

# TEANGA 24

**Bliainiris na Teangeolaíochta Feidhmí in Éirinn  
The Irish Yearbook of Applied Linguistics**

## **Peer Observation of Language Teaching: A Reflective Approach to Teaching**

*Anna Nunan*

### **Abstract**

Peer observation of teaching has increasingly been considered as a means of promoting reflective practice for language teachers. An interactive model is critical to the success of the observation process as it is structured, supportive and emphasises choice, control and observation between equals. The insistence on an information flow aimed at the observed helps reaffirm the idea that observation is not an administrative exercise but a beneficial process for the teacher and learner. If peer observation can uncover some of the assumptions teachers use to shape language teaching, including the resistance to teaching as an open practice, an improvement of existing approaches to language teaching may be within reach.

**Dr Anna Nunan** is a Lecturer in TESOL at the Applied Language Centre, University College Dublin and Module Coordinator for a large-scale university-wide language programme. Recently she has focused on the development of innovative models of language teaching, CEFR applications and language teacher education in Higher Education.

### **Introduction**

Peer observation is an increasingly scrutinised means of supporting the continuous professional development of language teachers. It has also been described as a potentially threatening process for teachers, with faculty members expressing dismay at aspects such as the intrusion of a stranger into the classroom or concern about the availability of the outcomes of observations (Carter, 2002; Purvis, 2009). Purvis describes a transition at the University of Sheffield Hallam from a university-wide programme of peer observation of teaching to a peer-supported review of learning, teaching and assessment, which was prompted by criticisms of the peer observation process by staff. Because this criticism was reflected in the literature, change was introduced. Peer-supported review allows for like-minded colleagues to work together to develop a specific area of learning which has the potential to be transformative, not judgemental. Staff members conduct an annual review of their professional practice in order

to locate an area for development, identify a colleague who could assist in some way and the approach ensures that the observed individual retains control over the way in which the outcomes are reported. In this case, nine out of ten participants thought their practice had improved as a result of the peer-supported review (Purvis, 2009).

The decision to undergo peer observation as a language teacher begins a process of critical reflection that challenges the hidden assumptions of the observed and the observer in the language classroom. There is an initial element of self-reflection in deciding to submit to peer observation of language teaching. It is generally recommended that peer observation be part of a voluntary process though it might be encouraged through peer involvement and positive feedback from colleagues on the process. This process goes beyond a review of action and requires the reflector to 'deconstruct long-held habits of behaviour by looking beyond the behaviour itself to their own self-image and examining why they do what they do' (Silvermann & Casazza, 2000). Teaching involves strongly held notions of what a 'good' teacher should do in a classroom. In language teaching this is complicated by pedagogical approaches such as 'communicative' language teaching, that are promising at first, but tend to gradually disappear into the mainstream (Little, 2006). There are also claims that students who spent long periods of time in language classes and acquired knowledge of the language often had little competence when faced with the situation of language in use. Combating the problems of lack of fluency or accuracy in language learning are also crucial in language classes where many complementary and competing approaches have been developed and discussed in the literature in this area (Skehan, 2003).

### **Peer observation and self-reflection**

Much effort in language teaching has been devoted to developing task-based methods of teaching to encourage language use, the contextualization of grammar, the building of vocabulary and the developing of meaning- and not form-focused methods of instruction. Choosing to undergo peer-observation encourages reflection on these issues on the part of the language teacher, but also on a plethora of other important language teaching issues such as group dynamics in small classes, changing student approaches to language learning, students' prior experience of language learning, the outcomes for specific language courses, expectations and achievement in language classes, fair assessment methods, etc. These issues are often cited as critical to what constitute the preoccupations of successful college teachers (Bain, 2004). Knowing that a person trained to be sensitive to all of these issues and an expert and scholar in teaching following Kreber's (2002) concept of the terms will observe a class encourages the observed to reflect on the many everyday aspects of language teaching. Whilst Gosling (2002) refers to three models of peer observation, only what is described as the reciprocal-reflective model seems to focus on developmental feedback and self-reflection. The alternative models are less useful because they focus on external reviews of teaching, such as quality assurance measures and performance benchmarks. Under the reciprocal-reflective model, performance is still under review, but the process is supportive and developmental. Gosling suggests that learning arising from the peer observation of individuals could be shared across larger numbers of teachers if

the data is collated and anonymised. This could be very constructive in language teaching when there are large numbers of teachers and it is not practical for all of those involved in teaching to undertake peer observation within a particular time frame. Information on the results of the process could be disseminated instead and examples of good and less good practice from the collated data could be publicized and used constructively.

