

---

---

## **EFL Teachers' Practices of Reflective Teaching and the Challenges they face: Kotebe Metropolitan University in Focus**

Getachew Baye Kebede and Daniel Tiruneh Woldemedhin<sup>1</sup>

### **Abstract**

This study was mainly conducted to 1) assess the extent to which EFL teachers at KMU employ the four reflection factors in teaching and 2) to inquire into factors that obstruct successfully employing reflective teaching. Data were collected from selected sample EFL teachers and students. A questionnaire with 40 items was distributed to 20 randomly selected EFL teachers. FGD was conducted with five randomly selected EFL teachers and five third year English majoring students. A semi-structured interview was prepared for three randomly selected EFL teachers and the interview was audio recorded. Data from questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics. The data obtained from the FGDs and the interviews were analyzed qualitatively. From the data collected through the questionnaire, interview and the FGD, there is no evidence showing that EFL educators are using reflective teaching within their career long learning though they know reflectivity is important in their teaching profession. From the data obtained, the factors obstructing the successful employment of reflective teaching include lack of university culture and system of reflective teaching, self-conceit of knowing better than others, lack of the right attitude (open mindedness, whole-heartedness, and responsibility), shortage of resources, having extra responsibility, and lack of incentive/encouragement

**Key words:** Reflective teaching, professional learning, reflection factors

---

<sup>1</sup>Kotebe Metropolitan University, Faculty of Languages and Humanities *Email:* [getbaye@gmail.com](mailto:getbaye@gmail.com), [danieltiruneh@gmail.com](mailto:danieltiruneh@gmail.com)

## 1. Introduction

Teaching is a complex profession which requires an ongoing improvement and commitment. Teachers, as professionals, need to learn how to learn and transform what they know into practice to the advantage of their students' growth and improved learning. Avalos (2010:10) says, "teacher professional learning is a complex process, which requires cognitive and emotional involvement of teachers individually and collectively, the capacity and willingness to examine where each one stands in terms of convictions and beliefs and the perusal and enactment of appropriate alternatives for improvement or change" (Avalos, 2010: 10).

Teacher professional development is a career-long process and job embedded commitment in which educators adjust their teaching to meet student needs. This endeavor "directly tackles teachers' teaching styles—the patterns of decisions teachers make when mediating their students' learning" (Díaz-Maggioli, 2004:5). According to Farrell (2013) teachers, whether they have just qualified for teaching or are in their mid-careers, need professional development for a number of reasons. He says those who recently completed their teacher education program, the novice teachers, seek professional development because they may not have got all the skills and knowledge in the courses they took. The experienced teachers, in their mid-careers, need to consider professional development because "... after years in the classroom they may need to reflect on their working principles and see where these have come from and how they have been shaped over the years" (Ibid: 18). This kind of professional development according to Johnson and Golombek (2002: 2) "emerges from a process of reshaping teachers' existing knowledge, beliefs, and practices rather than simply imposing new theories, methods, or materials on teachers."

As teachers strive to enrich their personal profession, they may consider a number of areas for growth all the way through their career. Richards and Farrell (2005: 9–10) list possible areas of development ranging from subject matter knowledge to career advancement.

Globally, professional development has attracted considerable attention in recent years (Craft, 2000) and “there are growing calls within the ELT profession for language teachers to regularly revisit what they know and what they think they know about teaching and learning and thus pursue various forms of professional development throughout their careers” (Farrell, 2013:19). Accordingly, professional development is becoming mandatory because there are speedy changes and teachers need to update and improve their skills through professional development (Craft, 2000:6)

From this argument, it follows that in order for teachers to ensure their own ongoing professional development; they need to practice reflection which these days are a broadly accepted form of professional growth of teachers (Calderhead and Gates, 1993).

Despite such multifaceted advantages of reflective teaching, however, the researchers' insider's view here at Kotebe Metropolitan University (here after KMU ) has always informed them that such a reflective teaching practice does not seem to have a coherent existence except there may be some fragmented efforts here and there by some committed staff. It is known that the majority of the academic staff at KMU attended the HDP courses where reflective teaching is prominently discussed. Yet, the extent to which, if at all, the EFL teachers practice reflective teaching has not been investigated.

### **1.1 Aim of the Study**

The aim of the study is to assess the extent to which EFL teachers at KMU employ the four reflection factors in their EFL classrooms and inquire into factors, if there are, that obstruct them from successfully employing reflective teaching

### **1.2 Research Questions**

In this respect, thus, the current study explores the following research questions:

- To what extent do EFL teachers at KMU employ the four reflection factors in their teaching practice?
- As a corollary, if they are not practicing them, what are the factors that obstruct the successful implementation of reflective teaching and how?

## **2. Review of Related Literature**

### **A brief overview of theories on reflective teaching**

Teaching is a multifaceted and multidimensional engagement (Richards and Lockhart, 2007). Therefore, being a teacher and maintaining professional growth afterwards is a perplexing and complex business (Ghaye, 2011). To understand this complex activity, Bartlett (1987) had already suggested that teachers should be given the means to recognize their own classroom practices better. Likewise, Hall and Simeral (2015:13) contended that “to improve our professional practice and increase our positive impact on academic achievement. ...we engage in rigorous, ongoing self-reflection about our professional responsibilities.” The reason for getting involved in a continuous self-reflection is that expertise in the teaching profession does not occur overnight (Hall and Simeral (2015).

In teaching, reflection is considered as “the process of critical examination of experiences” (Richards & Farrell, 2005: 7). To Hall and Simeral (2015: 14), reflection also called self-reflection is “the act of exerting mental energy about our professional responsibilities and a series of very specific reflective behaviors.” This would mean that teachers need to know why they do something the way they do it and how to better what they do for subsequent sessions in the teaching learning process. According to Richards and Lockhart (2007:2), teachers need to be engaged with asking and answering questions about teaching and themselves so that they can be “in a position to evaluate their teaching, to decide if aspects of their own teaching could be changed, to develop strategies for change.” These



scholars further argue that teachers can learn a lot about their profession through self-inquiry or critical reflection.

Teachers, whether they are experienced lecturers, professionals or novice ones, should get involved in reflection should they need to bring about professional growth. This is so because “all are practitioners and all have an impact on the quality of the learning experience of our students.” (Norton and Campbell, 2007:140)

The researchers' experience as university lecturers for over fifteen years now show that teachers with many years of teaching service tend to give less emphasis to peer observation, writing journals and giving feedback to colleagues. Their argument for developing such tendency is that their experience in teaching over years has made their profession a routine that comes naturally. Contrary to the propensity of heavily relying on experience and disregarding reflection in teaching, Richards and Lockhart (2007) contend that experience is inadequate as a foundation for professional growth. Regarding the need for reflection, Skoyles (1998: 105) has earlier highlighted that “to improve one's practice one needs to continually examine and reflect on courses of action to bring about change.”

