred to as the “apprenticeship of observation.” Teachers’ stated beliefs were also discussed for the relationship they have to classroom instruction, whereas literature explained that the belief teachers have about ELLs inform their instruction of ELLs (Basturkmen, 2012).
The literature on reflection showed that reflective practices elicit teachers’ emotions, and shared that teachers’ these emotions facilitate feelings of dissonance, dissatisfaction, or confidence, and/or feelings of success that challenge, reconstruct, or affirm teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning (Ashton & Gregiore-Gill, 2003). Reflection-on-action and reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983) were discussed to highlight the potential benefits of using video for reflection to meditate teacher candidates’ future-oriented goals to improve their instruction to ELLs; whereas reflection for action was discussed as a precursor to reflection-in-action. Additionally, the affordances video has for teacher professional development (Borko et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2011) were discussed to explain that teacher candidates and/or in-service teachers need to be supported by instructional coaches or university supervisors who can guide teacher candidates in noticing critical incidents of their recorded ELL instruction that may have be missed (Griffin 2003; Sherin & van Es, 2007).

Instructional coaching (Knight, 2007) and ELL cognitive coaching (Batt, 2010; Sherris, 2007) were shared to characterize the collaborative, coreflective instructional coaching process that were used in this research to shepherd ELL teacher candidate video-elicited reflection. In addition, the research on supervision pedagogical skills (Burn & Badiali, 2016) and supervision behaviors (Glickman, 1985) were elaborated on to provide terms for the instructional coaching actions used in this research to support teacher candidates’ video analysis. These terms included probing, unpacking, noticing, ignoring, processing, collaborative coaching and directive coaching. Moreover, the section on instructional coaching revealed that there is a gap in the literature in the use of instructional coaching for ELL teacher preparation. This research argued that ELL instructional coaches are needed for ELL teacher preparation to bridge teacher candidates’ experienced theory to practice gap. That should be used to accompany teacher
candidates’ use of video-elicited reflection to create dialectical tensions and facilitate teacher candidate dissonance (Gelfuso & Dennis, 2014).

Video-elicited reflection was discussed as a popular teacher preparation practice (Calandra & Rich, 2015) that allows teacher candidates to view their instruction from a student perspective. Video-elicited reflection requires guided reflection that is used to support teacher candidates’ noticing of critical incidents (Griffin, 2003; Tripp, 2011) Critical incidents involve deliberate attention to an instruction instance that leads to in-depth reflection and the meaning of the event. Still, the research surrounding ELL teacher candidates’ use of video-elicited reflection and video annotation tools (Rich & Hannafin, 2009) for ELL teacher preparation is scarce. A gap in the literature surrounding ELL teacher candidates’ use of video annotation tools for reflection was presented and showed that this research was needed to inform the field on how video-elicited reflection can be used for ELL teacher preparation.

Purposeful sampling (Patton, 2015) was used to select four, final semester teacher candidates who had a minimum of two ELLs in their internship. A qualitative, multiple case study approach (Stake, 2013) was used to select examine and examine three of the four cases studied. A case and cross case analysis was used to present findings on Taylor’s, Susan’s, and Erica’s cases.

Taylor’s case generated three findings: (a) As Taylor used video-elicited reflection, her instruction increasingly included more language accommodations and began to add student-centered instruction; (b) video-elicited reflection reconstructed Taylor’s beliefs about using one-on-one instruction with ELLs; and, (c) collaborative coaching behaviors influenced Taylor’s instruction of ELLS more than directive coaching behaviors.

Susan’s case analysis resulted in three findings: (a) Video-elicited reflection challenged
Susan’s misconceptions about ELLs’ language needs; (b) video-elicited reflection showed that Susan needed a better understanding of intentional language instruction; and, (c) instructional coaching mediated Susan’s understanding of ELLs’ English language proficiency levels.

