**REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ERCIYES UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE**

**A CASE STUDY OF REFLECTIVE PRACTICES
OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS**

By
Huriye MANNASOĞLU

Supervisor
Prof. Dr. Nazlı BAYKAL

PhD Dissertation

August 2022, KAYSERİ

T.C.
ERCİYES ÜNİVERSİTESİ
SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ
İNGİLİZ DİLİ VE EDEBİYATI ANABİLİM DALI

YABANCI DİL ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN YANSITICI UYGULAMALARI ÜZERİNE ALAN ÇALIŞMASI
(Doktora Tezi)

Hazırlayan
Huriye MANNASOĞLU

Danışman
Prof. Dr. Nazlı BAYKAL

Ağustos 2022, KAYSERİ

ETHICAL STATEMENT

I hereby declare that in this thesis study I prepared in accordance with thesis writing rules of Erciyes University, Graduate School of Social Sciences;

- All data, information and documents presented in this thesis have been obtained within the scope of academic rules and ethical conduct,
- All information, documents, assessments and results have been presented in accordance with scientific ethical conduct and moral rules,
- All material used in this thesis that are not original to this work have been fully cited and referenced,
- No change has been made in the data used,
- The work presented in this thesis is original,

or else, I admit all loss of rights to be incurred against me.

Huriye MANNASOĞLU

ORIGINALITY PAGE
REPUBLIC OF TURKEY
ERCIYES UNIVERSITY
Graduate School of Social Sciences

Department   : English Language and Literature

Program   : PhD

Thesis Title   : A Case Study of Reflective Practices of Foreign Language Teachers

Regarding the part of the thesis, whose information is given above, consisting of a) Introduction, b) Main chapters and c) Conclusion parts (Excluding Cover, Foreword, Abstract, Contents and Bibliography), a total of 134 pages according to the originality report obtained from ***Turnitin*** plagiarism program on the date of 11 / 08 / 2022 by applying the following filtering, the similarity rate of the thesis is 22 %.

Citations are **included** in the filtering. Portions of text containing **less than seven (7) words** overlap are excluded in the filtering.

I have reviewed the Application Principles of Erciyes University Institute of Social Sciences Thesis Plagiarism Report and I declare that the thesis study does not contain any plagiarism according to the maximum similarity rates specified in these application principles, I accept any legal liability that may arise in case of the opposite and I declare that the information I have given above is correct.

I hereby submit to your information. 16/08/2022

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nazlı Baykal   Student: Huriye Mannasoğlu

SUITABILITY FOR GUIDE

The doctoral dissertation, entitled "A Case Study of Reflective Practices of Foreign Language Teachers" has been prepared according to postgraduate thesis proposal and thesis writing guidelines of Erciyes University.

Prepared by   **Supervisor**

Huriye Mannasoğlu   Prof. Dr. Nazlı Baykal

Head of English Language and Literature Department
Prof. Dr. Hasan Baktır

ACCEPTANCE AND APPROVAL PAGE

The present study entitled **"A Case Study of Reflective Practices of Foreign Language Teachers"** prepared by **Huriye Mannasoğlu** under the supervision of **Prof. Dr. Nazlı Baykal** has been accepted by examining committee members as a **doctoral dissertation** in **the Department of English Language and Literature**, the Graduate School of Social Sciences at Erciyes University.

8/8/2022

EXAMINING COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Supervisor :

Member :

Member :

Member :

Member :

APPROVAL:

The Approval of this dissertation has been certified by the Institute Board with the date ……………………… and decision no: ……

……. /…...…../ ……..…

Prof. Dr. Atabey KILIÇ

Director of Graduate School of Social Sciences

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

YABANCI DİL ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN YANSITICI UYGULAMALARI ÜZERİNE ALAN ÇALIŞMASI
Huriye MANNASOĞLU

ÖZET

Öğretmenlerin mesleki gelişim sürecinde yansıtıcı düşünme yararlı bir pusula olduğu için bu durum çalışmasının odak noktası, İngilizceyi yabancı dil olarak öğreten üç katılımcının yansıtıcı uygulamasıdır. Katılımcılar, 12 haftalık yansıtıcı düşünme sürecine dâhil olmuştur. İlk aşama yansıtıcı yazılar ve grup tartışmaları yoluyla söz sorunları üzerine düşünmeyi, ikincisi ise yansıtıcı yazılar ve görüşmeler yoluyla sınıf uygulaması üzerine düşünmeyi kapsamıştır. Keşfedici sıralı desene sahip bu çalışmada, öğretmenlerin betimleyici ve eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmelerine dayanan veri önce nitel, sonra nicel olarak analiz edilmiştir. Nitel analiz bu iki yansıtıcı düşünme türünün alt gruplarının incelenmesini kapsamıştır. Nicel analiz ise tek yönlü uyum iyiliği ki kare testine dayalı olarak yapılmıştır. Bazı ortak noktalara rağmen katılımcıların yansıtıcı düşünmelerinde bireysel farklılıklar ortaya çıktı, bu da yansıtıcı düşünmenin erişilecek son seviyesi olmadığını, yalnızca çeşitli yolları olduğunu gösterdi. Sonuçlar katılımcıların eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmelerinin, betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmelerinden daha sık ortaya konduğunu ve eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmelerinin çoğunlukla öğretimi değerlendirmeye yönelik olduğunu gösterdi. Her bir katılımcının en çok değindiği beş konu arasında yaklaşım betimlemesi, inanç/kanı, derslerin olumlu değerlendirmesi ve öğrenci sorunları olduğunu ortaya koydu. Eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme açısından bir öğretmen beş, diğeri iki, sonuncusu üç özellikte gelişim gösterdi. Nicel analizlerin hepsinde istatistik açıdan anlamlı sonuçlar çıktı. Genel anlamda katılımcıların yazı, tartışma ve görüşmelerindeki yansıtıcı düşünmeleri, onlara bağlamına yanıt verme, bilinçli düşünme ve bilgiyle öğretme eylemini bütünleştirme fırsatı verdi. Böylelikle bu çalışmanın katılımcıların mesleki gelişimine katkıda bulunmuş olması beklenmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yansıtıcı Düşünme, Yansıtıcı Öğretme, Yansıtıcı Uygulama, Eleştirel Yansıtıcı Düşünme, Betimleyici Yansıtıcı Düşünme

A CASE STUDY OF REFLECTIVE PRACTICES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Huriye MANNASOĞLU

Erciyes University, Graduate School of Social Sciences
PhD Thesis, August 2022
Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Nazlı BAYKAL

ABSTRACT

Since reflection is a beneficial compass for teachers in professional development, the focus of this case study is reflective practice of three EFL teachers. The teachers were engaged in a 12-week reflection process. The first phase involved reflection on lexical problems through journals and peer discussions. The second was for reflection on classroom practice through journals and interviews. With a sequential exploratory mixed methods design, the study involved analysis of the teachers' descriptive and critical reflections first qualitatively and then quantitatively. The qualitative side involved investigation of subcategories of these two types of reflection. The quantitative side involved one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results. Despite some common points, there were individual differences between the participants' reflections, which showed that there is no final level of reflection, just different ways to reflect. The results revealed that their critical reflection outnumbered their descriptive reflection, and their critical reflection was mostly related to evaluating teaching. Among the top five topics for each participant were an approach/procedure, a belief/conviction, positive evaluations of lessons, and students' problems. In terms of development in the sense of critical reflectivity, one teacher displayed increase in five traits, another teacher in two traits, and the other in three traits. All the quantitative analyses had statistically significant results. Globally, their reflection in journals, discussions, and interviews enabled them to respond to the context, engage in conscious deliberation, and integrate knowledge into the teaching act. In this way, the study is expected to contribute to the participants' professional development.

Keywords: Reflection, Reflective Teaching, Reflective Practice, Critical Reflection, Descriptive Reflection

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A CASE STUDY OF REFLECTIVE PRACTICES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

CHAPTER 1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

ABBREVIATIONS

CEFR: Common European Framework of Reference for Languages

EFL: English as a Foreign Language

ELL: English Language and Literature

ELT: English Language Teaching

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Language teachers' professional development is a long and complicated process (Freeman & Johnson, 1998), but it is of crucial importance for the stakeholders as well since teachers are the ones who put programs into practice. Insider approaches to professional development prioritize institutional knowledge in order to promote self-directed learning. They allow teachers to analyze their own contexts and construct their own knowledge and understanding of their classroom practices (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Thanks to the insider approach reflective practice involves, it is a highly beneficial compass for teachers in their self-directed professional development journey (Farrell, 2020). It enables teachers to stop to see what they otherwise miss; that is, they can realize several valuable incidents in the classroom, distinctive qualities in their teaching style, or crucial decisions before, during or after classes (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). In brief, what language teachers need to do for development is not to seek ready-made solutions outside, but to shoulder responsibility for their own learning by exploring their own context, testing their assumptions, and synthesizing theory and practice, and reflective practice is the best way to achieve this.

Various benefits reflective practice brings for teachers makes it indispensable, too. For instance, they can reach new insights and informed decisions rather than invalid interpretations by examining their own data, attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions (Farrell, 2020). In this way, teachers can bring "doing, thinking, and knowing what to do" together (Freeman, 1996 cited in Bailey, 1997). As a result, they can change and promote their teaching (Richards & Lockhart, 1996), which means that they gain autonomy, deliberation (Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022; Pultorak, 1996), and confidence in testing new options (Richards & Lockhart, 1996).

Besides benefits of reflective practice, what kind of reflection teachers employ and how should also be investigated. A remarkable classification which attracted several

researchers' attention was introduced by Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999). They categorized reflective practice as descriptive and critical reflection with comprehensive subcategories. Descriptive reflection is procedural in nature answering, 'What do I do as a teacher?' (Ho & Richards, 1993, p. 32). On the other hand, critical reflection occurs when teachers investigate and evaluate their teaching, develop theories, or make plans of action (Ho & Richards, 1993). This classification covers different aspects of reflection and sheds light on various issues that need to be considered for professional development.

Reflective research so far is mostly qualitative and focuses on benefits of reflective practice or the effect of a certain instrument. Some of them involve pre-service teachers, some involve in-service teachers, and others involve teacher trainers but most of them disregard collaboration with students or peers. Analysis of different types of reflection is not very common in the body of research. There are also differences between the studies in terms of the instruments they use. The most common are interviews, discussions, and journals; however, very few use these three together.

In this study, reflective practices of teachers are examined through their reflection on a common topic they chose together during a meeting held before the research started. First, they decided to investigate written rather than spoken data as it could be observed and improved through activities both during and after class. Then the participants agreed to focus on lexical competence since they thought it was what their students needed to improve. As a result, the topic for the teachers' reflection was their students' lexical problems in written production.

This case study aims to contribute to literature by investigating three EFL teachers' descriptive and critical reflection, specifically on lexical problems in written production, besides their development in critical reflectivity as part of their professional development. What makes this research distinctive is that with a sequential exploratory mixed methods design, it involves data from journals, peer discussions, audio records of lessons, student feedback, and interviews, which were analyzed first qualitatively and then quantitatively. The study aims to answer these research questions:

1. What type of reflection (descriptive or critical) do English teachers commonly use?

2. What kind of descriptive reflection do English teachers employ? What kind of critical reflection do English teachers employ?

3. Does this process develop the use of critical reflection over time?

CHAPTER 1
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter aims to present key issues and studies as an outline of the research area and thus provide background to the study. It starts with what reflective practice is, how it is conducted, and its pros and cons. The chapter ends with review of research on reflective practice.

1.1. Reflective Practice: What

Learning to teach is a long and difficult journey for language teachers. During this journey, reflection can serve as a compass that they can use to stop to see their current position and identify their destination while moving spirally from thought to action and vice versa (Farrell, 2020). After we explore the role of reflective practice in professional development, we discuss its qualities and categories and ask whether it is possible to improve reflective practice.

1.1.1. Professional Development and Reflective Practice

Since teachers have a vital role in education as actors of programs (Kumaravadivelu, 2003) and they constantly need to revise and improve their knowledge and skills, their development as an ongoing process also has immense significance. Professional development certainly brings countless advantages for the teacher such as broadened understanding and a wide repertoire of knowledge and skills (Sadeghi & Richards, 2021), senior positions, better performance, enhanced retention (Richards & Farrell, 2005), opportunities for specialization, flexibility, tolerance (Collins & Gün, 2019), and preparation for and adaptation to the changes in the field (Sadeghi & Richards, 2021). In addition, professional development of practitioners of programs has substantial benefits for the stakeholders. As well as enhanced level of learning for the students, it brings the institution satisfactory outcomes, success, popularity (Richards & Farrell,

2005), socilization (Sadeghi & Richards, 2021), collaboration, preservation of inside knowledge, and contributions to accreditation (Collins & Gün, 2019).

How teachers can achieve professional development has been under discussion for a long time. Even if experience is seen as "the starting point for teacher development", without systematic analysis it is not sufficient for teacher development (Richards & Lockhart, 1996, p.4). Thus, Widdowson (2003) claims that expertise outweighs experience. To be more specific, what novice teachers need is not "reflecting what other teachers do, but reflecting on why they do it." In other words, they need to examine the rationale behind a specific practice, judge its validity, and adapt it to their own context. As a result, professional development is an expected outcome for expert teachers who can bring knowledge and action together, construct their theories based on interpretation of their context, and reflect and deliberate consciously (Tsui, 2009). To conclude, teachers' aim should be to gain expertise rather than experience.

Administrators, teacher trainers, and researchers also need to consider how to organize and run professional development programs and examine various major obstacles that might be encountered. For example, although action research is an effective teacher development practice, Bailey (1997) mentions not only lack of time, expertise, and support but also fear of being declared unqualified and of making their experience available as limitations. In addition, other contextual factors such as dissatisfaction with salaries, lack of motivation, lack of institutional support, inefficient management, and cost and quality of professional development programs are among the obstacles that negatively affect the process (Sadeghi & Richards, 2021). Another significant impediment is when teachers prioritize satisfying inflicted requirements rather than promoting students' learning and adjust to the measure of control on their performance in order to "[gain] or [protect] territory, security, and status" in their institution as a political network (Schön, 1983, p.332). In order to overcome all these problems in the path of professional development Sadeghi and Richards (2021) suggest some measures and solutions such as recruitment of capable teachers, increase in salaries for higher motivation, acknowledgement of teachers' beliefs and values, recognition of teachers' roles in the society, prevention of fossilization, needs analysis in professional development, variety in professional development activities, engagement of in-service teachers in development of professional development activities, follow-ups and

evaluation of professional development activities, increase in institutional support and rewards for professional development activities, rewards for engagement in professional development activities, encouragement of teachers' positive attitudes towards their professional identities and professional development activities, a bottom-up approach in professional development programs, and emphasis on teacher learning instead of teacher training.

Even though they all aim to help teachers to improve in specific areas, teacher development programs can vary in their emphases. Regarding the selection of content and the priority of context in the development program, they may have outsider or insider approaches. With content-based pre-determined programs, ready-made solutions, and short-term results (Yaman, 2004), outsider approaches prioritize knowledge outside the institution, in particular knowledge of experts based on general theories and principles (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Sadeghi and Richards (2021) mention benefits of training-oriented teacher development courses for novice teachers as they focus on procedures, tecniques, and strategies, and they add that this is just the first step. On the other hand, by allowing teachers to analyze their own contexts and construct their own knowledge and understanding of their classroom practices, insider approaches highlight institutional knowledge in order to promote self-directed learning. What is more, taking part in the formation and application of professional development programs help teachers feel ownership over the learning process and might promote student learning. In this way, teachers shoulder responsibility for their own learning and gain autonomy. Thus, there is a growing tendency towards insider approaches in the field (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Similarly, Richards and Lockhart (1996) encourage teachers' engagement in "collecting information about their teaching either individually or through collaborating with a colleague, making decisions about their teaching, deciding if initiatives need to be taken, and selecting strategies to carry them out" (p. 3). To sum up, outsider approaches value received knowledge whereas insider approaches focus on experiential knowledge, which makes the teacher more active in a bottom-up process.

Nonetheless, it is unfavorable to focus on only one type of knowledge and underestimate the value of the other. Wallace and Bau (1991) suggest that there should be a reciprocal relationship between received knowledge and experiential knowledge, which could be built thanks to a reflective approach. In this case, the received knowledge

should be reflected on considering the classroom experience, and the experiential knowledge should strengthen the received knowledge. They call this ongoing process the "reflective cycle" (p. 55).

The cyclic relationship between experiential knowledge and received knowledge that reflective practice involves is significant in teacher development, and its origins can be found in constructivism. According to the constructivist movement, a stone is not the same for someone only using his or her senses and for someone knowing about its history and future use (Dewey, 1910); hence, meaning and context have a vital role. Constructivists indicate that knowledge and understanding are "slowly constructed" as individuals build their own "versions of reality" based on their prior experiences. This means that rather than discovering the reality, each individual constructs their own reality which is not necessarily the same as others' (Pritchard & Woollard, 2010, p. 2-7). It is also essential to avoid "nothing-but type of reasoning" in order to "reconstrue life and find renewed hope among stark realities" (Kelly, 1991, p. 108). As a result, the focus on conscious inquiry of experiences paved the way for reflective teaching (Dewey, 1910).

Thus, a constructivist approach could be beneficial in language teacher development since teachers may react differently in the same context due to differences in their experiences, priorities, and prior knowledge (Freeman & Johnson, 1998) and "there is no single path teachers should follow for their professional development" (Sadeghi & Richards, 2021, p.6). Learning is constructive, and "all of our interpretations of the universe can gradually be scientifically evaluated if we are persistent and keep on learning from our mistakes" (Kelly, 1991, p. 11), so "learning to teach is a long-term, complex, developmental process that operates through participation in the social practices and contexts associated with learning and teaching" (Freeman & Johnson, 1998, p. 402). With a focus on such aspects as learning strategies, learner beliefs, and teacher thinking, constructivist approaches in language teaching require learners to make individual contributions to learning and teachers to make their own sense of their contexts and act as a reflective practitioner (Richards & Schmidt, 2002).

Reflective practitioner was found to be the optimal teacher role in comparison to two others, passive technician and transformative intellectual (Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022). Reflective practice could help teachers form and improve their teaching style. For

instance, through reflective practice they can learn more about their role in the classroom, their students' expectations of the teacher's role, and differences, if any, between these two (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). In addition, reflective teachers' informed decisions about their teaching are likely to result in "convergence of [their] beliefs and classroom practices" (Farrell, 2011, p.272). This is because reflection helps them to "integrate the two processes, 'practicalizing theoretical knowledge' and 'theorizing practical knowledge'" (Tsui, 2009, p.432). This can be achieved through "experimentation and exploration", "problematizing the unproblematic", and "responding to and looking for challenges" (Tsui, 2009, p.437). Therefore, reflection has a significant place in development of teachers' expertise.

1.1.2. Definition and Classification of Reflective Practice

For Dewey (1910), reflection, unlike routine thinking, involves "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and further conclusions to which it tends" (p.4). His views reveal basic characteristics of reflection. First, as a process that involves construction of meaning, reflection helps to see how experiences and ideas are related and connected. Thus, it brings constant learning and development of the individual and the society. Next, because reflection originates from scientific inquiry, it is systematic. Finally, reflection requires social interaction and positive attitudes towards personal and social development (Rodgers, 2002).

Teacher learning is a cognitive process involving personal construction and reflection (Richards & Farrell, 2005). Therefore, in our context reflection is

> [a] cognitive process accompanied by a set of attitudes in which teachers systematically collect data about their practice, and, while engaging in dialogue with others, use the data to make informed decisions about their practice both inside and outside the classroom (Farrell, 2020, p. 123).

In addition to this definition, Farrell (2020) suggests six principles of reflective practice. Accordingly, reflective practice is "holistic" and "evidence based". In addition, it is "a way of life" that "involves dialogue", "bridges principles and practices", and "requires a disposition to inquiry" (p. 9).

The fundamentals of reflective practice could be stated as "observed performance and expressed beliefs" (Larrivee, 2008), but what reflection is not should also be kept in mind. Farrell (2018) warns against regarding reflective practice as "a set of prescriptive techniques and recipe-following checklists teachers much follow" (p. 3). In this regard, it is a tool (rather than an end) bringing theory and practice together and contributing to the society as well as the individual (Rodgers, 2002).

As for classification of reflection, scholars have different perspectives. They handle reflection according to its types, levels, dimensions, or stages. Van Manen (1977) lists levels of teacher reflectivity as empirical-analytic paradigm, hermeneutic-phenomenological paradigm, and critical-dialectical paradigm. Empirical-analytic paradigm, the lowest level, involves an instrumental rather than a practical attitude. Reflecting on how to make the curriculum more effective through knowledge is an example of this. As for hermeneutic-phenomenological paradigm, it aims to reach various types of curriculum data based on different phases of curriculum practices. Finally, critical-dialectical paradigm, the highest level, aims to provide interactive social settings crucial to "genuine self-understanding, emancipatory learning, and critical consciousness" (pp. 221).

Later as a teacher in a professional school who is also involved in four other professions, Schön (1983) explored professional knowledge in order to fill the gap between research and practice and thought and action. He distinguished reflection-in-action, which involves inquiry during practice, from reflection-on-action, which involves inquiry after practice. Although he accepted both, his focus was more on reflection-in-action. He stated that reflection in and on action could involve a variety of topics such as norms and appreciations underlying a judgement, tacit strategies and theories in behaviors, feelings leading to certain actions, or roles within the institution.

The classification of reflective practice Bartlett (1990) introduced involved five phases in a cycle rather than in a linear or sequential relationship. He presented these phases along with helpful questions.

• Mapping: What do I do as a teacher?

• Informing: What is the meaning of my teaching? What did I intend?

• Contesting: How did I come to be this way? How was it possible for my present view of teaching (with reasons) to have emerged?

• Appraisal: How might I teach differently?

• Acting: What and how shall I now teach? (pp.209-213)

Based on Van Manen (1977), Pultorak (1996) suggested three levels of teacher reflectivity. The first level is technical rationality and involves technical application of knowledge and principles. The second, practical action, involves analysis of learner and teacher behaviors to find out whether objectives were met. The final one is critical reflection, which highlights the value of knowledge and social conditions without being biased.

Considering the deficiencies in Bartlett (1990), Ho and Richards (1993) distinguished between descriptive and critical reflection and listed five subcategories as presented in Table 1.1:

Table 1.1: Descriptive and Critical Reflection

Categories	Descriptive Topics	Critical Topics
1. Theories of teaching	Theories and beliefs about teaching and learning • a belief or conviction • an expert's views Applying theories to classroom practice • how a theory was applied	Theories and beliefs about teaching and learning • a justification for something • a personal opinion Applying theories to classroom practice • contradictions between theory and practice • how theories changed
2. Approaches and methods	Approaches and methods in teaching The content of a lesson	The teacher's knowledge • pedagogical knowledge • knowledge and experience The learners The school context
3. Evaluating teaching	Solutions to problems • seeking solutions from the tutor	Evaluating lessons • positive evaluations of lessons • negative evaluations of lessons Diagnosing problems • student's problems • classroom interaction • teacher's problems

		Solutions to problems
		• alternative ways of presenting a lesson
		• deciding on a plan of action
4. Self-awareness		Perceptions of themselves as teachers
		• their teaching style
		• comments on their language proficiency
		Recognition of personal growth
		Setting personal goal
5. Questions about teaching	Asking for advice and suggestions	Asking for reasons

<div align="right">(pp.32-33)</div>

Descriptive reflection is procedural in nature answering 'What do I do as a teacher?' (Ho & Richards, 1993, p. 32). Description of the content of a grammar lesson is an example of descriptive reflection. On the other hand, critical reflection refers to "evaluation, self-analysis, theory building, and planning" (Ho & Richards 1993, p. 32). Expressing an opinion about the value of classroom observation is an example of critical reflection. Farrell (1999) used the categories presented in Ho and Richards (1993), but unlike them he categorized the learners' background information, the relation between teaching and the school context, teaching style, and comments on their language proficiency as descriptive rather than critical.