Understandably enough, things are changing very fast and nothing remains unchanged. Accordingly, teachers need to keep abreast of changes in the globe where they live and work. It is true that experience is crucial. However, critical reflection involves scrutinizing teaching experiences as a basis for appraisal and decision making and as a source for change (Wallace 1991).

Teachers who get involved in reflection, need to have written accounts of their teaching (teaching journals), prepare lesson reports, collect information on some aspects of teaching and learning (surveys), observe a colleague's class (peer observation), and conduct action research (Richards and Lockhart (2007). Reflection, as has been discussed so far, requires teachers to be engaged with different activities and some teachers may feel that they are overburdened. Yet, it has to be understood that reflection is

part of the teaching and learning process and should not be considered another imposition of chores on teachers (Rechards and Lockhart, 2007).

Reflection, as argued by many scholars, is divided into two main categories: reflection-on-action and reflection-in-action. Reflection-on-action refers to the contemplation of past practices undertaken in order to unearth the knowledge used in practical situations, by analyzing and interpreting the information recollected (Fitzgerald, 1994). This means that it is an activity of looking back after the teaching learning has already taken place.

On the other hand, reflection-in-action refers to thinking about what one is doing whilst he/she is getting involved in the teaching learning process. This kind of reflection offers the practitioner a chance to restructure what he/she is doing (teaching) (Schon 1983).

### **3. Methodology**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

The authors have used the sequential explanatory mixed method design which consists of two distinct phases: quantitative followed by qualitative (Creswell et al., 2003). Creswell and Plano Clark (2001:71) describe that the design begins with the collection and analysis of quantitative data, which has the priority for addressing the study's questions. This first phase is followed by the subsequent collection and analysis of qualitative data. The second, qualitative phase of the study is designed so that it follows from the results of the first, quantitative phase. The researchers interpret the way that the qualitative results help to explain the initial quantitative results. In this study the purpose of the qualitative phase is to further explore than explain or purely interpret the results of the quantitative phase. From a pragmatic point of view, this approach is most suitable in providing a focus and answering the research questions.

### **3.2 Target Population**

In the context of this study, research population refers to all the EFL instructors at Kotebe Metropolitan University. According to Brink, Van Der Walt and Van Rensburg (2009:123) research population refers to the total number of people or objects which are of interest in terms of data collection. In other words, research population is that category of persons that meet the criteria in which the researcher is interested in studying. In the context of this study, research population refers to all EFL teachers and second year English majoring students in the department of Foreign Languages and Literature.

With regard to site selections in a study such as this with the chosen research design of the sequential explanatory mixed-methods, it is advised by advocates of mixed research design such as Beattie (1995), Goetz and Lecompte (1984) Denzin (1978,1989) that in a study whose thirst is to identify the beliefs, practices and challenges of practitioners, conducting case study was found out to be helpful to identify the details and intricacies of issues surrounding the area. Thus, with this scholarly back up in mind and because of convenience, this research was conducted at Kotebe Metropolitan University where the researchers are staff members in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature. A sample size of 20 EFL teachers of the total 35 were taken as part of the total sample size of this study and five students out of the total fifteen second English major students.

### **3.3. Instrumentation**

Focus Group Discussion and questionnaire were the tools used to gather data for the research. Interview and some follow-up questions based on Akbari, Behzadpoor, & Dadvand (2010) "Reflective Teaching" questionnaire were used to elicit information from the participants. Twenty EFL teachers filled out the questionnaire. Seven EFL teachers, who had also filled out the questionnaire, got involved in the FGD while three other teachers participated in the in-depth interview.

**3.4. Data Analysis, Interpretation and Discussions of Major Findings**

Data from questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistic (such as mean, standard deviation, and variance). For the focus group reports and interviews, the comments, and responses to the questions were transcribed verbatim. The data obtained from recurring themes and constructs were triangulated across the sources based on themes (Patton, 2002). Later, data were analyzed and interpreted in order to reveal a clear picture of the implementation of the reflective teaching practices. The Table below shows statistical data.

	N	Mini	Maxi	Mean	Std.Dev	Variance
item1	20	1.00	4.00	1.4500	0.9445	0.8920
item2	20	1.00	5.00	4.0000	1.0260	1.0530
item3	19	1.00	5.00	2.2632	1.0457	1.0940
item4	20	2.00	5.00	4.1000	0.7881	0.6210
item5	19	1.00	4.00	2.8421	0.8983	0.8070
item6	20	1.00	5.00	3.5500	1.0990	1.2080
item7	20	2.00	5.00	4.2500	0.9105	0.8290
item8	20	1.00	5.00	3.8000	0.9515	0.9050
item9	20	2.00	5.00	4.1500	0.8127	0.6610
item10	20	2.00	5.00	3.4500	0.8256	0.6820
item11	20	2.00	5.00	4.0500	0.9445	0.8920
item12	20	2.00	5.00	3.7500	0.7864	0.6180
item13	20	1.00	5.00	3.6500	0.9881	0.9760
item14	20	1.00	5.00	3.4000	1.0463	1.0950
item15	20	1.00	5.00	3.2000	1.1050	1.2210

$$s_i^2 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^k (n_i - 1) s_j^2}{\sum_{j=1}^k (n_i - 1)} = \frac{(n_i - 1) s_1^2 + (n_i - 1) s_2^2 + \dots + (n_i - 1) s_k^2}{n_i + n_i + \dots + n_i - k}$$

$$s_i^2 = \frac{1}{n_i - 1} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (y_j - \bar{y}_i)^2$$

Where

is the sample size of population i and the sample variances are

$$s_i^2 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{40} (n_i - 1)}{\sum_{j=1}^{40} (n_i - 1)} = \frac{(20-1)0.8920 + (20-1)1.0530 + \dots + (20-1)0.8920}{20+20+\dots+20-40} = \frac{19 \times (0.8920 + 1.0530 + \dots + 0.8920)}{19 \times 40}$$

**EFL Teachers' Practices of Reflective Teaching...** Getachew and Daniel

item16	20	1.00	5.00	3.2500	1.2927	1.6710
item17	20	1.00	5.00	2.6000	1.1425	1.3050
item18	20	1.00	5.00	3.2500	1.1180	1.2500
item19	20	1.00	4.00	2.0500	1.0501	1.1030
item20	20	1.00	4.00	2.1000	1.0208	1.0420
item21	20	1.00	4.00	3.0500	1.3484	1.8183
item22	20	1.00	5.00	3.5000	1.2354	1.5263
item23	20	1.00	5.00	3.7500	1.0699	1.1447
item24	20	1.00	5.00	3.7000	1.0311	1.0632
item25	20	1.00	5.00	3.8500	1.0400	1.0816
item26	20	2.00	5.00	3.5000	1.0513	1.1053
item27	20	1.00	5.00	3.6000	0.8826	0.7789
item28	20	1.00	5.00	2.5500	1.5035	2.2605
item29	20	1.00	5.00	3.2000	1.3611	1.8526
item30	20	1.00	5.00	3.3500	1.0400	1.0816
item31	20	1.00	5.00	3.6000	1.0463	1.0947
item32	20	2.00	5.00	3.8500	0.8751	0.7658
item33	20	2.00	5.00	3.5000	0.9459	0.8947

$$\frac{19 \times 45.2476}{19 \times 40}$$

$$1.1312$$

$$\frac{859.7044}{760} = 1.1312$$

The square root of a pooled variance estimator is known as a **pooled standard deviation**.