Erica’s case analysis led to three findings: (a) Video-elicited reflection reconstructed Erica’s beliefs about collaborative learning; (b) video-elicited reflection created a space where Erica explored using language accommodations for ELL instruction; and, (c) video-elicited reflection developed Erica’s beliefs about language.

The cross-case analysis resulted in three research findings: (a) video-elicited reflection challenged teacher candidates’ misconceptions about ELLs; (b) video-elicited reflection led teacher candidates to develop an understanding of language through appropriation; and, (c) video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ ELL pedagogical developments.

The discussion section of this research included a new understanding of tool mediation for ELL teacher preparation that includes the use of video annotation tools and instructional coaching as permanent scaffolds. Sociocultural theorists propose that scaffolding should be used with removal to promote learner independence (Budrova & Leong, 2007) however this research provided an extension to Manning and Payne’s (1993) discussion of social interaction to include teacher candidates’ physical tool use.

A cyclic model of ELL teacher professional development was discussed that began with an examination of the beliefs teacher candidates or in-service teachers have about ELLs. This model used video to examine teachers’ situated experiences and explained that video and instructional coaching mediated teachers’ development of a professional vision and goal setting. The cyclic model of ELL teacher professional development provided a new understanding of professional development that include video annotation and instructional coaching as integral
components of ELL teachers’ pedagogical developments. The cyclic model used argued that teacher candidates or in-service teachers need opportunities to examine and discuss their recorded video analysis with others in collaborative professional development programs.

A more detailed description of participatory appropriation was discussed that involved the use of video-elicited reflection to facilitate dialogue between ELL teacher candidates and an ELL instructional coach. The discussion included the affordance video-elicited reflection has for transitioning teacher candidates to higher degrees of appropriation (Grossman et al., 1999) where teacher candidates can apply second language theory for classroom instruction for ELLs and understand why theoretical applications are needed. Teacher appropriation was discussed as a collaborative action that involved the transfer of knowledge from the social to the individual level (Wertsch, 1998). Teacher candidates acquired social knowledge was used to design new ELL instructional ideas that were enacted in classroom instruction for ELLs.

**Significance**

This research filled a gap in the literature surrounding ELL teacher preparation and offered an empirical investigation of a video annotation tool that worked to improve teacher candidates’ instruction of ELLs. Additionally, this research offered insight on the need for ELL teacher preparation programs to combine video reflection with ELL instructional coaching and showed that collaborative discussion is needed to foster teacher candidates’ noticing of critical incidents of their recorded ELL instruction.

Findings from this research were significant to the field because they showed that teacher candidates’ instruction of ELLs improved when a combination of both physical and psychological tools were used to support teacher candidates’ reflection on the clinical
experiences they had with elementary-aged ELLs. This finding is significant to an understanding of tool use that remains constant without scaffolding so teacher candidates can learn to use video-elicited reflection as a habitual teaching practice.

This research also offered insight on how a video-elicited reflection model could be used for ELL teacher professional development to facilitate teacher goal-setting and professional visions of what ELL instruction should look like. A ELL teacher professional development model is significant to the field because published literature on ELL teacher preparation argues that teachers feel the least prepared for ELL instruction (Coady et al., 2011). The professional development model discussed in this research can be used to initiate ELL teacher professional development reform.

Finally, this research contributed to an understanding of participatory appropriation (Rogoff, 2008) as a process that reformed teacher candidates ELL instruction. Participatory appropriation was initiated in teacher candidates instructional coaching discussions and directed subsequent ELL instruction. Findings from this research showed that video-elicited reflection mediated teacher candidates’ knowledge of ELL instruction. Findings from this research supported a need for more ELL instructional coaching in the field to bridge teacher candidates’ experienced theory to practice gap. Additionally, this research has significance to an understanding of how mentor and learner collaborative conversations can be used to support ELL teacher candidate appropriation of knowledge about ELL pedagogy.

