A Fieldwork Report on Peer Group Reflection in Teacher Education in the Netherlands

NEKODA Kazuaki*

（Received September 26, 2025）

In Dutch teacher education, the development of expertise is closely linked to experience and reflection. Student teachers explore the essential aspects of challenges faced during internships through peer group reflection, consider policies and methods for improvement, and continuously engage in practice to enhance their professionalism. Compared with one-on-one reflection with a teacher educator, peer group reflection enables student teachers to examine the varied experiences of colleagues on an equal standing. This fosters an open atmosphere for addressing diverse issues. This paper focuses on the role of teacher educators in peer group reflection, based on observations and questionnaires, to examine how student teachers' learning can be supported. The findings indicate that teacher educators, while avoiding authoritative interventions, promote autonomous exchanges of opinion by frequently asking questions. However, when student teachers' perspectives become biased toward particular aspects of incidents and discussions stagnate, teacher educators broaden perspectives by introducing new interpretations. The survey further revealed that teacher educators facilitated deep, participatory reflection by employing a range of methods and tools. While student teachers generally viewed peer group reflection as significant and beneficial, they also noted challenges such as topic bias, lengthy discussions, and limited alignment with their individual concerns.

1. Introduction

1.1 Experiential Approach to Teacher Education in the Netherlands

In Dutch teacher education, the development of reflection skills has been identified as a critical component of the curriculum. In the earlier evaluation criteria of SBL Teaching Competencies, reflection was listed as one of the seven components for qualification. Following its transfer to the Revised Competence Requirements, which were initiated by Onderwijscoöperatie (a collaboration between teacher unions and professional associations of subject teachers), reflection was reaffirmed as an important element of professional development, encompassing three fundamental components: subject-specific, methodological, and pedagogical competence (Ministerie van OCW, 2017).

The experiential approach has a longstanding tradition in Dutch teacher education, dating back to the adoption of a more realistic approach in the 1980s (Korthagen et al., 2001). This approach prioritizes experiential learning and promotes the integration of theoretical knowledge with practical application through ongoing activities and reflection. Reflection is systematically integrated in the evaluation criteria and is therefore integral to the certification process, through which student teachers develop their professional vision. The role of the teacher educator is to cultivate student teachers' critical thinking by establishing a supportive learning environment and offering opportunities to explore the meaning of their experiences.

To promote effective reflection, Korthagen and Nuijten (2022) provided detailed descriptions of how to work with the ALACT model (Korthagen et al., 2001). In this model, students are guided to reflect on their actions, become aware of the essential aspects of their experiences, and then create alternative methods of action before making choices. To make this process function effectively, teacher educators are required to

＊ Faculty of Education, Yamaguchi University, 1677-1 Yoshida, Yamaguchi, Japan; nekoda@yamaguchi-u.ac.jp

make appropriate interventions at each stage using coaching skills such as being silent, emphasizing and using strengths, helping to make a connection with a professional framework, and supporting learning to learn (Korthagen & Nuijten, 2022, p. 49). These skills can be applied in either one-on-one or peer-group reflection sessions, the latter being referred to as *intervision* (*intervisie* in Dutch).

Intervision is a professional development approach in which participants in a peer group assist each other in gaining insight into work-related challenges. In small groups, they pose questions and suggest possible alternatives to the case provider, encouraging introspection and supporting decisions for improvement. This process is guided by a facilitator and fosters self-awareness, learning, and professional growth. A central objective is to identify "hidden drivers," that is, implicit beliefs that influence professional conduct. By recognizing these subconscious influences, professionals can enhance their effectiveness, refine their working style, and contribute positively to their organization (Bellersen and Kohlmann, 2016, p. 13).

Bellersen and Kohlmann (2016, pp. 17-19), drawing on the insights of Bateson (1972, 1984), Argyris and Schön (1978), Schön (1983), Dilts and Bonissone (1993), distinguish three levels of intervision that describes the depth of case discussion. At the "case level," the focus is on the specific issue—what could be done differently and what alternatives exist. The "characteristic actions level" shifts attention to the case provider's working style and decision-making approach. The "views level" is the deepest, exploring hidden drivers—subconscious beliefs that shape professional behavior. Intervision enables participants to uncover and clarify these hidden drivers to facilitate personal and professional growth.

