**Shona Whyte Interview Summary**
*(Cuts in)*
[00:00] *(Background)* Master's in France in English, went to the US and did her PhD in five years, then came back to a job at the University of Nice and has been there for 20 years. First 10 years: responsible for temporary native speaking teaching assistants – supervise, train, decide if they should stay on for a second year. Took this as a teacher education opportunity and learnt a lot from that experience. Later – more involved in pre-service teacher training, working with primary and secondary teachers. Also research: one strand is collaborative action research, also open educational practices (with Teresa MacKinnon) – video important in both. Involved in teacher education projects where the goal was not only to help support the teachers involved in the project, but also to produce open resources for other teachers. They selected examples of practice which were recorded in the project and prepared them as web resources for other teachers to access. Used video in three ways: a) to document classroom practice (for the researchers and for the teacher), b) for video-stimulated reflection, where the teacher selects extracts for the website or just talks about the lesson (the European project, iTILT, looked at the use of interactive whiteboards in language teaching), and c) for reflective practice with pre-service teachers in a much less formal way – peer recording on phones and looking for critical incidents for their own use, not for sharing with wider community.

```
1    SW:   so i can say that weve used video in three ways
2          there. so to document classroom practice whats
3          actually going on in the classroom for ourselves
4          and for the teacher. for video stimulated
5          reflection where we have the teacher look at the
6          video of the class and select extracts for the
7          website or just talk about it. so the development
8          there. so itilt was our project itilt dot eu
9          which is a european project based on integration
10         of interactive whiteboards in language teaching.
11         and then ive also used it for reflective practice
12         with pre service teachers and in a much less
13         formal way where they its peer recording. they
14         record each other on their phones. they look for
15         critical incidents. and we try to use that just
16         for themselves and not so much for sharing with
17         the wider community. so that would be three uses
18         that i have.
```

[03:45] Examples: three different projects. First: pilot project in 2010 – Learning to Teach via Videoconferencing in Primary Foreign Language Classrooms. 8 classes hooked up in 4 pairings – videoconferencing via interactive whiteboard. Used video stimulated recall to work with, and document the experience for, the teachers. Discusses project findings. First inkling that just having technology isn't going to improve learning opportunities unless teachers are given a lot of support on the pedagogical side and not just the technological side.

```
21   SW:   so the first ones a pilot project that i did in
22         2010. theres a publication 2011. and we call it
```

```
23          (xxxx) its called learning to teach with video
24          conferencing in primary foreign language
25          classrooms. this is a pilot project for the
26          european project that i was preparing for. and it
27          was unusually for my research something that came
28          down from above. so the academie de nice the local
29          education authorities in nice wanted to organise
30          video conferencing between two classes in english
31          in primary schools in different areas of the nice
32          department. and we had four classes. there were
33          eight classes that hooked up in four pairings
34          where the teachers connected the two classes by
35          video conferencing through an interactive
36          whiteboard and did activities. and so i followed
37          this project because i wanted to get some of the
38          teachers for an upcoming project and used the
39          video stimulated recall method to work with these
40          teachers and in fact to document the experience
41          for them to see what kinds of things we could
42          learn from this project. and we in fact learned
43          that if teachers are not helped to integrate
44          technology in this way are kind of thrown into a
45          somewhat artificial situation we found that they
46          didnt have the right reflexes to create useful
47          pedagogical activities for the learners. they
48          tended to put groups of children opposite each
49          other in front of the cameras. and they had two
50          patterns of interaction. either they rehearsed
51          their learners so it was kind of like being on
52          television talking to the camera and each person
53          already reciting more or less what they planned.
54          or they would have a kind of triangular exchange
55          where one learner would talk to another. but each
56          time the teacher on each side would be kind of
57          sitting on their shoulder and interposing and
58          translating and explaining. and you had very few
59          learner to learner turns. so that was maybe my
60          first inkling where i realised that technology
61          was not going to solve all our problems. and that
62          just the fact of having these affordances and the
63          fact that you can have a live conversation with
64          somebody else and in the case of the interactive
65          whiteboard where you can have other screen
66          sharing opportunities that in itself is not going
67          to improve learning opportunities for the
68          learners unless the teachers are given a lot of
69          support on the pedagogical side not just the
70          technological side. so saying that now it seems
71          like yes everybody knows that. but for me that
72          was a bit of an epiphany at the time. and there
73          were a few moments with some of the teachers who
74          also realised looking at my little videos of
75          their interactions like wow this is not how i
76          imagined it. and this is not how i experienced it
77          myself. i thought that things were going on. they
78          imagined that things were somehow different. and
```

```
79              when they saw the video with a bit of perspective
80              they could see that things needed to be changed.
81              and with that i found one of the teachers that
82              ive worked most successfully with i identified
83              her in that project and we carried on since then.
84              so it was a good start.
```