**Personal Reflection**

Conducting this research developed my understanding of preparing teacher candidates for ELL pedagogy. When I began this research, I believed video would be enough to support teacher
candidates’ selection and noticing of critical incidents of their instruction for ELLs. I never considered the critical role ELL instructional coaches have in facilitating teacher belief change before. By conducting this research my beliefs were also reconstructed. I knew tools were beneficial to teacher education, but have since developed a belief about tool use that includes both physical and psychological tools used simultaneously.

This dissertation research emphasized the importance of the social context for transforming teacher candidates’ internal thoughts and development of higher mental functions. Seeing the importance of social dialogue, I now feel a propensity to share my research findings with as many teacher preparation programs as possible to offer insight to the field on the use of video-elicited reflection for ELL teacher preparation. As a result of the research findings presented in this study, I hope to create publication surrounding video-elicited reflection for teacher candidate participatory appropriation in ELL education. Likewise, I will be using this research as a foundation for future research studies that I hope to conduct on video-elicited reflection dyads with ELL instructional coaches and/or supervisors working collaboratively with teacher candidates and collaborating teachers to examine and reflect on video recordings of ELL instruction.

In addition, findings from this research presented important considerations surrounding teacher candidates’ cultural awareness. For instance, in the pre and post lesson interviews I conducted, I tried to probe the participants to discuss ELL’ unique cultural backgrounds however, my questioning failed to elicit participants’ responses about ELLs’ cultural backgrounds. In several instances the participants shared that they did not know about ELLs’ home life or cultures, and used generic terms to discuss ELL’s ethnicities such as ‘Asian’ or ‘Hispanic’. Participants did not comment on ELLs’ unique cultural characteristics (i.e. language
spoken at home, specific ethnicity, years in this country, prior schooling). After conducting this research, I believe ELL teacher preparation programs need to consider more explicit ways to include knowledge of ELL student culture in ELL teacher preparation program coursework. One suggestion would be to use *Funds of Knowledge* (Gonzalez, Moll & Amanti, 2006) as a theoretical framework for ELL teacher preparation program curriculum. Teacher preparation programs can use Funds of Knowledge to design ELL teacher preparation coursework assignments that require teacher candidates to use ELL’s cultural information and home lives to design differentiated classroom instructional activities. These cultural activities will give teacher candidates a better understanding of ways they can to use culture to differentiate ELL instruction, and will support home to school life connections between teacher candidates’ and ELLs’ families.

Moreover, by conducting this research, I was able to see that a combination of V-Note (2014) and instructional coaching led participants to understand ELLs’ language needs and practice using accommodations for ELL instruction more explicitly. Combined physical and psychological tool use challenged the misconceptions participants had about ELLs. The participants included in this research were able use video to see evidence of instruction that worked and didn’t work with ELLs. Video evidence was used to facilitate dialogue with an ELL instructional coach and the conversation supported teacher candidate belief change or reconstruction when recorded instruction did not align with teacher candidates previously held beliefs about ELLs. Thus, V-Note and collaborative dialogue aided participants’ understanding of ELL instruction and language accommodations.

The most valuable take-away I had from this research was the influence my dissertation had on the participants included in this study. I am proud to say that all three of the participants
included in this research chose to apply to work at schools with high populations of ELLs because they felt more confident about instructing ELLs. Taylor, Susan and Erica previously stated that they did not feel prepared to teach ELLs and felt ELL instruction was their weakest teaching skill. After participating in this research, all three participants feel more confident about ELL instruction. Erica expressed, “Teaching ELLS ins something I can say that I can do now, and I couldn’t say this before” (Exit Interview). In addition, the participants stated that they planned to continue recording their instruction and use V-Note to show other teachers how this reflective tool can be used for professional development. Susan explained, “I think V-Note is very helpful. I want to show other teachers this tool. I feel it [V- Note] really helped me see my instruction in a more reflective way that I had never seen before” (Exit Interview).