However, moving beyond surface-level discussions can be challenging, as deeper reflection requires trust and openness. It can also be face-threatening if too much focus is placed on what went wrong and why. To address this, Korthagen and Vasalos (2005) proposed an approach centered on "core qualities," which helps student teachers identify their own strengths. Evelein and Korthagen (2015) offered comprehensive guidance on implementing core reflection practices. This approach, which emphasizes the positive aspects of experiences, is designed to facilitate an in-depth and balanced reflection process among student teachers. When combined with

the ALACT model, it can help them develop resilience and confidence.

1.2 Coaching in Peer Groups

Korthagen and Nuijten (2022, pp. 68-69) note that there are advantages to reflecting in peer groups. In comparison with one-on-one reflection sessions conducted with a teacher educator, peer groups are designed to collectively support the case provider's understanding of the incident's essential aspects and the development of more effective solutions. By gaining experience, applying coaching skills, and implementing various interventions to facilitate reflection, individuals can develop the capacity to evaluate their own reflections. Once student teachers have learned the role and skills of coaching through this process and are able to structure and lead peer group reflections effectively, they can train themselves autonomously without relying on external professionals in the schools where they work. When discussing problems encountered in schools, colleagues may reach essential aspects more quickly than teacher educators because the context is easier to share and similar experiences can be exchanged promptly. However, student teachers must first gain sufficient reflective experience under the guidance of teacher educators. These experiences must be carefully managed to ensure that student teachers are adequately prepared to exercise autonomy. The present study examines how teacher educators support student teachers in their learning and how student teachers engage in discussions to understand the significance and constraints of peer group reflection.

2. Method
2.1 Research Questions and Data Collection

The research question in this study is: How can teacher educators effectively facilitate peer group reflection? To address this question, intervision sessions in Dutch teacher education were investigated through observations and questionnaires administered to both teacher educators and student teachers. Five sessions were observed, including voice recordings, and questionnaires were distributed to twenty-six students and four teacher educators in March 2025 at the Dutch University of Applied Sciences (Hogeschool, or HBO) and the Teacher Training Institute of Research University. The sessions and questions were conducted

in English because the participants had sufficient English proficiency. Notta's Transcription Service was used to transcribe the discussion data.

The questions given to the teacher educators were as follows:

Q1. What do you keep in mind when conducting intervision? Explain your policies and procedures for managing group discussions.

Q2. What are the typical issues that need to be discussed in general pedagogy or subject didactics?

Q3. Do you teach your students how to reflect on their practice before and/or while conducting intervision? How do you support them in improving their reflective skills?

Q4. Are there any challenges in conducting intervision? What could be improved in managing the process?

The objective of these inquiries was to investigate the issues addressed in intervision and the teacher educators' policies and procedures for facilitating discussion. It was also important to consider how students can be supported in developing critical thinking and the reflective skills necessary for peer group reflection.

The questions given to the student teachers were as follows:

Q1. What are the learning goals or issues you have been working on?

Q2. How have the intervision sessions helped you?

Q3. Are you positive or negative about participating in intervision sessions? Why?

The objective of these inquiries was to identify the primary concerns of student teachers and determine the extent to which intervision sessions contribute to their professional development and attitudes toward them.

2.2 Research Ethics

The methods and contents of data collection were reviewed and approved by the Research Ethics Committee of Yamaguchi University. Participants were asked to sign a consent form after receiving a thorough explanation of the research aims and the procedures for managing the collected data.

3. Results and Discussion
3.1 Observations
3.1.1 Intervision Methods

There are various methods of intervision, but the observed sessions were mostly based on the "Incident Method" (Bellersen & Kohlmann, 2016, pp. 161-167), which consists of seven steps: (1) description of the incident, (2) asking questions, (3) discussing the situation, (4) looking for alternatives, (5) case provider's insights and action plan, (6) insights of participants, and (7) reflection on intervision. These steps are in harmony with Korthagen's ALACT model and correspond to looking back on the experience (Steps 1 and 2), awareness of essential aspects (Step 3), creating alternative methods of action, and making a choice (Steps 4 and 5).