$$s_p = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{40} (n_i - 1) s_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{40} (n_i - 1)}} = \frac{859.7044}{760} = \sqrt{1.1312}$$

**Pooled variance** is an estimate when there is a correlation between

pooled data sets or the average of the data sets is not

							identical.
item34	16	2.00	5.00	3.5000	0.9459	0.8947	Pooled variation is less precise the more non-zero the correlation or distant the averages between data sets.
item35	20	1.00	5.00	2.9500	0.9661	0.9333	The same conclusion for <b>pooled standard deviation</b>
item36	20	1.00	5.00	3.2500	1.3945	1.9447	
item37	20	1.00	5.00	2.8000	1.2085	1.4605	
item38	20	1.00	5.00	3.1000	1.1965	1.4316	The smaller the value of variance or standard deviation better the items clustered around the average mean.
item39	20	2.00	5.00	3.2500	1.1653	1.3579	
item40	20	2.00	5.00	2.9000	0.9119	0.8316	
Valid N (listwise)	16			<b>131.9053</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>45.2476</b>	

**\*\*Pooled sample variance** provides a higher precision estimate of variance than the individual sample variances. This higher precision can lead to increased statistical power when used in Statistical tests that compare the populations, such as the t-test.

<b>Combined (pooled) mean = 3.2976</b>	
<b>Combined (pooled) standard deviation = 1.0636</b>	
<b>Combined (pooled) variance = 1.1312</b>	

As can be seen from the Table above, responses to question number 1 asked as to how often a teacher dismisses students' perspectives without due consideration. The mean of the responses by the participants is 1.45 which is in between rarely and never. This might suggest that the teachers give due consideration for their students' perspectives. The result from the standard deviation which is also .9445 whose dispersion from the mean is below 1 implies that there is not that much variation in the responses given falling between minimum 2.00 and maximum 5.00.

With regard to question number 2 which inquires as to whether teachers see the need for thoughtfully connecting teaching actions with student learning or behavior, the responses of the participating teachers cluster around 4.0. This result might be interpreted to mean that the vast majority of the teachers try their level best to thoughtfully connect their actions with student learning or behavior. From this, one may adduce evidence that the research subjects' higher academic status coupled with their rich experience might have contributed very hugely for the teachers' taking of such a stance.

Question 3 asked whether the teachers' analysis of teaching practices is limited to technical questions about teaching techniques. Their response which on average 2.26 is near to rarely indicates that the teachers' reflections go beyond raising technical questions. This finding has also been proven through the FGD held in that many of the research participants are of the view that teaching practice apart from teaching techniques inherently calls for understanding the depth and intricacies of teaching which they usually give due prominence to.

Coming to question number 4 which is about making adjustments based on past experience, the responses from the participant teachers cluster around 4.1. This result might be interpreted to mean that these teachers are fully cognizant of the need to look into their present performance and to come up with the necessary adjustments. Such a practice known as reflection for action according to Schon (1983) is believed to make teaching an innovative practice and the reflective teacher an innovative practitioner in the times to come.

Despite the fact that the scientific literature clearly states the importance of assessing for a teacher his/her present performance and making the necessary adjustments for the times to come, the majority of them whose responses cluster around 2.84 claim that they question the utilization of specific practices but not general policies or practices. This result might seem to suggest that there is a rift in terms of creating a link between specific practices and that of general policies or practices. When such a scenario prevails, it can make teaching less effective and more of a routine (Reason, 2002).

The mean score 3.55 indicates somehow a stronger tendency of doing it usually to the very statement on whether teachers engage in constructive criticism of their own teaching. From the FGD discussions held with the teachers too, it has been found out that many of the participating teachers usually engage in reflective action with the view of helping their students learn the language better. As an instance, the excerpt below from Teacher 002 in the FGD further substantiates the case in point. The teacher stated, “As much as I can, I try to support my students or I reflect on how I could help my students. The learning which I think will happen is when the students are highly engaged. So I always evaluate how my students are trying to learn” (FGD/002/3-6). This finding correlates fairly well with that of Ball (2009) who asserts that reflective teachers must be willing to change their own teaching strategies in order to help their students become competent enough.



Question number 7, investigated whether the respondents have commitment to continuous learning and improved practice. The response to this question with a mean score average of 2.84 which clusters to the option of sometimes implies that their commitment to continuous learning and improved practice is not done so often which in turn is indicative of the fact that teaching is carried out in its traditional mode. When teachers lack such a frequent commitment, according to Mcintee *et al.* (2003), it makes teaching and learning so much in effective. It was also revealed in the responses of the participating teachers that they usually consider their students' perspectives in decision making as the mean score average point of 3.55 signifies. From this result, it can be inferred that most of the teachers might have begun understanding the significance of negotiating with students on mutual issues that need mutual decision. In such a situation, according to writers such as Calderhead and Gates (1993), learners can develop the sense of belongingness and ownership to their learning.

It is also indicated by their responses to question number 9 that they see teaching practices as remaining open to further investigation. The mean score of teachers to this question which is on "I see teaching practices as remaining open to further investigation" is 4.25 indicating the clustering of responses to *usually*. This result may imply that the teachers have a strong belief on the fact that in order for teachers to ensure their own ongoing professional development, they need to practice reflection. In fact, reflection these days is a broadly accepted form of professional growth of teachers and it is recognized as a foundation for pedagogy of teacher education. Thus, a teacher should always remain cognizant that teaching as a profession needs investigation. This idea is also further substantiated by teachers' responses to question number 10. The mean score which is 3.80 nearly shows that the majority of the respondents usually exert their maximum effort to see their classroom practice within the broader sociological, cultural, historical, and political contexts. Calderhead and Gates (1993) posits that teachers' reflective practice aims to enable teachers to analyze, discuss, evaluate and change their own practice, adopting an analytical approach towards teaching; foster teachers' appreciation of the

social and political contexts in which they work, helping teachers to recognize that teaching is socially and politically situated and that the teacher's task involves an appreciation and analysis of that context. In the FGDs held, many of the participants pointed out that they are quite aware of the principle of "teacher as lifelong learner; thus, they usually try to investigate their practice and take remedial solutions where ever needed.