[07:05] Second project: iTILT – higher level of planning. Involved 7 different countries, data collected in 6, filmed 81 classes, over 250 clips of classes of different levels, age groups, proficiencies and languages. Filmed lesson, researcher and teacher looked at video, then came together a week later to look again and select extracts to put on the website. Have teacher and learner comments and any materials they could get from the teacher/for the teaching unit. Ended up creating rich multimedia object that people could visit afterwards. Has had feedback from colleagues in different places who are using these videos as examples of technology integration, but also just as examples of teaching. Somewhat disappointing, in that they didn't get a huge range of different use of tools or pedagogical activities. Tried to work on other projects (with Euline Cutrim Schmid from Germany), where researchers were more involved in designing the tasks, rather than simply observing what the teachers designed.

```
85    SW:   second project then i can tell you about then is
86              itilt where this was a much more organised
87              situation. the project involved selecting in
88              each. we had seven different countries in the
89              project. six of them were getting data. so we
90              have data from six countries. we ended up filming
91              81 classes with over 250 clips of video in these
92              classes so different levels education levels
93              different ages different proficiency different
94              languages. and our method there was to go into
95              the classroom to film a session to then look at
96              the video afterwards the researcher on one side
97              and the teacher on the other. then wed come
98              together about a week later look at the video
99              again together and select extracts that we could
100             put on the website. the website would have
101             teacher comments. it would also have learner
102             comments and any materials that we were able to
103             get from the actual teacher and about the
104             teaching unit that could help other people. so we
105             ended up creating a kind of rich multimedia
106             object that people could then come and visit
107             afterwards. so it was nice in that the researcher
108             and the teacher were both involved in selecting
109             the video. so if the teacher wasnt happy about
110             something that didnt get shown. sometimes the
111             teachers didnt really want to look at their
112             videos themselves. and then it was more or less
113             we who said oh this one was quite interesting
114             what do you think and talked about it there. so
115             it was interesting from that point of view. we
116             got a lot of stuff that i think is useful for
```

```
117        others. ive had some feedback over the years from
118        colleagues in different places who are using
119        these videos as examples of technology
120        integration but also just as examples of teaching
121        so that people. theres enough information about
122        the teachers intention and about whats going on
123        in the classroom because you have the video that
124        people can understand quite well. so its turned
125        out to be a quite nice resource. what we also
126        found there from a research perspective was that
127        once again in terms of pedagogy and even in terms
128        of exploiting the pedagogical affordances of the
129        interactive whiteboard it was a little bit
130        disappointing in the sense that we didnt get a
131        huge range of different uses of tools or a huge
132        range of pedagogical activities. and so with my
133        colleague euline cutrim schmid whos in germany we
134        tried to work on other projects where we got more
135        involved in designing the tasks rather than
136        simply observing what the teachers designed for
137        us. so that takes us a little bit further away
138        from the use of video. but i have a certain
139        example for you which is more recent and its with
140        respect to pre service teachers. so these other
141        two were in service projects and the teachers
142        participated more or less because we invited them
143        because they were interested in what we were
144        doing and sometimes i think to maybe look good in
145        terms of their institutional requirements. so
146        there we didnt get too much in terms of feedback.
147        they werent paid for it and they didnt really get
148        direct you know career points or anything for it.
149        but some of them were interested and some of them
150        did it i think because they thought it was good
151        to participate in a project. and we saw quite a
152        lot of different development depending on why and
153        how people engaged with the project. so some
154        people went very far because they had their own
155        questions. and other people kind of stayed back
156        because they werent so let say they didnt have
157        their own action research questions to integrate.
158        but anyway the third project then is pre service.
```

