RESEARCH ARTICLES

A Mille-Feuille of Learning: Layered Reflective Practice in Language Teacher Development

Daniel Hooper
Tokyo Kasei University

Alexander Dodd
No Borders International School

Erik Tsuchiya
Nagoya University of Foreign Studies

This study examines a teacher-led approach to continuous professional development (CPD) grounded in data-led, dialogic reflective practice (RP). Two in-service language teachers participated in a graduate TESOL course intervention combining Walsh's Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework with Edge's Continuing Cooperative Development principles. Each teacher video-recorded their own lessons, identified significant moments, and transcribed selected excerpts for collaborative analysis. Peer discussions centered on interactional features such as scaffolding, teacher echo, extended wait time, and reformulation. These dialogues validated instinctive teaching practices, fostered greater classroom awareness, and encouraged alignment between visible behaviors and personal pedagogical beliefs. The process also revealed the emotional dimensions of RP: initial apprehension about sharing classroom data shifted to increased confidence through non-judgmental, empathetic peer support. The findings underscore the potential of integrating classroom data with supportive peer dialogue to bridge theory and practice, enhance teacher agency, and foster sustained professional curiosity, provided that safe, collaborative spaces and common analytical tools are available.

Keywords: professional development, reflective practice, practitioner research, cooperative development, dialogic reflection

Continuous professional development (CPD) in language teaching refers to continued formal and informal development of professional knowledge and skill repertoires across teachers' careers. More formal varieties of CPD in language teaching might include invited seminars from experts in the field, institutionally sanctioned workshops, and lesson observations, whereas informal varieties may be grassroots initiatives organized by groups or individual teachers such as peer observation and dialogue in critical friendships and keeping a reflective diary (Cirocki & Farrell, 2019; Hayes, 2019). Particularly in the case of bottom-up initiatives, focusing on areas selected by teachers based on professional curiosity, CPD has been argued to positively contribute to teachers' sense of agency and empowerment, as well as their motivation within the field (Cirocki & Farrell, 2017; Mercer & Pawlak, 2024). More specifically, reflective practice (RP) approaches based on dialogic analysis of classroom data with peers (Mann & Walsh, 2017) certainly represents one way in which teachers may highlight issues of personal value to them while also maintaining a culture of non-judgement so as to cultivate positive and efficacious

identities within a professional community of practice. Due to the importance of positive professional self-image in cultivating and maintaining teacher wellbeing and the established connection between teacher wellbeing and learners' psychological and academic success (Briner & Dewberry, 2007), dialogic reflective practice based on teachers' interests may represent a positive contribution impacting teacher and student alike. Unfortunately, it has been reported that a great deal of CPD initiatives remain fundamentally top-down and transmissive in nature (Hayes, 2019) and are often conducted from a deficit perspective in which external authorities are brought in or institutional mandates are implemented so as to "fix" teachers' "problematic" practice.

In order to explore an alternative transformative approach to CPD grounded in teacher curiosity, strengths-based learning, and peer support, this paper focuses on one reflective practice intervention that was conducted with two in-service teachers combining analysis of classroom data and supportive, non-judgmental peer discussion. In this paper, we share Alex and Erik's discoveries and reflections throughout this teacher-driven CPD intervention.

Literature Review

Reflective Practice

Based on existing studies in the area of language teacher CPD (Cirocki & Farrell, 2017; Godínez Martínez, 2018; Uchida & Rothman, 2023), RP appears to represent one way that teacher-driven and -administered CPD can take place. There are many previously documented benefits that RP can offer both pre- and in-service teachers such as enhanced self-efficacy and greater understanding of the theory-practice connection. In addition, reflective CPD initiatives also allow teachers to explore their pedagogical beliefs and examine the links between those beliefs and their actual classroom behaviors (Watanabe, 2016). This means that RP can act as a grassroots developmental tool that teachers can use to interrogate their personal sense of plausibility (Prabhu, 1990), i.e., what they (rather than an institution or outside expert) believe is important for their students and what they can do to bring their own actions into alignment with these beliefs.