With regard to how often a teacher observes himself/herself in the process of teaching, the mean score which is 4.15 revealed that most of the teachers do *usually* make an observation of their own action while teaching which in Schon's (1983) term is called reflection on action. As can be seen from the mean scores which are 3.45 and 4.05 to question 12 and 13 respectively, the respondents almost feel that they are aware of the incongruence between beliefs and actions and take action to rectify the problem and they are active inquirers, both critiquing current conclusions and generating new hypotheses. The implication of this could be that their experiential knowledge and their academic preparations might have contributed to their being conscious of the importance of such a reflective action.

Question 14 inquired into whether teachers challenge assumptions about students and expectations for students. As the mean value score which is 3.40 indicates, it is nearly *sometimes* that the majority of the teachers practice this. This finding shows that the majority of the teachers do not, in practical terms, engage in trying to know what their students' problems and expectations are which in Steven's (2013) terms are said to be "overlooking the crux of the matter- the learner's interest" and considering the learner as a vessel. In such a case teaching becomes a laze fare exercise.

Questions from 15 to 20 inquired into one of the six-component models of teachers' reflection which in Akbari, Behzadpoor & Dadvand's (2010) term is called *practical reflection*. According to the data for question number 15, it is the conviction of quite a good deal of the respondents whose mean score 3.20 of the respondents that it is only sometimes they try to have a file where they keep their accounts of their teaching for reviewing purposes.

This finding is also substantiated well in the FGD we made. One of the FGD participants said:

Teaching professionally is not that much rewarding; on top of that I am expected to teach 12 credit hours per week. There are also other official duties you might be given including teaching for extra load as I have to supplement my income. Thus, such a reflection practice though I believe in its importance, I feel that it is a luxury (FGD/18/4-

With regard to responses to question number 16, 17 and 18 which inquired into whether the teachers talk about their classroom experiences with their colleagues and seek their advice/feedback, the mean scores which are 3.25, 2.60 and 3.25, respectively show that it is only “*sometimes*” that they engage in such a reflective practice. From this finding, one might give evidence that the teachers are not in a position to assess to what extent their beliefs about their own teaching actions are implemented in their actual teaching actions.

Question 19 too, is the other group of items that requested the participants' practice on how often they observe other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices. In here the average mean score of 2.05 which tilts toward rarely shows the fact that the respondents do not almost engage in such a reflective teaching practice. The finding from the FGD seems to also validate the same. As an instance, Teacher 004 while narrating his experience with regard to lesson observation laments, “We seem to be having contradictory views to get you clarified. People do not want to be observed, because they feel that they know better than others, or because they have insecurity. Because they do not know subject area very well so that they do not want to get it revealed” (Teacher 004 17/4).

One can, thus, conclude from the discussions made above that peer observation is far from being practiced. As Liberman (1995:102) notes, learning chances appeared for students to solve real problems. Moreover,

teachers must learn as their students do and one way of doing this is through group observation while teaching.

Question 20 too, attempted to find out the reflective practice of EFL teachers on how often they ask their peers to observe their teaching and comment on their teaching performance. In this respect, too, as the mean score 2.10 implies it is only rarely that the majority engage in such a reflective practice and the FGD quoted above from Teacher 004 can also be a reason for the absence of such a practice which the literature also calls it a 'vital practice' (Farrell, 2003).

Reading articles related to effective teaching and participating in workshops/conferences are ways of being reflective. In question 21, when asked how often EFL teachers do these, the mean value (3) indicates that they get involved in these activities only sometimes. This result seems to contradict with the information obtained during the FGD and interview. During the FGD and interview, the participant EFL teachers recounted that they would depend on reading books and articles for professional improvement, given the fact that there is not any peer observation, and discussions among colleagues.

Scholars contend that EFL teachers should do action research works, share the findings with colleagues and implement the results of the study. Action research focuses on classroom issues and sets out to get immediate remedy for the observed problems. When EFL teachers were asked in question 22 how often they thought classroom events as potential research topics, they answered that they usually thought that classroom events can be potential research topics. Contrary to this, however, they indicated both during the FGD and the interview that they did no action research at all. This might show that there is a big gap between what teachers are aware of and what they actually do.

When a teacher is reflective enough, he/she thinks about his/her teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting his/her teaching. The EFL teachers who responded to the questionnaire in question 23 indicated that they would

usually contemplate about their teaching philosophy, their mean value being 3.75, suggesting that they are being reflective. In addition to thinking about one's teaching philosophy, an EFL teacher is also expected to figure out which aspect of his/her teaching provides him/her with a sense of satisfaction and what his/her strengths and weakness are, consciously reflecting on the roles given to him/her. The EFL teachers who responded to this questionnaire as given in question 24 noted that they usually think about what style of teaching would give them satisfaction and what their strengths and weaknesses are.

Regarding contemplating about weaknesses and strengths, the EFL teachers said that they would usually think about their weaknesses and strengths. Likewise, they said that they would usually identify their weaknesses and strengths through reflective discussions. The data collected during the FGD and interview, however, suggest that the EFL teachers get involved in academic discussions rarely.

Teachers have different roles in their profession which include assessing the learners' prior knowledge, selecting supplementary materials, preparing various learning activities, explaining and clarifying concepts, assessing learners' understanding, and providing feedback, just to mention a few. As indicated in question 27, the respondents said that they would usually engage on conscious reflections on the roles they are supposed to take as teachers.

One way of being reflective in teaching is through keeping journals, a written or an audiotaped account of teaching experience. Concerning what to include in a journal, Bartlett (1990: 209-10) advises that "Our writing will be about our routine and conscious actions in the classroom; conversations with pupils; critical incidents in a lesson; our personal lives as teachers; our beliefs about teaching; events outside the classroom that we think influence our teaching; our views about language teaching and learning." Regarding reflecting on one's strengths and weaknesses via reflective journals as indicated in question 28, the EFL

teacher said that they would do so only sometimes, their mean value being 2.55. During the FGD and the interview sessions, the majority of the EFL respondents highlighted that they would not use reflective journal as a way of thinking in a critical and analytical way about their teaching learning profession.

Teaching, as many would argue, is a collaborative academic endeavor. According to Tedick (2005: 177) “A key element in language teacher development is effective collaboration” As given in question 29, the sample EFL teachers’ responses mean value (3.2) show that they would get involved in collaborating with colleagues only sometimes. They indicated during the FGD and the interview that their collaboration is only when they set final exams for courses taught by many teachers. Despite the fact that the ELT teachers are not getting involved in collaborative reflection, scholars contend otherwise. Loh et al (2017:3), citing Parsons and Stephenson (2005) argue as follows:

Reflection is neither easy nor automatic. Sometimes the help of critical others allows one to be able to identify the issue(s), and hence ascertain possible solutions. As such, collaboration with colleagues is critical in such a situation. Colleagues provide the necessary external perspective and feedback; in addition, they act as a sounding board for alternative ideas. Moreover, they can offer suggestions to improve certain established practices.