Jay and Johnson (2002) introduced a typology for pre-service teachers that involved descriptive, comparative, and critical reflection without expecting a rigid hierarchy. Descriptive reflection refers to identification of the problem. Comparative reflection involves handling the problem from alternative perspectives. Finally, critical reflection refers to integration of the implications into a new understanding. Although they used three different labels, they had a holistic approach to the typology aiming to encourage various dimensions.

Larrivee (2008) examined the classifications in the literature and developed a tool to determine teachers' levels of reflective practice. The four levels in the tool were pre-reflection, surface reflection, pedagogical reflection, and critical reflection. Teachers at pre-reflection level do not make thoughtful connections between instances in the classroom and others or justify their beliefs with experience or research. They see

problems beyond their control and have a general attitude towards students' needs. Teachers at the level of surface reflection focus on procedures to fulfill requirements and justify their beliefs with experience, but not research. They accept students' needs. Teachers at the level of pedagogical reflection consider effects of their teaching on learning and ways to improve learning and justify their beliefs with experience and research. They have a multidimensional perspective towards education. Teachers at the level of critical reflection are constantly involved in reflection exploring philosophical views and classroom practice. They reflect on the effects of personal, familial, and social conditions on students and value democratic and ethical issues.

Benefiting from both Dewey's and Schön's approaches but without separating reflection and action, Farrell (2015) developed a holistic framework – Framework for Reflecting on Practice. With five levels of reflection, this framework starts with reflecting on philosophy and then moves to principles, theory, practice, and beyond practice. Encouraging evidence-based reflective practice, the framework allows teachers to become more aware of the origins, meanings, and impact of their actions.

1.1.3. Developing Reflective Practice

In literature there are different views about developing reflective practice. Some scholars believe teachers can improve their reflection throughout the process while others highlight the significance of supervision. The most important issue is related to moving from one level or type of reflection to another. Researchers also discuss whether one level or type of reflection is better than others. Overall, it would be more realistic to expect "expansion" rather than "change" in terms of development (Watanabe, 2016, p.167).

Ho and Richards (1993) introduced seven traits of development in critical reflectivity to see if there was a change at the end of the reflective process. These are (1) "a greater variety of types of critical reflectivity", (2) "being more able to come up with new understanding of theories", (3) "being more able to reflect across time span and experiences", (4) "being more able to go beyond the classroom to broader contexts", (5) "being more able to evaluate both positively and negatively", (6) "being more able to solve problems by the teacher", and (7) "being more focused on "why" questions" (p. 35). They found no great change in the participants' degree of critical reflectivity, and they

suggested training teachers in reflective writing. Farrell (1999) used an adapted version of these traits to examine development in critical reflectivity.

Some scholars with a hierarchical approach expect teachers to make a shift from one level or type of reflection to another, especially from descriptive reflection to critical reflection. This is also regarded possible for novice teachers as well as pre-service teachers as long as they receive support (Farrell, 2018; Larrivee, 2008). For one thing, critical reflection is generally considered to be an advanced level. Larrivee (2008) claimed that critical reflection is "the desired goal to reach over the course of one's professional career" (p.345). She also considered questioning whether a practice is the right thing to do as a higher level of thinking than inquiry of doing an activity in the right way. For another, descriptive reflection helps teachers see what is happening while critical reflection allows them to take control. For instance, Farrell (2011) found out that the participant in his research became aware of the communication flow in her classroom in the descriptive phase but was able to shape it as she wanted in the critical phase.

On the other hand, for some scholars with a holistic approach, teachers need not move from one level or type of reflection to another because they do not vary in value. For instance, Jay and Johnson (2002) or Watanabe (2016) do not consider critical reflection better than descriptive reflection. Descriptive reflection is "a crucial first step", and it is not possible to attempt to solve a problem, question its roots, or see it in the big picture before it is identified (Watanabe, 2016, p. 34). Moreover, although descriptive reflection might seem simple it should not be underestimated (Jay & Johnson, 2002). Externalization of an issue during descriptive reflection could serve as a clue since it helps teachers notice recurrent themes in their reflection and point to their values or assumptions.

Most importantly, it is unlikely for teachers to go through levels of reflection in a linear way because reflection itself is cyclic in nature (Bartlett, 1990; Wallace & Bau, 1991; Watanabe, 2016). Also, there is no order in progress because it is personal (Yu, 2018; Watanabe, 2016). At this point it might be useful to see how Hunt (1998, emphasis in original) preferred to warn potential reflective practitioners – "CAUTION! RP (Reflective Practice) DOES NOT PROCEED IN AN ORDERLY FASHION!' (p. 28). In the same vein, being a reflective teacher does not mean being reflective all the time. Ölçü-

Dinçer (2022) reports some teachers who used to be reflective but had to turn into a "passive technician" because of national exams, curricular requirements, and the political system. She concludes that "teacher roles are situated", and teachers can adjust themselves depending on the contextual needs (p.331). Similarly, when Korkmazgil (2018) investigated development in critical reflectivity, she found individual differences and indicated that absence of development did not mean absence of reflection. Watanabe (2016) adds that because the elements teachers focus on at different stages of their career might vary based on their goals and context, reflection at different times might involve different directions – the past, inner world, or outer world. As she concludes, "there is no 'final' stage of reflection, only varying ways to reflect" (p.32).

1.2. Reflective Practice: How

How reflective practice is conducted is significant because if it is done in an inappropriate way, it might result in adverse effects. For effective reflection, Gün (2010) suggests engaging teachers in "a thorough reflective process" integrated into classroom practice rather than "merely preach[ing]" reflection; otherwise, they would just "react", not "reflect". This could be more effective than trying to improve classroom techniques and procedures (pp. 131-133).

Such a process requires teachers to gather data, analyze their attitudes, beliefs, assumptions, and teaching practices, and use this information as a basis for reflection (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). These informed decisions are significant since some teachers tend to evaluate their practice merely based on students' response which might have nothing to do with the quality of the teachers' performance and thus be misleading (Farrell, 2020). As a result, the data collected and attitudes, beliefs, and assumptions examined during the reflective process would lead to systematic evidence-based outcomes rather than invalid interpretations.

Reflective process also brings questions that involve investigation of the current situation, value systems, and available alternatives along with their limitations (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). This means that reflective teachers need to go beyond "how to" questions to see the big picture and thus focus on "what" and "why" questions. In other words, they need to focus on the principles in their practice rather than technical skills. Based on Dewey's ideas, Bartlett (1990) summarised the principles that should be

considered during the reflective teaching process: (1) The issue upon which the teacher reflects must occur in the social context where teaching occurs. (2) The teacher must be interested in the problem to be resolved. (3) The issue must be 'owned' by the teacher – that is, derived from his or her practice. (4) Reflection on the issue involves problem solving from the teaching situation in which the teacher is located. (5) Ownership of the identified issue and its solution is vested in the teacher. (6) Systematic procedures are necessary. (7) Information (observations) about the issue must be derived from the teacher's experience of teaching. (8) The teacher's ideas need to be tested through the practice of teaching. (9) Ideas about teaching, once tested through practice, must lead to some course of action. There is a tension between idea and action which is reflexive; once it is tested the action rebounds back on the idea which informed it. (10) Hence, reflexive action may be transformed into new understandings and redefined practice in teaching. (pp.207-208)

Teacher development through reflective practice can be achieved using various procedures that require individual or collaborative work. Farrell (2018) reviewed 138 reflective studies between 2009 and 2015 and examined the instruments that were used. In descending order of frequency common instruments in the body of research were found to be discussion (involving teacher discussion groups and post-observation conferences), journal writing, classroom observations (self, peer, etc. with or without video/audio), action research, narrative, lesson study, cases, portfolio, team teaching, peer coaching, and critical friend/incident transcript reflections. The results also revealed increasing popularity of such online reflective tools as forums, chats, and blogs. Another point is that a significant drawback of collaborative tools might be fear of offending peers, which might result in a reduced amount of reflection. Farrell (2018) concluded that choice of reflective practice instruments should depend on the teachers' needs with a bottom-up approach instead of trainers' prescriptions.

Institutional factors play a crucial role in reflective practice. Negative effects of unsuccessful administrators, crowded classrooms, heavy workload, obligation to cover a specific amount of content within limited time, and lack of flexibility on teachers who would like to try reflective practice are noteworthy (Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022; Schön, 1983). Peer relations should also be considered as reflective teachers need to negotiate several issues with others and feeling isolated would be an obstacle for them (Schön, 1983).

Therefore, institutional support is of vital importance for these teachers, which also implies that reflective teaching may not be practical in every context.

Reflective practice stems from the desire to understand yourself and your impact on others (Freeman & Johnson 1998). However, some teachers might lack personal interest in professional development and might just attend professional development programs due to institutional obligations (Sadeghi & Richards, 2021; Watanabe, 2016). Therefore, the emotional aspect of reflection is as significant as the cognitive aspect. In this regard, Dewey (1933 cited in Farrell, 2020) highlighted three attitudes – whole-heartedness, open-mindedness, and responsibility. These attitudes help teachers to take action both in and out of the class and integrate reflective practice into their lifestyles (Farrell, 2020).

1.3. Reflective Practice: Why or Why Not

1.3.1. Benefits

Reflective practice brings numerous benefits to the field of English Language Teaching. In theory it combines the behavioral view, the cognitive view, and the interpretivist view. In other words, teaching is seen as a harmony of doing, thinking, and knowing what to do (Freeman, 1996 cited in Bailey, 1997). In this way "theory is not remote from practical experience but a way of making sense of it" (Widdowson, 2003, p.4).

Reflective practice is advantageous for the institution as well. First of all, reflective teachers redefine (and encourage others to redefine) several institutional values and principles. For instance, they question the concept of evaluation, and this results in independent qualitative judgments. Another redefined concept is supervision. Thanks to reflective practice, the focus moves from checking whether curricular content is covered towards promotion of reflection-in-action. These steps make the organization one where conflicts can occur and be resolved (Schön, 1983). Furthermore, reflective practice stimulates professional dialogue among teachers as they share their teaching stories with each other (Bailey, 1997).

Thanks to reflective practice, teachers can change their perspective towards their own context. First of all, they capture and utilize the instances that they otherwise miss (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). This gives them a chance to test their assumptions

(Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Widdowson, 2003), go beyond their initial perceptions by analyzing their own data (Farrell, 2020), and "make new sense of the situations of uncertainty or uniqueness" (Schön, 1983, p. 61). Next, thanks to informed decisions they make during the process (Bailey, 1997; Farrell, 2020; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Widdowson, 2003), they can examine and change their practice (Richards & Lockhart, 1996) and promote a profound understanding of teaching (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). As a result, reflective teachers can find, if any, gaps between teaching and learning (Richards & Lockhart, 1996), and aim at "good teaching" and "a good classroom" (Schön, 1983, p. 335).

In addition, reflective practice enables teachers to improve themselves. As a result of reflective practice, teachers improve their sense of purpose (Bailey, 1997), autonomy, deliberation (Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022; Pultorak, 1996), and confidence in testing new options (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Moreover, they can make further use of the classroom data to conduct several research projects besides action research (Bailey, 1997). Finally, reflective teachers examine and assess their professional growth (Richards & Lockhart, 1996), which contributes to their long-term goals.

As a result of reflective practice, teachers gain social benefits because they notice their own direct and indirect effects on the society (Bartlett, 1990). The benefits related to their immediate context include adapting to the cultural context (Bailey, 1997), setting an example for their students and encouraging them to reflect (Rodgers, 2002), situating their teaching stories, and sharing their valuable insights into teaching (Bailey, 1997). On a broader level, they can criticize unspoken beliefs based on recurrent practices, fight against inflexible requirements related to schedules and professional performance, and question the role of schools in transmission of knowledge (Schön, 1983). Finally, they can resist isolation they might experience due to daily routine or ignorant social language (Bartlett, 1990).

1.3.2. Criticism towards Reflective Practice

Despite a common positive attitude towards it (Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022), reflective practice has not been a universal approach in professional development, yet because we do not know for certain whether it improves teaching and learning (Borg, 2011; Farrell, 2020). For this reason, Borg (2011) highlights the need for more experimental studies on

contextual factors. In addition, Kumaravadivelu (2003) criticizes reflective practice because of its introspective viewpoint without much focus on interaction with students, other teachers, planners, and directors, ignorance of sociopolitical factors while focusing on classroom practice, and insufficient effort to stop disproportionate dependence on professional knowledge despite criticism.

Reflective practice could also be undesirable for teachers or administrators. Borg (2011) reports examples of teacher resistance to reflective practice which results from lack of guidance and purpose and regarding it as an administrative obligation. Another drawback for teachers might be political activism which reflective practice might result in. Teachers might see reflective practice unsuitable for their professional identities and/or responsibilities (Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022). Administrators might regard reflective practice as "a threat to the dynamically conservative system" since it encourages the teachers to produce ideas that go beyond the lesson plans and it might "disrupt the institutional order of space and time" (Schön, 1983, p. pp. 332-333). For instance, educational policies in Turkey, Taiwan, and the USA discourage reflective teachers (Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022).

1.4. Research on Reflective Practice

An overall review of 138 reflective studies between 2009 and 2014 in terms of their scope as well as participants and reflective tools can be found in Farrell (2018). The results showed that reflection on philosophy, principles, theory, or a combination of these had a positive effect on pre-service and in-service teachers. Commonly used reflective tools in the compilation were observed to be discussion, journal writing, classroom observations, video analysis, action research, narrative, and lesson study.

Few studies analyze teachers' reflection in terms of the two subcategories – descriptive and critical. For instance, Yang (2009) used blogs to promote reflection among pre-service teachers and observed their descriptive reflection was not as frequent as their critical reflection and highlighted the role of facilitator intervention in critical reflection. Another analysis is a case study by Farrell (2001) of an EFL teacher. The results revealed that the teacher's reflections were mostly descriptive. Liou (2001), a partial replication of Farrell's (1999), showed that pre-service teachers could do more critical than descriptive reflection but failed to show development in critical reflection.

The only research in Turkish context investigating descriptive and critical reflection based on Ho and Richards (1993) is Korkmazgil (2018). She explored contributions of blogging to pre-service teachers' reflectivity, and she found personal theories of teaching, evaluation of teaching, and approaches and methods as frequent topics whereas reference to self-awareness and reflective questions were rare. The researcher also observed individual differences in levels of reflectivity among the participants.

Some studies were based on Jay and Johnson's (2002) typology, which involved descriptive, dialogic, and critical levels. The research by Jumpakate, Wilang and Kong (2021) was based on both this typology and Yeşilbursa's (2011) categories to investigate reflective practice of two novice teachers. They used a general typology involving descriptive and reflective codes related to teaching, students, and self. They found the participants frequently reflected on instructional awareness act, negative student behavior, and instructional act. Another research based on this typology was Özkan (2019), which analyzed pre-service teachers' blog entry journals. She found that the most common reflective level was descriptive, which was followed by dialogic and critical levels.

Studies in Turkish context mostly focus on the benefits of reflective practice for professional development in pre-service or in-service level (Kuru-Gönen, 2012; Şanal-Erginel, 2006; Şire, 2004). Kuru-Gönen (2012) examined effects of reflective reciprocal peer coaching on 12 pre-service teachers and observed its benefits as well as increase in reflectivity levels. Şanal-Erginel (2006) aimed to investigate 30 pre-service teachers' perceptions on becoming reflective and promote reflective thinking in teacher education. The results revealed enthusiasm of the participants about reflection and significance of collaboration and guidance in promotion of reflection. Şire (2004) analyzed interactive instructional decisions of four novice and four experienced teachers. She found that experienced teachers had a more complicated decision-making process and a wider set of instructional actions.

Reflective studies in Turkish context do not only involve teachers as participants. For instance, İskenderoğlu-Önel (1998) gathered data from students through interviews and questionnaires as well as teachers' journals, observation notes, interviews, inventories and tests. She investigated the effect of action research on reflective teaching

and found raised awareness of classroom-related issues, more systematic consideration of students' feedback in lesson plans, and positive attitudes towards collaboration and professional development. Another example is the research by Öniz (2001), which involved three teacher educators and introduced a list of criteria for planning and conducting effective teacher education sessions and workshops as well as the participants' stages of reflection and processes of change.

Analysis of types of reflection can be found in Yeşilbursa's studies. In Yeşilbursa (2008), three ELT university instructors' post-observation conferences were analyzed to produce a list of reflective modes they were engaged in and a list of the content of their reflection, and the emerging rubric could be used quantitatively to examine teachers' reflective profiles. Some sub-categories in the first list are positive reflection, reflection on new discoveries, and reflection in the form of metaphor. The main headings in the second are the teacher, the students, language, classroom management, the participant's self, teaching techniques, and materials. She observed raised awareness in all participants and remarkable change in one participant. In Yeşilbursa (2011), 28 pre-service teachers' data were analyzed in terms of descriptive and dialogic reflection, and positive and negative stance. The results revealed individual differences among the participants, but thanks to the amount of insight reflection provided she uncovered its benefits in language teacher education.

CHAPTER 2
METHODOLOGY

2.1. Research Design

Teachers might be unaware of some incidents during classroom practice (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). However, insider approaches "encourage teachers to explore their own contexts and construct their own knowledge and understanding of what takes place in their classrooms" (Richards & Farrell 2005, p. 13) and to shoulder responsibility for their own learning and professional development. It is the aim of this dissertation to investigate the process EFL teachers go through when they reflect on their teaching using the data they have obtained from their own students' production. Bartlett (1990) maintains how critical reflection should be explored:

> Becoming critical means that as teachers we have to transcend the technicalities of teaching and think beyond the need to improve our instructional techniques. This effectively means we have to move away from the 'how to' questions, which have a limited utilitarian value, to the 'what' and 'why' questions, which regard instructional and managerial techniques not as ends in themselves but as a part of broader educational purposes. Hence we need to locate teaching in its broader cultural and social context. (p.205)

Therefore, we encouraged the participants to explore what kind of lexical problems their students have and why, reflect on it and bridge the gap between teaching and learning.

Teachers may react differently in the same context due to differences in their experiences, priorities and prior knowledge (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). Multiple instrumental case study makes comprehensive information available through examination of various forms of data from a few cases to provide insight into the complexity of an issue (Creswell, 2012). An example of a multiple instrumental case study on reflective teaching can be found in İskenderoğlu-Önel (1998), Öztürk (2015), Şanal-Erginel (2006),

and Yeşilbursa (2008). Thus, this research is designed as a multiple instrumental case study so that reflection process of each of three participants revealed through their journals, peer discussions and interviews is examined in depth.

A sequential exploratory mixed methods design allows us to analyze each research question first qualitatively and then quantitatively with "a fuller, richer and more complete understanding" of the outcomes (Hewson, 2006, p. 180). Such a design merges the strengths and weaknesses of the two types of analyses. As a result, what might be missed in one type of analysis could be noticed using the other. Another advantage of analyzing the data in this way is triangulation as findings can be validated in both analyses (Hewson, 2006).

The study aims to answer these research questions:

1. What type of reflection (critical or descriptive) do English teachers commonly use?

2. What kind of critical reflection do English teachers employ? What kind of descriptive reflection do English teachers employ?

3. Does this process develop the use of critical reflection over time?

2.2. Research Setting

This research took place at School of Foreign Languages at Erciyes University, a state university in Kayseri, during the spring semester in 2017. There are two EFL preparatory programs: one for students of ELT and ELL departments, and another for students of various departments which provide 30 % of their courses in English. The participants and the researcher in the study work in the latter.

The students in this program take a placement test at the beginning of the academic year and are grouped depending on their proficiency, named A for the lower, B for the higher, and C for the highest level with reference to CEFR. They have Coursebook, reading, and writing classes and are required to get at least 60 from their exams or to pass a proficiency exam in order to finish the program successfully and go on to their departments.

As part of their writing classes, the students are given a common topic according to their level, seated in exam position, numbered according to their position, and asked to

write a paragraph or an essay without consulting any materials or dictionaries. The teachers check the tasks, give written feedback on their use of English, content, and organization using correction symbols (see Appendix A), grade the tasks, and return them.

2.3. Participants

The method of selection was convenience sampling. Unlike a one-shot design, this 12- week process required the participants to devote a great deal of time and effort, and to cooperate fully. Besides, it was not a requirement from school administration or a postgraduate program. Therefore, only willing volunteers would serve best. At first, 11 teachers volunteered to participate in the research when they were informed about the topic in general. A meeting was held with these teachers about the details of the process on 6.1.2017, and three participants took part in the research.

All the three participants are native speakers of Turkish and two are female. They have been teaching between 18 and 29 years. At the time, only one participant was teaching C-level students and the others were teaching A and B-level students. In order to protect their privacy, the teachers were asked to use pseudonyms and they chose Ayhan, Star, and Süheyla. Detailed descriptions will be given before the analysis of each participant in Chapter 4.

2.4. Data Collection Instruments

2.4.1. Instruments for Basis for Reflection

The main observation in the thesis is how the participants reflect on lexical problems and solutions for them. In order to initiate and nourish the reflective process, the teachers were required to use the lexical problems in aforementioned productive writing tasks, audio-records during classroom practice, and feedback from students as the basis. They used the writing tasks to diagnose lexical problems and to monitor progress. As for the audio-records and student feedback, the aim was to reflect on the causes and possible solutions. The products of these three instruments only served as the basis for reflective data, so they were not included in the analysis.

2.4.1.1. Writing Tasks

To start with, it was the teachers' choice to use the writing tasks because students take them seriously due to the grades. In addition, if they had been given an extra task outside class, the students could have used dictionaries or other materials, cooperated with other people, written too little, or completely disregarded it. In that case, the tasks would not have reflected lexical problems accurately. This would have also meant additional work for the teachers. As a result, the documents they already get from the writing classes were involved due to their richness and practicality for the teachers.

Topics, frequency and dates of the writing tasks are determined in accordance with the students' level by the writing commission in the school. Also, morning and evening students in A and B Groups are given separate topics. Table 2.1 displays the rubrics for morning and evening students in A and B Groups.

Table 2.1: Rubrics for Writing Tasks in A and B Groups

Task	Rubric for Morning A&B Groups	Rubric for Evening A&B Groups
1	Write a paragraph about your favorite time of the day.	Write a paragraph about your favorite activity that you do at home.
2	Write a paragraph about an enjoyable day that you spent with your friends.	Write a paragraph about a memorable day from your childhood.
3	Write a paragraph that describes your ideal job.	Write a paragraph that describes your ideal house/flat.
4	Do you think being successful makes people happy?	Do you think having a lot of friends makes people happy?

Considering their higher level, C Groups are given different writing topics. The number of the tasks for these students also differ. Table 2.2 displays the rubrics for the tasks in C Groups.

Table 2.2: Rubrics for Writing Tasks in C Groups

Task	Rubric
1	Do you think travelling with your family is a good idea?
2	Write a paragraph that describes a perfect teacher.
3	Write a process paragraph about how to organize a birthday party for your best friend.
4	Write a paragraph that describes a modern city.
5	Do you think sharing a flat with friends is a good idea?

2.4.1.2. Audio-records of Classroom Practice

Although observation is an important way of data collection (Creswell, 2012; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Shousha, 2015) and its absence might be regarded as a limitation of the study design, during the meeting most of the participants seemed to feel rather uncomfortable with classroom observation and to prefer to reveal their classroom practice through audio-records, journals, and interviews. Additionally, audio-records provide a complete account of a lesson, which can be analyzed several times when needed, and reveal details that the teacher did not notice during the lesson (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). As the focus of the dissertation is how the participants see their practice rather than what they actually do, classroom observation was not included in the design.

The participants were asked to audio-record classes in which they did an activity to overcome the diagnosed problems. They used their mobile phones to record the lessons. They were also recommended to take notes or extra copies while/immediately after the classroom practice just in case.