In practice, the observed teacher educators modified the framework in different ways. They omitted Steps 6 and 7 due to time constraints; however, they recognized the importance of sharing insights and meta-reflections, which can be caried out on other occasions or as semester assignments. In most cases, student teachers acted as case providers, describing incidents they struggled with during school placements, but teacher educators occasionally introduced typical professional dilemmas for discussion. One teacher educator used a procedure in which each student teacher took turns as case provider, repeating the steps as time allowed. Another had student teachers choose an incident to discuss after all participants had completed the introductory descriptions. The advantage of the former procedure is that it provides more opportunities to discuss different incidents, whereas the latter allows for deeper focus on a single issue. To encourage multiple perspectives, one teacher educator used de Bono's "six thinking hats" (de Bono, 1985), which assigns six distinct roles (requesting factual information, highlighting positives, managing risks, expressing emotions, fostering creativity, and guiding the thinking process) represented by symbolic "thinking hats." This tool prompts student teachers to broaden their perspectives by taking on different roles.

The findings indicate that approaches to intervision vary among teacher educators, although encouraging active student participation in reflective discussions is a recurring feature.

3.1.2 Managing the Reflection Process

The teacher educators assumed the role of providing

structure for reflection and facilitating discussions among student teachers. They generally refrained from authoritative interventions and aimed to be empathetic listeners, asking many questions to elicit student teachers' thoughts. The following example illustrates this approach.

In this scene, despite the implementation of a prohibition on cell phone use in Dutch schools since 2024, participants engaged in discussions about managing students and colleagues who did not adhere to the regulations. A dichotomy emerged between two conflicting viewpoints: the first maintained that "the rules should be strictly followed by all means possible," while the second argued that "too strict control would reduce the students' motivation to learn, so a flexible approach is desirable." The discussion eventually shifted to the essential question of whether students would concentrate in class only if cell phone use were strictly prohibited. (ST refers to student teacher, and TE to teacher educator. The original texts were adapted for readability without altering their meaning.)

ST1: I think we are arguing that, even without the phone, they might still not pay attention. You can take away the phone, but that does not mean they will pay attention.

ST2: Well, they might be a little shocked that you took their phone, because they need to pay attention if they want to get it back. Maybe, you never know. The thing is, you cannot force them to pay attention, but you can try to engage them by giving them different tasks.

TE: So, what is the difference between forcing students to pay attention and engaging them?

ST2: The first thing is basically saying, "I want you to pay attention now. You need to listen to what I am saying, you need to watch what I am doing … you need to be there."

ST3: A good teacher makes their lesson so interesting that people want to pay attention to it instead of being forced to do so.

ST4: Some teachers are very good. They are very creative, can grab the attention of the class, although some students still do not want to.

TE: And then you could say, what is more fun than a computer game? How fun does a lesson have to be? Can you really make lessons so engaging that you can beat the game?

ST5: I think boredom is always present. Schools for teenagers are not interesting. No matter how fun we make it, like trying with Kahoot! (a game-based learning platform), which keeps them engaged for a while, but they will never be fully interested. I think, as a teacher, that is the reality you have to accept. Once you have accepted that, you can try to find ways to keep them somewhat entertained.

This example illustrates how a teacher educator directs discourse among student teachers. When ST1 and ST2 realized that strict rules would not necessarily lead to a solution, the teacher educator shifted the focus to the difference between enforcement and engagement by posing a question. ST3 and ST4 emphasized the importance of creativity for sustaining interest. The teacher educator then asked whether it was possible to make lessons that are more engaging than computer games. In response, ST5 admitted that teachers should accept that learning requires time and effort, rather than relying on unrealistic fun activities. In this example, the teacher educator refrained from making judgements and instead elicited remarks from the student teachers.

However, teacher educators sometimes need to function as knowledgeable informants when discussions drift away from essential aspects.

In the next example, a student teacher (ST6) in the case-provider role reported concern about students who frequently disrupted the classroom with repeated questions or shouting in an elementary classroom.

ST6: I was struggling with kids talking back during class when I was giving instructions. They asked too many questions and kept shouting things like "I don't get it, I don't get it. I still do not get it." I said, "okay you can come with me later to talk about it," but it was very difficult to continue the lesson, and there were just two kids who keep doing it. We talked to them about it.