A Call for Data and Dialogue

Despite the numerous advocates of RP as a teacher-led CPD approach, definitions and standards for RP were called into question around a decade ago by Mann and Walsh (2013), who claimed that it had become "bloated and riddled with inconsistencies" as it lacked a "detailed, systematic and data-led description of either its nature or value" (p. 292). Therefore, reflection that draws on classroom data through conversation analysis (CA) (Hale et al., 2018; Wong & Waring, 2010) has been suggested as a way of meeting the challenge over more robust and evidence-based RP.

One well-known data-driven RP approach is the Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (SETT) framework developed by Walsh (2006). SETT allows teachers to analyze their classroom discourse through two main lenses: distinct classroom modes (managerial, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context) and specific interactional features such as scaffolding and increased wait time (see Table 1 for a detailed list). Rather than framing classroom practice in "good" or "bad" terms, SETT encourages teachers to understand the specific features of their classroom interaction and judge for themselves whether their discourse aligns with their stated pedagogical goals and beliefs.

Table 1
Interactional feature types (Walsh, 2006, p. 141)

Feature	Description
A) Scaffolding	*1) Reformulation (rephrasing a learner's contribution)* *2) Extension (extending a learner's contribution)* *3) Modeling (providing an example for learner(s))*
B) Direct repair	*Correcting an error quickly and directly.*
C) Content feedback	*Giving feedback to the message rather than the words used.*
D) Extended wait-time	*Allowing sufficient time (several seconds) for students to respond or formulate a response.*
E) Referential questions	*Genuine questions to which the teacher does not know the answer.*
F) Seeking clarification	*1) Teacher asks a student to clarify something the student has said.* *2) Student asks the teacher to clarify something the teacher has said.*
G) Extended learner turn	*Learner turn of more than one utterance.*
H) Teacher echo	*1) Teacher repeats the teacher's previous utterance.* *2) Teacher repeats a learner's contribution.*
I) Teacher interruptions	*Interrupting a learner's contribution.*
J) Extended teacher turn	*Teacher turn of more than one utterance.*
K) Turn completion	*Completing a learner's contribution for the learner.*
L) Display questions	*Asking questions to which teacher knows the answer.*
M) Form-focused feedback	*Giving feedback on the words used, not the message.*

In addition to their original call for RP to be more data-driven, Mann and Walsh (2017), along with other authorities on RP, have also advocated for teachers to engage in dialogic RP with peers (Farrell, 2015, 2022), which is carried out in teaching communities of practice and smaller-scale, informal "critical friendships" (Farrell, 2018). Utilizing RP approaches such as SETT in collaboration with peers can foster richer insights, guard against self-centered reflection and "navel gazing", and promote shared understanding (Gill & Hooper, 2020; Mann & Walsh, 2017; Uchida & Rothman, 2023).

Non-Judgmental Dialogue in RP

Despite the numerous claimed benefits accompanying dialogic RP, it must be noted that this type of collaborative CPD may represent a face-threatening act for teachers due to the risk of judgment from peers and challenges to their professional knowledge and identity (Edge, 2015). Overly prescriptive or judgmental dialogue in RP may negatively impact both teachers' willingness to share their experiences and perspectives and the amount of reflective value they are able to derive from such dialogue. In recognition of this, Julian Edge proposed a dialogic RP approach called continuing cooperative development (Edge, 2002). This approach is grounded in the principles of respectful acceptance, empathy, and sincerity and asks that those participating in reflective dialogue take on one of two roles: the Speaker or the Understander. As the Speaker shares and reflects upon their classroom beliefs, experiences, and quandaries, it is the Understander's responsibility to open up as much interactional space as possible for the Speaker while also allowing them to make the most of that space. This can be done through techniques such as restating, asking open questions, attending with supportive body language, and simply staying silent. Edge summarizes the Understander's role as underpinned by the notions of humility and acceptance borne of recognizing that numerous paths may lead to the same goal in terms of "good" teaching.