2.4.1.3. Feedback from Students

Student feedback is a valuable instrument for teacher reflection (Yeşilbursa, 2008; Öniz, 2001). The participants were asked to obtain it at the end of each classroom practice. The students were expected to focus on the lexical side of the practice and respond anonymously in Turkish with the following titles on small cards:

- Kelime öğretimi açısından memnun olduğum noktalar (things I like in terms of teaching lexis)

- Kelime öğretimi açısından değiştirilmesi/çıkarılması gereken noktalar (things that should be changed / eliminated in terms of teaching lexis)

- Kelime öğrenmek için pratik yapmam gereken noktalar (things I should practice on for learning lexis)

2.4.2. Instruments for Reflective Data

The reflective data were gathered through journals, peer discussions and interviews, which have various advantages and are common sources for reflection in literature, at regular intervals. Journals "engage teachers in a deeper level of awareness and response to teaching" (Ho & Richards, 1993, p. 32). They were used by Farrell (1999), Ho and Richards (1993), İskenderoğlu-Önel (1998), Öniz (2001), Öztürk (2015), Şanal-Erginel (2006), and Yeşilbursa (2008). Discussions can be found in Farrell (1999), Ho and Richards (1993), and Nguyen and Nga (2018). Interviews provide the researcher with control over the type and specificity of information. They were used in İskenderoğlu-Önel (1998), Kuru-Gönen (2012), Şanal-Erginel (2006), and Şire (2004).

2.4.2.1. Journals

The journal entries (see Appendix B for a sample) were handwritten or typed in Microsoft Word in English. The participants were also informed about the option to audio-record the entry and then transcribe it when they felt short of time. They wrote two types of journals: one on lexical problems and another on their classroom practice. For each type of journal, they were given some questions to guide them for what to reflect on. They were expected to use relevant ones as the starting point for reflecting on their experiences, to avoid responding in a question-answer format (as in Şanal-Erginel, 2006), and to write in narrative form (as in Şanal-Erginel, 2006). In this way, the journals also gave the participants a chance to produce ideas in their own time that they might later use in peer discussions and interviews. The following questions were provided for journals on lexical problems:

- Why do the students make such mistakes?

- What should be emphasized during vocabulary presentation to prevent these mistakes?

- What kind of practice do the students need? How can you provide opportunities for such practice?

- Do you need to prepare extra materials?

The following questions adapted from Pultorak (1993; 1996) and Şanal-Erginel (2006) were given for journals on classroom practice:

- What were the essential strengths of the lesson?

- What, if anything, would you change about the lesson?

- Do you think the lesson was successful in terms of solving lexical problems? Why?

- How is your vocabulary teaching in this lesson different from what you did previously?

- Think about the product of the lesson, if any. What are the conditions that have an effect on this outcome? You can consider teaching techniques, feedback, error correction, and questioning techniques.

- Do you think that there were unplanned outcomes in this lesson? If so, what are they? Why do you think so?

- What did you think about student behaviors?

- Can you think of another way you might have taught this lesson?

- Do you think that if you teach this lesson with a different approach, the students' learning would be better? If yes, what approach?

- Do you think that the content of this lesson was of interest for students? If you were to explain the relevance and importance of the content, what would you tell an administrator and/or student to prove that the content was right?

- Also compare and discuss how you view yourself ideally and your actual performance.

- Ask yourself 'What have I learned about myself as a teacher through this practice?' and 'How will I apply to what I have learned to my future teaching experiences?'

- What do you think about this research as a whole? Do you think that it contributed to your learning and development? How?

2.4.2.2. Peer Discussions

The participants were asked to discuss with a peer to reflect on the causes of the problems and potential solutions. The discussions (see Appendix C for a sample) were conducted in English with a fellow teacher or teachers they preferred and audio recorded. They discussed the following questions:

- Why do the students make such mistakes?

- What should be emphasized during vocabulary presentation to prevent these mistakes?

- What kind of practice do the students need? How can you provide opportunities for such practice?

- Do you need to prepare extra materials?

2.4.2.3. Interviews

One-on-one interviews were held with each participant about their classroom practice and the whole process by the researcher. The interviews (see Appendix D for a sample) were conducted in English, in a familiar comfortable setting (either the participant's or the researcher's office), and audio recorded. A semi-structured approach which involved the questions below (adapted from Pultorak, 1993, 1996; Şanal-Erginel, 2006) and relevant probes for clarification and elaboration was chosen because of its flexibility:

- What were the essential strengths of the lesson?

- What, if anything, would you change about the lesson?

- Do you think the lesson was successful in terms of solving lexical problems? Why?

- How is your vocabulary teaching in this lesson different from what you did previously?

- Think about the product of the lesson, if any. What are the conditions that have an effect on this outcome? You can consider teaching techniques, feedback, error correction, and questioning techniques.

- Do you think that there were unplanned outcomes in this lesson? If so, what are they? Why do you think so?

- What did you think about student behaviors?

- Can you think of another way you might have taught this lesson?

- Do you think that if you teach this lesson with a different approach, the students' learning would be better? If yes, what approach?

- Do you think that the content of this lesson was of interest for students? If you were to explain the relevance and importance of the content, what would you tell to an administrator and/or student to prove that the content was right?

- Also compare and discuss how you view yourself ideally and your actual performance.

- Ask yourself 'What have I learned about myself as a teacher through this practice?' and 'How will I apply to what I have learned to my future teaching experiences?'

- What do you think about this research as a whole? Do you think that it contributed to your learning and development? How?

2.5. Data Collection Process

2.5.1. The Topic for Reflection

The participants were required to reflect on a common topic in order to keep them on the same track. For this reason, a meeting was held to specify the topic before the process started. The first decision was to analyze students' written production as it would be more practical for the participants to observe than spoken data.

Next, they decided to focus on lexical competence in written production as it could be improved through activities both during and after class. For practicality, the participants also decided to use the lexical information they already get from writing classes, which require them to give students feedback on their use of English, content, and organization using correction symbols.

The next decision to make the topic more specific was to define the lexical problems as those related with meaning, collocations, and word formation. These categories are derived from the three types of lexical feedback included in the correction symbols they use: inappropriate word, missing word / redundant word, and word form.

2.5.2. Reflection Process

The 12-week reflection process included two-phase procedures repeated four times for A and B-level teachers and five times for the C-level teacher. The first phase of each procedure involved reflection on lexical problems and the second was for reflection on classroom practice.

In the first phase, the participants diagnosed their students' lexical problems by analyzing the writing tasks. First of all, they were asked to take photos of their students' papers for storage and make a separate list of errors for each type of lexical problem (meaning, collocations, and word formation) in order to see the patterns, draw conclusions, and shape their teaching accordingly. In each list they needed to include the task number, student seat number, the sentence with the lexical problem, and the type of the problem. Repetition of a problem could be marked with an asterisk. They had the option of forming the lists manually or digitally (see Appendix E for samples). Also, each participant was provided with a USB drive so that they could store the information they had and get enough space for upcoming recordings on their mobiles. Then, they examined the lists to see what kind of problems occurred frequently. Based on their analysis, the participants were asked to reflect on the causes of the problems and possible solutions in a journal and then in a peer discussion.

The aim of the second phase was to reflect on classroom practice. At the end of each practice, they asked the students to give feedback on small cards. After examining the records and the student feedback, the participants wrote another journal entry focusing on what they had done to overcome the problems and what outcomes they had expected. Then, each participant was interviewed by the researcher on the same topic.

The data were stored both by the participants and the researcher. At the end of each procedure, the participants gave the researcher photos of the texts written by students, digital or handwritten lists of mistakes, audio-records of classroom practice, photos of student feedback cards, digital or handwritten journals, and audio-records of peer discussions. In this way, the researcher was also able to monitor the process. The interviews were audio-recorded and stored by the researcher.

Table 2.3 reveals the reflection process for A and B level Teachers. The procedures are listed in order of application. The table also includes the deadlines set in

accordance with the academic calendar. Due to low attendance in the final week, only analysis of the writing task, journal on lexical problems, peer discussion, and interview could be conducted.

Table 2.3: The Reflection Process for A and B Level Teachers

Date	Procedure
27 February - 17 March 2017	Analysis of Writing task 1 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion Classroom Practice Student Feedback Journal on Classroom Practice Interview
20-24 March 2017	Analysis of Writing task 2 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion
10-14 April 2017	Classroom Practice Student Feedback Journal on Classroom Practice Interview
27 April - 10 May 2017	Analysis of Writing task 3 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion Classroom Practice Student Feedback Journal on Classroom Practice Interview
11-18 May 2017	Analysis of Writing task 4 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion Interview

Table 2.4 presents the reflection process for the C level teacher. The procedures are listed in order of application. The tables also include the deadlines set in accordance with the academic calendar. Due to low attendance in the final week, only analysis of the writing task, journal on lexical problems, peer discussion, and interview could be conducted.

Table 2.4: The Reflection Process for the C Level Teacher

Date	Procedure
9-17 March 2017	Analysis of Writing task 1 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion Classroom Practice Student Feedback Journal on Classroom Practice Interview
23-31 March 2017	Analysis of Writing task 2 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion
10-14 April 2017	Classroom Practice Student Feedback Journal on Classroom Practice Interview
20-26 April 2017	Analysis of Writing task 3 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion Classroom Practice Student Feedback Journal on Classroom Practice Interview
27 April - 10 May 2017	Analysis of Writing task 4 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion Classroom Practice Student Feedback Journal on Classroom Practice Interview
11-18 May 2017	Analysis of Writing task 5 Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion Interview

2.5.3. Training

A brief training was organized in order to present the steps of the research and clarify what the participants would need to do using a handout (see Appendix F). It was arranged to take place on 10.03.2017, but one participant was not available then, so there was another session for him on 13.03.2017. The first session for two participants was

completely in English. However, the second one for the other participant was mostly in Turkish due to his preference.

First of all, the aim of the research and reflective practice were explained. Then the list, sequence, frequency, and due dates of the activities that the participants were expected to conduct were presented. This was followed by instructions on each activity, and the training ended with presentation of sample journals taken from Şanal-Erginel (2006).

During the training, the participants asked some questions, especially about classroom practice, to make things clear. One participant wanted to conduct peer discussions with two of her five officemates. As for the other two participants, whose offices are in separate but neighboring buildings in the same campus, they wanted to work as a pair.

2.5.4. Piloting

Piloting the procedures that the participants would need to follow took a week between 10 and 17 March 2017. This week enabled them to experience what they were expected to do and to feel clear about it. For instance, the discussion group with three members did not remember to audio-record the peer discussion and needed to repeat it. Understanding classroom practice was also demanding for the participants. One of them said she was not sure if it would work and seemed likely to withdraw. However, the process became clear for them as they conducted each activity. When that teacher was interviewed at the end of the week, she was entirely positive about the study.

During the piloting week, monitoring the participants was also an important task for the researcher to keep track of what had been completed and what was left to be done and to store data. Therefore, the researcher and the participants visited each other quite often. Most of the interaction was face to face. However, the researcher also formed a Whatsapp group called *Reflective Teachers* for announcements and reminders. Also, some teachers used Whatsapp to send the photos and the documents.

At the end of the week, most of the data seemed sufficient and appropriate to use, and everybody in the research – the teachers, the students, and the researcher – seemed to benefit from the activities done. Both the teachers and their students found the classroom practice useful. Also, the teachers' reactions to the research were all positive at the end

of the week, when everything was clear. Having interacted with all three participants, the researcher was able to share many ideas, enrich her repertoire, and reflect on vocabulary teaching.

2.6. Data analysis

When the data collection had been completed, literature was reviewed in order to find a taxonomy for types of reflection. The taxonomies for descriptive and critical reflection presented in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999) are the ones which include a variety of subcategories and coincide closely with the content of the questions provided for the journals, peer discussions, and interviews; thus, they were adapted and coded as:

Topics for Descriptive Reflection

1. Theories of teaching

D1A. A belief/conviction - e.g., what constitutes good language teaching

D1B. An expert's view - e.g. referring to Krashen's views about language

D1C. How a theory was applied - e.g. trying out a questioning strategy described in a lecture

2. Approaches and methods

D2A. An approach or procedure - e.g. the teacher's approach to the teaching of reading skills or the procedures used during a listening lesson

D2B. The content of the lesson - e.g. a description of the content of a grammar lesson

3. Evaluating teaching

D3. Solutions to problems by seeking solutions from experts - e.g. asking for ways for overcoming particular difficulties

4. Questions about teaching

D4A. Questions about what should be done - e.g. asking whether the teacher should spend more time on grammar

D4B. Asking for information - e.g. asking what is meant by good questioning skills

D4C. Asking how to do things - e.g. asking how to motivate the students

Topics for Critical Reflection

1. Theories of teaching

C1A. A justification - e.g. describing a theory to justify something the teacher did

C1B. A personal opinion - e.g. expressing an opinion about the value of classroom observation

C1C. Contradictions between theory and practice - e.g. describing why a classroom incident does not support a theory

C1D. How theories changed - e.g. how classroom experience changes the teacher's theories

2. Approaches and methods

C2A. The teacher's pedagogical knowledge - e.g. knowledge about the demands of class task

C2B. The teacher's knowledge and experience - e.g. pointing out how his or her teaching has become more student-focused

C2C. The learners' background information - e.g. pointing out that students have little opportunity to practice English outside classroom

C2D. The relation between teaching and the school context - e.g. how administrative constraints or school policies affect teaching

3. Evaluating teaching

3.1. Evaluating lessons

C3A. Positive evaluations of lessons - e.g. commenting that the lesson went well because all students were active in it

C3B. Negative evaluations of lessons - e.g. pointing out that the lesson failed to achieve its goals

3.2. Diagnosing problems

C3C. Students' problems - e.g. difficulties student had with particular grammar items

C3D. Classroom interaction - e.g. a planned grouping arrangement did not work because of problems students had interacting with each other

C3E. Teacher's problems - e.g. the teacher did not have time and energy to mark the students' homework

3.3. Solutions to problems

C3F. Alternative ways of presenting lesson - e.g. beginning a lesson in a different way

C3G. Deciding on a plan of action - e.g. deciding to use role play activities more often

4. Questions about teaching

C4. Asking for reasons - e.g. asking why planned lessons may be no more successful than unplanned ones

5. Self-awareness

C5A. Recognition of personal growth

C5B. Setting personal goals

C5C. Perceptions of their teaching style - e.g. describing the style of teaching s/he feels more comfortable with, such as a teacher-centered style

C5D. Perceptions of their language proficiency - e.g. saying that they do not speak English fluently

The researcher used different pieces of data from various participants in order to train herself in data coding. After familiarization, she coded the data for each participant separately. The codes not only made the analysis more practical, but also enabled us to recognize the category that a topic belongs to. The data from the participants' reflections in the journals, peer discussions, and interviews were entered manually on an SPSS 23 data set (see Appendix H for a sample). As the main focus was how the participants

reflect, the basis for reflection (i.e. texts written by students, lists of mistakes, audio-records of classroom practice, and student feedback) was not included in the analysis. Next, frequency counts and percentages were obtained using Descriptive Statistics.

One piece of data was given only one label. The decision was based on the context rather than the word. For instance, if the teacher observed at the beginning of the lesson that the students were ready to learn what he or she was going to present that day, this piece of data was coded as learners' background information. However, if the teacher observed that the students looked ready to learn further as an outcome of the classroom practice, this was coded as positive evaluations of lessons.

In this longitudinal case study, each participant was examined separately as a unique case based on the data. For the qualitative part of the study, the results were examined to find out the patterns and reasons for them. For the first research question, the overall results were presented contrasting descriptive and critical reflection. For the second one, the results were analyzed in depth according to the topics for descriptive and critical reflection listed above. For the last research question, in each participant's critical reflection we searched for the seven traits of development in critical reflection presented in Farrell (1999) and compared the percentage of each trait in the first and last procedure as Ho and Richards (1993) did. Table 2.5 shows calculation of these percentages:

Table 2.5: Analysis of Development in the Sense of Critical Reflectivity

Traits of Development in Critical Reflection	Calculation Used for the Analysis
A greater variety of traits of critical reflection	number of types of critical topics used / total number of critical topics
Discussing theories of expert and own	total frequency of C1A, C1B and C1C / total frequency of critical reflection
Being more able to reflect through teaching experience	total frequency of C2A and C2B / total frequency of critical reflection
Being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context	frequency of C2D / total frequency of critical reflection
Being more able to evaluate both positively and negatively	total frequency of C3A and C3B / total frequency of critical reflection
Being a better problem solver	total frequency of C3F and C3G / total frequency of critical reflection
Asking more questions	frequency of C4 / total frequency of critical reflection

To be able to generalize the qualitative data, to a certain extent, a statistical test, one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square, was used. The test showed if the results were statistically significant for the alpha level at .05, and explained the patterns found. Finally, similarities among the participants were stated.

2.7. Trustworthiness

The researcher's identity as a colleague contributed to the reliability of the data. First of all, because she was not an in an administrative position in the institution, the participants did not feel obliged to take part in the research or meet the requirements during the process. What is more, thanks to the good relationship between the researcher and the participants, they were cooperative during the process and felt free to reveal numerous details about their teaching. Finally, her knowledge of the context was an advantage since it made her interpretations trustworthy.

Reliability of data coding was improved by having 10% of the data coded by an independent researcher. The result of the reliability formula, number of agreements / total number of agreements + disagreements (Miles and Huberman, 1994, p.64), revealed 92% concurrence between the two coders.

CHAPTER 3
RESULTS

3.1. Introduction

The analysis presented in this chapter begins with the introduction of the participant mentioning the date of birth, mother tongue, experience abroad, academic qualifications, teaching experience, current courses, current teaching load and positions held in the current institution. The chapter aims to answer these research questions based on analysis of data from each participant separately with reference to the categories given in Table 3.1:

1. What type of reflection (descriptive or critical) do English teachers commonly use?

2. What kind of descriptive reflection do English teachers employ? What kind of critical reflection do English teachers employ?

3. Does this process develop the use of critical reflection over time?

Table 3.1: Descriptive and Critical Topics

Categories	Descriptive Topics	Critical Topics
1. Theories of teaching	• a belief/conviction • an expert's view • how a theory was applied	• a justification • a personal opinion • contradictions between theory and practice • how theories changed
2. Approaches and methods	• an approach or procedure • the content of the lesson	• the teacher's pedagogical knowledge • the teacher's knowledge and experience • the learners' background information • the relation between teaching and the school context

3. Evaluating teaching	• solutions to problems by seeking solutions from experts	Evaluating lessons
		  • positive evaluations of lessons
		  • negative evaluations of lessons
		 Diagnosing problems
		  • students' problems
		  • classroom interaction
		  • teacher's problems
		 Solutions to problems
		  • alternative ways of presenting lesson
		  • deciding on a plan of action

4. Questions about teaching	• questions about what should be done • asking for information • asking how to do things	• asking for reasons
5. Self-awareness	-	• recognition of personal growth • setting personal goals • perceptions of their teaching style • perceptions of their language proficiency

For the first research question, a global look at the participant's reflection is given with reference to the ratio of critical reflection to descriptive reflection besides the number of different types of topics mentioned and the list of the topics used more frequently. For the second one, the results are analyzed in depth according to the topics for descriptive and critical reflection. These subsections start with the overall frequency, the number of different types of topics mentioned, and the type of tasks engaged in frequently, and they end with details of frequent topics along with extracts from the raw data. For the last research question, the focus is on the comparison of the percentage of each trait of development in critical reflection in the first and last procedure. All these results are analyzed both descriptively and statistically based on one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results.

3.2. The Case of Süheyla

3.2.1. Introducing Süheyla

Süheyla is a teacher born in 1967. She is a native speaker of Turkish and has been to Austria on holiday. She gained an arts and master's degree in ELL in a state university in Central Anatolia and finished a PhD in 2021 in the same field. She has been teaching EFL at the same university since 1998. She has also worked as the coordinator, the head of writing commission, and a member of material office, testing office, and various commissions in the institution. During this research, she was teaching C-level (with reference to CEFR) students writing, listening, coursebook, and reading for 22 hours a week.

An overall analysis of Süheyla's reflection reveals that she referred to 83% of the topics in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999). The distribution of these topics is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 734.609, df= 23, p=.000). According to chi-square results, nine topics were mentioned more frequently than the statistically expected level. The common topics, ranked in order of frequency, are listed in Table 3.2:

Table 3.2: Common Topics in Süheyla's Reflection

Type of reflection	Category	Topic	Frequency (N)
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Students' problems	79
Descriptive	Approaches and methods	An approach or procedure	75
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Positive evaluations of lessons	65
Descriptive	Theories of teaching	A belief/conviction	52
Critical	Theories of teaching	A personal opinion	28
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Alternative ways of presenting lesson	27
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Teacher's problems	26
Critical	Approaches and methods	The learners' background information	26
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Deciding on a plan of action	21

There are only two descriptive topics in this list, namely an approach/procedure and a belief / conviction; however, the former is the second most frequent of all. The others are

all critical, and most of them are related to evaluating teaching: students' problems, positive evaluations of lessons, alternative ways of presenting lesson, teacher's problems, and deciding on a plan of action.

A global look at of Süheyla's reflection in Table 3.3 shows that besides a great variety of topics (90%) her critical reflection (69%) far outnumbered her descriptive reflection (31%). Regardless of this low frequency, the variety of the topics was over half (67%) in her descriptive reflection.

Table 3.3: Overall Analysis of Süheyla's Reflection

Type of reflection	Frequency (%)	Variety (%)
Critical	69	90
Descriptive	31	67

3.2.2. Süheyla's Descriptive Reflection

Overall, Süheyla did not engage in descriptive reflection very frequently (31%), but when she did, she used a good variety (67%) of descriptive topics especially in interviews and journals on classroom practice. An approach/procedure and a belief/conviction are the descriptive topics she used more frequently than statistically expected, and their categories and frequencies are displayed in Table 3.4. According to the table, more than half of her descriptive reflection (54%) is related to approaches and methods. However, the teacher never mentioned an expert's view, solutions to problems by seeking solutions from experts, or asking for information.

Table 3.4: Descriptive Topics Süheyla Mentioned Frequently

Category	Topic	Frequency (%)
Approaches and methods	An approach/procedure	54
Theories of teaching	A belief/conviction	37.4

The distribution of her descriptive reflection among the four types of instruments is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 137.633, df= 3, p=.000). Moreover, the distribution of her descriptive reflection among

the topics that she mentioned is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 223.547, df= 5, p=.000). The frequency and percentage of the topics mentioned in each instrument are listed in Table 3.5:

Table 3.5: Descriptive Topics Süheyla Mentioned in Each Instrument

Topic	Journal on lexical problems	Journal on classroom practice	Peer discussion	Interview	Total (N)	Total (%)
An approach/procedure	1	26	4	44	75	54
A belief/conviction	4	3	5	40	52	37.4
The content of the lesson	0	3	0	5	8	5.8
Questions about what should be done	0	0	1	1	2	1.4
Asking how to do things	0	0	0	1	1	0.7
How a theory was applied	0	0	0	1	1	0.7

3.2.2.1. An Approach/Procedure

An approach/procedure was the most common type of descriptive topic in Süheyla's reflection. It comprised 54% of her descriptive reflection. Süheyla described an approach/procedure in her journals on lexical problems and classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews.

Süheyla mentioned this descriptive topic to refer to the procedures in different phases of the class. For instance, in the second journal on classroom practice she referred to her preparation for the class stating "I planned this feedback session as whole class study. Before I entered into the class, I had already finished keeping each student's vocabulary mistakes into the Excel file. I prepared a list of mistakes [that] appeared in the texts." An additional example is found in the first interview when she described how she started the class. She said, "At the very beginning I always say, 'Your writings are all very good, I thank you all', I always try to praise them." Then in the same interview,

when she moved on to the description of the input phase, she told the researcher "I try to warn them that it's not always right to just translate directly." Generally, while editing the writing tasks, the teacher prepared an Excel document to detect both good examples of language use and common lexical problems and later shared them with the students during the input phase. The main focus of attention during this phase was on guidance and collaboration on how to use an online collocation dictionary to overcome such problems. In the second interview, she mentioned the procedure saying, "In this lesson I tried to make it more practical for them, I gave them the papers with symbols, and I warned them that in a more detailed way vocabulary mistakes can be coped with using a dictionary." In the practice phase she asked her students to use their body for miming or association, write some examples, create a short story together, retell a story using the prompts, discuss and share ideas, produce a text in pairs, or provide feedback for their peers. Finally, in the second interview, Süheyla also described how she ended the class saying, "I asked them to use the dictionary in order to improve their writing in terms of vocabulary expansion in a way that adding adverbs, adjectives or I mean some extras into their writing."