It has been claimed that peer observation is very effective if the managerial and administrative aspects of the process are reduced and the developmental element emphasized. A developmental approach to peer observation of language teaching means that the process is focused on improving the learning experience for the student and on encouraging the observed to become a critically reflective teacher. Becoming a critically reflective teacher necessitates an exploration of the complexities involved in both teaching and practising reflection (Peel, 2005), and involves many stages of considering the lenses through which teaching may be viewed by unveiling assumptions which the teacher uses to shape and influence their teaching. Critical reflection helps teachers to understand why they teach in a certain way and assess the impact and perceptions of these practices (Brookfield, 1995). Reflective practice also involves different ways of looking back at events and learning from them by asking what could have been done differently (Gibbs, 1988). Following the experience of a supportive peer-observation, the language teacher may be inspired to make changes to existing practice as a means of improving the learning experience of the student and to try out innovative strategies to test the learning opportunities in alternative approaches to language teaching. Teaching observations using educational developers as observers, particularly for those relatively new to teaching, can foster formative notions, such as the deepening of understanding, critical reflection and enhancement of teaching practice (Hatzipanagos, 2006).

### **Evidence of a reflective approach to language teaching**

In attempting to become critically reflective about peer observation it is useful to note that Brookfield describes the heart of the reflective process as a perspective of teaching from four different lenses: the teacher's autobiography, experience and assumptions that shape teaching, the students' view of the teaching, the colleagues' perceptions and the advice of the theorists in the literature on teaching and learning (Brookfield, 1995). The first lens involves assumption analysis, contextual awareness, imaginative speculation and reflective scepticism and Brookfield describes at least three different types of assumption. Paradigmatic assumptions are the hardest to uncover. He claims that we assume these beliefs are 'facts' and we will examine them critically only after a great deal of resistance and an amount of dis-confirming experiences to change them, however if they are changed, the consequences are enormous. Prescriptive assumptions are what we think ought to be happening in a particular situation and are often based on paradigmatic assumptions but also on how we think teachers should behave. Casual assumptions are less strongly held and can be uncovered and reversed easily enough. Brookfield's book aims at uncovering casual assumptions, but would prefer practitioners to work back to the more deeply embedded prescriptive paradigmatic assumptions.

Brookfield mentions peer observation as a means of unveiling the assumptions of teachers based on their own experiences as teachers and learners. He also refers to videotaping as a means of re-viewing teaching processes. This suggestion is useful in uncovering teachers' assumptions about language teaching and reviewing reactions to innovative strategies. Often teachers assume videotaping of teacher observations will change the atmosphere of the language class too much because of the self-conscious nature of the process. A class that is videotaped appears to entail less of a focus on the individuals in the class and intensifies the sense of a performance for a wider audience. This reaction exposes the deep underlying assumption that language teaching is a process adapted to individuals and is most effective in a small group situation where it appeals to the students as it is generally preferable to large group teaching. Videotaping a lecture may be acceptable to teachers, but a language class differs from a lecture in its focus on students and class activities which appear not to lend themselves well to film. There are also legitimate concerns about the quality of the video production feasible in non-professional settings. Teachers and students are accustomed to television-style filming involving close-ups and changing camera angles. The videos produced for teaching purposes are often uninspiring by comparison. However in view of the changing nature of the delivery of third level instruction through online courses and distance learning, language teachers need to accept that small group teaching may become a more open practice than hitherto. It is becoming a public realm open to visitors and scrutiny. Peer observation which has the explicit purpose of making teaching 'public' and visible to others who support its development (D'Andrea, 2002) extends the public dimension by introducing videotaping. The benefits of videotaping sessions for observers and observees (as well as potentially for students to review) are clear but conflict with basic teaching assumptions.

The literature on this subject supports the strategy of videotaping teaching observations. Gross Davis (1993) writes that watching a videotape of a teaching session is an extremely valuable experience. It allows the teacher to view and listen to the class as the students do and scrutinize the students' reactions to their teaching. The teacher can check the accuracy of their perceptions of how well they teach and identify those techniques that work and those that need improvement. She warns of 'video induced despair' but otherwise strongly recommends the method because the tape can be reviewed and analysed objectively with a colleague and helps distinguish between the assumption that certain techniques went well and the evidence that the students reacted to the material in the expected manner. In this way it might help in uncovering paradigmatic assumptions which are difficult to uncover and would probably require a disconcerting approach to dislodge them.