> As Understander, in the full knowledge that we each have different paths to tread in order to become the best teacher that we each can be in the process of becoming, I want to put that knowledge into practical use by laying aside my own experience in order to help someone else shape their own. (Edge, 2015, p. 69)

Based on these non-prescriptive, exploratory principles of CPD, we outline below a data-based and dialogic RP approach that we conducted within a graduate TESOL program in order to stimulate in-service teachers' deeper understandings of their own classroom interactional patterns. Drawing on both CA and reflective analysis of classroom data, we then illustrate the ways in which this particular approach may have contributed to our continuing development as language teaching professionals and the viability of such an approach in the wider field.

Methods

Participants

At the time of this RP intervention, Alex and Erik were in-service teachers enrolled in an elective Sociocultural Theory (SCT) course taught by Daniel within the MA TESOL program at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies in fall 2024. Alex was working in a private after-school program and Erik was a teacher at a public elementary school at the time of writing (see Table 2 for background information). During the SCT course, both participants showed interest in collaborating as participant-authors on this reflective study based on the RP process they engaged in during the course.

Table 2

Participant Information

Participant	Nationality	Years of teaching experience	General teaching context
Alex	Canadian	10	Elementary (grade 3-5), private after school class
Erik	American	17	Elementary (grade 4), public school

Procedure

In contrast to a previous study (Hooper et al., 2024), in which teachers were forced to reflect on mock "microteaching" sessions with peers in the SCT course, we were able to obtain ethical and institutional approval to collect classroom data from our respective teaching contexts. This meant that we were able to observe and analyze far richer and more representative samples of their teaching practice. Both teachers chose to video record their selected classes in order to include both linguistic and paralinguistic features of their teaching within their subsequent data transcriptions and analyses. Alex worked at a private school for elementary-age children and, in line with the school's policy, received permission from the school and the students' parents before any class recordings were made. Erik worked at a public elementary school and obtained approval from both the school and the Board of Education to record classes for training purposes and action research projects. Furthermore, in line with ethical guidelines, all students' names have been removed from any data excerpts appearing in this paper.

Alex and Erik were instructed to watch the videos of their classes multiple times at home just after they had recorded them and take extensive notes on their impressions and feelings. They subsequently analyzed the interactional features they had used in their classes as well as the impact this might have had on students' interactional space based on Walsh's SETT model. They were also encouraged to reflect on the extent to which their "visible behaviors" (Farrell & Vos, 2018) were in alignment with their personal teaching beliefs and goals. Following the CA approach to reflective action research proposed by Hale et al. (2018), the teachers also selected short segments from their recordings that they found particularly meaningful—whether interesting or problematic—for deeper exploration. These segments were transcribed using CA conventions (Appendix) based on an approach from Hale et al. (2018). Alex and Erik brought their CA transcripts and any personal notes they had taken to the following SCT class. We then engaged in collaborative discussion, grounded in principles of continuing cooperative development and language learning advising, based on these data and reflections. Audio recordings of these discussions formed an additional source of data and reflective stimuli that contributed to Alex and Erik's understanding of their own development and, ultimately, the writing of this paper. In the following sections, both Alex and Erik outline their respective classroom analyses and the various influences on their teacher cognition and emotions throughout this reflective process.

Alex's Perspective

My Lesson Recording

When I reviewed the video of my teaching, I was struck by a wave of self-criticism. I initially reacted by focusing on every possible flaw, awkward pause, or moment where I felt I saw opportunities for improvement. This made it difficult to appreciate the positive aspects of my teaching. While analyzing the video, I noticed that certain interactional features were more prevalent than others: teacher echoes, scaffolding (Lines 53 and 56), and extended waiting times (Line 56). For example, this excerpt is taken from a listening activity where students are engaged with both a worksheet and my instructions simultaneously:

Excerpt 1

51 (T)eacher: my two sisters taught me how to play the saxophone
52 Student A: whats saxophone
53 T: my two sisters taught me how to play my big yellow saxophone
54 Student A: oh
55 Student B: Alex what is what is saxophone

56 T: my two sisters taught me how to play my big yellow saxophone big and yellow do you see something that is big and yellow {20.0} ready

I was self-conscious about sharing this video with my peers because it appeared that the students were having trouble with the materials and my verbal instructions. The thought of exposing my teaching to scrutiny was daunting and I worried about how my peers would interpret the long silences and the restlessness of my students in the video. Knowing that my classroom environment was not the most vibrant, I feared that it could be interpreted in ways that diverged from my intentions. My hope was that my peers would see the same potential and engagement that I experienced in the classroom.