The findings from this research will forever change the way I prepare teacher candidates for ELL instruction. I will use this research to rationalize my decisions for including physical and psychological tool use in the ELL teacher preparation courses I teach in the future. In addition, this research has inspired ideas I have for future publications. I hope to analyze my data differently to report on the ELL instructional coaching process used in this study. I also am considering future research projects where I can include collaborating teachers and ESOL resource teachers in the video-elicited reflection process with teacher candidates to add insight on the use of video-elicited reflection for teacher candidate participatory appropriation.
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Research Study # 00028435

You are invited to participate in a research study conducted at the College of Education by Ms. Monica M. Gonzalez.

The purpose of this study is to examine your beliefs about English Language Learner (ELLs) and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) instruction.
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3. Becoming more familiar with the use of technology for reflective practice.
4. Completing tasks that can be used for future coursework.

This study will span a four month period and will require no more than 2 hours of your time each month.
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We are asking you to take part in a research study called: Using Video-Elicited Reflection to Understand Teacher Candidates’ Beliefs About ELLs

The person who is in charge of this research study is Monica M. Gonzalez. This person is called the Principal Investigator. However, other research staff may be involved and can act on behalf of the person in charge. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Jennifer Jacobs.

The research will be conducted at the University of South Florida, College of Education, Tampa.

Purpose of the study
The purpose of this study is to examine your beliefs about English Language Learner (ELLs) and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) instruction.

Why are you being asked to take part?
We are asking you to take part in this research study because you design and implement instruction to English Language Learners.

Study Procedures:
If you take part in this study, you will be asked to complete and or participate in the following:

• Complete one Initial Interview, lasting no longer than 45 minutes with the researcher at the College of Education, Tampa where you will be asked about your prior experiences with and your beliefs about English Language Learners.

• Complete a one-hour V-Note tutorial at the College of Education, Tampa where you will learn how to use V-Note video analysis software for reflective practice.
• Participate in three 30-45-minute pre-instruction interviews with the researcher at the College of Education to discuss your ESOL instruction lesson plans and ESOL instructional goal.

• Analyze your recorded ESOL instruction at home and complete Video Guide questions, using V-Note on three separate occasions to reflect on how well your ESOL instruction went.

• Participate in three post instruction interviews lasting no longer than 45 minutes with the researcher at the College of Education, Tampa to share your thoughts, feelings, perceptions and beliefs about the strengths and areas of improvement regarding your ESOL instruction.

• Write three written reflections (one per lesson) on your ESOL instruction after the post instruction interviews have been conducted with the researchers and send these written reflections to the researcher electronically.

• Participate in one final exit interview lasting no longer than one hour at the College of Education Tampa with the researcher to discuss how you used V-Note for reflection.

Note: All interviews conducted in this research will be recorded. You must give consent to be recorded. Your name will not be used to identify you in any of these recordings or data collected in this research. Only Monica M. Gonzalez and Dr. Jenifer Jacobs will have access to the data for review. All data collected in this research will be kept for five years and will be destroyed after (electronic files will be deleted and all hard copy documents will be shredded).

**Total Number of Participants**
About ten individuals will take part in this study at USF.

**Alternatives/Voluntary Participation / Withdrawal**
You do not have to participate in this research study. You are free to decide to participate in this research or to withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits that you are entitled to receive if you decide not to participate or to discontinue participation at any time. Your decision will not affect your student status, course grade, recommendations, or access to future courses or training opportunities. You should only take part in this study if you want to volunteer. You should not feel that there is any pressure to take part in the study. You are free to participate in this research or withdraw at any time. There will be no penalty or loss of benefits you are entitled to receive if you stop taking part in this study. Your decision to not participate will not affect your student status (course grade).

**Benefits**
The potential benefits of participating in this research study include:

1. You may become better at ESOL instruction.
2. You may become better at using technology for reflection.
3. You may be able to use the reflection you complete for this research for your reflection assignments in your final internship course EDE 4940.

**Risks or Discomfort**
This research is minimal risk. That means that the risks associated with this study are the same as what you face every day. There are no known additional risks to those who take part in this study.