3.2.2.2. A Belief/Conviction

Another recurrent type of descriptive reflection of Süheyla was a belief/conviction comprising 37.4% of the total. She expressed a belief/conviction in her journals on lexical problems and classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews. The participant stated her beliefs about teaching and especially learning.

For example, in the second interview when she referred to how an extra activity should be handled, she said, "If you start, you should go on doing it in order to make it effective." Later, she referred to how vocabulary should be taught:

We should teach them in their context by production, I think. If they don't use it, if they don't need it, and if they don't use it, they just learn it till the end of the exam, but it is not their own vocabulary until they use it, it is the vocabulary.

In her second journal on classroom practice, she mentioned the importance of dictionary skills stating "They realized that dictionaries had more than they needed, so they had to choose (the correct word). This is a real dictionary skill that every language learner should have."

In the second interview, Süheyla's focus was primarily on her beliefs about learning. First of all, she referred to language learning in general:

This is something not depending on only one thing. This is their language knowledge, and this is about their language practice, so our students need time in order to have better writing. This is not only related to vocabulary choice or correct use of vocabulary, but this is related to their perception, practice, and production.

Then, she highlighted the importance of students' recognition of "their way of learning vocabulary". Later, she continued saying, "I realized that when they are on their own doing something in the class separately, they believe in themselves more."

3.2.2.3. The Content of the Lesson

Süheyla also referred to the content of the lesson, which comprised only 5.8% of her descriptive reflection. She mentioned it in her journals on classroom practice and interviews. For instance, in the second interview she maintained that "it was a writing class" and later explained the focus of the lesson:

They write *'it's a nice day'* or *'she's a teacher'* for example, but what kind of a teacher she is or where [she works as] a teacher, so I ask them to improve their writing by adding some more vocabulary or lexical items from the collocation dictionary.

3.2.2.4. Questions about What Should Be Done

In her descriptive reflection Süheyla asked two questions about what should be done. The first one was found in her third peer discussion. After talking about how she attempted to solve lexical problems, Süheyla asked her peers "What else can I do?". The teacher asked the second question in the fourth interview. She mentioned a problem related to the students, asked herself about improvement, and answered "But shall I try again? Yes, I can try again but with more clear instructions."

3.2.2.5. Asking How to Do Things

Asking how to do things was a rare descriptive theme in Süheyla's reflection. She only used it once. In the second interview, while discussing ways to improve vocabulary teaching, Süheyla asked "How can we do it (teach vocabulary in context)?"

3.2.2.6. How a Theory was Applied

Another infrequent descriptive theme in Süheyla's reflection was how a theory was applied. Only in the fifth interview, she referred to "awareness raising" saying, "In this sense we can realize that how the teacher guides the students also increases their attention on the topic the teacher has been concentrating on. It is a kind of awareness raising."

3.2.3. Süheyla's Critical Reflection

With 90% variety Süheyla's critical reflection constituted 69% of the whole, and it could be observed in all types of instruments but mostly in interviews and peer discussions. Statistically, Süheyla referred to seven critical topics more frequently than expected, and the top two were much more prevalent than the others. These are given in descending order in Table 3.6, which reveals that most of her critical reflection (69.8%) is related to evaluating teaching. However, the teacher never expressed how theories changed or comments on her language proficiency.

Table 3.6: Critical Topics Süheyla Mentioned Frequently

Category	Topic	Frequency (%)
Evaluating teaching	Students' problems	25
Evaluating teaching	Positive evaluations of lessons	20.6
Theories of teaching	A personal opinion	8.9
Evaluating teaching	Alternative ways of presenting lesson	8.5
Evaluating teaching	Teacher's problems	8.2
Approaches and methods	The learners' background information	8.2
Evaluating teaching	Deciding on a plan of action	6.6

The distribution of her critical reflection among the four types of instruments is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2=214.051, df= 3, p=.000). Moreover, the distribution of her critical reflection among the topics that she mentioned is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 490.241, df= 17, p=.000). Table 3.7 presents the frequency and percentage of the topics mentioned in each instrument:

Table 3.7: Critical Topics Süheyla Mentioned in Each Instrument

Topic	Journal on lexical problems	Journal on classroom practice	Peer discussion	Interview	Total (N)	Total (%)
Students' problems	18	4	23	34	79	25
Positive evaluations of lessons	5	17	4	39	65	20.6
A personal opinion	0	2	7	19	28	8.9
Alternative ways of presenting lesson	3	1	8	15	27	8.5
Teacher's problems	0	2	0	24	26	8.2
The learners' background information	5	2	4	15	26	8.2
Deciding on a plan of action	9	3	4	5	21	6.6
Recognition of personal growth	0	0	1	16	17	5.4
A justification	0	2	0	4	6	1.9
The teacher's knowledge and experience	0	0	0	4	4	1.3
Pedagogical knowledge	0	0	0	3	3	0.9
The relation between teaching and the school context	0	0	0	3	3	0.9
Her teaching style	0	0	0	3	3	0.9
Contradictions between theory and practice	0	0	0	2	2	0.6
Classroom interaction	0	0	0	2	2	0.6
Setting personal goals	0	0	0	2	2	0.6
Negative evaluations of lessons	0	0	0	1	1	0.3
Asking for reasons	0	0	1	0	1	0.3

3.2.3.1. Students' Problems

The most recurrent critical topic was students' problems, which comprised 25% of the total and appeared in journals on classroom practice and lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. Süheyla reflected on a variety of problems. Some of her reflections involved a general description of the problems with reference to their frequency or similarity to the ones in previous tasks. However, other problems addressed were related to more specific issues. For instance, in the third interview she shared one of her observations during an error correction session in class stating "While we were just correcting them on the board, not every student was active. They were following us but sometimes they couldn't create what it would be, so I thought that they need more help with rewriting the sentence."

Besides, Süheyla explored the three types of lexical problems identified for this research – meaning, collocations, and word formation. The problems related to meaning were, according to her, usually confronted as "inappropriate word use". The teacher also mentioned her students' incorrect collocations such as *'good information'* and "extra wordings such as *'they effect to the students'*". An example of lexical problems related to word formation was found in her criticism of lack of "enough adjectives to make their paragraphs more descriptive".

The teacher reflected on problems related to lack of some learning strategies, too. For her, the students needed to discover their own learning style, balance their focus on grammar and vocabulary, and search for different ways of learning vocabulary rather than employing "only one direct method – learning Turkish and English version of the word". Having observed that her students used "some very simple dictionaries", the teacher even maintained that "it's not enough for them just to say they use it" because "the main problem is how to use the dictionary". To be more precise, "they don't search the correct form of the word" and thus spend too much time. Süheyla also noticed that her students had difficulty putting what they knew into practice. For example, she realized that although they had learnt the word *'significant'*, they mostly used *'important'* in their writing. She also observed that they could correct errors under teacher guidance but not alone. In the last peer discussion, she gave some details:

When you give feedback to them, they realize that there is a mistake with word formation, and they correct it, but of course during the timed writings we [give] them time to revise their writings, but they don't do anything throughout this period, they just read and finish, but they don't know how to search for a mistake.

One further issue that attracted Süheyla's attention was some students' negative reactions towards peer editing. They liked neither revising somebody else's text nor being revised. The students also criticized the language their partners used and their "discouraging" feedback.

When Süheyla stated a problem, she did not only describe it but also reflected on the root of that problem. For instance, during the second peer discussion, upon diagnosing the collocation mistake, the teacher considered why this happened saying, "They don't know any other adjectives that might be used with the word *'information'*". Süheyla

referred to mental aspects of her students' problems, too. For example, in the second peer discussion she reflected "These problems might have appeared because of that situation I think, because of their psychology, because these problems are not the problems that they normally have during the writing." Moreover, she mentioned "the gap in their conceptual performance", writing in English "directly after thinking and planning in L1", "resistance" to take risks, and the need to "break their chains". In the fourth interview she examined why the students avoided using vocabulary they already knew saying, "They are afraid of making mistakes, and as you say they feel themselves safe perhaps just using the words they know, they are sure about it." The teacher also discussed other reasons such as "difficulty of the topic", low levels of students' motivation at the end of the term, or their readiness.

3.2.3.2. Positive Evaluations of Lessons

Süheyla's positive evaluations of lessons comprised 20.6% of her critical reflection. They were found in journals on classroom practice and lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. The teacher realized that some of her classroom practices proved to be effective, contrary to her predictions. For instance, one was "active" rather than "boring", and another one "worked" although it was "very traditional". At the same time, the teacher managed to remain positive despite some difficulties she faced. For instance, in the second interview she stated:

Of course, this is not my ideal performance because it was also my first attempt to use a collocation dictionary in the class so that I can't also just predict some of the outcomes during the lesson, so it was not an ideal class, but in any way it's a beginning for me too.

Süheyla's positive evaluations of her practice involved such phrases as "a good collocation study", "a good beginning", "keep their attention", "useful", "interesting", "motivating", "very active", "very effective", "like an ideal", "I have managed it", and "it worked". Süheyla evaluated her practice positively based on criteria such as the students' gain, their attitudes, or her own reaction. She mentioned them all in the fourth interview:

It was good for me. It was like an ideal because I can motivate my students, they accepted what I offered because this was something new, and they were happy, and they tried their best, and it was good, it was an ideal atmosphere.

Süheyla's account of students' gains included success in overcoming lexical problems, ongoing practice, permanent learning, collaboration, eagerness, self-belief, motivation to improve their vocabulary and writing, "fun", and "increased intimacy". The teacher also referred to increased awareness of dictionary skills and "word choice" as indicated by their use of "some extraordinary words at their level such as *'schedule'*, *'to tackle the issues'*, etc." The teacher's reflection on positive attitudes of the students to what had been done was found in various cases. For instance, in her second journal on classroom practice she mentioned how she reacted to favorable remarks from students in another class:

By the way, my other class that I am mainly teaching listening and speaking besides a few main course hours criticized me in a manner that made me so happy. They said that they had heard about the collocation dictionary study in my writing class, and they had felt a bit disappointed with my disregard. They wanted to learn how to use it too.

The students' positive attitudes were observed when they commented positively, found what had been done good, useful, enjoyable, "interesting", "easy", or important, "wrote quite creatively", productively, or carefully, seemed glad, "enthusiastic", "relaxed", "satisfied", attentive, interested, or cooperative, or did some further work related to classroom practice. Süheyla's positive evaluation of classroom practice based on her own reaction was signaled when she stated she "liked the lesson" or felt "surprised" or "happy".

3.2.3.3. A Personal Opinion

8.9% of Süheyla's critical reflection was expression of a personal opinion in journals on classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews. The teacher presented her views on the resources, the effectiveness of her practice, whether she thought an activity would work, the importance of such issues as self-editing, and motivation, students' gains, the value of students' production, the differences in students' involvement, students' mistakes, and how students felt.

In addition to these, Süheyla reflected on this research, too. In the last interview, she maintained her views on the difference between this study and seminars:

> You know that in seminars mostly you are not active, you are the receiver, somebody is there telling you or suggesting you doing something or just conveying a piece of information, maybe an application, okay, but you are not involved if it is not a workshop. Still in the workshops you know you may just work in groups, but still some group members are active, but you are not an active one, so you have things to say, things to do, but you are a bit, I mean you are not involved much, so there might be such things. But here in this practice, it is only me and my application and my ideas and my imagination and me myself as a teacher, so it is the real professional development because I did it myself. So I mean I realize that I'm still a learner and I can learn, I can imagine, I can create, and I can apply, so this is the development I think.

3.2.3.4. Alternative Ways of Presenting Lesson

Süheyla mentioned alternative ways of presenting lesson in 8.5% of her critical reflection in journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. The alternatives included introducing an online collocation dictionary, improving time management, increasing the number of examples, and organizing them. For instance, in the third journal on lexical problems, she stated:

So, this gave me the idea that it might be a useful way to write the problem sentence on the board and ask them to find and correct the mistake in it.

3.2.3.5. Teacher's Problems

Found in journals on classroom practice and mostly in interviews, Süheyla's reflection on teacher's problems comprised 8.2% of her critical reflection. Her statements about these problems involved both "I" and "we". The teacher referred to such problems as "lack of time", "time management", keeping up with the "pacing" required by school management, "the need of preparation", lack of experience in specific areas, being unable to guide students well, "the students' attitude", the teacher's mood, lack of autonomy, and being unable to realize some students' problems. The teacher also mentioned the problems she had during this study. For example, she found the schedule intense and had difficulty writing the journals. In the last interview she added:

I would like to comment more clearly on my journals and I would like to just do some more extra applications in terms of vocabulary in my classes but ….we have lots of things to do. Maybe I can say that I could not apply all the things that came to my mind.

3.2.3.6. Learners' Background Information

Reference to learners' background information comprised 8.2% of Süheyla's critical reflection, and it could be observed in journals on classroom practice and lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. The teacher presented background information about her students in two ways. The first type of information she provided was related to her students' academic background, which mostly involved what they knew, how they had been learning, and what they could do. For instance, in the third interview the teacher explained "They can deal with the sentences, they can deal with the word, I mean let's say word formation, it's *'organize'* but it should be *'organization'*, they can find it easily." Other examples included Süheyla's reference to the students' level of awareness and the content of the writing task. The second one involved the students' mood. Such reflection was generally based on her observations at the beginning of classroom practice. In various cases the teacher found them "active", "energetic", "excited", and "eager".

3.2.3.7. Deciding on a Plan of Action

Deciding on a plan of action comprised 6.6% of Süheyla's critical reflection, and it could be observed in journals on classroom practice and lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. Her plans included introducing collocation dictionary and assigning the students to use it, encouraging peer-editing and self-editing, involving smart boards during classroom practice, creating some situations for the students to practice vocabulary, creating a blog, using activities effective in one class in others as well, increasing the amount of "corrective feedback", focusing on some grammar points, conferencing with "weak students", being "more careful", giving "more clear instructions", giving feedback to "praise some good vocabulary use", or providing "correcting mistake exercises". Nevertheless, the teacher sometimes needed to change her plans as she stated in the third journal on lexical problems "I have changed the idea of creating a class blog to share students' texts since one of the other teachers of this class had already informed them about a blog and asked them to write for this blog."

3.2.3.8. Recognition of Personal Growth

Recognition of personal growth was observed in 5.4 % of Süheyla's critical reflection. It appeared in a peer discussion and several interviews. When the teacher was asked about the whole process, she often found it beneficial because with a greater "awareness" she "had an aim" which was always in her mind, tried "to create or find out a teaching method related to the context, related to the needs" exchanging "some ideas with the friends", could "learn", "imagine", "create", and "apply", and could "go deep into" herself as a teacher. In the third interview, she said:

> I became aware of the things while I'm writing the journal, so it helped me a lot, and this interview in fact just arises the feeling that there is something valuable in your class, in your teaching, or you as a teacher, so I'm just thinking about my teaching.

As a result, she became "more tolerant", "happier", "more interested", and "proud" of herself.

3.2.3.9. A Justification

Justifications comprised 1.9 % of Süheyla's critical reflection. She expressed a justification in her journals on classroom practice and interviews. The teacher usually referred to her "aim" in what she had done. For instance, in the fourth interview she said, "They helped each other, and it activates their relationship, it warms their relationship, so I always prefer things like that."

3.2.3.10. The Teacher's Knowledge and Experience

Süheyla's reference to her knowledge and experience in some interviews comprised 1.3 % of her critical reflection. The teacher generally shared details of activities she tried for the first time. Also, in the last interview she reached a conclusion based on her overall experience in teaching vocabulary saying, "Throughout the years that I have been teaching I have learned that reducing the students' vocabulary mistakes is not an easy task for the students to maintain."

3.2.3.11. Pedagogical Knowledge

In 0.9 % of her critical reflection Süheyla addressed her pedagogical knowledge, and this was observed in some interviews. During her reflection, the teacher not only explained what she knew about teaching vocabulary, but also revealed what she did not

know. In the second interview she said, "It (how to teach vocabulary in context) is a big question Huriye, I can't answer it".

3.2.3.12. The Relation between Teaching and the School Context

In some interviews Süheyla mentioned the relation between teaching and the school context both positively and negatively, and this comprised 0.9 % of her critical reflection. The positive effect of the school context was "facilities in terms of technology" that allowed the teacher to use the internet during classroom practice and thus introduce online collocation dictionary. However, in the fourth interview she referred to some restrictions "We don't have any other chance to check the vocabulary we taught again in the following lessons because maybe you don't teach that class again during that week and the next week is far away" and added:

> The main problem is our not being on our own, let me say we don't have any enough right and chance to just possess our own class because you know we have the book, we have the workbook, and we have extra materials to be done, and we have pacing, we have other partners, so this is the main constraint I think for the teachers.

3.2.3.13. Her Teaching Style

Süheyla reflected about her teaching style in 0.9 % of her critical reflection. In the first interview she mentioned the importance of feeling "free" for both the teacher and the students, and added:

> I like doing things which might be useful for my students and might be something new or maybe something that I forgot to do for years, and so remembering something that I abandon (?) I mean it makes me happy, I mean OK the monotonous way of teaching always bores me.

3.2.3.14. Contradictions between Theory and Practice

Contradictions between theory and practice were mentioned in 0.6 % of Süheyla's critical reflection. In the second interview she expressed her disapproval of referring to students' inappropriate use of language as "mistakes". Later, she touched on the role of autonomy in learning vocabulary and giving "a chance for the students to choose their own word" but then stated that it would be "very utopic" in her context.

3.2.3.15. Classroom Interaction

Classroom interaction was another infrequent topic in Süheyla's critical reflection. It was found in 0.6 % of the data and only in the second interview. The teacher explained how she interacted with the students to "create the correct version of the phrase on the board" but later questioned "the involvement of every student in the same way".

3.2.3.16. Setting Personal Goals

Setting personal goals appeared in 0.6 % of Süheyla's critical reflection. The goals she mentioned in two interviews were becoming "more tolerant" towards students' mistakes and focusing on vocabulary.

3.2.3.17. Negative Evaluations of Lessons

Süheyla evaluated her classroom practice negatively only once in the second interview. She said it was not her "ideal performance" because it was her "first attempt" and she could not "predict some of the outcomes".

3.2.3.18. Asking for Reasons

Asking for reasons appeared only once in Süheyla's critical reflection. In the first peer discussion she asked her friends "Can we say that this (thinking firstly in Turkish and then trying to write in English) is the reason of their common mistakes in inappropriate words?"

3.2.4. Development in Süheyla's Sense of Critical Reflectivity

Table 3.8 contrasts the percentages of traits of development in Süheyla's critical reflection in the first and fifth procedures. An increase is observed in discussing theories of expert and own, variety of traits of critical reflection, being able to evaluate both positively and negatively, being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, and being able to reflect through teaching experience. Nonetheless, there is a decrease in being a problem solver and asking questions.

Table 3.8: Development in Süheyla's Sense of Critical Reflectivity

Traits of Development in Critical Reflection	1st procedure (%)	5th procedure (%)	Difference (%)
Discussing theories of expert and own	8.5	19.3	+ 10.8
Variety of traits of critical reflection	55	60	+ 5
Being able to evaluate both positively and negatively	12.8	15.8	+ 3
Being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context	0	1.8	+ 1.8
Being able to reflect through teaching experience	4.3	5.3	+ 1
Being a problem solver	17.1	8.8	- 8.3
Asking questions	2.1	0	- 2.1

3.2.4.1. Discussing Theories of Expert and Own

Discussion of theories of expert and own involved expressing a justification, a personal opinion, and contradictions between theory and practice. Analysis of the first and fifth procedures indicated that Süheyla only stated a personal opinion in both procedures but with a much higher frequency in the fifth. In the first procedure she generally expressed her opinions about classroom activities. For instance, in the first interview she said, "It's a good idea I think because first when you write the Turkish sentence on the board you create the need for the students so they realize that they need that word." On the other hand, in the fifth procedure she focused more on overall evaluation of the whole study. For example, in the fifth interview the teacher said, "I am also happy with this study in both ways in terms of the students' gains and in terms of my gains."

3.2.4.2. Variety of Traits of Critical Reflection

Variety of traits of critical reflection was calculated based on the proportion of number of types of critical topics used by the participant to total number of critical topics. Comparison of the first and last procedure revealed that Süheyla used a little wider variety of critical topics in the last one. The topics that the teacher used at first but later did not touch on were asking for reasons and her teaching style. On the other hand, the ones she did not use at the beginning but mentioned later were pedagogical knowledge, the relation between teaching and the school context, and setting personal goals.

3.2.4.3. Being Able to Evaluate Both Positively and Negatively

This trait was analyzed based on the teacher's positive and negative evaluations of lessons. The evaluations Süheyla made in the first and last procedure were all positive; however, there was a small increase in frequency in the fifth. The teacher's positive evaluations in the first procedure involved the students – their reactions, awareness, and improvement. For instance, in the first journal on classroom practice she wrote, "Almost all of the students are eager to use it (online collocation dictionary)". On the other hand, the positive evaluations in the fifth procedure included not only the students' side but also the teacher's side and "the end result". For example, in the fifth journal on lexical problems Süheyla wrote, "My main aim for the feedback sessions is awareness raising of their mistakes in their production, and I think that I have managed it a bit."

3.2.4.4. Being Able to Go Beyond the Classroom to Greater Context

Being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context was evaluated according to the teacher's reference to the relation between teaching and the school context. Süheyla never made such reference in the first procedure, but in the fifth interview she mentioned the contribution of the school context to her practice, which indicated a small increase. The teacher said:

> Because of the effect of opportunities in terms of technology now in this school we have some more facilities in terms of technology, and it helped me to apply some more things related to internet or mobiles or I mean laptops or just online things, so online collocation dictionary was one of them, and it helped a lot.

3.2.4.5. Being Able to Reflect through Teaching Experience

Analysis of being able to reflect through teaching experience was based on reference to pedagogical knowledge and expression of knowledge and experience. The analysis revealed a small increase in this trait. In the first procedure Süheyla only reflected about her pedagogical knowledge, specifically "the first time" she did an activity. Nonetheless, in the last procedure she expressed her knowledge and experience in vocabulary teaching besides pedagogical knowledge. For instance, in the last interview the teacher said, "I knew that collocation dictionary was so important for the students to use, as a person I use it quite often".

3.2.4.6. Being a Problem Solver

Whether Süheyla was a problem solver was analyzed in terms of her reflection on alternative ways of presenting lesson and deciding on a plan of action. Comparison of the first and last procedures revealed that there was a decrease in her reference to these topics. In the first procedure the teacher mainly reflected on her classroom ahead. For instance, in the first journal on classroom practice she wrote, "I'm planning to use it (online collocation dictionary) during my course in the class and outside the class in the following weeks". However, in the fifth procedure her reflections were mostly directed towards her future teaching. For example, in the fifth peer discussion she said:

> And one of the implications for the future from my opinion I think I don't know if it is correct or not, how it can be done, but maybe we can ask the students at the practice stage to give them a sentence and find the mistake in it and correct it.

3.2.4.7. Asking Questions

Development of this trait was analyzed based on asking for reasons. In the first procedure Süheyla only asked, "Can we say that this (thinking firstly in Turkish and then they try to write in English) is the reason of their common mistakes in wrong in inappropriate words?" However, in the fifth procedure there were no such questions.

3.3. The Case of Ayhan

3.3.1. Introducing Ayhan

Ayhan is a teacher born in 1966. He is a native speaker of Turkish and has never been abroad. He graduated from a reputable university in the capital city in 1990 with a degree in ELT. He worked in a state school before he started teaching at School of Foreign Languages in a state university in Central Anatolia in 1997. He has also worked as a member of testing office and reading, coursebook, and outside reading commissions in the institution. He also has wide experience in private courses. At the time, he was teaching A-level (with reference to CEFR) students reading, listening, writing, and coursebook for 28 hours a week.