In response to the case provider's description, the other student teachers posed several questions.

ST7: Does it happen with the (mentor) teacher as well?

ST6: A little bit less than with me, but it is still the same kids that keep doing it. She says, "Okay, well, you can come for an explanation later."

ST8: Do you know if they do it to disrupt others or if they genuinely do not understand?

ST6: I do not think they understand that they are being disruptive.

ST9: How do you respond when it happens?

ST6: Well, yesterday it happened quite a lot, so I got very overstimulated. I also tried to explain things if they had a question, and I said, "I will give you the explanation later", but sometimes they keep doing the same thing.

ST9: What is the tone when you say it?

ST6: I said, "Okay so this is what we did, but you didn't get it. You can come and sit at the circle table where you can get a more in-depth explanation later." But they just ignore me, and they do the same thing with my (mentor) teacher as well.

ST10: When you talked about it with them, was it separately, or with your (mentor) teacher, or how was it handled?

ST6: I did not really speak to them one-on-one, but I did talk a bit with one of them after the lesson or during their work.

After the participants finished their questions, the teacher educator moved on to the next step, in which student teachers were expected to provide suggestions for possible alternatives.

ST7: Sometimes you need to get a bit angry, I think. They have to know it is serious. The whole class is really irritating. So you can get a bit mad with your voice. I think it's hard as well because sometimes it is a bit of an act, but you have to do it because then the kids feel it is annoying, and that it is not nice.

ST8: I would tell them that I will give my main instructions, and most children will get to work. If some children do not understand, that's not a problem. I will explain further, and if it keeps happening, I will just kick them out of the classroom.

ST9: I would say the same as ST8. If you do not understand, just wait until my instructions are over, and then you can come to me personally. If I see that you are shouting, you get two warnings, and if you do not listen, you do not get extra instruction and you will have to leave the classroom. We have already discussed this, and if you do not listen, you do not respect the rules, so you can leave.

The student teachers' suggestions focused mainly on approaches that emphasized making children understand rules and consequences and punishing them when they broke them. At this point, the teacher educator began to implement authoritative interventions by referring to a specific part of the case provider's answers.

TE: What I liked about one of the things that you said was, "I do not think they do it on purpose." One of the things we usually do is focus on consequences, escalation ladders, and punishment. We have already gone through the suggestions linked to this. So, I wanted to come up with something completely different. There are two things to consider. First, sometimes these children create their own behavioral patterns. They think, "I do this, and then all the teachers that I have had in the past react the same way." Even if they may lack attention at home and no one listens to them, if they shout in the classroom, they still get a reaction. So, even if the teacher is angry, they are still interacting. Breaking that cycle of expectation is one way of getting students to rethink their classroom interactions without relying on consequences. You can do something unexpected. In this situation, I would try to focus their attention in a different way.

After listening to the teacher educator's intervention, ST6 began to share more of his understanding of the child's problematic behavior based on daily observations and expressed his desire to maintain a welcoming atmosphere for children's questions, which shifted the discussion to the essential aspect of this issue.

ST6: It is just that impulse control goes a little awry, because they know what they have to do, and they know that they have to raise their hand. They know that there is a moment where they can ask questions. It is still like the filter in his head is missing, so they just ask immediately. I also do not want to discourage asking questions, because I still struggle to ask questions myself, and I do not want to do that to other people.

Listening to ST6's concerns, ST8 proposed an idea based on her own experiences.

ST8: I have a different idea. This was in high school, but I was the same during math class, but I did not understand it. So the math teacher decided to give me a whole week of extra tuition after school. It was really hard, but I finally understood it, and my grades improved a lot.

TE: Yes, when you first hear that, it sounds like punishment, but it might be what they need.

ST6: Yes, it is not punishment. It is care.

TE: So, the way you deliver it and the way you ask what they need, or whether this is a solution, might make a difference. You might be able to help children up to five o'clock every day, and if they are willing, they can stay and see if you can help them understand. It is the same thing you were doing before, but now it is not negative—it is care. That is a diabolical twist to education, but you can present something that feels like punishment as an opportunity and possibility.