**Compensation**
Participants will be awarded $75 total for participation in the entire study. Money will be prorated as follows.

1. Initial Interview $10
2. V-Note Training $10
2. ESOL Lesson 1- Pre-lesson interview, post lesson interview and reflection $15
2. ESOL Lesson 2- Pre-lesson interview, post lesson interview and reflection $15
3. ESOL Lesson 3- Pre-lesson interview, post lesson interview and reflection $15
4. Final Exit Interview- $10

**Costs**
It will not cost you anything to take part in the study.

**Conflict of Interest Statement**
The principal investigator has no influence over your course grade. Your participation in this research is voluntary.

**Privacy and Confidentiality**
We will keep your study records private and confidential. Certain people may need to see your study records. Anyone who looks at your records must keep them confidential. These individuals include:

- The research team, including the Principal Investigator and study coordinator.
- Certain government and university people who need to know more about the study, and individuals who provide oversight to ensure that we are doing the study in the right way.
- Any agency of the federal, state, or local government that regulates this research such as the Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP).
- The USF Institutional Review Board (IRB) and related staff who have oversight responsibilities for this study, including staff in USF Research Integrity and Compliance.

We may publish what we learn from this study. If we do, we will not include your name. We will not publish anything that would let people know who you are.

**You can get the answers to your questions, concerns, or complaints**
If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this study, or experience an unanticipated problem, call Monica M Gonzalez at (786) 506-9824.
If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, or have complaints, concerns or issues you want to discuss with someone outside the research, call the USF IRB at (813) 974-5638 or contact by email at RSCH-IRB@usf.edu.

**Consent to Take Part in this Research Study**

I freely give my consent to take part in this study. I understand that by signing this form I am agreeing to take part in research. I have received a copy of this form to take with me.

Signature of Person Taking Part in Study

Date

Printed Name of Person Taking Part in Study

**Statement of Person Obtaining Informed Consent**

I have carefully explained to the person taking part in the study what he or she can expect from their participation. I confirm that this research subject speaks the language that was used to explain this research and is receiving an informed consent form in their primary language. This research subject has provided legally effective informed consent.

Signature of Person obtaining Informed Consent

Date

Printed Name of Person Obtaining Informed Consent
Appendix C: Video Reflection Guide

Directions: Use the following steps to analyze your ESOL instructional video recording. Bring this sheet and your V-note coding to your post-instruction interview.

Before Watching
(1) What was your ESOL instructional goal in this lesson?

Write your ESOL instructional goal down on a sticky note/paper in front of you so it is visible while you watch your ESOL video.

First View
(2) Watch your entire video recording using your ELL instructional goal as your lens.
(3) Select a 5-15-minute segment pertaining to your ELL instructional goal that you want you to analyze further.

Second View
(4) Referring to your ELL instructional goal, watch your 5-15-minute video a second time. This time as you watch note your instructional strengths and needed areas for improvement.
   (a) Write down words or phrases regarding your ESOL instructional strengths
       and areas for improvement in the box below.
(5) Look at the words and phrases you wrote in the box above. Notice similarities, patterns or themes to create code buttons. List your code buttons in the space below

Third View
(6) Watch your video for a third time. This time use the codes you created to code and analyze your ESOL instructional video using V-Note.

After Coding
(7) What do you notice? Did you lesson go according to plans?

   (a) What codes did you use the most?

   (b) What codes did you use the least?

   (c) Do you see any patterns?

   (d) How did you/ did you not meet your instructional goal?

   (e) What are your next steps?

   (f) What ideas/considerations will need to be made?

   (g) Is there anything else you want to discuss?
Appendix D: Initial Interview

Background

1. Think about your experiences teaching.
   
   What grade levels have you interned in?
   
   About how many ELLs have you taught?
   
   What grade level are you teaching now?
   
   About how many ELLs are in your current class?
   
   Did you speak a language other than English? If so, what language?