The notion of videotaping teachers has also been under review in a controversial context in the US as Bill Gates has suggested that videotaping classroom lessons might make for better teachers (Fairbanks, 2010). His foundation has donated \$335 million to not only develop a better system for evaluating the effectiveness of good teaching, but to work on solving the mystery of how to replicate it. This move has prompted the question of whether this kind of mandatory or regularized videotaping of teachers borders on surveillance. Nonetheless many US universities offer videotaping of teaching observations as a

means of improving teaching in Teaching and Learning service departments (Bruff, 1999). The use of videotaping in peer observations deserves careful attention and trial as a strategy.

Brookfield's other suggestions on writing a 'Survival Advice Memo' or 'Teaching Learning Audit' are useful in pinpointing the assumptions that any individual language teacher might find most influential in their teaching, but these strategies do not challenge basic assumptions about teaching to the extent that videotaping questions the notion of what should be going on in a language class. The suggestion of videotaping challenges hidden assumptions in a deep way and introduces the notion of imaginative speculation in contemplating ways of trying to come to terms with innovative strategies in language teaching.

### **An interactive model of peer observation for language teaching**

Many teaching observation systems stem from government initiatives aimed at the enhancement of professionalism of teaching in higher education and use peer observation models that assist with the measurement of standards as part of responses to external reviews (Hatzipanagos, 2006), tending often towards perceptions either of leniency or harshness and ultimately mistrusted by staff. A productive developmental approach to peer observation is the model of peer observation employed at University College Dublin. This model is based on an interaction between equals and is involves a five-stage process (McMahon et al., 2007). The person to be observed accepts classroom observation by choosing to participate in the teaching observation programme. The person to be observed also decides who observes them, and what happens to the subsequent observation report.

The first stage of the McMahon process involves is a pre-observation meeting in which details are supplied on the session to be observed. A pre-observation report details how the session fits into a specific programme and the characteristics of the student group. At the second stage, the person being observed introduces the observer in the agreed manner and teaches the session. Stage three involves a post-observation meeting. Here the person being observed starts by discussing their impression of the session (compared with previous sessions and the way the teacher intended the session to go). The observer's comments and ideas are then discussed and an action plan is drawn up to include specific improvements in the students' learning experience. At stage four, the observed produces a definitive version of an action-plan with targets and dates. Stage five involves a final report on how the observation led to improvements in the learning experience of students.

This model of peer observation is very successful in providing clear instructions for the observed and the observer which are detailed in the model and are open and clear to the person being observed. In this model the person being observed has a better idea of what to expect during the process than in other models where the instructions for the observer are not shared with the observed. This interactive model is thus transparent and the person being observed is likely to feel less exposed to criticism from an unexpected source by knowing the directives for the observer. It may be reassuring for the observed to read, for example, that the observer is asked to arrive on time, stick to the agreed process and will be participating in the discussion on how to improve the students' learning experience, not on how to improve the teacher's approach to

teaching. The focus in this model is on the improvement of the learning experience and not on approval of the teacher's actions as in other models that require peer-observation to check the 'standard' of teaching.

The description of McMahon's model as 'an interaction between equals' is an important component of this model and is credible because of the clear directives for the observer and because of the focus on student learning rather than on teacher performance. It is also more likely to be constructive if suggestions for improvement are based on the claim that students may learn more easily following a change in approach than to try to introduce a change that seems to focus on the person of the teacher. McMahon et al. (2007) also argue convincingly for equality in peer observation and claim that if 'peer' is taken to indicate equality of status, only a model of 'peer' (not third party) observation that guarantees confidentiality or control over what is reported and to whom is compatible with the idea of the teacher as reflective practitioner. If the teacher has control over the report, s/he also has the psychological space needed to reflect on his/her teaching, the observation process and the improvements suggested. The reflection rather than the observation or the report is crucial to the process of enhancing teaching. The instigation of teaching observations by an institution is sufficient for the initiation of the process of reflection, control over the report by the institution is not necessary because the implementation of some of the suggestions made by the observer lies ultimately with the individual teacher not the institution. Theorists suggest that management should monitor the uptake and value of teacher observations in ways that evaluate the system, not the participants (Byrne, 2010).