This example illustrates that the teacher educator's intervention successfully elicited further involvement from ST6 and shifted the discussion from punishment to a caring approach, which aligned with the case provider's professional identity. Generally, the role of teacher educators is to be good listeners and to refrain from prescriptive interventions, but different kinds of interventions may be more effective depending on the situation. This complexity of facilitation is an interesting aspect of managing reflective processes.

3.2 Findings from Questionnaire for Teacher Educators
3.2.1 Policies and Procedures

With respect to policies, the responses from the four teacher educators were summarized into five main concepts:

1) Membership in a professional learning community
Participants should be able to share their situations and experiences and contribute to the group without being dominant over others.

2) Examining from multiple perspectives
Participants should be familiar with both positive and negative viewpoints. Therefore, they should consider these perspectives before making decisions.

3) Examining from theorical knowledge
Participants were encouraged to connect the various theories learned in their methodology classes with the topics being discussed.

4) Safe environment
Participants were expected to treat problems as professional issues and refrain from attributing their causes to individuals. This approach fosters a conducive learning environment in which diverse perspectives and experiences can be freely shared.

5) Prompt for deeper reflection
Coordinators should exemplify active listening, encourage open dialogue, and ask follow-up questions to deepen participants' reflection.

These fundamental policies are predicated on the active participation of group members. Consequently, teacher educators are expected to provide a safe and cooperative learning environment in which student teachers can take initiative and broaden their perspectives through open discussions and by integrating theories with practical experience.

With respect to procedures, the teacher educators adjusted the "Incident Method" described in section 3.1.1. One teacher educator also reported combining it with "Appreciative Inquiry," which focuses on what student teachers believed worked well, rather than on problems, and discusses how to achieve ideal practice. This method emphasizes learning from positive aspects

that are often overlooked, and it is expected to increase trainee motivation. This teacher educator also mentioned a method called "Gossiping," which deliberately reduces the involvement of the case provider by having them sit outside the group and listen to the discussion. In this way, participants are expected to deepen the discussion without being influenced by the case provider's reactions, while the case provider gains insight by observing the discussion from an outsider's perspective (Bellersen & Kohlmann, 2016).

3.2.2 Topics and Issues

The topics discussed in the observed sessions were mostly related to pedagogical issues such as classroom management, including how to gain learners' attention in class and how to deal with pupils' problematic behaviors. As teacher educators noted, student teachers frequently raised classroom management issues, particularly during the initial stages of their internships. However, as their experience progressed, they also engaged in discussions concerning subject-specific matters. The main issues mentioned by the teacher educators are listed below.

Pedagogical issues
- Classroom discipline and order and their effect on group dynamics
- Creating a safe and supportive classroom climate
- How to address (cyber)bullying
- Fostering autonomy rather than passive learning
- Managing classroom space (socially and physically)
- Diversity and inclusion
- Motivation and learner development
- Student-teacher relationships balanced with professional boundaries (authority and empathy)

Subject-specific issues (second language teaching)
- Selection and organization of subject content
- Addressing academic achievement gaps
- Use of target language in the classroom
- Relating language-based and abstract concepts to real-world contexts and student interests to make subject content meaningful and accessible
- Linking reading, writing, listening, and speaking to intercultural communication skills, literary tools, language awareness, and critical thinking
- Teaching the use of AI

- Grammatical and communicative approaches
- Assessing subject-specific knowledge and skills fairly and effectively
- Exploring the relationship between curriculum goals, student needs, and societal expectations so that teaching is both academically rigorous and socially appropriate
- Cultivating citizenship through academic learning

3.2.3 Guidance and Supporting Tools for Reflection

Teacher educators provide guidance and supporting tools because student teachers do not begin with effective reflection skills. Prior to intervision sessions, student teachers were encouraged to formulate focused reflection questions (related to instructional dilemmas, beliefs, and goals) based on their practical experiences. Sometimes, reflection methods are described in internship guidelines and manuals, and conceptual models such as the ALACT model (e.g., Korthagen et al., 2001) and the levels of intervision (Bellersen & Kohlmann, 2016) are referred to during discussions. At other times, phased frameworks for reflection, such as Gibbs' Reflective Cycle (Gibbs, 1988) and the DIEP framework (adapted from Boud, Keogh & Walker, 1985) can be introduced to help structure student's thinking. Communication models or tools such as Leary's Rose (Leary, 1957), Core Quadrant (Ofman, 2004), and Socratic Dialogue have also been introduced. Student teachers are sometimes encouraged to apply these models when discussing how to communicate with colleagues or students.