A global look at Ayhan's reflection shows that he referred to 76% of the topics in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999). The distribution of these topics is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 641.945, df=

21, p=.000). According to chi-square results, nine topics were mentioned more frequently than the statistically expected level. The common topics, ranked in order of frequency, are listed in Table 3.9:

Table 3.9: Common Topics in Ayhan's Reflection

Type of reflection	Category	Topic	Frequency (N)
Descriptive	Approaches and methods	An approach or procedure	118
Descriptive	Theories of teaching	A belief/conviction	75
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Positive evaluations of lessons	51
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Students' problems	46
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Teacher's problems	42
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Alternative ways of presenting lesson	41
Descriptive	Approaches and methods	The content of the lesson	41
Critical	Theories of teaching	A personal opinion	40
Critical	Approaches and methods	The learners' background information	37

There are only three descriptive topics in this list – an approach/procedure, a belief / conviction, and the content of the lesson. Nevertheless, the first two are more frequent than all the other topics although the content of the lesson is not so prevalent. Most of the critical topics, namely positive evaluations of lessons, students' problems, teacher's problems, and alternative ways of presenting lesson, are related to evaluating teaching.

Overall analysis of Ayhan's reflection in Table 3.10 shows quite a high variety of topics in both his critical reflection (75%) and descriptive reflection (78%). Although critical reflection (56 %) outnumbered descriptive reflection (44%), their frequencies were very close.

Table 3.10: Overall Analysis of Ayhan's Reflection

Type of reflection	Frequency (%)	Variety (%)
Critical	56	75
Descriptive	44	78

3.3.2. Ayhan's Descriptive Reflection

Overall, Ayhan's engagement in descriptive reflection is quite frequent (44%), and he used it mostly in interviews and peer discussions with a great variety (78%). The

results reveal that he mentioned three descriptive topics more frequently than statistically expected. These topics are listed in descending order in Table 3.11, which reveals that most of his descriptive reflection (60.6%) involved approaches and methods. However, the teacher never mentioned an expert's view or solutions to problems by seeking solutions from experts.

Table 3.11: Descriptive Topics Ayhan Mentioned Frequently

Category	Topic	Frequency (%)
Approaches and methods	An approach/procedure	45
Theories of teaching	A belief/conviction	28.6
Approaches and methods	The content of the lesson	15.6

The distribution of his descriptive reflection among the four types of instruments is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 199.649, df= 3, p=.000). Besides, the distribution of his descriptive reflection among the topics that he mentioned is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 311.786, df= 6, p=.000). The frequency and percentage of the topics mentioned in each instrument are listed in Table 3.12:

Table 3.12: Descriptive Topics Ayhan Mentioned in Each Instrument

Topic	Journal on lexical problems	Journal on classroom practice	Peer discussion	Interview	Total (N)	Total (%)
An approach/procedure	6	15	18	79	118	45
A belief/conviction	7	0	13	55	75	28.6
The content of the lesson	6	7	7	21	41	15.6
Asking how to do things	1	0	8	1	10	3.8
Asking for information	3	0	0	6	9	3.4
Questions about what should be done	5	0	2	1	8	3.1
How a theory was applied	0	0	1	0	1	0.4

3.3.2.1. An Approach/Procedure

An approach/procedure was the most common type of descriptive topic in Ayhan's reflection. It comprised 45% of his descriptive reflection. Ayhan described an

approach/procedure in his journals on lexical problems and classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews.

Ayhan used it to refer to the procedures in different phases of the class. For instance, in his second journal on lexical problems he wrote how he preferred to start a class "I sometimes use this (asking students some interesting questions) as a way of teaching vocabulary, grammar and speaking, and before I start a class, I always encourage my students to talk about something which is not directly related to the lesson." As for the input phase, in the second interview the teacher indicated "I usually give the meanings, maybe sometimes ask the students to make sentences". When Ayhan focused on the practice phase, he referred to various activities such as writing a paragraph like the one in the book, leaving "some parts uncompleted", and asking the students "to complete them with the correct word forms", having the students "write a paragraph", having the students "talk among themselves about what they read", asking the students "to make up some situations" where the target vocabulary can be used and "let their partners guess", or asking the students "to make sentences or to define or redefine a word which they have seen in the book". An example that explains how he ended a class can be found in his second journal on classroom practice. He wrote, "We studied this passage on Tuesday (11 April), and after highlighting some words in this passage I asked my students to write a similar paragraph as homework."

The teacher also explained how he guided his students about learning grammar or vocabulary. For instance, in the second interview he mentioned his advice about how learning one rule can help in many ways saying "You can kill not two birds but many birds with one stone if you know how to add –ing to a verb you can use it in many places". Ayhan also indicated that he tried to raise the students' awareness towards "different techniques" of learning vocabulary. In the first interview he said:

> So sometimes I hear "This teacher said this" or they say that "This teacher said you can learn in this way or that's the best way for you." I tell them that there is no best way for everybody. Yani each person, yani one technique or one way or my way might not be the best way for you yani my technique or my technique when learning words might not be the best one for you. So in time I am saying I tell them that there are some ways, my technique is this, I'm saying this is my technique but you can use your own technique. I'm sure that you will find your own technique in time.

3.3.2.2. A Belief/Conviction

Another recurrent topic in Ayhan's descriptive reflection was a belief/conviction comprising 28.6% of the total. He expressed a belief/conviction in his journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. The participant stated his beliefs about teaching and learning.

An example of his beliefs about teaching vocabulary can be found in the second interview, in which he declared "To an extent every study, everything that you do, every strategy, every technique can solve a problem, to an extent yani I believe that all of them can have a part in solving the problem." Then he added:

I believe that always there is a better way of teaching something … if they want to learn, if we want to teach something we can find a way to teach it … but within the techniques that we are used to doing or within our knowledge we are trying to do our best.

When the teacher talked about learning in the third interview, he emphasized the importance of motivation saying:

If they don't want to learn, if they don't want to memorize something, you know there is a proverb, I don't remember it word by word – you can take a horse to water but you can't make it drink. So you can show them lots of words, you can expose them with many words, but if they don't want to learn it, you can't teach them.

As for his beliefs related to learning vocabulary, Ayhan usually addressed the issue of responsibility. In the third peer discussion he said:

Vocabulary is something that students should learn, it is not something teachers should teach, that's what I always think about it … Maybe there are some things or there are some parts in which teachers can help their students learn something, but basically it is a burden that students should carry, it's not a burden I think the teachers should carry, it is something that students should do, that's what I think.

The teacher also added his own example:

That's what we do in our profession or during our university education we always did this, teachers didn't teach us vocabulary, we learn vocabulary… Most of us after we graduated from university, we also learn words, we are still learning words, and nobody is teaching us these words, we are learning them ourselves.

In the second interview he compared "*learning* vocabulary" to "*teaching* grammar" stating "When you teach grammar maybe your burden is more, yani you have you need to share a bigger part of the burden, but in learning vocabulary most of the burden is on their (students') shoulders." The role of practice is another issue that the teacher considered. For instance, in the fourth journal on lexical problems he wrote:

> Learning vocabulary, or rather memorizing a word is one thing, using it correctly and properly in context is another thing… Not having a good grammar hampers reading and speaking or using language, so not using a language is another reason of not learning/teaching vocabulary, which I think has a domino effect.

3.3.2.3. The Content of the Lesson

Ayhan's descriptive reflection on the content of the lesson was found in 15.6% of the data. He mentioned the content in his journals on lexical problems and classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews. The teacher referred to covering such points as reading comprehension, speaking practice, listening practice, vocabulary presentation and practice, and grammar revision. For instance, in the first journal on classroom practice, he wrote about the content of vocabulary presentation stating "… and we also talked about word forms and the ways we can see whether a word is a verb, a noun, an adjective etc." In addition, Ayhan mentioned such themes as money, love and relationships, food and cooking, speaking habits, and child minding.

3.3.2.4. Asking How to Do Things

Ayhan asked how to do things in 3.8% of his descriptive reflection. He asked these questions in the journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. The questions were mostly related to teaching vocabulary. For example, in the first peer discussion he asked, "Should we have them make sentences to increase vocabulary practice and production?"

3.3.2.5. Asking for Information

Asking for information appeared in 3.4% of Ayhan's descriptive reflection in his journals on lexical problems and interviews. The questions were mostly related to teaching vocabulary. For example, in his first journal on lexical problems, he wrote, "Sometimes their Turkish meanings are given without much ado, or some teachers choose the more difficult maybe the easier way of trying to explain them in the target language,

but whatever technique we use does it make much difference in terms of putting the words into their heads?"

3.3.2.6. Questions about What Should Be Done

Although he did not use them very frequently (3.1%), Ayhan asked some questions about what should be done during his descriptive reflection in the journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and in an interview. Most of his questions were related to identifying his focus as in the one in his first journal on lexical problems, "Should I teach or should they learn?"

3.3.2.7. How a Theory was Applied

The least frequent descriptive topic in Ayhan's reflection was how a theory was applied (0.4%). In the first peer discussion the teacher said:

I read that they need to be exposed to the word that they learnt today, one day later, three days later, one week later, one month later … There are some questions I regularly ask in warm up … or there are some questions I frequently use to practice previously covered grammar points.

3.3.3. Ayhan's Critical Reflection

Ayhan's critical reflection constituted 56% of the whole with a great variety (75%), and it could be observed in all types of instruments but mostly in interviews and peer discussions. Statistically, Ayhan used seven critical topics more frequently than expected. These are given in descending order in Table 3.13, which reveals that most of his critical reflection (60.2%) is related to evaluating teaching. However, the teacher never mentioned a justification, contradictions between theory and practice, how theories changed, pedagogical knowledge, or classroom interaction.

Table 3.13: Critical Topics Ayhan Mentioned Frequently

Category	Topic	Frequency (%)
Evaluating teaching	Positive evaluations of lessons	15
Evaluating teaching	Students' problems	13.6
Evaluating teaching	Teacher's problems	12.4
Evaluating teaching	Alternative ways of presenting lesson	12.1
Theories of teaching	A personal opinion	11.8
Approaches and methods	The learners' background information	10.9
Evaluating teaching	Deciding on a plan of action	7.1

The distribution of his critical reflection among the four types of instruments is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 474.416, df= 3, p=.000). Besides, the distribution of his critical reflection among the topics that he mentioned is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 213.168, df= 14, p=.000). Table 3.14 presents the frequency and percentage of the topics mentioned in each instrument:

Table 3.14: Critical Topics Ayhan Mentioned in Each Instrument

Topic	Journal on lexical problems	Journal on classroom practice	Peer discussion	Interview	Total (N)	Total (%)
Positive evaluations of lessons	0	2	6	43	51	15
Student's problems	10	0	8	28	46	13.6
Teacher's problems	1	0	8	33	42	12.4
Alternative ways of presenting lesson	3	0	8	30	41	12.1
A personal opinion	8	0	9	23	40	11.8
The learners' background information	3	2	9	23	37	10.9
Deciding on a plan of action	2	0	2	20	24	7.1
Recognition of personal growth	0	0	0	22	22	6.5
Negative evaluations of lessons	0	0	0	11	11	3.2
His teaching style	0	0	0	10	10	2.9
Setting personal goals	0	0	0	6	6	1.8
Comments on his language proficiency	0	0	1	4	5	1.5
The relation between teaching and the school context	0	0	0	2	2	0.6
Knowledge and experience	0	0	0	1	1	0.3
Asking for reasons	1	0	0	0	1	0.3

3.3.3.1. Positive Evaluations of Lessons

The most recurrent critical topic found in Ayhan's reflection was positive evaluations of lessons, which comprised 15% of the total and appeared in journals on classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews. For instance, in the second interview he said "Yani I think strong points outweigh the weak points …. Actually, the things that we got or the outcomes we got were the things we expected". The positive phrases he

used to evaluate his practice were "totally positive", "useful", "not bad", "clear and 100 % related", "good", and "not remote from my ideal performance".

The teacher evaluated his practice positively based on three criteria. To start with, Ayhan observed satisfactory outcomes in his students' performance. For instance, in the third interview he uttered, "My goal, my intention was there to make them learn the words, and they learn the words, so I reached my goal". The teacher also noticed that the students "still remember", "will never forget the words", "work harder", "had no difficulty answering most of them (the questions) correctly", and "made some progress". Another criterion for Ayhan's positive evaluations was the students' attitudes, which was indicated when they found the practice "useful" or "a good way of learning vocabulary" or "gave positive feedbacks". Finally, the teacher's positive evaluations included his own reactions as well. For instance, in the second interview Ayhan said "within my knowledge or within the strategy I use I like my performance I can say".

3.3.3.2. Student's Problems

Another recurrent critical topic was students' problems, which comprised 13.6% of the total and appeared in journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. Some of Ayhan's reflection on his students' problems involved a general description of the problems with reference to their frequency or similarity to the ones in previous tasks. For instance, in the fourth journal on lexical problems, the teacher wrote "It seems that our students have recurrent and repetitive problems about vocabulary …. Mostly vocabulary mistakes and grammar mistakes are intertwined."

However, other problems addressed were related to more specific issues. One type of specific problems the teacher noticed is a lack of motivation for improvement. For instance, in the first interview Ayhan said:

> The problem starts with the bell, when the bell rings or when they go out, the problem starts because after class they, as I said, they grudge allocating some time with learning or to learning English, so the problem starts after class.

He also referred to this problem in the fourth interview when he said:

> Maybe they don't make enough practice. They write only when they are asked to write something, they read only when they are asked to read something, they don't

write, or they don't read anything at their pleasure or willingly. They just do it as homework or as classwork, so they don't make enough practice.

Besides the three types of lexical problems – meaning, collocation, and word form – he analyzed, Ayhan mentioned some other points related to language use such as problems with "prepositions", "phrasal verbs", "conjunctions and connectors". He also noticed that "they usually avoid using new words". The teacher reflected on the root of students' lexical problems, too. He thought they might be related to storing the words in their "short term memories".

3.3.3.3. Teacher's Problems

The teacher's / teachers' problems were revealed in statements with the pronouns "I" or "we" in 12.4% of Ayhan's critical reflection. He referred to such problems in journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews focusing mainly on those faced while teaching vocabulary.

To start with, Ayhan acknowledged the importance of teaching vocabulary in the first interview when he said "I am giving some YDS courses, in these courses yani we teach grammar, we try to teach reading, but I always thought there was something missing, it was vocabulary" In the first peer discussion, he also indicated "We don't really do vocabulary teaching, we present the vocabulary…We don't test vocabulary, we only do that in quizzes…We don't focus on vocabulary."

Although such limits as "time" and personal "weak points" were accepted, most of the problems mentioned were related to what the teacher/s do not do. Lack of preparation and lack of enthusiasm to "improve" professionally and to shoulder an "extra burden" were among them. In the fourth interview Ayhan provided some details:

Generally, we think what I do in class is enough…I get some salary from this job and my activities or the things that I do in my class is enough for me to deserve my salary, so we usually don't bother to do some other extra activities.

Ayhan also criticized teachers for "act(ing) like a dictionary", not "check(ing) whether they have learnt", and not "do(ing) more research". The teacher referred to lack of effort to "mak(e) students learn these words permanently or plac(e) these words into their long term memory" as well and summarized it in the second peer discussion saying "Yani the

problem is not what we do in class, but what we can do after class or in the following classes".

In addition, Ayhan touched on problems in teacher - student relationship while teaching vocabulary. For instance, in the first interview he stated, "I always expect them to learn, that's something which prevents our success". Similarly, in the second interview the teacher indicated "We say that's enough, if they want to learn they should study more." Also, in the third interview he said, "Sometimes we spoon-feed them, especially maybe in class we do this, we give the meanings in Turkish. It is the easiest way, we don't want to tire them or we don't want to tire ourselves."

3.3.3.4. Alternative Ways of Presenting Lesson

Ayhan reflected about alternative ways of presenting lesson in 12.1% of his critical reflection. This was observed in journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. The alternatives were generally related to enhancement of vocabulary. For example, in the first interview the teacher said, "Maybe I could have written something longer, maybe I should have copied it somewhere and maybe I could have given them to students in papers prepared before" and later added, "Maybe we can also ask them to write a short story themselves." The teacher talked about what could be done, too. For instance, in the second interview he stated "Maybe we should see the other techniques, we should be inquisitive, we should try to see what other people are doing, or maybe on the internet we can search for other people's techniques. That is something we never do." and then added, "Maybe all the teachers taking part in the study should come together. And maybe we should discuss some things together, not just with my partner, maybe we can have a group work. It can help us."

3.3.3.5. A Personal Opinion

11.8% of Ayhan's critical reflection involved a personal opinion, which was observed in journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. He expressed his views on students' mistakes and strengths, classroom activities, importance of regular practice, teaching vocabulary, the role of productive skills while teaching vocabulary, and importance of some grammar topics. For example, in the second interview he stated, "When they write, they can change, or they can change the sentences, or they can see

their mistakes, and they can fix their mistakes, so when they write, maybe they are more courageous."

3.3.3.6. The Learners' Background Information

Reference to learners' background information comprised 10.9% of Ayhan's critical reflection, and it could be observed in journals on classroom practice and lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. The teacher presented background information about how his students learnt, what they could do, their mood, and their attitudes. For instance, in the third interview he said "When you write something about grammar, no excuse, all excuses are solved. They take notes, they can find a pencil, or they can see the board."

3.3.3.7. Deciding on a Plan of Action

Deciding on a plan of action comprised 7.1% of Ayhan's critical reflection, and it could be observed in journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. His plans included improving vocabulary practice through written production, finding a way of teaching vocabulary in private courses, "doing something different" or "authentic" and "looking for some new ways", and searching the internet to improve his vocabulary teaching.

3.3.3.8. Recognition of Personal Growth

Recognition of personal growth was found in 6.5% of Ayhan's critical reflection and observed only in interviews. He mentioned trying an activity for the first time and wishing to continue doing it, accepting both weaknesses and strengths and seeking improvement, learning from his peer, and his gains. For instance, in the third interview he stated,

> For example, when we always walk, but if you ask me to run 100 meters and in the shortest time, so I can see my limits, in how many seconds can I run 100 meters. These kinds of studies sometimes force you to find your limits or to think about what you can do, what strategies I can develop.

and in the fourth interview added,

> When you focus on teaching vocabulary as a part of study, yes sometimes you see some points that you have overlooked or ignored before. There are things that you

do in your class as a part of the routine, but when you take part in a study, sometimes you are more aware of something.

3.3.3.9. Negative Evaluations of Lessons

Ayhan's negative evaluations of lessons were found in 3.2 % of his critical reflection in interviews. Most of these evaluations were based on the students' performance or reactions. For instance, in the second interview he stated

There were some students who said this kind of study was useless. There were a few students saying that, and their sentences were short, just one sentence saying "I didn't find it useful", and maybe I don't think that the student was very serious because writing just one sentence and expressing your remark or idea in one sentence shows how serious this student is.

Besides, Ayhan was able to see the negative side of an issue that could be evaluated positively. In the second interview he maintained

It was a strong point but maybe it was also the weak point, I mean giving the words, asking them to memorize only these words. Maybe when they wrote the composition, maybe they used the words without memorizing them, maybe they just looked at their meanings. The strong point maybe was also the weak point.

3.3.3.10. His Teaching Style

Reference to his teaching style was found in 2.9% of Ayhan's critical reflection in interviews. When Ayhan reflected on his teaching style, he referred to his personal qualities. In the first interview, for instance, he indicated "I think I'm a good observer", and in the fourth interview he said "I usually like using my time for myself. For example, when I have some free time, I want to read something, I want to study vocabulary."

3.3.3.11. Setting Personal Goals

Ayhan set personal goals 1.8 % of his critical reflection in interviews. They included both short-term goals as the one in the third interview, "I'm thinking of trying to find something different for our last study I want find something different maybe something more effective I hope I will," and long-term goals as the one in the first interview, "I would like to be a better teacher".

3.3.3.12. Comments on His Language Proficiency

Ayhan's comments on his language proficiency were found in 1.5 % of his critical reflection in a peer discussion and an interview. These comments revealed his desire "to be more fluent", "to have a better pronunciation", and "to have better skills". In the third peer discussion he also mentioned his ongoing learning saying, "We also learn words, we are still learning words, and nobody is teaching us these words, we are learning them ourselves".

3.3.3.13. The Relation between Teaching and the School Context

Ayhan referred to the relation between teaching and the school context in 0.6 % of his critical reflection in interviews. His focus in these instances were primarily on pacing. In the first interview, for instance, he stated, "We usually don't do extra studies in class, we usually try to follow the pacing."

3.3.3.14. The teacher's Knowledge and Experience

The only reference to his own knowledge and experience, which comprised 0.3 % of Ayhan's critical reflection, was found in the last interview. He said, "Actually, maybe it (vocabulary practice) helped me look for some ways of looking for or finding some ways of teaching vocabulary."

3.3.3.15. Asking for Reasons

The only question Ayhan directed to ask for a reason, which comprised 0.3 % of his critical reflection, was found in the first journal on lexical problems. He said, "Why bother to do activities to have them memorizing words when it is something they can do with so many materials at hand?"

3.3.4. Development in Ayhan's Sense of Critical Reflectivity

Table 4.15 presents the percentages of traits of development in Ayhan's critical reflection in the first and fourth procedures. An increase is observed in discussing theories of expert and own and being able to reflect through teaching experience. However, there is a decrease in variety of traits of critical reflection, being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, being able to evaluate both positively and negatively, being a problem solver, and asking questions.

Table 3.15: Development in Ayhan's Sense of Critical Reflectivity

Traits of Development in Critical Reflection	1st procedure (%)	4th procedure (%)	Difference (%)
Discussing theories of expert and own	7	10	+3
Being able to reflect through teaching experience	0	1	+1
Variety of traits of critical reflection	70	55	-15
Being able to evaluate both positively and negatively	24	13	-11
Being a problem solver	21	14	-7
Asking questions	1	0	-1
Being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context	1	0	-1

3.3.4.1. Discussing Theories of Expert and Own

Discussion of theories of expert and own involved expressing a justification, a personal opinion, and contradictions between theory and practice. During critical reflection, Ayhan never mentioned a justification or contradictions between theory and practice; thus, Ayhan only stated a personal opinion in the first and fourth procedures but with a little higher frequency in the fourth. In the first procedure he generally expressed his opinions about teaching vocabulary. For instance, in the first journal on lexical problems he said, "It is easy for us to give the meanings of the words, it is possible to have a slight/nodding acquaintance with the words but it is difficult or very hard to make them put the words in their long term memories." On the other hand, in the fourth procedure he focused more on his views related to a classroom activity. For example, in the last interview he said,

As they wrote more, they made more mistakes. That's something expected, that was not a surprise, but I can say that what they wrote was not bad actually … The writings were not so bad, the mistakes were the mistakes that we were expecting.

3.3.4.2. Being Able to Reflect through Teaching Experience

Analysis of being able to reflect through teaching experience was based on reference to pedagogical knowledge and expression of knowledge and experience. Ayhan experienced a small increase in this trait as he reflected on none of them in the first procedure and referred to his knowledge and experience only once in the fourth

procedure. For instance, in the fourth interview he said, "Actually, maybe it (vocabulary practice) helped me look for some ways of looking for or finding some ways of teaching vocabulary."

3.3.4.3. Variety of Traits of Critical Reflection

Variety of traits of critical reflection was calculated based on the proportion of number of types of critical topics used by the participant to total number of critical topics. Comparison of the first and last procedure revealed that in the last one Ayhan did not have as much variety as in the first. The topics that the teacher used at first but later did not touch on were the relation between teaching and the school context, asking for reasons, setting personal goals, and comments on his language proficiency.On the other hand, the one he did not use at the beginning but mentioned later was knowledge and experience.

3.3.4.4. Being Able to Evaluate Both Positively and Negatively

This trait was analyzed based on the teacher's positive and negative evaluations of lessons. Ayhan made both positive and negative evaluations in the first and fourth procedures but with lower frequencies in the fourth. The first procedure involved positive evaluations based on satisfactory outcomes in the students' performance, the students' attitudes, and the teacher's own reactions. For instance, in the first interview he said, "I am sure that they will never forget the words I use there." The negative evaluations in the first procedure were mostly based on the students' attitudes. For example, in the first interview he said, "Yani they were surprised because they didn't use to or they were not used to seeing something like that." As for the fourth procedure, both positive and negative evaluations were mostly based on the outcomes in the students' performance. For instance, in the fourth interview he said, "Sometimes they make mistakes like this, but they are learning something …. Sometimes they don't learn."