The idea that the language teacher becomes more reflective following an observation process is only credible if the individual steps of the reflective model are strictly adhered to. If the notion of equality is not sensitively addressed, the teacher is likely to feel coerced into a teaching approach which may be partially adopted but not fully endorsed. Change will only occur meaningfully if the teacher believes wholeheartedly in the benefits of the approach suggested. Carter (2008) stresses the importance of understanding different teaching methods on the part of the observer in this situation and reflecting on the notion that one approach will not be recommendable for all courses. The observer should ask the question of how well the pedagogy may advance the language learning goals in each case rather than insisting on 'ideal' models of teaching in all cases. Carter also usefully suggests that close attention be paid to the pre-observation meeting and the documentation, class material, assessment process, etc., which is also a feature of the interactive model.

One element of the 'interaction between equals' that is missing in the McMahon model is the notion of reciprocity which is mentioned in Gosling's (2002) 'third way' and entails mutual observation of teaching by all staff in a school. A model of peer observation 'between equals' should include a stipulation of a tandem visit to the observer's class. In the interest of openness, equality and learning from experienced colleagues, the observed could attend a class taught by the observer. This would provide an interesting dimension of diversity to the peer observation process. Inevitably there would be differences in style and approach between the observer and the observed. The offer of a visit to the observer's class could help alleviate some of the intimidation reported around peer observation for teachers (Peel and Shortland, 2004; Carter, 2008).

Most teachers value an opportunity to partake in true reciprocal peer observation and even if inexperienced, teachers can make interesting suggestions on approaches to language teaching and learning. Although this potentially adds a dimension of complexity to the peer observation model in arranging further documentation and visits to classes and complicates the issue of the benefits of training observers prior to visits, it does introduce an incomparable element of collegiality, transparency and equality and should not pose any significant difficulty for the trained observer.

### **Documentary evidence**

Following the interactive model of peer observation, documentary evidence should be produced prior to the observations. This documentation involves detail on the context of the class being observed and a description of how the class might fit into the programme of study. This description of context is useful in reviewing the overall language goals of the programme and in reflecting on the course from an outside perspective. Although this is routinely required in an external examiner process, the positioning of one class in a context is rarely necessary and provokes a lot of thought about the contexts of specific classes. The position of one class in a programme is not the only consideration at this point, the students' previous experience with the language and the group dynamic also need to be analysed which are complicated topics. Lots of issues relevant to language teaching need to be considered such as attendance levels, student interests, motivation for learning, group dynamics, etc. The students in the classes to be observed often have divergent levels, interests and reactions to the material introduced. Describing the group to the observer prior to observation involves a searching for language in order to adequately portray the situation and is a useful exercise in reflecting on small group language teaching in general. At this point there is often a strong recognition of the inevitably unique group of individuals involved in language teaching and the varying coping strategies required in dealing with multiple personality types.

The teaching approach, learning outcomes and lesson plans are less contentious at the documentation stage as these have been generally agreed upon prior to observation. They have to be determined before the language course and do not lend themselves much to alteration during the term though they are often subject to change at the end of the term. A casual approach to explaining the observer's presence in the classroom is often suggested. It is announced at the beginning of class that the observer would like to see how the language is taught. It is also recommended that the method of recording data be agreed prior to the observation and care be taken to make the process as unobtrusive as possible. The identification of aspects for the observer to focus on requires reflection on the part of the observed. The main areas of interest in language classes are student involvement and group engagement, oral communication, timing and aspects of skills training.

### **Pre-observation meetings for language classes**

The self-consciousness and reflection on approaches to language teaching that begin during the process of deciding to undergo observation often resurface noticeably at the pre-observation meetings. These meetings are intense and involve an amount of discussion and explanation. The use of a non-language-

specialist as observer is possible and though it may involve a few minor drawbacks such as the need for longer explanations of objectives, it can provide a novel perspective and a useful 'outsider' frame of reference. It has been pointed out that if the observer understands the materials being taught during an observation, they may concentrate on the subject rather than focusing on the student experience which they tend to do if they are observing an unfamiliar subject area (Hammersley-Fletcher & Orsmond, 2004). The focus on the student experience and the clarity of the experience is sometimes appropriate and the perspective of the non-linguist can be crucial in this case.