Brookfield (1995) has also already stressed that teaching requires cooperation, and there is a considerable need to have a continual dialogue with peers about teaching in a jointly cooperative environment.

As part of reflective teaching, teachers are expected to consider introducing new teaching techniques and participating in workshops/conference to improve the teaching learning process. When asked how often they do these in questions 30 and 31, respectively, they responded that they sometimes do so which implies that they are not being reflective to improve the quality of their teaching

In addition to sharing information and facilitating the teaching learning processes, teachers are also expected to give due considerations to students' emotions. When asked how often teachers give attention to students' emotions, they responded that they would attend to students' emotions usually. Likewise, they added that they would usually (with mean value 3.5) respond more time with when the student is having an emotional problem or when he/she is neglected by his/her peers.

The teachers think of writing articles based on their classroom experience only sometimes, with a mean value of 2.95. During the FGD and the interview sessions, the respondents highlighted that they would not get involved in researching their classroom experience, thereby having a little experience of doing research. However, they argued that they would sometimes, with mean value of 3.25, look at journals to learn recent developments in their professions.

So far, attempts have been made to deal with the quantitative strand of the research, which focused on the extent to which teacher practice reflective teaching. The following section discusses the reflective teaching factors.

#### **4. Practical Factor**

According to Farrell (2003), Richards and Farrell (2005), "journal writing," "lesson reports," "surveys and questionnaires," "audio and video recordings," "observation," "action research," "teaching portfolios," "group discussions," "analyzing critical incidents" are believed to be the most crucial elements that do constitute the practical factors of teachers classroom lives or something related. In this respect, one of the themes that surfaced abundantly in the FGD held with the seven English teachers was that none of them have the habit of accomplishing such crucial elements. They raised various difficulties they encounter with regard to fully implementing such practices of reflective teaching. As an instance, Teacher 004 while narrating his experience with regard to lesson observation laments:

We seem to be having contradictory views to get you clarified. People do not want to be observed, because they feel that they know better than others, or because they have insecurity. Because they do not know subject area very well so that they do not want to get it revealed (Teacher oo4 17/4-7)

The idea from the other teacher (006), however, seems to be dependent on the educational culture of the academic institution. He said, “I never had peer observation here at Kotebe Metropolitan University for there is nothing that is legislative and legally binding, but I had peer observation when I was teaching at Gondar College of Teacher’s Education. That was because, it was directed by the dean that each teacher had to do peer teaching.” (FGD /17/13-16).

From the foregone excerpts, it could be inferred that the absence of the culture among the staff and also lack of institutional culture that helps nurture such reflective practices might have triggered the problem to prevail.

The above evidence might compel us to believe that the teachers practice teaching under the condition of relationship which can be interpreted as monological, non-trustful and non-collaborative (Brookfield 1995: 247-251). Under such a supervisory relationship, re-constructive learning is impeded. This kind of relationship directly speaks to the researchers’ experientially observed problem of teachers’ inability to reflect and reconstruct new understandings and skills. Reason (2002) argues that effective learning from practice requires practitioners’ collaborative research, inquiry and exploration.

It is also found out that most of the teachers do not have a file where they keep their accounts of class room teaching for reviewing purposes. One of the participating teachers in the FGD states the reason why he lacks such an experience saying:



Teaching professionally is not that much rewarding; on top of that I am expected to teach 12 credit hours per week. There are also other official duties you might be given including teaching for extra load as I have to supplement my income. Thus, such a reflection practice though I believe in its importance, I feel that it is a luxury (FGD/18/4-6).

#### **4.1 Cognitive Factor**

Reflective teachers attempt for shaping their professional development. In this regard, they employ cognitive factor which can influence on their teaching practice. In this respect, it is obvious that parameters including carrying out an action research, attending conferences and workshops, and reading related literature could help teachers to improve their teaching skills (Richards & Farrell, 2005). In this study, therefore, the researchers attempted to find the teachers' answers to the questions about cognitive reflection factor, consisting of questions "Do you think of using/introducing new teaching techniques in your classes?" "Do you read books/articles related to effective teaching to improve your classroom performance?", and "Do you participate in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues?"

The responses to these factors given by the majority of the teachers who participated in the FGD assert that they tend to follow innovative teaching methods though scarcity of resources has always remained to be a mammoth challenge. The teachers are of the view that using new teaching material and technology help them to make connection between new teaching techniques to traditional one, and consequently improve and modify teaching strategies. Some of the responses for this question go as:

I love my job and I always search for new or useful thing out of that, like a new task or a new teaching technique. Previously I was not from the family of pedagogy. So I was a born teacher not a made teacher. The difference on myself began from previously what I understood

gradually that I am changing particularly when I tried to implement Active Learning (Teacher 002/FGD 3/6-9)

Further validating this claim, this sameteacher 002 accentuates the extent to which his participation in different professional development workshops helped him a lot in further polishing his professional career. He said, “.... Change is important...I believe there is always slight change in my professional career. I am improving myself thanks to my participation in trainings like the HDP which got me introduced with the concept of active learning.”

It is also in the finding that the majority of the participants are of the opinion that they mostly try to update their teaching materials to make connections between new teaching techniques and the traditional ones with the view of increasing students’ motivations and attention to learning. The following point from Teacher 001 brings the whole idea fully on board. In his own words, he noted, “As much as I can, I try to support my students or I reflect on how I could help my students. The learning which I think will happen is when the students are highly engaged. So I always evaluate how my students are trying to learn” (FGD/002/3-6)

This finding correlates fairly well with that of Ball (2009) who asserts that reflective teachers must be willing to change their own teaching strategies in order to help their students. The fact that the majority of the participants in this research are well experienced and highly qualified academicians, it might be possible to argue that their vast reading and involvement in scientific research might have helped them to be ardent in shaping their professional development to the timely demand.

Teachers know that each student is unique and learns differently and require new teaching strategies to teach their lessons. For this reason, they were of the opinion that they needed to use new teaching material and technology to make connection between new teaching techniques to traditional ones so as to increase student’s motivation and also their attention to learning.

This finding is in accordance with those of Ball (2009) who declared reflective teachers must be willing to change their own teaching strategies. Many of the research participants highlighted the importance of reading articles and books related to teaching techniques so as to identify alternative ways of representing ideas and concepts to EFL learners. Some selected responses from the focused group discussions do also hint the same. As an instance, T 007 says, "Every night I read the books or articles that relate to method of teaching and learning because I want to learn something more." (T007/DN/11).