3.3.4.5. Being a Problem Solver

Whether Ayhan was a problem solver was analyzed in terms of his reflection on alternative ways of presenting lesson and deciding on a plan of action. Comparison of the first and last procedures revealed that there was a decrease in his overall reference to these topics despite the increase in his reference to a plan of action in the fourth procedure. In terms of alternative ways, the teacher's focus was on way of presentation, opportunities

for enhancement, and his new experience in the first procedure but only on his new experience in the last procedure. For instance, in the first interview he said, "The things or the points that I want to change – or not change, but modify let's say – maybe try something longer, to add some extra activities, and to make them join in this activity more effectively." As for deciding on a plan of action, in the first procedure the teacher reflected on what he could do throughout the study, whereas the focus in the last procedure was more on further implications for his future practice. For example, in the fourth interview he said, "Maybe the thing that I do, or I have done in my classes with my students can also be done with my private students too."

3.3.4.6. Asking Questions

Development of this trait was analyzed based on asking for reasons. In the first procedure Ayhan only asked, "Why bother to do activities to have them memorizing words when it is something they can do with so many materials at hand?" However, in the fourth procedure there were no such questions.

3.3.4.7. Being Able to Go Beyond the Classroom to Greater Context

Being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context was evaluated according to the teacher's reference to the relation between teaching and the school context. Ayhan mentioned one of his limitations as a teacher only in the first interview saying, "We usually don't do extra studies in class, we usually try to follow the pacing – you know the pacing schedule." Nonetheless, he never made such reference in the fourth procedure.

3.4. The Case of Star

3.4.1. Introducing Star

Star is a female participant who was born in 1966. She is a native speaker of Turkish and has been to Poland for in-service training on Accelerated Learning and to Italy, Germany, Switzerland, France, Finland, Sweden, Spain, Austria, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Morocco on holiday. She graduated from a reputable university in the capital city with a degree in ELT. Before starting to work in her current institution in 1991, she had taught in a private school for 4 years. She has worked there as the coordinator, a mentor in in-service training commission, and a member of the testing office and various commissions. At the time, she was teaching B-

level (with reference to CEFR) students reading, writing, and coursebook for 20 hours a week.

A global look at Star's reflection reveals that she referred to 72% of the topics in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999). The distribution of these topics is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 463.269, df= 20, p=.000). According to chi-square results, eight topics were mentioned more frequently than the statistically expected level. The common topics, ranked in order of frequency, are listed in Table 3.16:

Table 3.16: Common Topics in Star's Reflection

Type of reflection	Category	Topic	Frequency (N)
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Positive evaluations of lessons	69
Descriptive	Approaches and methods	An approach or procedure	64
Critical	Approaches and methods	The learners' background information	57
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Students' problems	45
Descriptive	Theories of teaching	A belief/conviction	37
Critical	Theories of teaching	A personal opinion	30
Descriptive	Approaches and methods	The content of the lesson	24
Critical	Evaluating teaching	Teacher's problems	23

Most of the topics in this table are critical, and the most frequent one is related to evaluating teaching like two others, one related to theories of teaching, and one related to approaches and methods. There are only three descriptive topics – two about approaches and methods and one about theories of teaching.

Overall analysis of Star's reflection in Table 3.17 shows that with a great variety of topics (80%) her critical reflection (71 %) far outnumbered her descriptive reflection (29 %). Despite this low frequency, the variety of the topics was just over half (56%) in her descriptive reflection.

Table 3.17: Overall Analysis of Star's Reflection

Type of reflection	Frequency (%)	Variety (%)
Critical	71	80
Descriptive	29	56

3.4.2. Star's Descriptive Reflection

In general, Star's descriptive reflection is not very frequent (29 %) but found mostly in interviews and peer discussions with a good variety (56%). Statistically the two topics in Table 3.18 were used more frequently than expected, and half of her descriptive reflection (50.4%) is related to approaches and methods. However, the teacher never mentioned an expert's view, how a theory was applied, solutions to problems by seeking solutions from experts, or questions about what should be done.

Table 3.18: Descriptive Topics Star Mentioned Frequently

Category	Topic	Frequency (%)
Approaches and methods	An approach/procedure	50.4
Theories of teaching	A belief/conviction	29.1

The distribution of her descriptive reflection among the four types of instruments is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 127.394, df= 3, p=.000). Moreover, the distribution of her descriptive reflection among the five topics that she mentioned is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 110.913, df= 4, p=.000). The frequency and percentage of the topics mentioned in each instrument are listed in Table 4.19:

Table 3.19: Descriptive Topics Star Mentioned in Each Instrument

Topic	Journal on lexical problems	Journal on classroom practice	Peer discussion	Interview	Total (N)	Total (%)
An approach/procedure	0	12	9	43	64	50.4
A belief/conviction	5	1	6	25	37	29.1
The content of the lesson	0	3	4	17	24	18.9
Asking for information	0	0	0	1	1	0.8
Asking how to do things	0	0	1	0	1	0.8

3.4.2.1. An Approach/Procedure

An approach/procedure was the most common type of descriptive topic Star's reflection. It comprised 50.4 % of her descriptive reflection. Star described an

approach/procedure in her journals on classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews.

A remarkable example of an approach/procedure in Star's descriptive reflection was found when she referred to the contribution of her peer, Ayhan, in the third peer discussion. She told him, "In our last interview you talked about [the fact that] the matter was not teaching but learning, it was something in my mind, and I tried to use it – the thing I got from you."

The teacher also mentioned an approach/procedure to refer to the procedures in different phases of the class. Star explained how she prepared the content, for instance, in the first interview saying, "I have chosen few words, that is, the common mistake." Analysis of her reference to the input phase reveals the importance she attaches to "context", "exposure," and repetition. For example, in the first peer discussion she said,

I raise an object and ask, 'Who does it belong to', I sometimes write it on the board and ask them to write a sentence with that, I focus on some words so that they learn them better, the following day I start with the same word, I remind that word again after warm-up.

During the practice phase, Star wanted to make sure that the students had "the chance to use it many times in two hours of reading class". The teacher sometimes provided variety with jokes and games as well as asking her students to "close their books to remember the words", spell the target word/phrase, complete some sentences with the correct form of the target word/phrase, "give sample sentences from their daily life, share with class or with their partners," "look up their dictionary," or "discuss." In the third interview, Star shared an example to show how "teachers can make situations they can use the vocabulary [and] make them remember all the time":

Before the reading quiz I told them a word that could be used in the questions before the reading quiz, it was "infer". And one of my students asked me what the word was in the quiz, of course I did not tell him. I [had] taught it many times in the class. He could not remember. It was "infer", the word was "infer", and whenever I got into the class I asked Okan, he was Okan, the same word again and again. Of course, the whole class heard that all the time. "Okan do you remember our word?" Even I

did not tell the word. "Of course, teacher, it was 'infer', I will never forget it". The
class repeated it again.

Besides preparation, input, and practice phases the teacher reflected on how she ended a
class. For instance, in the third interview she stated, "Using the information they got from
the reading and using their own ideas and the ones we shared in the class they tried to
write a paragraph."

3.4.2.2. A Belief/Conviction

Another recurrent descriptive topic found in Star's reflection was a
belief/conviction comprising 29.1 % of the total. She expressed a belief/conviction in her
journals on lexical problems, journals on classroom practice, peer discussions, and
interviews. The participant mostly stated her beliefs about teaching and learning.

Most of the beliefs/convictions Star mentioned related to teaching vocabulary
stressed the importance of providing "context" and using "attractive reading texts,"
"practical questions," "discussions," productive activities, and various "extra materials".
She also highlighted the value of repetition, as she did in the third interview "It goes in
their brain again and again in a joke, in an activity, in a repeat, in a repetition any way."
She maintained the teacher's role when she wrote, "… we should focus on how students
learn!" in the third journal on classroom practice and added, "Maybe we teach, we always
teach, the book teaches, we teach, there are techniques, but following learning is really
very important, [monitoring] if they learn" in the fourth interview. Star provided more
details about this in the third interview saying:

> In general, even in our coursebooks we try to teach, we try to give the things, you
> know we try to feed the students. Yes, we can prepare the food but let them eat
> themselves… We should be ready to help them, but we should teach them how to
> eat.

As she stated in the first peer discussion, Star believed that "learning vocabulary
is students' responsibility." For the teacher "exposure" seemed to be one of the key points
while learning. For instance, in the second interview she noted, "If they watch a movie,
if they read something even a short paragraph, if they use the language on the internet or
somewhere in any way, they will learn it." Another point Star emphasized was "practice".
In the fourth interview, for example, she asserted, "The more they use, the better they use

the vocabulary in their spoken English [and] in written English." The teacher also expressed the need for "a long period of time" in the third interview.

3.4.2.3. The Content of the Lesson

Star's reference to the content of the lesson comprised 18.9 % of her descriptive reflection. She mentioned it in her journals on classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews. The teacher referred to covering themes like "money" and "cellphones". Star usually reflected on her practice during writing and reading classes with a focus on word forms of some specific words such as *relax*, *benefit*, *focus*, and *infer*. In the third interview she explained how she decided what to focus on "I especially choose the words they would use in daily life, they would need later and related with the topic."

3.4.2.4. Asking for Information

Star raised only one question to ask for information, and it formed 0.8 % of her descriptive reflection. After she reflected on the positive sides of her practice in the first interview, she asked herself "Has anything irritated me?" but could not find any instances.

3.4.2.5. Asking How to do Things

During her descriptive reflection, Star asked how to do things only once, which comprised 0.8 % of the whole. In the fourth peer discussion when her peer, Ayhan, told her about the higher number of mistakes in longer texts, Star asked him, "If they don't make mistakes, how can they learn to use it?"

3.4.3. Star's Critical Reflection

Found in 71% of the whole with a great variety (80%), Star's critical reflection could be observed in all types of instruments but mostly in interviews and peer discussions. Statistically, Star mentioned seven of these topics more frequently than expected. These are given in descending order in Table 3.20, which reveals that almost half of her critical reflection (44.5%) is related to evaluating teaching. However, the teacher never mentioned how theories changed, pedagogical knowledge, asking for reasons, or comments on her language proficiency.

Table 3.20: Critical Topics Star Mentioned Frequently

Category	Topic	Frequency (%)
Evaluating teaching	Positive evaluations of lessons	22.4
Approaches and methods	The learners' background information	18.5
Evaluating teaching	Students' problems	14.6
Theories of teaching	A personal opinion	9.7
Evaluating teaching	Teacher's problems	7.5
Self-awareness	Recognition of personal growth	6.5
Self-awareness	Her teaching style	6.5

The distribution of her critical reflection among the four types of instruments is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 402.208, df= 3, p=.000). Besides, the distribution of her critical reflection among the topics that she mentioned is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 344.675, df= 15, p=.000). Table 4.21 presents the frequency and percentage of the topics mentioned in each instrument:

Table 3.21: Critical Topics Star Mentioned in Each Instrument

Topic	Journal on lexical problems	Journal on classroom practice	Peer discussion	Interview	Total (N)	Total (%)
Positive evaluations of lessons	0	2	8	59	69	22.4
The learners' background information	0	9	9	39	57	18.5
Students' problems	13	0	16	16	45	14.6
A personal opinion	1	1	3	25	30	9.7
Teacher's problems	5	1	2	15	23	7.5
Recognition of personal growth	0	0	0	20	20	6.5
Her teaching style	0	2	1	17	20	6.5
Negative evaluations of lessons	0	0	0	11	11	3.6
Alternative ways of presenting lesson	0	0	2	6	8	2.6
The teacher's knowledge and experience	0	0	1	6	7	2.3
Deciding on a plan of action	0	0	1	5	6	1.9

The relation between teaching and the school context	0	0	0	3	3	1.0
Setting personal goals	0	0	0	3	3	1.0
A justification	0	0	1	1	2	0.6
Contradictions between theory and practice	0	0	2	0	2	0.6
Classroom interaction	0	0	0	2	2	0.6

3.4.3.1. Positive Evaluations of Lessons

As the most frequent topic, positive evaluations of lessons comprised 22.4% of Star's critical reflection. They were found in journals on classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews and revealed with such phrases as "it worked a lot / well", "natural", "close to ideal", "useful", "enjoyable", "helpful", "interesting", "not easy" (in a positive sense), and not "unexpected".

The main criterion for Star's positive evaluations seems to be students' reactions, which she could understand from "their faces" and "feedback". For instance, in the first interview she stated, "… students said that it was very effective, and they learnt how to use them." The students generally "liked" and "enjoyed" the classroom practice and were "eager", "happy", "careful", "ready to learn" more, "positive", or "pleased". Another important point Star considered while evaluating her lessons was students' engagement and improvement. For example, in the second interview she said, "Some of them tried to remember the first letter of it, some of them tried to make it resemble to another word. It was the strongest point, so making them think hard." In the last interview she concluded, "They have certainly improved. As I see from the beginning of the second term and end of the second term, their vocabulary and sentences have improved." During her classroom practice, most students "didn't speak any Turkish", became "aware of their lexical problems" and "tried to solve" them, "learnt", "used", and "practiced" the target vocabulary, "tried hard to remember" the target vocabulary, and "realized that they always need to practice". Star's positive evaluations were also based on her own reactions. For instance, in the first interview she said, "It was also beneficial for me. I focused on something and later it was beneficial for both students and for me." Most of the time the teacher "liked" her classroom practice because she felt she had "achieved" and was "pleased" with this.

3.4.3.2. The Learners' Background Information

Observed in 18.5% of Star's critical reflection in journals on classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews, reference to learners' background information was also a recurrent topic. One type of background information the teacher presented about her students is details related to the students' mood. In the second interview Star stated, "This class is really very calm, sometimes too calm. They don't wonder anything, they don't even chat, sometimes too silent, they are not active enough." In the third interview she indicated, "You know there are few students that always reject learning. There are few of them." Nonetheless, in many other cases she noticed positive details saying that the students "had more attention", "felt excited", "care[d] about vocabulary learning", "[took] it (the classroom practice) very seriously", "were ready", "were interested", "were positive", "were happy", "were eager", or "were enthusiastic". Another type of background information is their academic background, which mostly involved what they already knew, how they had been learning, and what they could do. For instance, in the third interview the teacher explained "We have nearly twenty students, they are not all the same. In one class maybe one of them is learning with the communicative way, in the other one if we use a traditional way of teaching for a difference, maybe some students can benefit from it."

3.4.3.3. Students' Problems

Another frequently mentioned critical topic by Star was students' problems, which appeared in 14.6% of her critical reflection in journals on lexical problems, peer discussions, and interviews. Some of the problems she expressed provided a general description with reference to their frequency or similarity to the ones in previous tasks. For instance, in the third journal on lexical problems the teacher wrote, "In this week's work, I have realized that the same students are still doing the same mistakes despite the corrections, revisions and different vocabulary teaching techniques." Star also addressed some specific issues like the three types of lexical problems identified for this research – meaning, collocations, and word formation. In the first interview she identified each type

> The first word was relax. It was the common mistake in most of the papers. I have given the forms of them … They used focus without the preposition or with the

wrong preposition … They don't usually know but they want to use the word (benefit).

Besides these, using "very limited vocabulary to avoid the mistakes" is also regarded as a lexical problem. In the second peer discussion, Star stated, "It doesn't reflect their real usage of the vocabulary." and added, "Not to make mistakes they keep themselves safe, use only the ones they know very well." As she explained in the second interview, this results in "avoid[ing] using the different vocabulary" they have learnt and expressing themselves clearly. Nevertheless, in the fourth interview the teacher observed when the students "tried to give their opinion in longer sentences, in most ideal sentences …. they still do not know how to use a word in different forms in the nouns, adjectives or the others, but they try to use new words, or they use richer vocabulary in opinion essay."

Star reflected on not only lexical problems themselves but also the roots of these problems. In the third journal on lexical problems, she listed three of them as "1. lack of practice and revision, 2. lack of exposure, 3. lack of need of language use." In the second journal on lexical problems, she illustrated an important point "Students expect practice exercises from the teachers, they do not try enough." The teacher addressed the "time" limit in classroom tasks and storing the words in "short term memories" as other reasons.

3.4.3.4. A Personal Opinion

Star expressed a personal opinion in 9.7% of her critical reflection. Found frequently in journals on lexical problems and classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews, these opinions were related to "teaching in context", the importance of practice, revision, and repetition, using games in the classroom, making mistakes, and some teaching techniques. As well as opinions on learning and teaching, Star shared those related to learning to teach. In the fourth interview she said, "(This) study is something practical. Using is the best way of learning, I think."

3.4.3.5. Teacher's Problems

In 7.5% of Star's critical reflection in journals on lexical problems and classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews, we can often observe reference to teacher's problems with the pronoun "I" or "we". She mentioned problems related to lack of time, "course hours", keeping up with the "pacing" required by school management, lack of

opportunities for practice, teacher talk time versus student talk time, "making things much more enjoyable," especially by "preparing games", and overcoming recurrent lexical problems. The teacher referred to emotional problems, too. She mentioned being unable to feel "free" because of the pacing. In the first interview she remembered feeling "stressed" at the beginning of the research and added "This is the feeling I was testing myself or I'm doing something for a research. This is something different for me." The students' side was also important for Star. In the first interview she stated that when she had listened to the record of her classroom practice, she had noticed her emphasis on crucial points and added "I hope students also feel it, I felt it, but I don't know how they feel."

3.4.3.6. Recognition of Personal Growth

As another recurrent topic, recognition of personal growth appeared in 6.5% of Star's critical reflection in interviews. The teacher appreciated "recording [and] testing [her]self", "asking lots of questions to [her]self" such as "what am I doing", "could I have done it better", or "why haven't I practiced the other one", becoming "aware of" what she had been doing, "trying most of the things [she has] already planned in [her] mind", "sharing ideas" with her peer, feeling refreshed, "active", and "motivated", getting closer to her "ideal" teaching, and contribution of reflective practice to both learning and teaching.

3.4.3.7. Her Teaching Style

Found in 6.5% of Star's critical reflection in journals on classroom practice, peer discussions, and interviews, reference to her teaching style was also a frequent topic. In the third interview she expressed her interest in vocabulary teaching, "I am the teacher who is very eager to teach vocabulary, one of the vocabulary teaching lovers". This teacher's distinctive qualities are "teaching in context", offering variety, emphasizing crucial points, asking individual students "lots of questions" in order to use the target language, "trying to follow the rules" without flexibility in order to "do everything correctly", using very few games not "to lose the control of the class and waste time", and valuing "awareness" in every way.

3.4.3.8. Negative Evaluations of Lessons

Star's negative evaluations of lessons were found only in 3.6% of his critical reflection in interviews. Some of these evaluations were based on the quality of the classroom practice. Sometimes it was impractical or unnatural. In the first interview she stated, "written or spoken practice was missing". However, the teacher reflected on the reasons, too, saying, "It's the first time we have been doing it (audio-recording the classroom practice). The thing I felt was something like duty." Some negative evaluations were related to what the teacher had done. In the first interview she indicated, "Instead of using it myself, I should have made them use it themselves. I practiced it myself, not the students." Additionally, the negative evaluation in the fourth interview was related to the students. Star said, "In one of the classes I tried to use it (a game) but they refused."

3.4.3.9. Alternative Ways of Presenting Lesson

Star considered alternative ways of presenting lesson in 2.6% of her critical reflection in peer discussions and interviews. The alternatives she mentioned were "prepar[ing] a practice exercise" that involves "writing or speaking" and promotes production and "prepar[ing] games for each activity".

3.4.3.10. The Teacher's Knowledge and Experience

Star referred to her own knowledge and experience in 2.3% of her critical reflection in peer discussions and interviews. Most of these references involved how many times she had done an activity. For instance, in the third peer discussion she stated, "I have done it several times before, but for this study (for the) first time I'm trying it in the class." In the third interview she explained how she made use of her knowledge

> It is not something new, most of them are not something new, somewhere in my mind, it is in the corner in a small place. I keep it for a long time, I remember I have already used it, I remember, it was years ago, but it was somewhere there.

In the last interview she referred to "seminars" as a source of knowledge for teachers and then added, "We are reading something from the internet, or from the books, from our colleagues, we always get something."

3.4.3.11. Deciding on a Plan of Action

Deciding on a plan of action comprised 1.9 % of Star's critical reflection, and it could be observed in peer discussions, and interviews. Her plans included asking students to "write a paragraph" to practice target vocabulary, "involv[ing] games in [her] teaching", "chang[ing] the way [she] use[s]" some techniques, "plan[ning]" and "work[ing] on" her classroom practice in advance, overlooking the students' mistakes in their written tasks to "encourage them to use them (the target words)".

3.4.3.12. The Relation between Teaching and the School Context

Star showed the relation between teaching and the school context in 1% of her critical reflection in interviews. Her focus was on the course book. For instance, in the last interview she said, "[In] our coursebooks, our material we are using lots of vocabulary teaching techniques."

3.4.3.13. Setting Personal Goals

Setting personal goals appeared in 1 % of Star's critical reflection in interviews. The teacher expressed two goals. The first was related to awareness raising and mentioned in the second interview, "I should make this awareness for the students, they should be aware what they are doing". The second was related to "making it (her vocabulary teaching) enjoyable" by "playing games" and mentioned in the last interview.

3.4.3.14. A Justification

The two justifications Star provided in a peer discussion and in an interview comprised 0.6% of her critical reflection. In the first peer discussion she expressed the importance of repetitive exposure, "I read that students learn when they are exposed about 20 times, I support exposure." In the third interview, she referred to language teaching techniques, "Although techniques are working, when I was a student the thing our teachers were saying [was] that there was no one technique to teach and "Use the one you need in class". It can be the very old-fashioned or traditional one, it can be the modern one, communicative one or other one, so it was always in my mind, then I use them all."

3.4.3.15. Contradictions between Theory and Practice

Star stated contradictions between theory and practice twice in a peer discussion, which comprised 0.6 % of her critical reflection. In the first peer discussion she said,

"They (The students) don't write a paragraph or speak after reading a text and working on vocabulary, reading vocabulary in context, filling in gaps, speaking about it, doing extra exercise. This is the ideal way and what we learnt at university." Then she added, "We used to spend almost an hour on one word, but now we don't. We only present the vocabulary and move on, we use the short methods you mentioned."

3.4.3.16. Classroom Interaction

Found only in 0.6 % of Star's critical reflection, classroom interaction was another infrequent topic. In the third interview she stated, "They (The students) did most of the things themselves. It was not a teacher-centered class. It was student-centered and [they] interacted well." Later she explained how her interaction with one student – aiming to provide context for repetitive exposure – was actually intended for the others, "Whenever I got to the class I asked Okan … the same word again and again. Of course, the whole class heard that all the time."

3.4.4. Development in Star's Sense of Critical Reflectivity

Table 3.22 contrasts the percentages of traits of development in Star's critical reflection in the first and fourth procedures. An increase is observed in being able to reflect through teaching experience, being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, and discussing theories of expert and own. Nonetheless, there is a decrease in being able to evaluate both positively and negatively, variety of traits of critical reflection, and being a problem solver. In addition, the teacher asked critical questions in neither the first nor the last procedure.

Table 3.22: Development in Star's Sense of Critical Reflectivity

Traits of Development in Critical Reflection	1st procedure (%)	4th procedure (%)	Difference (%)
Being able to reflect through teaching experience	0	7	+ 7
Being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context	0	1.8	+ 1.8
Discussing theories of expert and own	13.5	14	+ 0.5
Being able to evaluate both positively and negatively	29.1	22.8	- 6.3
Variety of traits of critical reflection	60	55	- 5
Being a problem solver	4.8	1.8	- 3
Asking questions	0	0	0

3.4.4.1. Being Able to Reflect through Teaching Experience

Analysis of being able to reflect through teaching experience was based on reference to pedagogical knowledge and expression of knowledge and experience. The analysis revealed the highest increase in this trait. Although Star never reflected about these in the first procedure, four references to knowledge and experience were detected in the last procedure. In the fourth interview, for instance, after Star stated that she had used similar lexical activities over time, she added how seminars "motivated" her, "During my teaching experiences, I have been in many of the seminars, most of them were not [about something] new, but they were making me remember some of the things."