[09:38] Third, more recent example: pre-service teachers (other two in-service teachers; saw different development, linked to motivation for participating in the project) – Master's students training to be secondary EFL teachers - very little classroom experience. Students were asked to design 15-20- minute task, teach it on their placement and film it on their phones. Quality so bad, that ethical issues were naturally dealt with – but it was enough. Tried critical incident approach. Outlines some results that she feels they wouldn't have got if they hadn't been filming and hadn't worked on critical incidents.

```
159   SW:   so I work with masters students who are training
```

160      to be secondary efl teachers. a couple of years
161      ago i tried a project which im rerunning this
162      year where they design a task. so they have a two
163      week. they have two two week teaching placements
164      where they go in. theyre not in charge of the
165      class. they go in with another teacher whos a
166      more experienced teacher. and in the second
167      placement which is happening right about now this
168      time of year they get to teach some activities
169      some sessions by themselves. and so i ask them to
170      design a task that they could teach something
171      that lasts like 15 20 minutes. they teach that
172      and they film it on their phone. so the time we
173      did it two years ago i had them. we had a lot of
174      lead time into the teaching placement. and we had
175      them design tasks that could fit together so
176      either in the same school working with the same
177      kids or they were in nearby schools but the same
178      level. they designed a task that they could all
179      do. and then they watched a peer and filmed a
180      peer do it. and then that way it was nice because
181      they could compare their own use of the activity
182      with another kids use of it. and you had someone
183      there to film with the phone. and that was
184      interesting because in terms of ethical stuff the
185      quality of the film was so bad that i was able to
186      show it. i showed it at a conference at a seminar
187      i was giving a couple of weeks ago. it was so
188      blurry without doing anything to it. you know you
189      could see the guy. the sound was fine but the
190      blurring it was already done because it was just
191      somebodys phone. but it was enough. and so what i
192      had them do there which i hadnt done before was i
193      tried the critical incident technique. i dont
194      know if you remember that paper by breen and
195      colleagues 2001 paper where you ask them to find
196      something problematic something that didnt go so
197      well or conversely something that was rewarding
198      and kind of typical. and you say choose an
199      incident and explain what you learned from that.
200      so this is very much more didactic in a way of
201      orienting what we want to learn because these are
202      very inexperienced teachers. this is practically
203      their first approach to the classroom. and i have
204      paper a 2015 paper where i talk a little bit
205      about that. what i found was that they had a bit
206      difficulty designing a task. they wanted to do
207      very traditional activities. and they had trouble
208      understanding exactly what a task was so we spent
209      a lot of time on that. and then what their
210      critical incidents tended to be what you might
211      expect which is problems of discipline in the
212      classroom or problems of giving instructions you
213      know the kind of normal novice teacher problems.
214      but we had a couple of people who had very
215      interesting critical incidents. it was the task

```
216        that was probably the most problematic in terms
217        of design and the implementation didnt go well
218        either. but two of the pre service teachers there
219        i really felt that they understood something from
220        that because one of them said when i looked at my
221        video i understood that i had been trying to
222        shoehorn a grammatical structure into this task
223        where the task really should have been treated in
224        and of itself. there was no reason for the pupils
225        to use this structure i wanted in this task. and
226        so in fact he said when i taught it the second
227        time i left out the grammatical requirement. and
228        a second teacher it was more the question of task
229        as process as opposed to task as plan. the plan
230        was okay. but once he started implementing it he
231        wrote some words on the board because he thought
232        that the learners needed some of that. and then
233        he transformed his task into something that
234        should have been spontaneous language production
235        into more reading what was on the board. and he
236        realised this as it was happening and when he saw
237        his film afterwards. and he said. it was really
238        interesting his reflection because he said yes of
239        course i see it and i see why i made the mistake.
240        but at the same time i also stand by what i did
241        at the time because i was just nervous that they
242        wouldnt be able to finish it. and i really wanted
243        them to be successful in the task. so nice kind
244        of reflection that i think we wouldnt have got if
245        we hadnt asked them to film and if we hadnt then
246        asked them to look at it through this critical
247        incident frame which is quite. its nice because
248        its very broad you know
```