Feedback on students' contributions to intervision was also provided to encourage critical self-reflection, and meta-reflection (reflecting on how student teachers reflect on their own reflections) was conducted regularly.

3.2.4 Challenges

According to the teacher educators' responses, there are challenges in conducting intervision. These arise when the policies described in Section 3.2.1, are constrained by difficult situations. For instance, uneven participation, dominant voices, and interpersonal tension can affect the quality of reflection. Finding the right balance between empathic listening and constructive criticism may be difficult; however, both are essential for learning. Thus, an experienced coordinator is necessary, especially when participants are not yet sufficiently skilled to manage the dynamics.

Furthermore, the significance of intervision for students is contingent upon their level of engagement. If there is no clear connection with their personal and professional development, the sessions may begin to feel like chores. If this occurs, there is a risk that students will participate only to earn credit.

3.3 Findings from Questionnaire for Student Teachers

The learning goals or issues mentioned by most student teachers were related to classroom management, such as discipline and rule setting, taking consistent action against inappropriate behavior, creating an atmosphere of trust and security, managing lesson time, maintaining class flow and structure, and sustaining learners' motivation and engagement. Some student teachers also noted that they prioritized the ongoing development of subject-specific knowledge and teaching skills, including the differentiation and the promotion of learner engagement through creative textbook use. Others highlighted the importance of relationships with their mentoring teachers.

To address these issues, student teachers gave positive responses to intervision, which are summarized as follows: (The original texts have been adapted without changing their original meaning.)

1) Expansion of perspectives

By delving into each other's cases, I gained valuable insights into how others deal with issues. I learned to approach my teaching differently by defining which part of the case we wanted to focus on. This exploration phase helped me learn to ask better questions and to avoid offering immediate solutions or interpretations. It helps me reach a better understanding and find better solutions. I try to implement these open-ended questions when asking for input and when making contact. I strive to create real, meaningful conversations.

(Graduate student teacher)

2) Rationalizing decision making

It helped me understand how my peers thought about issues related to classroom management. It helped me rationalize my own decisions and gave me a new perspective.

(Graduate student teacher)

3) Professional identity

To know what kind of teacher you are, you need to hear the different perspectives of other teachers. This will also help you determine the kind of teacher you do not want to be.

(Second-year student teacher)

4) Adopting a new approach

Hearing about what works for others inspired me to try new things. For example, one of my colleagues said that she took reading breaks when her group became rowdy. This strategy worked well with my students.

(Fourth-year student teacher)

5) Professional learning community

I was happy to participate in intervision. They offered fresh perspectives on certain problems and allowed team members to support each other. I think it is very helpful to discuss specific problems. You realize that someone else has experienced almost every problem before. You are not the only person who has dealt with these certain issues.

(Fourth-year student teacher)

Most responses were positive, and majority of student teachers appreciated the value of intervision for their professional development, especially in terms of learning different perspectives from other group members.

However, there were also a few negative responses, which are summarized as follows.

1) Correspondence to individual goals

I must say that I often have trouble connecting the intervision sessions to actual practice. This is partly because the goals of intervision (which apply to all students) differ from my personal goals for my internship.

(Graduate student teacher)

2) Redundancy

Sometimes, we discuss topics that I would not otherwise consider, which can be beneficial but is often redundant.

(Graduate student teacher)

3) Time consuming

I was a bit critical because it sometimes moved slowly or took a long time. On the other hand, it allowed for many different perspectives, which could be helpful in

the future.

(Fourth-year student teacher)

4) Knowledgeable others
It can certainly help; however, there needs to be a topic of discussion on which others are more knowledgeable. Otherwise, it turns into a light conversation with no clear direction.