3.4.4.2. Being Able to Go Beyond the Classroom to Greater Context

Being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context was evaluated according to the teacher's reference to the relation between teaching and the school context. Although Star never made such reference in the first procedure, in the last interview she mentioned the contribution of the course material to her practice, which indicated a small increase. The teacher said, "[In] our coursebooks, our material we are using lots of vocabulary teaching techniques."

3.4.4.3. Discussing Theories of Expert and Own

Discussion of theories of expert and own involved expressing a justification, a personal opinion, and contradictions between theory and practice. Even though she mentioned these topics quite frequently both in the first and last procedure, the difference between them was not big. In the first procedure, Star referred to all these topics. The only justification she expressed was found in the first peer discussion when she said, "I read that students learn when they are exposed about 20 times, I support exposure." Reference to a personal opinion was the most common critical topic in this procedure. The teacher generally expressed her opinions about techniques or strategies she found "useful", especially "using context" and games. For instance, in the first journal on classroom practice she wrote, "Real life situations always work!" The two contradictions between theory and practice that Star indicated were observed in the first peer discussion. In these cases, she contrasted the theories she studied at university and practice in her current institution. She complained about being unable to spend appropriate time on presentation ("They [The students] don't write a paragraph or speak.") and to promote

practice through production ("We used to spend almost an hour on one word.") mainly due to lack of time. On the other hand, her critical reflection in the fourth procedure involved only one topic, a personal opinion, which mainly focused on teaching and learning to teach. For example, in the last interview she said, "It (whether you can play a game in a class) depends on the students."

3.4.4.4. Being Able to Evaluate Both Positively and Negatively

This trait was analyzed based on the teacher's positive and negative evaluations of lessons. Star often made both positive and negative evaluations in the first and fourth procedures but with lower frequencies in the fourth. Positive evaluations in the first and last procedures were based on satisfactory outcomes in the students' performance, the students' attitudes, and the teacher's own reactions. For instance, in the first interview the teacher stated, "I achieved, I felt it from the feedbacks. After the students had written the feedbacks, I realized that I achieved." As for the negative evaluations, in the first procedure they were based on the quality of classroom practice. For example, Star criticized her practice in the first interview saying, "I was not pleased that it was not natural." The rare negative evaluations in the last procedure, however, were related to the students' unwillingness. In the fourth interview, for instance, she said, "They (The students) did not want to play. Then I gave up."

3.4.4.5. Variety of Traits of Critical Reflection

Variety of traits of critical reflection was calculated based on the proportion of number of types of critical topics used by the participant to total number of critical topics. Comparison of the first and last procedure revealed that in the last one Star did not have as much variety as in the first. The topics that the teacher used at first but later did not touch on were a justification, contradictions between theory and practice, teacher's problems, and deciding on a plan of action. On the other hand, the ones she did not use at the beginning but mentioned later were knowledge and experience, the relation between teaching and the school context, and setting personal goals.

3.4.4.6. Being a Problem Solver

Whether Star was a problem solver was analyzed in terms of her reflection on alternative ways of presenting lesson and deciding on a plan of action. Comparison of the first and last procedures revealed that there was a decrease in her reference to these topics.

In the first procedure the teacher reflected on both topics. The only reference to alternative ways of presenting lesson was found in the first interview when she said, "I would probably prepare a practice exercise, maybe I can make them write or speak on these. I think I should have asked them to write a sentence containing three of them." Her decisions on a plan of action involved increasing productive activities, games, and planning in advance. For instance, in the first interview she said, "Maybe before the class I can plan it in my mind the vocabulary I'm teaching in the reading or in somewhere what we are studying. Then I can work on it in advance." In the last procedure, on the other hand, the only reference was related to alternative ways of presenting lesson. In the fourth interview she referred to her new experience saying, "I have tried it (playing games)."

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

4.1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to evaluate and interpret the implications of the findings with respect to the research questions below and the review of theoretical background and to reach conclusions:

1. What type of reflection (descriptive or critical) do English teachers commonly use?

2. What kind of descriptive reflection do English teachers employ? What kind of critical reflection do English teachers employ?

3. Does this process develop the use of critical reflection over time?

For each participant, the findings are evaluated, and insights into their teaching provided by their reflection are presented.

4.2. Discussion of the Case of Süheyla

4.2.1. Overall Analysis of Süheyla's Reflection

The first research question required a global look at the participant's reflection: What type of reflection (critical or descriptive) do English teachers commonly use? The participant's reflection was first analyzed based on the ratio of critical reflection to descriptive reflection, the ratio of the topics she mentioned to the whole, and the topics she used more frequently. Overall, Süheyla's critical reflection (69 %) outnumbered her descriptive reflection (31 %), which is parallel to Liou (2001) but in contrast with Yang (2009) and Farrell (2001). Süheyla referred to most of the topics (83%) with statistically significant results. Her reflection was mainly critical, but descriptive topics were found in the list of frequent topics as well. This close connection between descriptive and critical reflection implies that teachers should not be expected to reflect completely critically.

Thanks to descriptive reflection, the teacher could recall what had happened and then go beyond that.

4.2.2. Süheyla's Descriptive and Critical Reflection

The second research question involved detailed analysis of each type of reflection: What kind of descriptive reflection do English teachers employ? What kind of critical reflection do English teachers employ? The participant's descriptive reflection and critical reflection were each analyzed based on their frequency, the ratio of the topics she mentioned to the whole, and the type of tasks she engaged in frequently.

The findings revealed that Süheyla's descriptive reflection comprised 31% of her total reflection involving 67% of the descriptive topics. Despite the low frequency, the teacher was able to refer to a good variety of topics. This might indicate limitation of descriptive reflection since elaboration of descriptive topics is not as easy as of critical topics and there is not much the participant can add after describing certain qualities. Her descriptive reflection was mostly found in interviews and journals on classroom practice. She frequently mentioned an approach/procedure and a belief/conviction, which is similar to the results in Ho and Richards (1993) but different from Korkmazgil (2018). The teacher also described the content of her lessons and how she applied a theory in addition to asking what to do and how to do things unlike findings in Korkmazgil (2018). In contrast to findings in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999), however, no reference to experts was detected. These results lead to the conclusion that she employed descriptive reflection with various topics to set the scene or to introduce the basics for the listener or the reader as Jay and Johnson (2002) and Watanabe (2016) indicated. This is what makes descriptive reflection essential.

Involving 90% of the critical topics, Süheyla's critical reflection appeared in 69 % of her whole data. Such high frequency and wide variety might reveal the enormous potential of critical reflection. Her critical reflection was mostly found in interviews and peer discussions probably due to the effect of interaction. Süheyla's critical reflection was mainly about evaluating teaching with a focus on students and lessons, which is similar to the findings in Korkmazgil (2018). Although the teacher mentioned some problems, she also reflected, with a generally positive attitude, on the rationale behind her practice, the reasons for specific problems, and the range of possible solutions, which is similar to

what Korkmazgil (2018) observed. Besides, personal opinions and teaching problems were among prevalent critical topics as in Farrell (1999) and Korkmazgil (2018) but there were few entries related to self-awareness as in Ho and Richards (1993), Farrell (1999), and Korkmazgil (2018). Nonetheless, the teacher never mentioned how theories changed or perceptions of her language proficiency. Considering the results for frequency and variety, we might conclude that critical reflection, in contrast to descriptive reflection, made it possible for the teacher to make more elaborate comments.

An overview of the role of the three instruments for reflective data reveals differences in frequencies of the topics used in each. The most common instrument during both descriptive and critical reflection was interviews, and the second was journals during descriptive reflection and peer discussions during critical reflection. Involving interviews and discussions as frequent instruments seems parallel to the findings in Farrell (2018). In addition, prevalence of interviews and discussions might be related to the effect of interaction on reflection as mentioned in Farrell (2020). As a result, type of instrument could serve as a variable or a point for consideration in further studies.

4.2.3. Development in Süheyla's Use of Critical Reflection

For the last research question, the focus was on traits of development in critical reflection at the beginning and end of the 12-week reflection process: Does this process develop the use of critical reflection over time? This was investigated based on the comparison of the percentage of the following traits of development in critical reflection (Farrell, 1999) in the first and last procedure: (1) a greater variety of traits of critical reflection, (2) discussing theories of expert and own, (3) being more able to reflect through teaching experience, (4) being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, (5) being more able to evaluate both positively and negatively, (6) being a better problem solver, and (7) asking more questions.

According to the results, there was a decrease in being a problem solver and asking questions. This might come as no surprise since at the end of the process she might have felt she had found answers to her initial problems and questions and might have felt no further need to reflect on them. On the other hand, the analysis revealed an increase in many traits of development in Süheyla's critical reflection. This result confirms the findings of Farrell (2011) and Korkmazgil (2018) but is in contrast with Liou (2001). She

was able to refer to a wide variety of critical topics, consider both expert opinions and her own, bring knowledge and experience together, go beyond the classroom to greater context, and evaluate both positively and negatively.

Furthermore, there are significant implications of these results. For instance, Süheyla's reference to a wider variety of critical topics at the end is notable since it might indicate her broad perspective. Another significant point in this respect is the diversity of the topics mentioned. There were certain topics referred to only in the first procedure but not in the last, and vice versa. To be more specific, the topics that were used only at the beginning were asking for reasons and her teaching style. She might have reflected on them at first to set out her aims, but to conclude her experience throughout the study she might have focused on her pedagogical knowledge, the relation between teaching and the school context, and personal goals for the future in the last procedure. In conclusion, like an expert teacher Tsui (2009) defined, Süheyla seems to be able to link theory and practice and, as a consequence, to bring knowledge and experience into the classroom.

4.2.4. Insights into Süheyla's Teaching

Süheyla's reflection during this research provided some insights into her teaching as mentioned by Bailey (1997) and Richards and Lockhart (1996). For instance, what she decided to do to enrich the students' vocabulary and solve common problems was to use an online collocation dictionary as part of her classroom practice. As well as bringing a reliable and practical resource with right word combinations to the classroom, this new activity required meticulous preparation on the teacher's side. The indications of her meticulous attitude can also be observed in her detailed descriptions, her reference to various stages of practice, and her deep-seated beliefs about teaching and learning.

Another noteworthy point about Süheyla's teaching is her multi-dimensional perspective. For example, the teacher's observations and evaluations focused not only on the lessons but also on the students and the teacher herself, which is similar to the findings in Yeşilbursa (2008). Even her account of students' gains included various sides such as academic ("permanent learning"), individual ("self-belief"), and social gains ("collaboration"). Besides, when Süheyla presented learners' background information, she did this in two ways – academic background and mood. The teacher's multi-dimensional perspective was also evident in her plans of action. The plans were not

limited to adding new activities – they involved making students more active and responsible (encouraging peer-editing and self-editing) and shouldering extra load (conferencing with "weak students"). All these examples lead to the conclusion that Süheyla is an observant teacher who can consider a broad context and framework.

Süheyla's positive attitude was significant, too. Being a positive teacher, Süheyla was good at observing the students' mood when they were "excited" or "eager". Although she faced some difficulties or predicted some negative outcomes during practice, critical reflection helped her discover a positive detail to focus on. Her solution-oriented approach was also outstanding because it helped her to shoulder responsibility and gain autonomy (as mentioned in Richards & Farrell, 2005). For instance, students' and the teacher's problems were both frequent topics in her reflection, but Süheyla did not just complain when she referred to these problems. Being also aware of background factors beyond the classroom, she noticed patterns in recurrent problems and identified their roots so that she could find alternative ways of presentation or decide on a plan of action. Besides, she presented a justification or rationale when she mentioned a choice or a decision.

As a teacher who became "more tolerant", "happier", "more interested", and "proud" of herself, Süheyla seemed to be satisfied with her professional development journey as an EFL teacher as mentioned in Richards and Lockhart (1996). First of all, this reflective process changed her perspective. The "aim" she always had in her mind as mentioned in Bailey (1997) helped to raise her own "awareness" (as found in İskenderoğlu-Önel, 1998; Yeşilbursa, 2008) as well as her students' (Rodgers, 2002). Furthermore, she was able to integrate her knowledge and experience with ideas from her students and peers "to create or find out a teaching method related to the context" as mentioned in Richards and Lockhart (1996). This led her to informed decisions as mentioned in Bailey (1997), Farrell (2020), Richards and Lockhart (1996), and Widdowson (2003). Finally, the process was also beneficial to her self-growth. The teacher gained autonomy and deliberation by taking action rather than merely complaining about problems as mentioned in Ölçü-Dinçer (2022) and Pultorak (1996), and she noticed the value of her knowledge, beliefs, opinions, experience, style of teaching, and interaction with her peers and students. These results imply that Süheyla is an expert teacher as described in Tsui (2009) who can respond to her context, engage in

conscious deliberation, and integrate knowledge into the teaching act. She also seems to have the three important attitudes in reflective practice Dewey (1933 cited in Farrell, 2020) introduced – whole-heartedness, open-mindedness, and responsibility.

The teacher's interest in academic studies might have had an effect on her remarkable efforts to uncover the reasons behind what is happening and on her prevalent use of examples from her own data, that is, phrases from students' writing tasks, which seems parallel to what Ölçü-Dinçer (2022) found. She was also hoping to use the classroom data she had collected in her future research as mentioned in Bailey (1997). Also, Süheyla's experience in teaching, attitude towards learning and teaching, and motivation for professional development might have had an impact on the results. These could be used as a variable in further studies.

Despite her rich academic background, the topics Süheyla never referred to were mostly related to experts' views, and questions were rare. This might be because the research was not part of a teacher education program as in Ho and Richards (1993) or because the teacher was in touch with her colleagues rather than teacher trainers or professors in graduate programs. Besides, the decrease in being a problem solver as a trait of development in critical reflection might be related to reaching the end of the reflective process. As Süheyla approached the final week of the process and thus of the academic year, she might naturally have found it unessential to make a plan of action.

4.3. Discussion of the Case of Ayhan

4.3.1. Overall Analysis of Ayhan's Reflection

The first research question required a global look at the participant's reflection: What type of reflection (critical or descriptive) do English teachers commonly use? The participant's reflection was first analyzed based on the ratio of critical reflection to descriptive reflection, the ratio of the topics he mentioned to the whole, and the topics he used more frequently. Although Ayhan's critical reflection (56 %) was more prevalent than his descriptive reflection (44 %), the difference between the two was not enormous. His tendency to use critical reflection more frequently than descriptive reflection is similar to the findings in Liou (2001) but in contrast with Yang (2009) and Farrell (2001). The teacher referred to 76% of the topics with statistically significant results. Moreover, three out of nine common topics in Ayhan's reflection (including the top two) were

descriptive. This implies that descriptive reflection goes hand in hand with critical reflection and, thus, should never be underestimated.

4.3.2. Ayhan's Descriptive and Critical Reflection

The second research question involved detailed analysis of each type of reflection: What kind of descriptive reflection do English teachers employ? What kind of critical reflection do English teachers employ? The participant's descriptive reflection and critical reflection were each analyzed based on their frequency, the ratio of the topics she mentioned to the whole, and the type of tasks engaged in frequently.

The results from Ayhan's descriptive reflection indicated that it was found in 44 % of his total reflection with reference to 78% of the descriptive topics. The low frequency of descriptive reflection but wide variety of topics might point to limitation of descriptive reflection since it does not involve as much elaboration as critical reflection. His descriptive reflection was mostly observed in interviews and peer discussions, which indicates the role of description during conversation. The frequent topics were an approach/procedure and a belief/conviction, which is similar to the findings in Ho and Richards (1993) but different from Korkmazgil (2018). The teacher also described the content of his lessons and asked what to do and how to do things unlike findings in Korkmazgil (2018). Unlike what Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999) reported, however, no reference to experts was found in Ayhan's descriptive reflection. To conclude, as Jay and Johnson (2002) and Watanabe (2016) indicated, descriptive reflection helped the teacher to set the scene or to introduce the basics and then to get into details especially while interacting with another teacher.

Referring to a big majority (75%) of the critical topics, Ayhan's critical reflection was observed in 56 % of the whole data. Compared with the teacher's descriptive reflection, the frequency of his critical reflection was very close though higher, and the variety was lower. Ayhan's critical reflection was mostly found in interviews and peer discussions. As in Ho and Richards (1993), most of the critical topics found in his reflection were related to evaluating teaching, and topics related to approaches and methods were frequently mentioned, which is similar to the findings in Korkmazgil (2018). Other prevalent critical topics were teaching problems and personal opinions as in Farrell (1999) and Korkmazgil (2018). Although the teacher referred to topics related

to self-awareness, they were not very common, which is similar to the findings in Ho and Richards (1993), Farrell (1999), and Korkmazgil (2018). However, the critical topics Ayhan never mentioned were justification, contradictions between theory and practice, how theories changed, pedagogical knowledge, and classroom interaction. According to the results for frequency and variety, we might conclude that even though descriptive topics seem more restricted, the teacher found them as attractive as critical topics.

There were remarkable differences in frequencies of the topics used in each of the three instruments for reflective data. High frequencies of both descriptive and critical reflection in interviews and peer discussions appears comparable to the findings in Farrell (2018). High frequency of interviews and discussions might also be related to the effect of interaction on reflection as mentioned in Farrell (2020). Thus, type of instrument could serve as a variable or a point for consideration in further studies. What is more, Ayhan's experience in teaching, attitude towards learning and teaching, and motivation for professional development might have also had an impact on the results. These could also be used as a variable in further studies.

4.3.3. Development in Ayhan's Use of Critical Reflection

For the last research question, the focus was on traits of development in critical reflection at the beginning and end of the 12-week reflection process: Does this process develop the use of critical reflection over time? This was investigated based on the comparison of the percentage of the following traits of development in critical reflection (Farrell, 1999) in the first and last procedure: (1) a greater variety of traits of critical reflection, (2) discussing theories of expert and own, (3) being more able to reflect through teaching experience, (4) being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, (5) being more able to evaluate both positively and negatively, (6) being a better problem solver, and (7) asking more questions.

Despite the frequency of critical topics in his reflection, Ayhan did not show substantial development in critical reflectivity, which is similar to what Liou (2001) found but different from findings in Korkmazgil (2018). According to the findings, the teacher was more able to discuss theories of expert and own and reflect through teaching experience in the last procedure. Reflecting on his experience throughout the process, the teacher might have shaped his ideas related to teaching towards the end.

Nevertheless, he displayed a decrease in variety of traits of critical reflection, being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, being able to evaluate both positively and negatively, being a problem solver, and asking questions. This might be related to the teacher's changing attitudes as he might have needed to interpret and analyze the context at the beginning but not later. Especially, the decrease in the variety of traits of critical reflection might be the result of a reduced need to consider a broad range of topics towards the end.

In addition, there was diversity in the topics used at the beginning and at the end. To be more specific, he did not refer to his knowledge and experience at the beginning but mentioned it later. Also, the topics that Ayhan mentioned at first but later did not touch on were the relation between teaching and the school context, asking for reasons, setting personal goals, and comments on his language proficiency. He might have thought that reflecting about these issues while planning his route at the beginning of the process was more essential, and later he might have preferred to focus more on teaching experience.

4.3.4. Insights into Ayhan's Teaching

Insights into Ayhan's teaching during the reflective process reveal some distinctive qualities of the teacher as mentioned by Bailey (1997) and Richards and Lockhart (1996). For instance, the prominent role of productive skills and grammar while reflecting on teaching or learning vocabulary indicated the importance that he attached to language use. Ayhan's positive attitude was also remarkable. Although students' and the teacher's problems were both frequent topics, positive evaluations about both students and teachers outnumbered them. In addition to discovering details about the students' mood, performance, and attitudes as "a good observer", Ayhan frequently reflected on his own experience in learning vocabulary. This allowed him to make sense of the students' side of the story and to generate ideas to bridge the gap between learning and teaching as mentioned in Richards and Lockhart (1996). Besides, many of his observations about teaching involved "we" as the subject. This might be related to the benefits of reflection for professional dialogue as mentioned in Bailey (1997), the feeling of ownership as indicated in Richards and Farrell (2005), and/or his ability to consider the big context.

At the beginning of the study, Ayhan wanted to clarify some concepts. Thus, he questioned learning vocabulary versus teaching vocabulary by "problematizing the unproblematic" as mentioned in Tsui (2009, p.437). The teacher made "new sense of the situations of uncertainty" as mentioned in Schön (1983, p. 61) by examining his practice, reaching a profound understanding of teaching, and searching gaps between teaching and learning as mentioned in Richards and Lockhart (1996), which might have helped him reach an answer. In the third peer discussion the answer was expressed as, "Vocabulary is something that students should learn, it is not something teachers should teach… Maybe there are some things or there are some parts in which teachers can help their students learn something". The details of how teachers can do this were revealed in the variety of productive tasks he used during the practice phase and the range of lexical strategies he shared. In this way, the students were able to bear the responsibility of their own learning as they worked with the target phrases actively, and the teacher acted as a guide who designed activities to promote "permanent learning" or to activate "long term memory" rather than "spoon-feeding" them with translations.

Moreover, Ayhan's attitude to professional development was manifested in his intention to be "a better teacher", and it is parallel to Schön (1983). Besides, in line with the Constructivist ideas in Dewey (1910) he said, "To an extent every study, everything that you do, every strategy, every technique can solve a problem, to an extent yani I believe that all of them can have a part in solving the problem" in the second interview. Then he added:

I believe that always there is a better way of teaching something … if they want to learn, if we want to teach something, we can find a way to teach it … but within the techniques that we are used to doing or within our knowledge we are trying to do our best.

In this respect, the teacher's enthusiasm for "experimentation and exploration" as mentioned in Tsui (2009, p.437) is also noteworthy. He often "look[ed] for some new ways" or tried an activity for the first time, which might have helped him improve his confidence in testing new options as Richards and Lockhart (1996) mentioned. Despite this willingness, there was a lack of reference to experts in the teacher's reflection, which might be related to the nature of this study – the process took place within research, not

as part of a teacher education program conducted by teacher trainers or professors as in Ho and Richards (1993).

Thanks to his tendency to "be inquisitive", do research, and share ideas, he asked some questions to himself, his peer, and the researcher, which seems related to conscious inquiry in Dewey (1910). Although he did not use them very frequently, Ayhan asked some thought-provoking questions about teaching. For example, in the second peer discussion he asked, "I mean how can we make them learn the words or the vocabulary for a longer period of time, yani how can we make the words permanent in their brains?" In his first journal on lexical problems, he wrote, "If a colleague explains a word in English while I choose to give their Turkish meanings as the shortest and surest way of overcoming the problem of sorting out unknown words, does it make any change in output?" He also questioned the limitations. In the third interview, for instance, Ayhan said "To what extent can you do this, to what extent can you give them a candy to study?" The teacher's style is also noteworthy as he employed rhetorical ("How can they learn words without reading them, writing them, uttering them and hearing them?" in the first journal on lexical problems) and indirect questions ("I wonder whether they still remember the words they learnt there" in the first interview) besides non-rhetorical ones ("I mean writing six or seven compositions or let's say at most ten compositions, to what extent can they change students' vocabulary or their ability of production" in the fourth interview). These questions encourage the teacher to investigate the current situation, values, and alternatives along with their limitations focusing on the principles rather than technical skills as Richards and Lockhart (1996) mentioned.

During this professional development journey, the teacher did not see himself "remote from (his) ideal performance", and he was "more aware" (as found in İskenderoğlu-Önel, 1998; Yeşilbursa, 2008). This might be because he defined his responsibilities and limits, noticed his weaknesses, strengths, and gains, and sought improvement (as mentioned in Schön, 1983). What is more, he seemed to have learnt a lot from his peer, students, and his own experiences (as mentioned in Richards & Farrell, 2005). These results indicate that Ayhan aimed to improve his teaching and seemed to be satisfied with his professional development. Based on the findings it seems possible to conclude that Ayhan is an expert teacher as described in Tsui (2009) who can respond to his context, engage in conscious deliberation, and integrate knowledge into the teaching

act. Apparently, the three important attitudes in reflective practice Dewey (1933 cited in Farrell, 2020) introduced – whole-heartedness, open-mindedness, and responsibility – seem to be part of Ayhan's teaching.