2. Think about your own K–12 schooling experiences.
   
   Where students in your classes/ school culturally different from you?
   
   How was your classroom/school learning environment compared to today’s classroom/ school learning environment?
   
   Tell me story when you interacted with someone who was spoke a language other than English?

Teaching

1. Describe your experiences instructing ELLs.
   
   What do you believe is the teacher’s role in teaching ELLs?
   
   How have you seen a teacher modeling the role you just described?
   
   Do you consider yourself to be an ESOL teacher? Explain your answer.
   
   What do you believe are effective ESOL instructional strategies or practices?
   
   Where did you get these ideas?
   
   Why do you believe these strategies or practices work to teach ELLs?
Where did you get these ideas?

Why do you believe these strategies or practices work to teach ELLs?

2. You have a new student today; he/she is an ELL who has just moved to this county from Guatemala. The student has little proficiency in English.

What comes to mind when you think about this student as a learner?

How will you provide instruction to this student?

What challenges will you face?

What supports will you need?

Video Reflection

1. Within your internship experiences how do you feel about using video for reflection?

Have you ever focused your instructional video recording on how you taught to an ELL student? If so, please explain.

Final Thoughts

1. Is there anything else you want to add about your beliefs about ESOL instruction ELL students or the use of video for reflection?
Appendix E: Pre-Lesson Interview

Participant Time ____________________________
Time and date of lesson __________ Content Area__________ Grade ________

Planning Instruction

1. What is the instructional goal of this lesson and Common Core Standard?
2. Why was this goal selected?
3. What is your instructional goal for ELL students? What ELD Standard applies?
4. Do you expect ELL students to have any difficulty with the content or vocabulary used in this lesson? How do you know this?
5. Discuss the steps you will take in this lesson. Will you need or use any resources for the ELLs?
6. Will this lesson be a small or whole group instruction? Explain why this instructional method was chosen.

Accommodations

1. What will ELLs be able to do on their own? How do you know this?
2. What will ELLs need help with? How do you know this? How will help be provided to them?
3. What supports or accommodations will ELLs need or receive to meet the instructional goal?
   Why were these accommodations selected for this lesson? How will they be provided?

Assessment

1. How will ELLs show they have met the instructional goal?
2. How will other students show they have met the instructional goal?
3. How will you grade or provide feedback to the general education students?
4. How will you provide feedback to ELLs?
5. List any additional comments or concerns you would like to discuss with me.
Appendix F: Post-Lesson Interview

Planning
1. Describe and explain your ESOL instructional goal
   a. Why did you select this goal?
2. How did you record video to capture this ESOL goal or ELLs working to meet this goal?
3. While planning this lesson what teaching actions and practices did you anticipate yourself having to complete as the teacher?
4. Going in to this lesson what did you expect ELLs to be able to do well as students?
5. What did you think the ELLs would need assistance and support with?

Video Analysis
1. What codes did you select to analyze your instruction?
   a. What did you notice?
   b. Were there any themes or patterns?
   c. What did these themes/patterns suggest to you about your instruction to ELLs?
   d. What was unexpected when it comes to your ELL instruction and what you saw on video?
   e. What was expected when it comes to your ELL instruction and what you saw on video?

Future Instruction
1. Describe any future actions you will take for your next lesson with ELLs.
2. Have your beliefs about ELLs as student learners changed in any way?
3. Have your beliefs about teaching ELLs changed in any way?
4. What did you enjoy most about using V-Note for reflections?
5. What did you enjoy the least when using V-Note for reflection?

Conclusion
1. Is there anything else you would like to add about your instruction to ELLs or V-Note for reflection?
Appendix G: Exit Interview

Beliefs

1. What are your beliefs about ELLs as student learners? What influenced the development of these beliefs?

2. What are your beliefs about instruction for ELLs? What influenced the development of these beliefs?

3. What feelings do you have about yourself as an ELL teacher? What influenced the development of these beliefs?

4. What are your beliefs about the role of the classroom teacher and ELLs? Are these beliefs the same as the beliefs you had before participating in this study?