Discussion Amongst Peers

After the class discussion about my teaching video, I felt a significant boost in both my motivation and confidence. It appeared my initial trepidation about sharing was unfounded. Engaging with my peers and teacher in this reflective space allowed me to see my teaching from a new perspective, and their supportive feedback made me feel more validated in my efforts. One of the most encouraging aspects was that my peers seemed to recognize what I was attempting to achieve in class. The focus of the discussion was particularly refreshing; we concentrated on what actually happened in the classroom rather than dwelling on what should have happened. It felt empowering to discuss the realities of my classroom experience without the pressure of perfectionism. When analyzing the video as a group, the interactional features mentioned before were viewed as positive features. The other teachers commented that these features were beneficial to my students. Frequencies and lengths of time were viewed as appropriate and, judging by the needs of the students, required. Other parts of the video, such as Excerpt 2 below, were also discussed, which I was surprised to find that they were of interest to my peers.

Excerpt 2

49 T: okay {10.0} well you can guess also and I can tell you the you can look at the read the people and you can make a guess if you want or do you want a hint {1.9} do you want a hint {11.9} oh {8.0} in in australia I really like to listen to music {4.0} I love listening to music in australia

This excerpt was perceived by my peers as unique because it was an extended teacher turn that contained many pauses. I thought that this was something that was not going to be viewed well considering that the students were not talking. However, I was pleasantly surprised to hear that my actions were discussed positively in that I used different interactional features such as extended wait time and referential questions to convey information to students without forcing engagement through things like display questions and unwanted help. Again, this was a huge boost to my confidence especially since these actions were based more in instinct rather than self-awareness. The main takeaway from the discussion was how closely tied my teaching experience was to my emotions. Initially, I felt anxious about how my peers would respond to my video, but as the conversation progressed, I transitioned to a state of excitement about sharing more about my class and other videos. I believe this shift in my emotional state was directly linked to the positive mood of the discussion.

Recording of our Peer Discussion

Upon listening to the recorded audio of our peer discussion, I found myself becoming critical again. It was interesting to observe how my self-perception shifted as I revisited the conversation on my own. I realized that my explanation of my research was not as clear as I would have liked it to be. This realization was somewhat disheartening, as I had hoped to communicate my ideas more effectively during the discussion. I realized that the activity was understood by all parties beforehand, which made detailed explanations unnecessary. In listening to the discussion later, I was able to rediscover moments of learning about my own teaching. In this excerpt, a colleague used a new term to describe how I was assisting my students.

Peer Discussion Excerpt 1

Alex: Uh, yeah. I think you can look at that as him being like, "I got this."
Daniel: Yeah, actually I picked that as a really important point. I said you were "drip feeding."
Alex: Ah…
Daniel: Like scaffolding.

I found this insightful especially considering that I seemed more concerned with how my students were learning rather than my own teaching. This moment served to heighten my own classroom awareness.

Erik's Perspective

The reflection and lesson recording we did were of immense learning value to me. Two salient benefits I identified through this process were: (1) confirmation of my classroom teacher talk and (2) identification of opportunities to improve classroom interaction and lessons. It was from my lesson recording that I could recognize and analyze the quality and quantity of my language use. For example, I originally considered my classroom English usage to be appropriate for the level of my students, and this was confirmed in the peer discussion. In my teaching context I am the primary teacher with a Japanese homeroom teacher supporting me. As a language teacher for young, beginner learners (nine to ten years old), I use English as much as possible to provide comprehensible input, while simultaneously attempting to avoid an excess of teacher talk and teacher centeredness. My peers supported my teacher talk strategies, especially noticing my use of language scaffolding, paralinguistic scaffolding, voice pitch, teacher echo, and speed. An example can be seen below in Excerpt 3 where I had just started the lesson and was reviewing with students the month, day of the week, weather, and time of day.