From such findings, it could be learnt that the teachers were willing to learn from reading related literature and use them to improve their teaching. Still one of the concepts of cognitive reflection element is the one that focuses on the idea that teachers seek ways to improve teaching practice and developing their teaching knowledge through participation in workshops and conferences (Johnson and Golombek, 2002). In this respect, it is the view of the majority who took part in the FGD that as a result of participating in different workshops and seminars that the way they perceived teaching and their roles in the process of teaching changed.

#### **4.2. Meta-cognitive Factor**

Writers such as Dadvand (2010) state that teachers' personality, beliefs, values and more specifically their affective make up, can influence their tendency to get involved in reflection and will affect their reaction to their own image resulting from reflection. In this respect, the participants in the FGD were asked to reflect their practices with regard to their teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting them including their feeling about their strengths and weaknesses as teachers. Pertaining to these agenda set for discussion, most of the participants underscored that they do have their own goals and usually pose questions to themselves as to how they can teach their students, on the basis of what criteria they select assignments for their students and what teaching procedures might be better for them. As an instance, T 002 addressing this issue noted on his teaching philosophy

stating, “As a teacher, I always take the role of facilitation and approach my students in the way they like to receive. Mixing my approaches when I am teaching in the same class the same students in a different approach and problem is my philosophy” (FGD 003//20-23)

This excerpt might suggest that the teachers have an idea about the importance of teaching philosophy and how it could impact on teaching performance. This does seem also to be the belief of T 003 who claims that understanding the students’ problems and trying to figure out the possible solutions is the corner stone of his teaching philosophy.

As a whole the fact that the teachers examine their behaviors and attitude throughout the course could help them to recognize obstacles to learning and changing strategies to achieve teaching objectives (Ball, 2009). Therefore, this finding confirms those of previous studies which suggest that there is a strong bond between teaching philosophy and teaching practice (Afshar&Farahani, 2015).

The other practice of metacognitive reflection that one has to look in to is the fact that teachers have to always be engaged on reflecting about their high and low performances in their teaching endeavor including their strengths and weaknesses. The following idea from Teacher 002 illustrates the case in point:

I believe in this. There is a saying from the American Conversationalist who says “try again, fail again and feel better .... We can learn from our failure. That is what I have always been practicing ... analyzing my failure stories and those of my success and take actions for the times to come (FGD/006/3-5).

This finding might imply teachers’ eagerness to learn from their mistakes, and their willingness to change and move forward is immense. It is for this reason that they believed their past experiences helped them improve their performance. This might be because of the fact that teachers perceived their performance in the classroom would influence students’ performance.

Teachers knew that their strengths and weaknesses require regular monitoring and evaluation to be effective teachers. This means that teachers have meta-cognitive knowledge of own strengths and weaknesses which would influence to the way they teach (Burden & Williams, 1997). Consequently, it can be understood that teachers with meta-cognitive characteristics have concerns about their reflection on their own attitudes and behavior and have reflective thinking. They think more on their own actions; so they have more conducive classrooms and more successful learners. It can be concluded that teachers with meta-cognitive reflection reflect on their own emotional constitutes, increase students' learning outcomes, and improve students' results. Hence, this finding is in accordance with those of Ghorban Dordinejad & Rashvand (2014) who found that those teachers who reflect on meta-cognitive element impact on the learner's success.

#### **4.3. Affective Factor**

In this study the researchers wanted to clarify EFL teachers' perspectives about affective aspects of their teaching by asking two questions including "Do you think about your students' emotional responses to your instructions?", "When a student is having an emotional problem or is neglected by his/her peers, do you try to spend more time with him/her?" Qualitative content analysis on the FGD revealed that the majority of them consider students' emotional responses and feedback about their own teaching performance in order to evaluate their teaching practice and also enhance students' learning.

The descriptive note taken during the FGD from one of the participating teachers consolidates the above idea. This respondent noted, "I ask students to reflect on my teaching method, what they learned, what they liked and what they didn't understand, clarity of instructions and explanations. I ask my students to write about my teaching performance and I collect their paper, so I learn from their response and improve my teaching practice in future." (T 006/DN/005/12)

According to the obtained results, it appears that teachers reflect on their action as proposed by Schön (1987). The implication is that these EFL teachers know the value of getting feedback from students. They know that students' feedback gives important information about their teaching and it is helpful for their teaching progress. It seems they noticed their student's feedback and used their feedback to improve their classroom teaching. They know that students' feedback does play a significant role in helping them to teach in a better way and improve their teaching practice. The teachers perceived that students' statements about their teachers confirmed they were competent and effective teacher in what they were doing.

So far as affective factor is concerned, it is believed that it is the teacher's responsibilities to address the emotional needs and interests of their students so as to increase their attention in classrooms (Kember and Kelly 1993). In line with this T005 assured that he cared and spent most of his time with students.

This finding may indicate that since the affective factor is about the teachers' reflection on their learners in the classroom, how students are learning English language and how they act emotionally in the class, it could be good for teachers to build effective interpersonal relationship in the classroom and improve their communication with students by paying further notice to the learner's wants.

As presented above, we dealt with the four factors of reflection and teachers degree of implementation. Now, we move on to the factors obstructing the successful implementation of reflective teaching.

#### **4.4. Factors obstructing the successful employment of reflective teaching**

It is often argued that reflection is a way of learning and offers teachers the opportunity to maximize on their professional development. In reality, teachers, including college and university instructors, may not practice reflecting on what they do as a tool to improve their profession. There could

be various factors obstructing the practice of reflective teaching. Some teachers selected from the Department of Foreign Languages and Literature at Kotebe Metropolitan University were asked, during both FGD and interview sessions, about factors that might affect their reflective practices.

One of the factors hindering teachers from reflecting, as pointed out during the FGD, is a lack of commitment and willingness on the teachers' part. Another is being uncertain of colleagues' willingness and openness to work together for professional improvement. According to the FGD participants, colleagues rarely consider and practice the importance of reflective teaching as a way of developing skills and boosting knowledge and hardly ever wish to exchange views collaboratively. Unwillingness and lack of interest to work together and exchange views were also highlighted during the interview sessions. All those interviewed mentioned that teachers are not willing to allocate time to discuss teaching and learning matters.

Participants considered organizational culture as a contributing factor for not being reflective. Reflective teaching is not being practiced in the university where they teach or if they start it, they are not at all consistent. Participant 004 stressed that reflective teaching is not a career-long learning habit for most of the teachers in the department.

Another factor obstructing reflection, as mentioned by the participants of the FGD, is not accepting the reality that they do not know everything about their profession. Participant 003 stressed that "since we are pretending to be what we are not; we often consider ourselves as someone perfectly professional; we do not want to learn from others. We do not want to reflect on what went well and what didn't." For this respondent, self-conceit or saying "I am an expert on this and that" is what prevents them from being reflective and exchanging views and experience with other colleagues. Participant 001 shares the view held by participant 003 and argues that reflection is not being done in the department because each of the teachers thinks that he/she is highly professional, more professional than he/she actually is. From the responses given by the participants, we may deduce

that the teachers are not ready to welcome new ideas and share what they know with others.