Many questions surface at the pre-observation meetings about the goals, outcomes and assessment of the language class and a significant amount of time is needed to discuss the assessment system, the scope of the course, topics covered and their suitability. Alternatives are discussed and some wider issues such as alignment with similar courses in other languages and overall goals and the needs of students with differing levels are also proposed and require further investigation and discussion with the appropriate colleagues. The reflection on the broader context of language teaching is often one of the consequences of embarking on a process of peer observation and testifies to the way in which the process enhances the overall quality of teaching and learning in higher education not just the improvement of one class.

The students, their expectations and likely achievement in the language programme are also under discussion which leads to questions about these issues and the need to make the gap between the language teaching methods and examinations at second level and the expectations at third level clearer to the students. First year students with experience of the Irish Leaving Certificate system have expectations of language learning which are significantly examination-oriented and less oriented towards language in use. This contextual situation threatens the ability of third level institutions to provide institution-wide language learning which is useful for employers and students seeking employment. The change in expected goals and outcomes for language learning in higher education requires further reflection on the part of the teacher and further clarity for the student.

At the pre-observation meeting the observer needs to take the task at hand seriously and think through the aims of the classes, the context of the modules and the experience of the students. The observer needs to be supportive and proceed in a structured manner and so that the effectiveness of the structured supported reflective practice process mentioned by Bell (2001) is evident.

### **The experience of observation of language classes**

The observer's presence during the observations often has a less intrusive effect than anticipated. Teachers often report less intimidation than expected, (Hatzipanagos, 2006) though there is at first a sense of trepidation upon being observed which may affect the students in a small group. Students in a language class often pay close attention to the teacher's demeanour. They seem conscious of whether the teacher is annoyed, amused, anxious etc. The group tends to go through inevitable stages known as 'Storming, Forming, Norming, Performing and Adjourning' (Tuckman, 1977). Groups may move through the stages of the model in a single session or may 'regress' to storming after a few sessions, but

some of these stages of caution, challenging, sharing, becoming involved and ending the session are obvious during observations.

Interestingly the students may closely observe the language teacher during observation sessions or alternatively hardly seem to notice the observation process. The experience leads to an awareness of the differences in teaching experiences and to the conclusion that the study of 'group dynamics' is highly relevant to language education because the success of classroom learning is very much dependent on how students relate to each other, co-operate and communicate with each other (Dörnyei, 2004). Cooperative learning has been found to be a highly effective instructional approach in second language learning. The affective domain of cooperative learning plays a crucial role in the educational potential of the method (Dörnyei, 2011). If the affective domain of cooperative learning is highly developed because of the necessity of change in the students' language learning, this leads to a situation where the students pay close attention to the observation process as part of their awareness of a change in the aims of the language learning in the programme.

Sometimes observation entails the unexpected and this can compromise the undertaking or generally cause the expected reaction on the part of the learners to fail and require a change of lesson plan mid-session. Sometimes the students will attempt to 'aid' the teacher in view of the 'inspector's' presence and imbalance the timing for the session by responding to questions with uncharacteristic speed. Fortunately this kind of energetic response is often unsustainable and the students revert to a medium level of enthusiasm in time.

Student over-reaction is more common in advanced language classes, students in *ab initio* classes appear not to consider themselves in a position to 'assist' the teacher by making a greater effort to answer questions quickly and are more likely to respond to new vocabulary in the usual manner as they are not familiar with the material. This difference causes reflection on the inevitable element of 'change' introduced in an observed session and the interesting common positioning of the students on the side of the teacher in the face of review by an 'outsider.' In their view the observer is usually an inspector looking for performance markers and not a 'peer' observer. The different reactions from advanced and *ab initio* language groups reinforces the notion that beginner and advanced levels are in different positions in terms of learning and the approach to language teaching might need to be further considered in terms of the appropriate approach in each case.

### **Post-observation meetings**

The post-observation meetings are very important in promoting the reflection on and discussion of various methods of language learning. In language teaching the principles of task-based instruction are often the driving force for syllabus design and the engagement of acquisitional processes. Task-based learning involves a moving away from reliance on structure or grammar and towards meaning-focused tasks. However even if learners are participating in interactions with meaning as primary concern (negotiation of meaning), there has been a lot of debate about a need for a focus on form because without it students have exhibited a lack of sustained development (Skehan, 2003; Nunan, 2005). Some studies assume that interaction in itself is not enough for language learning and believe focus on form is essential, however there are differences in

approach as to how to achieve such a focus on form, such as by placing emphasis on feedback, attention allocation, interaction, input and output. This kind of emphasis avoids a return to a focus on grammatical exercises but nonetheless improves accuracy through approaches such as contextualized grammar instruction (Weaver, 1999).