Excerpt 3

10 (T)eacher: what day is it? ((pointing to a thursday card on the blackboard))
11 Student A: {2.0} sunday
12 T: {2.0} $what day is it?$ ((gesturing with outward arms))
13: Students: ((various answers))
14: Student B: thursday {2.0}
15: T: It's <<thursday>> {2.0} <<thursday>> ((pointing index finger towards mouth while emphasizing use of the tongue on "th" utterance)

After reviewing my lesson audio, I returned to this segment and noticed my use of reformulation and direct repair of Student A's utterance as well as a modeling teacher echo of "Thursday." My reflection and the lesson recording reaffirmed to me that my teaching approach

was indeed appropriate for my teaching context. Reviewing my lesson and discussing it with my peers helped me to realize my own particular teaching approach and that "this is how I teach" (Hooper et al., 2024). A teacher can write notes during/after lessons, audio/video record their lessons, have someone observe them, etc. Teachers can then reflect on and/or discuss the lessons with peers. In these ways, SETT deepens reflective practice, looking at a lesson through multiple layers.

My peers also highlighted some areas in the lesson that could maybe be experimented with or enhanced. I considered my classroom language use good. I do not always use complete sentences, but I try to make my language use comprehensible for my students, who are complete beginners. This was confirmed by my peers. They also noticed opportunities to potentially further improve classroom interaction. My peers pointed out the Japanese homeroom teacher's interactions with students as being one such opportunity. In Excerpt 4, I am modeling the input task and using display questions to verify that students understand the English vocabulary. The purpose of the task is for students to listen to the English language and vocabulary I use, then move one of several picture cards on their desk to a pre-determined section of their desk based on what they understood.

Excerpt 4

33 T: ((pointing to "I don't have" on blackboard)) I don't have a randoseru {2.0} I don't have a randoseru ok? (gestures ok sign)
34 Student C: yes
35 T: I have a= in Japanese ((puts hands on hips))
36 Students: mottemasu
37 T: ok good
38 HRT: motteru {3.0} motteru ka mottenai kara
39 T: I don't have:: ((pointing to blackboard))
40 Students: mottenai
41 T: I don't have a randoseru ok::? ((gestures wearing a backpack))

My peers iterated that the students understood the vocabulary, therefore perhaps negating the need for confirmation in Japanese by the homeroom teacher. There was a tendency by the teacher to explain some of my utterances in Japanese. This is to make sure students understand and follow the lesson but could be preventing students from having an opportunity to understand my simplified spoken English. In other words, we teachers could, inadvertently, be denying students the opportunity to learn English.

Peer Discussion Excerpt 2

Alex: So uh the first thing I thought was I've heard you in the past talk about negotiation of meaning and having that CLT classroom. But if you were saying something and he is explaining it afterwards in Japanese there's no opportunity for the kids to say [anything]. For you to reformulate your responses or anything like that. He's taking that away.
Erik: Uh, yes, and I agree…

While I had noticed the homeroom teacher's frequent explanations in the video recording and transcription, I had not considered how this could affect language learning. My peers and I concluded that this could be improved by giving students a few more seconds after hearing classroom language in English before a Japanese explanation is given (extended wait-time).

Extended wait-time would afford students time to negotiate meaning, which is necessary to develop their communicative competence. While I could identify one of the modes and some of the interactional features on my own by recording, watching, and transcribing a part of my class, my peers noticed modes and features I did not, helping me to better understand my classroom, and provided me with ways that my classroom interaction could be improved. It is true that through self-reflection I can notice, identify, and make some teaching adjustments on my own. Furthermore, analyzing the lesson recording added even more details that I had ultimately missed, not noticed, and/or could not identify. However, my peers were instrumental in taking it that one step further by pushing my reflection beyond what I could do on my own.