[15:27] (*Equipment*) HDV DV camera (now looking a bit old fashioned) takes mini DV cassettes. Extra mike that goes with it, uses free Apple software. Has a tripod. Second project: enough money to have someone to help. Started out using small cameras to try to preserve the ecology of the classroom, but didn't work very well, so got university audio-visual team to come in – two cameras, one fixed, one mobile, mike on the board (interactive whiteboard project so a lot of sound was going at the board) with cable taped down on floor, teachers had radio mics, used lights. Didn't have very good video projectors in a lot of the classrooms, so quite a technical challenge. Videos so much better with audiovisual team. Epiphany: much better to have something with a bit more editing – much clearer for the person looking at it. Can have close ups, feel much more that you're involved in the interaction. Different ways of reflecting reality – a camera put as far away as possible to be unobtrusive is not necessarily going to give you a faithful representation of what went on.

[18:12] Audiovisual team had good reflexes for obtaining right footage for later editing (photos of the classroom as fillers, for example). One mobile camera to capture individual learners, then team did the editing with Final Cut.

[18:58] Third project: used phones. Teachers wouldn't always let them – ethical issues. Previous project: parents and kids signed consent forms. For this (third project) SW sent blanket authorisation/explanation to establishments – a couple refused, so did audio recording. If she could change something, she would have a better relationship with authorities and inspectors, and get them to accept that this kind of research/training is beneficial for everybody.

[20:31] Phones not put on tripods for recording – a bit wobbly, but just records for students themselves. Discuss elements of choice in the project. TH: What proportion didn't want to do it/didn't do it? SW: Everybody did something – had to, to pass the module. Some people had audio and some claimed "technical problems."

[22:06] *(Would video training have helped the students in the third project?)* Had too much to deal with.
*Discuss SW's papers.*

[24:25] *(Feedback/evaluation)* Didn't do formal evaluation for that class, but students had to write up the critical incident. Discusses students' pressures, responses and priorities.

```
253   SW:   last year we had them do a
256         telecollaborative project where they worked with
257         another class of trainee teachers at a university
258         in the netherlands. and asked them to design
259         tasks that they could do between their classes.
260         so they did email exchanges. they did work on
261         google drive. they exchanged videos. they did
262         this sort of stuff. and when i asked them at the
263         end what did you think of it a lot of them seemed
264         to say its not our professional priority at the
265         moment right. were worried about getting to the end
266         of the year passing our inspection getting a job
267         and doing this. and they kind of thought like yes
268         later on. and i get that feedback sort of
269         informally from quite a lot of my masters
270         students. its like i can see what youre doing. i
271         can see how its useful. you know theyre very nice
272         about it and they can see that im motivated and
273         that i like it. but its just as i say its one
274         voice in many other voices that theyre hearing
275         and its not the most influential voice lets say.
276         and so i would think if we scraped a little bit
277         and said what do you think about the value of
278         this they would say yes its not time you know. we
279         want to pass our (xxxx) exam and get in the
280         classroom. were not so worried about this you
281         know. but maybe if we were able to ask them a few
282         years down the line what did you do at university
283         that was useful, i think that might have been
284         helpful because you do get the impression from
285         the papers that there were some even if they
286         werent like heartfelt epiphanies ive understood
```

```
287        this youve forced them to think about things in
288        ways that they might not have done it. because up
289        until them their idea was i taught the lesson
290        that my tutor suggested or that my tutor approved
291        and the tutor thought it went okay and so thats
292        fine you know what i mean. no further questioning
293        of could i have done it differently or what did
294        the learners actually learn which is i think
295        video can help you get that distance.
296   TH:  yes but in a way the fact that they did papers.
297        the fact that you know youve got that feedback.
```

[27:30] *(What would you like to do but currently can't?)* Better access to the classes – let it be normal for people to film classes, talk about what's going on, share videos, without it being a big deal and people worrying about what they look like. Also a bit disappointing: if you're a pre-service teacher with no experience, you don't know what to look for and you don't see the right things. TH suggests easy annotation might help and mentions H5P. Discuss idea of people videoing themselves as a matter of course, and lecture capture.
*Closing remarks*