For someone to be a reflective practitioner, he/she should have the right attitudes, which are important in predisposing him/her to reflect. The three attitudes one needs to possess are open-mindedness, whole-heartedness and responsibility (Loughran, 1996: 4, citing Dewey, 1933). For Loughran (*ibid*):

Open-mindedness ... is the ability to consider problems in new and different ways, to be open to new ideas and thoughts that one may not have previously entertained. To be open-minded is to be ready to listen to more sides than one... to be prepared and able to hear thinking that may be contrary to one's own, and to be able to admit that a previously held belief may in fact be wrong. Whole-heartedness is displayed when one is thoroughly involved in a subject or cause. It is being enticed and engaged by thinking... Responsibility is bound up in the need to consider the consequences of one's actions. It is the need to know why; to seek the meaning in what is being learnt.

One can conclude, therefore, that lack of possession of these attitudes is the major factor preventing the staff in focus from reflecting. From the FGD participants' responses, it can be inferred that EFL teachers are seldom open to acknowledging their possible shortcomings. From the data collected, one can deduce that the gap between the teachers' imagined view of themselves and the reality might be very wide, finally preventing them from reflecting in teams or in pairs. This claim is also supported by Loughran (1996) cited above.

According to participant 004, the way EFL teachers were taught could have a huge impact on them as reflective professionals. How to be reflective and the benefit of reflection were not offered as courses and graduates had limited awareness of being reflective practitioners. Participant 004 went on



to say that reflective practice has not yet been a culture, part and parcel of their daily teaching practice. The participant added that the concept had not been internalized and made a habit.

Participant 002 added that the lack of a university system regarding reflective teaching is one major factor affecting its successful implementation. If the university does not have a system in which colleagues are expected to work together, observing each other and providing feedback, they may not be reflective enough, the participant added. The participant seems to be implying that there are no opportunities in the university for colleagues to work together to fix broken bits and celebrate what works well. As learnt from the participants, planning lessons and setting continuous assessment questions together for the same course taught by the teachers are not practiced. One of the interviewees recounted during the interview that he and a colleague taught one course in the same semester to two different groups of students. He later learned that the two groups of students had been given two entirely different exam questions. What follows from the interviewee's explanation is that discussions on what topics were covered, what the expected competencies of the course were, what assessment questions needed to be set, and whether the students had difficulties did not take place. In fact, the interviewee noted that he contemplated ways of helping the students who performed poorly. However, as Smyth (1993) emphasizes, reflection should not be delimited to teachers reflecting individually upon their teaching; there also needs to be a shared and combined dimension to it.

Lack of resource is another reason for not being reflective as stated by the FGD participants. As the classroom ambience is not conducive, the teachers are unable to record what they teach and observe it later on how the teaching learning went on. Despite what the FGD participants say about resource as a restricting factor of being reflective, the researchers recognize that the teachers could have recorded, sometimes at least, themselves teaching. Virtually every teacher possesses a smartphone which could be set to record what is going in the class. None of the interviewed university

lecturers have had ever recorded themselves teaching despite the fact that they had their smartphone gadget. Everything considered, lack of commitment, motivation and openness seem to be factors hindering the implementation of reflection by the teachers.

Having extra responsibilities is another factor mentioned by participants affecting their efforts to be reflective. According to participant 04, responsibilities other than teaching consume their time thereby making them fail to reflect. According to this participant, reflective teaching is difficult in an overstretched working environment. This is supported by Finlay's argument (2008) that busy professionals are likely to find reflective practice challenging.

Another factor likely to discourage reflection is lack of timely feedback from students. As participants argued, students are also expected to reflect on their learning. They need to assess what has gone very well and what has not; what has been productive and what has been counterproductive. To ensure that students are active participants of the teaching-learning process, teachers are expected to ask for students' feedback, which gives them some ideas to think over for upcoming semester/sessions. The FGD participants, however, responded that students would often be given chances to reflect at the beginning of a course regarding the previous course they had completed. The assumption, according to participant 02, is students may not reveal their true feelings if the course has not been completed yet. According to this participant, students express their genuine feelings regarding the course delivery after grades have been submitted.

Many would presumably agree that the quality of education in general and of higher institutes in particular has been falling over the years. Yet, very few educators have ever contemplated on what role they have had on the degradation of the quality of education. Put it another way, they have not reflected and discovered what it is that they have done or have not done which has contributed to the falling of quality. During the interview session, respondents admitted that quality issues are often attributed to factors such

as policy and curriculum issues, students' background and other issues. Teachers have not allotted time and thought about what they should (not) have done. In other words, teachers do not seem to have contemplated that they have their own influence, contributing to the learning and progress of their students.

All in all, from the FGD and interview responses given by participants, one can deduce that teachers are not striving to achieve quality education through getting involved in reflective practices to the expected level. In fact, quality education requires concerted efforts, ranging from policy makers to curriculum designers. Yet, teachers do also have a part to play. From the FGD participants' responses, one notes that they are not used to replay, either in their heads or in their journal, the events of their days for future references and corresponding actions. Though thinking about past experience is part of human being, what the FGD participants said they would think about their past seems to be a casual thinking, not a conscience effort of thinking about what went well, what did not and why and what need to be done to remedy it. What reflection means, according to Dewey (1933), cited in Loughran (1996: 3), is given as follows:

Reflective thinking, in distinction from other operations to which we apply the name of thought, involves (1) a state of doubt, hesitation, perplexity, mental difficulty, in which thinking originates, and (2) an act of searching, hunting, inquiring, to find material that will resolve the doubt, settle and dispose of the perplexity.

As a learning tool, the EFL teachers in the said department at KMU are not using reflection to make sense of their experience and develop their profession. They do not reflect on their moments of success and moments lacking success, particularly with colleagues. One particular reason for this, as to the interviewees' response, is fear of criticism. The participants, both during the FGD and the interview sessions, stressed that the academic staff in the department of Foreign Languages and Literature, are not open enough

to share elements of practice with colleagues in the department, lacking the important attitudes constituting reflection.

## **5. Conclusion**

The aim of the study is to assess the extent to which EFL teachers at KMU employ the four reflection factors in their EFL classrooms and inquire into factors that obstruct them from successfully employing reflective teaching. The results revealed that the EFL teachers employed the four constructs of teachers' reflectivity in their practice namely the practical, cognitive, meta-cognitive, and affective factors to a varying degree though the effective implementation of the practical factors fell far below the expected level as compared to the remaining three.