This kind of dialogic reflective practice based on lesson recordings feels very deep and layered to me, like a mille-feuille. Some of the reflective layers include video recording a lesson, watching it, transcribing it, watching it with your peers, dialogically analyzing the lesson recording, and finally reviewing the peer discussion and writing on it. Each layer adds depth, and I was able to learn more about my classroom interaction at each of these layers. These layers of reflection also extend and expose us as teachers and how we teach and interact in the classroom. Teacher reflection can be daunting as we must make a conscious effort to review ourselves. At every layer, from video recording to peer discussion, I felt exposed as my peers observed my teaching approach. This exposure was negated, however, by my peers focusing on understanding and exploring my teaching and classroom talk, rather than criticizing it. I was originally hesitant to have others watch my lesson and give feedback, but I am now grateful as I could learn and grow because of this type of lesson analysis. Therefore, based on this experience, I feel data-based and dialogic reflection is a useful method to improve classroom instruction and interaction and further teacher professional development.

Summary

Looking back on Alex and Erik's reflections, we can observe a number of dynamics in action. In Alex's case, we see a perspective shift, with his self-criticism of his classroom data and his anxiety over sharing it with his peers gradually transformed into a realization of his strengths as a teacher. Recurring features of his interactional style that he viewed negatively or ambivalently such as teacher echo and extended wait time were reframed by his peers as strengths that scaffolded student participation. Consequently, this appeared to deepen his understanding of his own teacher talk and boost his confidence as a professional. Looking at Erik's experience, the multilayered process of self- and peer-analysis of classroom data led him to delve deeper into the minutiae of his interactional style (such as scaffolding and teacher echo) and gain reassurance by confirming the congruence between his "visible behaviors" (Farrell & Vos, 2018, p. 2) and teaching beliefs. Furthermore, through peer dialogue, he also became aware of previously unconsidered contextual factors that may be facilitating or constraining interaction in his classroom.

Discussion

This practitioner-driven, exploratory study centered on a CPD intervention grounded in classroom data and supportive peer dialogue. In particular, we examined how this intervention contributed to the professional development of Alex and Erik, two in-service language teachers. By reflecting on classroom conversational data analysis utilizing Walsh's SETT framework and peer discussion influenced by Edge's notion of continuing cooperative development, we interpreted numerous ways in which this CPD approach positively contributed to deeper understanding of classroom practices and teachers' professional identities and needs. In the following discussion, we present the key implications of the study in relation to the value of classroom data and peer

interaction, issues relating to teacher emotion and identity, and challenges relating to the sustainability and transferability of CPD.

One of the most salient takeaways from this study was the apparent value and enhanced insight that Alex and Erik derived from data-based analysis of their own teaching practices through the SETT framework. Both teachers were able to refer to concrete examples of different interactional features in their own teacher talk, such as scaffolding, teacher echo, extended wait time, and reformulation. Without the transcribed CA data that they collected from their classrooms and the SETT guidelines that allowed them to collaboratively discuss their findings with a shared terminology, various interactional idiosyncrasies may have simply passed by unnoticed. By engaging in what Mann and Walsh (2017) call dialogic and evidence-based reflective practice, Alex and Erik moved beyond surface-level generalities and helped each other to reach new realizations about their "visible behaviors" (Farrell & Vos, 2018, p. 2) in the classroom. Erik described the process as a "mille-feuille" of learning, with each layer of reflection throughout the SETT process adding nuance and depth to his understanding of classroom interaction. This type of enhanced understanding then has the potential to catalyze future CPD by stimulating informed pedagogical decisions rather than teachers being guided solely by "impulse or routine" (Farrell, 2015, p. 8).

A further theme apparent from Alex and Erik's reflections was the emotional dimension of reflective practice and CPD. Alex's initial self-criticism and anxiety about sharing his video with his peers exemplify the vulnerability and emotional labor that may come with exposing one's teaching to others. However, through our non-judgmental approach that focused on areas of interest identified by each teacher, and which highlighted strengths and opportunities rather than taking a deficit perspective (Hayes, 2019), we can observe how Alex's apprehension changed to validation and enhanced curiosity. With the other members of our group taking on a role as empathetic "Understanders" (Edge, 2002) as opposed to a more top-down, judgmental role, Alex unearthed previously unnoticed value in instinctive actions, such as the "drip feeding" of scaffolding, that he had previously dismissed. These teacher reflections reinforce the notion that RP or CPD should not merely be a technical exercise, but a socio-emotional process that carefully takes into account a teacher's sense of self and professional worth.