(Second-year student teacher)

These responses indicate that certain shortcomings can overshadow the positive aspects of peer groups. However, student teachers' motivation and engagement are unlikely to deteriorate if teacher educators are skilled facilitators who can teach the purpose and function of group reflection while managing discussion dynamics at an appropriate distance. If student teachers value and take ownership of the learning community, its positive aspects will naturally emerge.

4. Conclusion

This paper described intervision practices conducted in Dutch teacher education based on the author's fieldwork in the Netherlands. The teacher educators oriented and facilitated student teachers' discussions as skilled coaches and knowledgeable informants. Although the fundamental policies of reflection sessions and the coaching skills required are generally shared among teacher educators, the procedures, and contents of intervision should show more variation than those described here. The findings showed that student teachers recognized the value of peer group reflection and retained ownership as independent, self-directed teachers. It is essential for student teachers to receive careful coordination from skilled coaches, as well as supporting tools for self-awareness and reflection, especially in the early stages of developing their reflection skills. Regular participation of student teachers in peer group reflection sessions supports their professional development with sustainable skills for a continuous career in education.

Future work will require attention to the management adjustments that teacher educators may need to make when the sociocultural context in which peer group reflection takes place differs. One teacher educator who collaborated with us in this study mentioned that many Dutch student teachers like to actively share their experiences with colleagues and talk openly about their thoughts. While these characteristics may enhance the quality of reflection, further exploration is necessary to ensure quality of reflection in other contexts. This exploration should involve incorporating guidance and providing the necessary support adapted to specific sociocultural contexts.

References

Argyris, C., & Schön, D. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective.* Addison-Wesley.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind.* Ballantine Books.

Bateson, G. (1984). *Het verbindend patroon.* Bert Bakker.

Bellersen, M., & Kohlmann, I. (2016). *Intervision: Dialogue methods in action learning.* Vakmedianet.

Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). *Reflection: Turning reflection into learning.* Routledge.

De Bono, E. (1985). *Six thinking hats: An essential approach to business management.* Little, Brown, and Company.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* Macmillan Company.

Dilts, R.B., & Bonissone, G. (1993). *Skills for the future, managing creativity and innovation.* Meta Publications.

Evelein, F.G., & Korthagen, F.A.J. (2015). *Practicing core reflection: Activities and lessons for teaching and learning from within.* Routledge.

Gibbs, G. (1988). *Learning by doing: A guide to teaching and learning methods.* Further Education Unit; Oxford Polytechnic.

Kolb, D.A. (1984). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development.* Prentice Hall.

Korthagen, F.A.J. (1985). Reflective teaching and preservice teacher education in the Netherlands. *Journal of Teacher Education, 9*(3), 317-326.

Korthagen, F.A.J., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Lagerwerf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001). *Linking practice and theory:*

The pedagogy of realistic teacher education. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Korthagen, F.A.J., & Vasalos, A. (2005). Levels in reflection: Core reflection as a means to enhance professional growth. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 11*(1), 47-71.

Korthagen, F.A.J., Kim, Y.M., & Greene, W.L. (2013). *Teaching and learning from within: A core reflection approach to quality and inspiration in education.* Routledge.

Korthagen, F. & Nuijten, E. (2022). *The power of reflection in teacher education and professional development: Strategies for in-depth teacher learning.* Routledge.

Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality; a functional theory and methodology for personality evaluation.* Ronald Press.

Ministerie van OCW (2017). Besluit van 16 maart 2017 tot wijziging van het Besluit bekwaamheidseisen onderwijspersoneel en het Besluit bekwaamheidseisen onderwijspersoneel BES in verband met de herijking van de bekwaamheidseisen voor leraren en docenten, *Staatsblad*, Vol. 2017/148.

Ofman, D. (2004). *Core qualities: A gateway to human resources.* Cyan Communications.

Randall, M., & Thornton, B. (2001). *Advising and supporting teachers.* Cambridge University Press.

Schön, D.A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Basic Books.

Snoek, M. (2017). The teaching profession in the Netherlands: from regulative structures to collaborative cultures. In J. Heijmans, & J. Christians (Eds.), *The Dutch way in education: teach, learn & lead the Dutch way* (pp. 91-107). Onderwijs Maak Je Samen.