Most researchers argue however that the reaction of the language learner in task-based learning is key rather than the debate over the focus of the task on meaning or form (Willis, 1996). The tension between focus on form versus focus on meaning is an important and difficult issue that frequently arises during observations of language teachers. It requires attention from different perspectives and forms a significant element of the learning contracts resulting from peer observations of language classes. It involves research into the teaching of grammar and accuracy in language learning and the trial of new strategies for teaching grammar in language classes.

Students also have expectations of grammar instruction following their experience of prior language learning and these expectations need to be addressed and further clarified for future learners. The reflection on methods of focusing on form and delivering feedback at the most propitious moment in relation to grammar is beneficial and will result in the improvement of teaching in language modules. Theorists of recasting in language learning prefer the learner to attempt to make an utterance and the interlocutor to rephrase the sentence but with changes made to make it correct (Long, 1998). This usually allows the learner to be more receptive to the correction. This could be a successful approach in grammatical instruction. If the student is allowed to form their utterance and then be corrected with a recast, they are more likely to be receptive to change. This is an area of grammatical review that could be developed and form part of the learning contract resulting from language teaching observations.

## **Conclusion**

An interactive model of peer observation is an attempt at avoiding the notion of intimidation in language teaching observations through its structured, supportive, detailed model, its attention to choice and control and emphasis on observation between equals. Compromised confidentiality and lack of control are obstacles to the peer-observation process as a means of enhancing teaching but McMahon et al. (2007) successfully identifies six dimensions of control to be safeguarded and confirms that maintaining control over the process significantly alleviates the resistance to the process on the part of the teachers to be observed. Another common criticism of peer observation is the worrying charge of meaninglessness. It is often claimed that teaching observations are routinely carried out for quality assurance, something to be 'ticked off' the annual job list (Byrne, 2010) and little attention is paid to the outcomes. This is often attributed to a change in teaching towards being driven more centrally and controlled by economic and managerial consideration (Biggs & Tang, 2007) and this has a negative impact on processes such as peer observation which is interpreted as an element of the accountability demanded by administrative staff, rather than the improvement process intended. The change in focus for peer observation towards control of the information flow for the observed (McMahon et al., 2007) tends to encourage belief in a focus on improvement and result in a more

beneficial process for the observed. It has also been claimed that whilst individual developmental needs might be met through appraisal, peer observation does not contribute to wider school developmental initiatives (Hammersley-Fletcher & Orsmond, 2004). The individual developmental needs are addressed in McMahon's model through the focus on a resulting learning contract and action plan based on the issues identified through the observation and the details of how a particular activity will be undertaken in order to achieve specified learning goals, but wider engagement is recommended through the dissemination of areas of common interest, anonymising the outcomes of peer-observation cycles and publicising the solutions to findings of less good language teaching practices.

Peer observation of language teaching that does not require or promote critical debate about teaching plays no useful role in teacher development, however if teaching observations of language classes involve professional dialogue aimed at improvement, control and choice over participation, the process can be very rewarding. If peer observation can uncover some of the assumptions teachers use to shape language teaching and encourage critical reflection on teaching practices, it can substantially contribute to an enhancement of language teaching. Following the experience of supportive peer observation of language teaching, the teacher can be inspired to make changes to existing practice as a means of improving the language learning experience of the student and a means of trying out innovative strategies and testing the learning opportunities in alternative approaches to language teaching.

## References

- Bain, Ken. 2004. *What the Best College Teachers Do*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bell, Maureen. 2001. Supported Reflective Practice: A Programme of Peer-observation and Feedback for Academic Teaching Development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 6(1).
- Biggs, John and Catherine Tang. 2007. *Teaching for Quality Learning at University: What the Student Does*. Maidenhead: Open University Press/McGraw Hill Press.
- Brookfield, Stephen. 1995. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey- Bass.
- Bruff, Derek. 1999. *Services of the CFT: The Value of Videotaping*. Center for Teaching Vanderbilt University. Accessed 1 December 2016, <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/library/articles-and-essays/the-teaching-forum/services-of-the-cft-the-value-of-videotaping/>
- Byrne, Jenny, Brown, Hazel and Challen, Doreen. 2010. Peer development as an alternative to peer observation: A tool to enhance professional development. *International Journal for Academic Development* 12(3), 215-228.
- Carter, Vicki K. 2008. Five steps to becoming a better peer reviewer. *College Teaching*, 56(2), 85-88.
- D'Andrea, Vaneeta. 2002. *Peer Review of Teaching in the USA*. London: City University.