It seems that these four reflection factors have, to some degree, their own effects on teachers' behaviours, attitudes, and their teaching practice in the classroom. In fact, by practicing these reflection components, the teachers believed that they could improve their teaching and use new teaching strategies to involve the learners in learning. It means that teachers' reflectivity and its four reflection elements had some important roles in learners' success. Despite the fact that the findings indicated that there were attempts to a greater degree from the sides of the teachers to be reflective practitioners, the fact that their lived experiences are full of challenges, it made it hugely difficult to observe some aspects of reflection like the practical ones to their expected level. Such challenges, according to the findings, emanated from lack of organizational culture that could encourage reflective teaching mandatory, insufficient logistical support from the management, the teachers' own attitude toward reflective teaching etc. These findings correlate fairly well with previous studies such as that of Bolton (2010).

## **6. The way forward**

To encourage and nurture reflection in higher institutes, academic debate and experience sharing platforms will play essential roles. Accordingly, all

concerned bodies in universities should take the role of reflective practice in enhancing quality of education and try their level best to create favorable environment. Another issue equally worth considering is students' timely feedback to their teachers. Students should give descriptive details of what they think their teachers should improve and keep up doing.

### References

- Avalos, B. 2011. Teacher Professional Development in *Teaching and Teacher Education over Ten Years*. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 10-20.
- Avalos, B 2010. Teacher professional development in Teaching and Teacher Education over ten years In *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27, 10-20 Elsevier Ltd.
- Akbari, R. 2007. Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System*, 35(2), 192-207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system>. 2006.12.008
- Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Dadvand, B. 2010. Development of English language teaching reflection inventory. *System*, 38(2), 211-227. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system>. 2010.03.003
- Bartlett, L. 1990. Teacher Development through Reflective Teaching. In J.C. Richards and D. Nunan (eds.), *Second Language Teacher Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 202-14.
- Ball, A. F. 2009. Toward a theory of generative change in culturally and linguistically complex classrooms. *American Educational Research Journal*, 46(1), <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0002831208323277>
- Beattie, M. 1995. *Constructing Professional Knowledge in Teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bolton, G. 2010. *Reflective practice: Writing and professional development*. London: Sage publications.
- Brink, H., Van Der Walt, C & Van Rensburg, G. 2009. *Fundamentals of research methodology for health care professionals (2nd ed.)*. Cape Town: Juta.
- Brookfield, S. 1995. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco.
- Burden, L. R., & Williams, M. A. 2000. *Psychology for language teachers*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Calderhead and Gates. 1995. *Conceptualizing Reflection in Teacher Development*. London: The Falmer Press.

- Carr, W. and Kemmis, S. 1986. *Becoming critical; knowing through action research*. Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Cowan, J. 1998. *On becoming an innovative university teacher*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Creswell, J.W. and Plano Clark, V.L. 2000. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Creswell, J. W., Fetters, M. D. and Ivankova, N. V. 2003. Designing a mixed methods study in primary care. *Annals of Family Medicine*, 2(1), 7-12.
- Day, C. 1999b. Researching teaching through reflective practice. In J. Loughran (ed.) (1999). *Researching Teaching: Methodologies and Practices for Understanding Pedagogy*. London, Falmer Press, 215- 232.
- Denzin, N. K. 1978. *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. New York: Praeger
- Farrell, T. 2003. Reflective teaching: Principles and practice. *English Teaching Forum*, 41(4), 14-21.
- Farrell, T. 2013. *Reflective Practice in ESL Teacher Development Groups: From Practices to Principles*. Palgrave
- Finlay, L. 2008. Reflecting on 'Reflective practice'. Open University.
- Fitzgerald, M. 1994. *Theories of Reflection for Learning*. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific.
- Ghaye, T. 2011. *Teaching and Learning through Reflective Practice: A practical guide for positive action*. London: Routledge
- Ghorban, D. F., & Rashvand, M. 2014. The role of Iranian EFL teachers' reflectivity and teaching style in the students' achievement. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 4(1).
- Goetz, J., & LeCompte, M. 1984. *Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press
- Hall, P. and Simeral, A. 2015. *Teach Reflect Learn: Building your capacity for success in the classroom*. Alexandria: ASCD.
- Jasper, M. A., 2003. Nurses' Perceptions of the Value of Written Reflection. *Nurse Education Today*, 19(6), 452-463.
- Johnson, K and Golombek, P. 2002. *Inquiry into experience: Teachers' personal and professional growth*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K.E. and Golombek, P.R. 2002. Inquiry into experience: Teachers' personal and professional growth. In K.E. Johnson and P.R. Golombek (eds.) *Teachers' Narrative Inquiry as Professional Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kember, D., & Kelly, M., 1993. Improving Teaching through Action Research. *Herdsa Green Guide*, 14.
- Loughran, J. 1996. *Developing reflective practice: Learning about teaching and learning through modeling*. London: Palmer Press.

- Loh, J., Hong, H. & Koh, E. 2017. *Malaysian Journal of ELT Research*, Vol. 13(1), 1-11.
- Loughran, J. 2005. *Developing reflective practice: Learning about teaching and learning through modeling*. London: Palmer Press.
- McIntee, G. H., Appleby, J., Dowd, J., Grant, J., Hole, S., Silva, P., & Check, J. W. 2003. *At the heart of teaching: A guide to reflective practice*. London: Teachers College Press.
- Norton, L. and Campbell, A. 2007. The development of reflective practice in higher education: a theoretical perspective. In: Norton, L and Campbell, A (eds.). *Learning, Teaching and Assessing in Higher Education: Developing Reflective Practice*. Southernhay East: Learning Matters LTD, 140-148.
- Patton, M. Q. 2002. *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Reason, P. 1994. Three Approaches to Participative Inquiry. In Denzin, N. & Lincoln, Y. (eds). *A Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage: 324-339.
- Richards, J.C. and Farrell, T.S.C. 2005. *Professional Development for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J.C. and Lockhart, C. 2007. *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schön, D.A. 1983. *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schön, D. A. 1987. *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, US: Jossey.
- Skoyles, P. 1998. Introducing a vocational course for lower ability students into an academic sixth form. Unpublished MA dissertation, Canterbury Christ Church University College.
- Smith, J. 1993. Reflective Practice in Teacher Education In *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*. V 18 Issue 1.
- Stevens, J.S. 2013. The Process of How Teachers Become Teacher Leaders and How Teacher Leadership Becomes Distributed within a School: A Grounded Theory Research Study. Western Michigan University: Scholar Works.
- Tedick, D. J. (ed.). 2005. *Second Language Teacher Education: International Perspectives*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Wallace, M.J. 1991. *Training Foreign Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, G. 1989. 'Educational change and school improvement', Let's Talk, Newsletter 2:1 of the Talk Project, Mississauga, Ontario, Peel Board of Education.