5. Are the beliefs you have about yourself as an ESOL teacher the same or different from the beliefs you had about yourself before participating in this study? Explain why.

Reflection

4. What comes to mind when you think about the three ELL lessons you taught? Were there any memorable moments?

5. What was the influence of your CT in your development as an ESOL teacher this semester? Were there any other influences on your instruction to ELLs?

6. How did seeing your instruction on video help you? Can you give me an example/ tell me a story about this?

7. How did the conversations you had with me help you? Can you give me an example?

8. How did analyzing your instruction with V-Note help you? Can you give me an example/ tell me a story about this?

Conclusion

9. What have been the most valuable takeaways for your future teaching to ELLs?

Member Checking

Findings and categories will be presented to each participant.
## Appendix H: Initial Beliefs Case Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Category</th>
<th>General Beliefs About ELLs</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beliefs about Self as ELL Teacher</strong></td>
<td>* I am an ESOL teacher</td>
<td>“It’s not a pick and choose”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* I feel difficulty/frustration</td>
<td>“When we did communicate it was through other students... It was difficult and frustrating for me.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* I am unprepared</td>
<td>“It’s an area I feel weak in and don’t feel prepared for”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELLs as Student Learners</strong></td>
<td>* ELLs are embarrassed to speak out loud</td>
<td>“It was awkward for her because she did it in class, in front of everyone.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Some ELLs are also ESE</td>
<td>“Two students in the class are ELL and ESE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ELLs take too long to do their work</td>
<td>“They take too long to do their work and I’m not sure if it’s a language issue or it’s due to an academic learning issue.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ELLs need constant reassurance</td>
<td>“They constantly ask if they are doing it right.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ELLs’ Parents care</td>
<td>“Parents who don’t speak English try extremely hard despite the language barrier.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Communication with ELLs’ parents is important</td>
<td>“If there’s a disconnect with parents it’s going to reflect in the student.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction for ELLs</strong></td>
<td>* Differentiation but not based on language needs</td>
<td>“Differentiating for individual students and what they need, not just geared to them being ELLs, but them as a learner.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Repeating myself a lot</td>
<td>“It takes a lot of prompting, saying it again and prompting.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Translations based on needs (ex. ELL with limited English or ELL who is also ESE)</td>
<td>“Putting that in front of her is not going to do that much good if there’s no translation for her.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Collaborating Teacher (CT) (CT helps develop my preexisting beliefs about ELLs)</td>
<td>“My CT is wonderful, she has a million ideas for every type of learner you could imagine. I’m just trying to soak it all in.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ESOL Resource Teacher</td>
<td>“She comes in every day and helps.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix I: Lesson Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Category</th>
<th>Stated Beliefs About Writing Instruction for ELLs</th>
<th>Classroom Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self as ELL Writing Teacher</td>
<td>* I am unprepared to instruct ELLs.</td>
<td>* I record my instruction to ELLs for reflection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLs as Student Learners of Writing</td>
<td>* Take too long to work</td>
<td>* ELLs wrote independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Might need help with generating ideas to write about</td>
<td>* Taylor gave ELLS topics to choose from and ELLs completed a Venn diagram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.* Need constant reassurance</td>
<td>* ELLs discussed their writing with the teacher in a one-on-one conference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Instruction for ELLs</td>
<td>* Model, practice, independent learning (I do, we do, you do)</td>
<td>* Teacher modeled, ELLs planned together then teacher had writing conferences with ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* ELLs must use complete sentences</td>
<td>* One-one-one conferences with ELLs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* One-on-one Instruction</td>
<td>* Students were provided with a copy of the story.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix J: Worksheet Two: Themes