- Dörnyei, Zoltán 2004. *Group Dynamics in the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dörnyei, Zoltán 2011. Psychological processes in cooperative language learning: Group dynamics and motivation. *The Modern Language Journal*. 81(4).
- Ellis, Rod 2004. *Task-Based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairbanks, Amanda M. 2010. *Will Videotaping Teachers Make Them More Effective?* Accessed 1 December 2016, <http://www.good.is/post/will-videotaping-teachers-make-them-more-effective/>
- Gibbs, Graham. 1988. *Learning by Doing: A Guide to Teaching and Learning Methods*. Oxford: Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.
- Gosling, David. 2002. Three Models of Peer Observation of Teaching. Learning and Teaching Support Network. Accessed 1 December 2016, [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267687499\\_Models\\_of\\_Peer\\_Observation\\_of\\_Teaching](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267687499_Models_of_Peer_Observation_of_Teaching)
- Gross Davis, Barbara. 1993. *Tools for Teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Accessed 12 December 2016, <https://www.elon.edu/docs/e-web/academics/teaching/Tools%20For%20Teaching.pdf>
- Hammersley-Fletcher, Linda and Orsmond, Paul. 2004. Evaluating our peers: Is peer observation a meaningful process? *Studies in Higher Education*, 29(4), 489-503
- Hatzipanagos, Stylianos and Lygo-Baker, Simon. 2006. Teaching observations: Promoting development through critical reflection. *Journal of Further and Higher Education* 30(4).
- Klapper, John. 2006. *Understanding and Developing Good Practice: Language Teaching in Higher Education*. London: CILT.
- Kreber, Carolin. 2002. Teaching excellence, teaching expertise, and the scholarship of teaching. *Innovative Higher Education* 27(1), 5-23.
- Little, David. 2007. Language learner autonomy: Some fundamental considerations revisited. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching* 1(1), 14-29.
- Long, Michael H., Inagaki, Shunji and Ortega, Lourdes. 1998. The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *Modern Language Journal* 82 (3), 357-371
- McMahon, Tim, Barrett, Terry and O'Neill, Geraldine. 2007. Using observation of teaching to improve quality. *Teaching in Higher Education* 12(4).
- Nunan, David. 1998. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston, MA: Heinle ELT.
- Nunan, David. 2005. *Task-based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Peel, Deborah and Shortland, Sue. 2004. Student teacher collaborative reflection: Perspectives on learning together. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 41(1), 49-58
- Peel, Deborah. 2005. Dual professionalism: Facing the challenges of continuing professional development in the workplace? *Reflective Practice*, 6(1), 123-140.
- Purvis, Alison, Crutchley, Dave and Flint, Ali. 2009. Beyond peer observation of teaching. In Gosling, David and O'Connor, Kristine Mason. (eds.). *Beyond the Peer Observation of Teaching*. SEDA Paper (124). London, Staff and

- Educational Development Association, 23-28. Accessed 12 December 2016, [http://shura.shu.ac.uk/1497/2/SEDA\\_book\\_chapter\\_beyond\\_peer\\_obs.pdf](http://shura.shu.ac.uk/1497/2/SEDA_book_chapter_beyond_peer_obs.pdf)
- Schön, Donald A. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner, How Professionals Think in Action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Shortland, Sue. 2010. Feedback within peer observation: Continuing professional development and unexpected consequences. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 47(3), 295-304
- Silvermann, Sharon L. and Casazza, Martha E. 2000. *Learning and Development: Making Connections to Enhance Teaching*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Skehan, Peter 2003. Task-based instruction. *Language Teaching* 36(1), 1-14.
- Weaver, Constance. 1996. *Teaching Grammar in Context*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook.
- Willis, Jane. 1996. *A Framework for Task-Based Learning*. London: Longman.