Conclusion

The practical implications of this study primarily concern the benefits of utilizing classroom data (either audio or transcribed CA) integrated with robust analytical frameworks like SETT in order to encourage teachers to identify personally-relevant points of interest in their classroom interactions and to analyze them in collaboration with supportive peers. It also bridges the gap between theory and practice by highlighting techniques such as scaffolding, extended wait time, and teacher echo as theoretically-sound features of intentional, student-sensitive teaching, thus reinforcing teachers' sense of plausibility (Prabhu, 1990) as professionals.

In terms of theoretical implications, this paper responds to Mann and Walsh's (2013, 2017) call for more systematic and robust accounts of RP. In integrating data-led analysis with emotional and dialogic facets of teacher reflection, we adopted a grassroots approach to CPD based on teachers' professional curiosity rather than the sterilized "box-checking" (Walsh & Mann, 2015, p. 353) that often takes place in top-down CPD initiatives. Furthermore, Alex and Erik's reflections on their underlying feelings of insecurity and the resulting need for emotional safety embedded in this CPD intervention further reinforced Edge's (2015) argument that truly developmental dialogue must be grounded in empathy, humility, and non-judgement.

The small scale and context-specific nature of this intervention naturally limit the degree to which our findings and experiences can be generalized to the field as a whole. Only two

teacher-participants were involved, and both operated within the supportive environment of a graduate MA TESOL course. However, the depth of insight gained suggests the potential value of expanding such interventions to larger groups or more diverse teaching contexts. Furthermore, it could most certainly be argued that the considerable work required for data collection and analysis, as well as the potentially face-threatening nature of data sharing, could greatly impact the applicability of this particular RP approach in contexts beyond graduate school programs. Potentially valuable future studies could focus on developing less intense, teacher-friendly iterations of this type of intervention which are realistically implementable for teachers struggling with heavy workloads, and who are perhaps skeptical or apprehensive about externally mandated PD. From a research perspective, investigating long-term effects of dialogic RP on teacher development via longitudinal case-study research or examining RP's impact on teacher and student learning or wellbeing could be fruitful areas for future engagement.

References

Briner, R., & Dewberry, C. (2007). *Staff wellbeing is key to school success.* Worklife Support.

Cirocki, A., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2017). Reflective practice for professional development of TESOL practitioners. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and TEFL*, *6*(2), 5–24.

Cirocki, A., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2019). Professional development of secondary school EFL teachers: Voices from Indonesia. *System*, *85*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.102111

Edge, J. (2002). *Continuing cooperative development: A discourse framework for individuals as colleagues.* The University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.8915

Edge, J. (2015). Non-judgemental discourse in the development of critical capacity for language teachers. *RELC Journal*, *46*(1), 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214561622

Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Promoting teacher reflection in second language education: A framework for TESOL professionals.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315775401

Farrell, T. S. C. (2018). *Reflective language teaching: Practical applications for TESOL teachers.* Bloomsbury. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350021389

Farrell, T. S. C. (2022). *Reflective practice in language teaching.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009028783

Farrell, T. S. C., & Vos, R. (2018). Exploring the principles and practices of one teacher of L2 speaking: The importance of reflecting on practice. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *6*(1), 1–15. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2018.20486

Gill, A., & Hooper, D. (2020). Integrating conversational analysis and dialogic reflection within reflective practice. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *8*(2), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2020.120886

Godínez Martínez, J. M. (2018). How effective is collaborative reflective practice in enabling cognitive transformation in English language teachers? *Reflective Practice*, *19*(4), 427–446. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2018.1479688

Hale, C. C., Nanni, A., & Hooper, D. (2018). Conversation analysis in language teacher education: An approach for reflection through action research. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, *33*, 54–71. https://doi.org/10.16986/HUJE.2018038796

Hayes, D. (2019). Continuing professional development/continuous professional learning for English language teachers. In S. Walsh & S. Mann (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education* (pp. 155–168). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315659824-14

Hooper, D., Braun, A., Kako, M., Kurashita, N., Soto Prado, R., Tajima, Y., & Watashima, S. (2024). Interactional analysis using scientific and everyday concepts in teacher development. *Accents Asia*, *18*(1), 1–24.