### WORKSHEET 2. The Themes (Research Questions) of the Multicase Study

These Themes indicate primary information about the Quintain that the researchers seek. Below are some examples from the Step by Step project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme 1:</th>
<th>Initial Beliefs about ELLs were challenged when T.C. used video</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme 2:</td>
<td>Language as critical to ESOL instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 3:</td>
<td>Practice using language accommodations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 4:</td>
<td>Video for ESOL PD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 5:</td>
<td>Evidence challenges T.C. initial beliefs about ELLs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 6:</td>
<td>ELLs have different needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme 7:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From *Multiple Case Study Analysis*, by Robert E. Stake. Copyright 2006 by The Guilford Press. Permission to photocopy this worksheet is granted to purchasers of this book for personal and professional use only (see copyright page for details). Worksheets may be downloaded from www.uiuc.edu/circe/worksheets/worksheet/.
Appendix K: Worksheet Three: Theme Prominence

WORKSHEET 3. Analyst’s Notes While Reading a Case Report

Code Letters for This Case:

Case Study Report Title: Taylor

Author(s):

Analyst’s Synopsis (possibly identifying the case, All were writing lessons, departmentalized the sites, 1st grade class, 5 ELLs, only worked with the ELL at first. Never worked w/ELL key information sources and context information):

Situational Constraints: ESOL Resource Teacher, monolingual

Uniqueness among Other Cases:

Prominence of Theme 1 in This Case:
Prominence of Theme 2 in This Case:
Prominence of Theme 3 in This Case:
Prominence of Theme 4 in This Case:
Prominence of Theme 5 in This Case:
Prominence of Theme 6 in This Case:

Expected Utility of This Case for Developing Theme 1:
Expected Utility of This Case for Developing Theme 2:
Expected Utility of This Case for Developing Theme 3:
Expected Utility of This Case for Developing Theme 4:
Expected Utility of This Case for Developing Theme 5:
Expected Utility of This Case for Developing Theme 6:

Conceptual Factors (for Track III):

Findings:
L. Video as P.D. V. Challenged deficit beliefs about ELLs' practice accommodations
II. Challenged beliefs about ELLs' language as critical
III. Language

Possible Excerpts for the Multicase Report (noting case report page number):

Commentary (sometimes noting case report page number):

From Multiple Case Study Analysis, by Robert E. Stake. Copyright 2006 by The Guilford Press. Permission to photocopy this worksheet is granted to purchasers of this book for personal and professional use only (see copyright page for details). Worksheets may be downloaded from www.uiuc.edu/circe/worksheets/worksheet.
Appendix L: Member Checking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Category</th>
<th>Stated Beliefs About Writing Instruction for ELLs</th>
<th>Classroom Practices</th>
<th>Instructional Issues, What I Noticed, Ideas I Have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ELLs as Student Learners of Writing | * Take too long to work  
* Might need help with ideas to write about  
* Need constant reassurance | * ELLs completed a Venn diagram  
* ELLs wrote independently.  
* ELLs discussed their writing with the teacher in a writing conference. | * ELLs did not finish their paragraphs on time.  
* ELLs copied from the text  
* ELL comprehension |
| Role as ELL Writing Teacher          | * Model, practice, independent learning (I do, we do, you do) | * Teacher modeled  
* Teacher had writing conferences with ELLs | * I repeated myself many times and it didn't work. |
| Self as ELL Writing Teacher          | * I am unprepared to instruct ELLs | * I record my instruction to ELLs for reflection. | * Seeing myself on video helps me reflect on my instruction to ELLs. |
| ELLs' Writing Accuracy               | * ELLs must use complete sentences | * ELLs share their writing with the teacher | * ELLs' sentences did not make sense |
| Supports/Accommodations for ELL Writing | * One-on-one Instruction  
* ESOL Resource Teacher | * Writing conferences with ELLs  
* Students were provided with a copy of the story | * ESOL Resource teacher did not come.  
* Students need more background knowledge about writing conferences |

Comment: I somehow want to make a table with this info using the video table on the last page, because this is part of the video analysis.
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