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

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

Mercer, S., & Pawlak, M. (2024). Language teacher professional curiosity: Understanding the drive for professional development. *Studies in Second Language Learning and Teaching*, *14*(3), 393–420. https://doi.org/10.14746/ssllt.39293

Prabhu, N. S. (1990). There is no best method—Why? *TESOL Quarterly*, *24*, 161–176. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586897

Uchida, A., & Rothman, J. (2023). *Cultivating professional development through critical friendship and reflective practice: Cases from Japan.* Candlin & Mynard. https://doi.org/10.47908/27

Walsh, S. (2006). Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom. *ELT Journal*, *60*(2), 133–141. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cci100

Walsh, S., & Mann, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice: A data-led way forward. *ELT Journal*, *69*(4), 351–362. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv018

Watanabe, A. (2016). *Reflective practice as professional development: Experience of teachers of English in Japan*. Multilingual Matters. https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783096985

Wong, J., & Waring, H. Z. (2010). *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203852347

Appendix

Conversation analysis transcription symbols

Symbol	Meaning
.	(period) Falling intonation.
?	(question mark) Rising intonation.
,	(comma) Continuing intonation.
-	(hyphen) Marks an abrupt cut-off.
::	(colon(s)) Prolonging of sound.
wo:rd	(colon after underlined letter) Falling intonation on word.
wo:rd	(underlined colon) Rising intonation on word.
word	(underlining)
word	The more underlying, the greater the stress.
WORD	(all caps) Loud speech.
°word°	(degree symbols) Quiet speech.
↑word	(upward arrow) raised pitch.
↓word	(downward arrow) lowered pitch
>>word<<	(more than and less than) Quicker speech.
<<word>>	(less than & more than) Slowed speech.
<	(less than) Talk is jump-started—starting with a rush.
hh	(series of h's) Aspiration or laughter.
.hh	(h's preceded by dot) Inhalation.
[ ]	(brackets) simultaneous or overlapping speech.
[ ]	
=	(equal sign) Latch or contiguous utterances of the same speaker.
{2.4}	(number in parentheses) Length of a silence in 10ths of a second.
(.)	(period in parentheses) Micro-pause, 0.2 second or less.
( )	(empty parentheses) Non-transcribable segment of talk.
((gazing upward))	(double parentheses) Description of non-speech activity.

(try 1)/(try 2)	(two parentheses separated by a slash) Alternative hearings.
$word$	(dollar signs) Smiley voice.
#word#	(number signs) Squeaky voice.

About the Authors

Daniel Hooper is an associate professor in the Department of English Communication at Tokyo Kasei University. He has been teaching in Japan for 19 years in a variety of contexts including primary/secondary schools, English conversation schools, and universities. His research interests include teacher and learner identity, reflective practice, self-access learning communities, and communities of practice. tywardreathdan@gmail.com ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9431-3195

Alexander Dodd is currently pursuing a Master of Arts in TESOL at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies (NUFS). With a decade of experience teaching English across various contexts, including preschool, elementary school, and business classes. His research interests encompass young learners, interactional competence, and willingness to communicate.
doddalexander2025@gmail.com

Erik Tsuchiya is a MA TESOL student at Nagoya University of Foreign Studies and a part-time English teacher at Nanzan Primary School. He has been teaching English in Japan for 17 years in a variety of educational contexts and is currently working at a private elementary school. His research interests are communicative language teaching, young learners, and learner autonomy.
eriktsuchiya@mac.com