4.4. Discussion of the Case of Star

4.4.1. Overall Analysis of Star's Reflection

The first research question required a global look at the participant's reflection: What type of reflection (critical or descriptive) do English teachers commonly use? The participant's reflection was first analyzed based on the ratio of critical reflection to descriptive reflection, the ratio of the topics she mentioned to the whole, and the topics she used more frequently. Overall, Star's critical reflection (71 %) far outnumbered her descriptive reflection (29 %), which is parallel to Liou (2001) but in contrast with Yang (2009) and Farrell (2001). Star referred to most (72%) of the topics with statistically significant results. Her reflection was mainly critical; however, three descriptive topics were also in the list of frequent topics, and one was the second most common topic. Such close connection between descriptive and critical reflection indicates that teachers should not be expected to reflect entirely critically. Thanks to descriptive reflection, the teacher could recall what had happened and then go beyond that.

4.4.2. Star's Descriptive and Critical Reflection

The second research question involved detailed analysis of each type of reflection: What kind of descriptive reflection do English teachers employ? What kind of critical reflection do English teachers employ? The participant's descriptive reflection and critical reflection were each analyzed based on their frequency, the ratio of the topics she mentioned to the whole, and the type of tasks she engaged in frequently.

According to the findings, Star's descriptive reflection involved 29 % of her total reflection referring to 56% of the descriptive topics. This indicates that the teacher considered a variety of topics but without many details probably due to the limited number of features that can be described. Her descriptive reflection frequently appeared in interviews and peer discussions. She mostly mentioned an approach/procedure and a belief/conviction, which is similar to the results in Ho and Richards (1993) but different from Korkmazgil (2018). The teacher also described the content of her lessons besides asking what to do and how to do things unlike findings in Korkmazgil (2018). In contrast

to findings in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999), however, there was no reference to experts. We might conclude that although there are only certain features to describe, they helped the teacher, especially during conversation, to provide the background before reflecting critically as Jay and Johnson (2002) and Watanabe (2016) indicated.

Referring to 80% of the critical topics, Star reflected critically in 71 % of the whole. Prevalent use of critical reflection with a wide variety of topics might indicate the tremendous opportunities critical reflection provides for elaboration. Her critical reflection was mostly found in interviews and peer discussions possibly because of the effect of interaction, and it was mainly about evaluating teaching as in Ho and Richards (1993), which is similar to the findings in Korkmazgil (2018). Evaluating teaching involved reflecting on the lessons mostly as well as the students and the teacher. Other prevalent critical topics were personal opinions as in Farrell (1999) and Korkmazgil (2018) and learners' background information. Unlike Ho and Richards (1993), Farrell (1999), and Korkmazgil (2018), self-awareness was common in Star's critical reflection. However, the critical topics Star never mentioned were how theories changed, pedagogical knowledge, asking for reasons (which is similar to findings in Korkmazgil, 2018), and comments on her language proficiency. Based on the results for frequency and variety, it seems possible to conclude that unlike descriptive reflection, critical reflection allowed the teacher to make numerous comments on a variety of topics especially during conversation.

An analysis of the three instruments for reflective data reveals that both in her descriptive and critical reflection most of the data appeared in interviews and peer discussions. Common use of interviews and discussions seems parallel to the findings in Farrell (2018). In addition, this high frequency might be related to the effect of interaction on reflection as mentioned in Farrell (2020). As a result, type of instrument could serve as a variable or a point for consideration in further studies.

4.4.3. Development in Star's Use of Critical Reflection

For the last research question, the focus was on traits of development in critical reflection at the beginning and end of the 12-week reflection process: Does this process develop the use of critical reflection over time? This was investigated based on the comparison of the percentage of the following traits of development in critical reflection

(Farrell, 1999) in the first and last procedure: (1) a greater variety of traits of critical reflection, (2) discussing theories of expert and own, (3) being more able to reflect through teaching experience, (4) being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, (5) being more able to evaluate both positively and negatively, (6) being a better problem solver, and (7) asking more questions.

The analysis of these traits of development in Star's critical reflection revealed there was no change in asking questions as she did not ask any in the first or the last procedure, which is similar to the findings in Korkmazgil (2018). However, there was increase in three and decrease in three. At the end of the process, she was more able to reflect through teaching experience, go beyond the classroom to greater context, and discuss theories of expert and own, which is similar to the findings in Korkmazgil (2018). On the other hand, there was a decrease in being able to evaluate both positively and negatively, variety of traits of critical reflection, and being a problem solver.

These findings indicate that at the end of the process Star reflected more on knowledge, experience, theories, and the context than evaluation and solutions. A similar pattern is also found in the diversity in the topics mentioned. To be more precise, among the topics that Star mentioned at first but later did not touch on were teacher's problems and contradictions between theory and practice. On the other hand, the ones she only mentioned in the last procedure included knowledge and experience and the relation between teaching and the school context. This diversity might imply a change in the teacher's attitudes towards the end – she might have started the process with a focus on negative issues to find ways to overcome them throughout the process and completed it with a consideration of the big picture of her teaching. Besides, the decrease in the variety of traits of critical reflection might indicate a reduced need to consider a broad range of topics towards the end.

4.4.4. Insights into Star's Teaching

Star's reflection during this research provided some insights into her teaching as mentioned by Bailey (1997) and Richards and Lockhart (1996). For instance, as the teacher valued being "natural" in the classroom, she disliked doing classroom activities "like a duty". Star generally prioritized "teaching in a context" in a "natural" flow as well

as practice of productive skills, especially in an integrated way, and students' engagement and improvement.

Another important detail about Star's teaching is her positive attitude. As a positive teacher, Star was good at noticing the students' mood when they were "excited", "interested" or "eager". Even when she made negative evaluations, instead of complaining she reflected on the reasons to find solutions, which helped her to shoulder responsibility and gain autonomy (as mentioned in Richards & Farrell, 2005).

Star's attitude towards professional development is also remarkable. In the first interview she referred to reflection-in-action, which was introduced in Schön (1983), saying, "Recording, testing myself, what am I doing, always asking, could I have done it better, why I haven't practiced the other one, I ask lots of questions to myself." Thanks to this attitude, Star raised her awareness of "most of the things [she had] been doing in the class" as she had not "realize[d] [she had] been doing them". This is in line with Richards and Lockhart (1996), who stated that "much of what happens in teaching is unknown to the teacher" and reflective practice can "make teaching more visible, through collecting and examining data on many dimensions of teaching" (pp.3-4). Thus, Star found the reflective process in the study "helpful" since "trying most of the things [she had] already planned in [her] mind and [she] really wanted to do" was now possible and she believed "using is the best way" in learning to teach. During this process she also acknowledged the contribution of her previous experience, various resources, her peers and students, and professional development activities in shaping her professional knowledge.

During this professional development journey, the teacher sought improvement (as mentioned in Schön, 1983) and seemed to have learnt from her peer, students, and her own experiences (as mentioned in Richards & Farrell, 2005). This might be because she became "more aware" (as found in İskenderoğlu-Önel, 1998; Yeşilbursa, 2008) due to informed decisions she reached as mentioned in Bailey (1997), Farrell (2020), Richards and Lockhart (1996), and Widdowson (2003). Most importantly, she gained autonomy and deliberation by taking action rather than merely complaining about problems as mentioned in Ölçü-Dinçer (2022) and Pultorak (1996). These findings imply that Star seemed to be satisfied with her professional development. To conclude, she is an expert

teacher as described in Tsui (2009) who can respond to her context, engage in conscious deliberation, and integrate knowledge into the teaching act. In addition, it seems that Star has the three vital attitudes in reflective practice, whole-heartedness, open-mindedness, and responsibility (as mentioned in Dewey, 1933 cited in Farrell, 2020).

4.5. Conclusion

The findings in this research are remarkable for teacher development. To start with, the benefits of the bottom-up approach in this study with a focus on teacher learning instead of teacher training, which is in line with what Sadeghi and Richards (2021) suggested, have significant implications for professional development programs. To be more specific, the reflective process promoted the teachers' self-directed learning, autonomy, and responsibility (as mentioned in Richards & Farrell, 2005). It was also advantageous for the stakeholders since it benefited the learners in terms of raised awareness and engagement and the institution in terms of collaboration and preservation of inside knowledge (as mentioned in Collins & Gün, 2019). Nonetheless, the expected development as an outcome of reflective practice should not necessarily be major changes since professional development is a long journey and reflective practice is not linear in fashion or a point that could be reached once and kept forever (as indicated in Watanabe, 2016; Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022). The focus should be more on the process of expansion (as indicated in Watanabe, 2016), which promotes awareness and provides countless insights. These insights are valuable not only for the teachers involved but also researchers, preservice or in-service teachers, or teacher trainers. Thus, data from reflective practice could be used to inspire new research questions for all.

Reflective practice is a long-term and demanding process with various features which could be observed in the three participants' reflections. First, they built their own versions of reality (Pritchard & Woollard, 2010) through investigation of data from their own context in a systematic way (Bartlett, 1990; Farrell, 2020; Rodgers, 2002), which led to informed decisions and convergence of theory and practice (Farrell, 2020; Pultorak, 1996; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Rodgers, 2002; Tsui, 2009). Second, the teachers collaborated with others – their students and peers (Farrell, 2020; Rodgers, 2002), so they were able to examine their role in the classroom, their students' expectations in this respect, and differences between these two (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). In the same

vein, the researcher's interaction with the three participants and exposure to and analysis of reflective data contributed to her own professional development as well. This is similar to the conclusion in Watanabe (2016). Third, the participants displayed "interest in the problem to be resolved" (Bartlett, 1990, p.207) and "attitudes that value the personal and intellectual growth of oneself and of others" (Rodgers, 2002, p. 845). In addition, the participants avoided "nothing-but type of reasoning" (Kelly, 1991, p. 108) when they faced students' mistakes. Rather than giving automatically negative responses, the teachers reflected on them and even discovered how helpful they could be. In addition, although the instruments in this research involved reflection-on-action, the participants' accounts of their classroom practices also revealed instances of reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983). Last but not least, the participants experienced reflective teaching as "a harmony of doing, thinking, and knowing what to do" (Freeman, 1996 cited in Bailey, 1997). Despite all these common points, there were individual differences between the participants' reflections, which leads to the conclusion that "there is no 'final' stage of reflection, only varying ways to reflect" (Watanabe, 2016, p.32).

An overall look at how the three participants used the topics leads to some conclusions. On the one hand, the topics the participants mentioned above the statistically expected level are almost the same despite minor differences in orders of frequency. Further studies could focus more on these common topics. Another similarity among the participants was the instruments in which they proved to be more productive. All the three teachers reflected more frequently in interviews and peer discussions thanks to social interaction, so they might be given priority in further research. In this respect, the data that were not included in the current analysis, i.e. texts written by students, lists of mistakes, audio-records of classroom practice, and student feedback, could be considered in further research. On the other hand, there were differences between the participants in the topics they used, especially the ones they used at the beginning and at the end of the process, which is in line with personal distinctions mentioned in Freeman and Johnson (1998) and Watanabe (2016). This might indicate the importance of considering differences in both theoretical and practical context in further studies.

The research led to significant conclusions related to descriptive and critical reflection. To begin with, descriptive reflection helped the participants, especially during conversation, to provide the background before reflecting critically as Jay and Johnson

(2002) and Watanabe (2016) suggested. However, descriptive reflection seems more limited in comparison to critical reflection. Elaboration of descriptive topics is not as easy as of critical topics and there is not much the participant can add after describing certain qualities. Thus, high frequency and wide variety of critical reflection might reveal its enormous potential. In contrast to descriptive reflection, critical reflection allowed the participants to make more elaborate comments. Nonetheless, these results do not mean critical reflection is better than descriptive reflection. Descriptive reflection goes hand in hand with critical reflection and, thus, should never be underestimated. In further studies it could be more beneficial to focus on how they are used together with a holistic approach as Jay and Johnson (2002) and Watanabe (2016) suggest rather than a dualistic approach.

Finally, there are some vital issues that require planning ahead in further research in this field. The obstacles the participants indicated, lack of time, heavy workload, obligation to cover a specific amount of content within limited time, and lack of flexibility (as mentioned in Ölçü-Dinçer, 2022), should be considered while conducting reflective research. What is more, in spite of all the obstacles, voluntary participation of these three teachers in such demanding research indicates their whole-heartedness, open-mindedness, and responsibility (Dewey, 1933 cited in Farrell, 2020). Last but not least, the participants' relationship with each other and the researcher seemed to contribute to this process, which is inevitably a crucial point to consider in further reflective research (Schön, 1983; Watanabe, 2016).

YABANCI DİL ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN YANSITICI UYGULAMALARI ÜZERİNE ALAN ÇALIŞMASI

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

Giriş

Öğretmeyi öğrenmek "uzun vadeli, karmaşık, gelişimsel bir süreçtir" (Freeman & Johnson 1998, s. 402). Bu süreçte öğretmenler bazı olaylardan habersiz olabilir; bununla birlikte, eylem üzerine düşünme, kendi bağlamlarını araştırarak, teori ve pratiği entegre ederek ve böylece öğretmenin öğrenmesini geliştirerek, ne olduğunu ve neden olduğunu anlamalarına yardımcı olabilir. Keşfedici sıralı desene sahip bu vaka çalışması, üç İngilizce öğretmeninin günlüklerden, grup tartışmalarından, derslerin ses kayıtlarından, öğrenci geri bildirimlerinden ve görüşmelerden elde edilen verilere dayalı olarak betimleyici ve eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmelerini araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Çalışma şu araştırma sorularına cevap vermeyi amaçlamaktadır:

1. İngilizce öğretmenleri hangi yansıtıcı düşünme türünü (betimleyici veya eleştirel) sıklıkla kullanmaktadır?

2. İngilizce öğretmenleri hangi tür betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmeyi kullanmaktadır? İngilizce öğretmenleri hangi tür eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmeyi kullanmaktadır?

3. Bu süreç zaman içinde eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme kullanımını geliştirir mi?

Literatür Taraması

Programların uygulayıcıları olarak, öğretmenler dil eğitiminde hayati bir role sahiptir. Dolayısıyla öğretmen gelişiminin sadece öğretmene değil, kuruma ve öğrencilere de faydaları vardır. İlk olarak, öğretmen için üst düzey pozisyonlar, daha iyi performans ve geliştirilmiş bellek sağlar. Kurumun öğrenme çıktılarını, başarısını ve popülerliğini artırır. Son olarak, öğrencinin öğrenme düzeyi geliştirilir (Richards & Farrell, 2005).

Öğretmen geliştirme programları, dışarıya veya içeriye dayalı bir yaklaşımı benimseyerek öğretmenlerin belirli alanlarda gelişmelerine yardımcı olabilir. Dışarıya dayalı yaklaşımlar, kurum dışındaki bilgilere, özellikle de uzmanların genel teori ve ilkelere dayalı bilgisine değer verir (Richards ve Farrell, 2005). Bu yaklaşımların içerik bazlı önceden belirlenmiş programları, hazır çözümleri ve kısa vadeli sonuçları vardır

(Yaman, 2004). Öte yandan, içeriye dayalı yaklaşımlar, öz-yönetimli öğrenmeyi teşvik etmek için kurumsal bilgiye öncelik verir. Öğretmenlerin kendi bağlamlarını analiz etmelerini ve sınıf uygulamalarına ilişkin kendi bilgi ve anlayışlarını oluşturmalarını sağlar (Richards ve Farrell, 2005).

Yansıtıcı düşünme, öğretmenlerin "teorik bilgiyi pratikleştirme" ve "pratik bilgiyi teorileştirme" olmak üzere iki süreci bütünleştirmelerini sağladığı için öğretmen gelişiminde önemli bir role sahiptir (Tsui, 2009, s. 432). Bunu, sınıflarından elde ettikleri verilerden yola çıkarak kendi uygulamalarını araştırarak ve bu araştırmadan yola çıkarak yaptıkları değişikliklerle gerçekleştirebilirler (Gün, 2010). Bu şekilde öğretmenler "uygulamalarına ilişkin yeni bir anlayış kazanabilirler" (Farrell, 2016, s. 224). Farrell (2011), yeni bir İngilizce öğretmeninin "betimleyici bir yansıtıcı aşamadan" "pratiğinde daha eleştirel bir duruşa" geçmekten nasıl yararlandığını, çünkü "artık öğretiminin belirli yönleri hakkında bilinçli bir karar verebildiğini… ve bunun sonucunda inançları ve sınıf uygulamaları arasında daha fazla yakınlaşma olduğunu" bildirmiştir (s. 272).

Yansıtıcı düşünme farklı şekillerde sınıflandırılır. Ho ve Richards (1993) ve Farrell (1999) eleştirel ve betimleyici yansımanın alt kategorilerini sunmuş ve bunları ilki öğretmen günlüklerinde, ikincisi de grup tartışmalarında incelemiştir. Betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünme, doğası gereği "Öğretmen olarak ne yapıyorum?" yanıtını veren usule dayalı düşünmedir (Ho & Richards, 1993, s. 32). Bir dilbilgisi dersinin içeriğinin tanımı, betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmenin bir örneğidir. Öte yandan, eleştirel yansıtma "değerlendirme, kendi kendini analiz etme, teori oluşturma ve planlama" anlamına gelir (Ho & Richards 1993, s. 32). Sınıf gözleminin değeri hakkında bir fikir ifade etmek, eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmenin bir örneğidir. Eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmede gelişimin özellikleri ise Ho ve Richards'ta (1993, s. 35) şu şekilde listelenmiştir:

- eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme türlerinde daha fazla çeşitlilik,

- teorilere daha fazla yeni anlayış getirebilme,

- zaman aralıkları ve tecrübeler arasında daha fazla yansıtıcı düşünebilme,

- sınıfın ötesinde daha geniş bağlamları daha fazla göz önüne alma,

- hem pozitif hem de negatif olarak daha fazla değerlendirme yapabilme,

- öğretmen kaynaklı sorunları daha fazla çözebilme ve

- "neden" sorularına daha fazla odaklanma.

Bazı bilim insanlarına göre, eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmeden daha ağır basmaz. Örneğin, Watanabe (2016), "bir bireyin bu yansıtıcı düşünme seviyelerinde doğrusal bir şekilde hareket etmesinin" (s.32) pek mümkün olmadığını iddia etmektedir. Öğretmenlerin kariyerlerinin farklı aşamalarında odaklandıkları unsurlar, amaçlarına ve bağlamlarına göre değişebileceğinden, farklı zamanlardaki yansıtıcı düşünmenin farklı yönleri (geçmiş, iç dünya veya dış dünya) içerebileceğini de ekler ve "yansıtıcı düşünmenin 'nihai' aşaması yoktur, yalnızca farklı yolları vardır" (s.32) sonucuna varır. Aynı şekilde, yansıtıcı öğretmen olmak her zaman yansıtıcı olmak anlamına gelmez. Ölçü-Dinçer (2022), eskiden yansıtıcı olan ancak ulusal sınavlar, müfredat gereklilikleri ve siyasi sistem nedeniyle "pasif teknisyen" haline gelmek zorunda kalan bazı öğretmenleri bildirir ve "öğretmen rollerinin konumlandığı" ve öğretmenlerin bağlamsal ihtiyaçlara bağlı olarak kendilerini ayarlayabilecekleri sonucuna varır (s.331).

Öğretmenlerin yansıtıcı düşünmelerini, betimleyici ve eleştirel olmak üzere iki alt kategori açısından analiz eden çok az çalışma vardır. Örneğin, öğretmen adayları arasında yansıtıcı düşünmeyi teşvik etmek için blogları kullanan Yang (2009), betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmelerinin eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmelerinden daha fazla olduğunu bulmuş ve eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmede kolaylaştırıcı müdahalesinin rolünü vurgulamıştır. Başka bir araştırma, Farrell (2001) tarafından yapılan bir İngilizce öğretmeninin vaka çalışmasıdır. Bulguları, katılımcının düşüncelerinin çoğunlukla betimleyici olduğunu göstermiştir. Farrell'in (1999) kısmi bir tekrarı olan Liou (2001), öğretmen adaylarının eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmelerinin betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmelerinden daha fazla olduğunu ancak eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmede gelişme gösteremediklerini ortaya koydu. Bununla birlikte, hiçbiri söz sorunlarına dayalı yansıtıcı düşünme araştırmasına odaklanmamıştır. Türkiye bağlamında sadece yansıtıcı öğretimin öğretmen gelişimine faydalarını ortaya koyan araştırmalar (Kuru-Gönen, 2012; Şanal-Erginel, 2006; Şire, 2004) bulunmaktadır. Yeşilbursa (2008) ve Yeşilbursa (2011) yansıtıcı düşünme türlerini analiz etmiştir, ancak kendi geliştirdiği kategorileri kullanmıştır.

Bu vaka çalışması, üç İngilizce öğretmeninin mesleki gelişimlerinin bir parçası olarak eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmedeki gelişimlerinin yanı sıra, özellikle yazılı üretimdeki

söz sorunları üzerine yaptıkları betimleyici ve eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmelerini araştırarak literatüre katkıda bulunmayı amaçlamaktadır.

Araştırma Deseni

Bu çalışma, beş katılımcı ile çok araçlı bir vaka çalışması olarak tasarlanmıştır ve yalnızca üç katılımcının günlükleri, grup tartışmaları ve görüşmeleri aracılığıyla ortaya koyduğu yansıtıcı düşünme sürecine odaklanmaktadır. Keşfedici sıralı karma yöntem deseni, verileri önce nitel, sonra nicel olarak analiz etmeye yardımcı oldu.

Çalışma, biri ana eğitim dili İngilizce olan bölümlerin öğrencileri ve diğeri derslerinin %30'unu İngilizce olarak veren çeşitli bölümlerin öğrencileri için olmak üzere iki hazırlık programı yürüten bir devlet üniversitesinde gerçekleştirilmiştir. Bu araştırma 2017 yılının bahar döneminde yapıldığında, katılımcılar ikincisinde çalışıyorlardı.

Katılımcı seçme yöntemi kolay ulaşılabilir durum örneklemesidir. Katılımcıların mahremiyetini korumak için katılımcılar tarafından önerildiği üzere Süheyla, Ayhan ve Star takma adları kullanılmıştır.

Yansıtıcı Düşünme Konusu

Beş katılımcının aynı yolda ilerlemelerini sağlamak için ortak bir konu üzerinde düşünmeleri istendi. Bu nedenle süreç başlamadan önce bu katılımcılarla konunun belirlenmesi için bir toplantı yapılmıştır. Katılımcıların ilk kararları, gözlemlenmesi sözlü verilere göre daha pratik olacağından ve hem ders sırasında, hem de ders sonrası etkinliklerle geliştirilebileceğinden, öğrencilerin yazılı üretimlerini analiz etmek oldu.

Bu kurumdaki yazma derslerinde, öğrencilere seviyelerine göre düzenli olarak ortak bir konu verilir ve herhangi bir materyale ya da sözlüğe başvurmadan yazmaları istenir. Öğretmenler öğrencilerin metinlerini kontrol eder, düzeltme sembollerini kullanarak İngilizce kullanımı, içerik ve organizasyon hakkında yazılı geri bildirimde bulunur ve ardından metinleri notlandırır ve geri verir. Sonuç olarak öğrencilerden verilen konuları ciddiye almaları ve içerik açısından zengin metinler üretmeleri beklenmektedir. Bu nedenle katılımcılar bu metinlerden yazılı veri elde etmeye karar vermişlerdir. Ayrıca fazladan veri toplamak zorunda kalmayacakları için bu sürecin katılımcılar için pratik olması bekleniyordu.

Toplantının nihai sonucu analizin odak noktasıydı. Kurumdaki öğrencilere dilbilgisi konusunda yeterli alıştırma verildiğine, ancak kelime bilgisinin pekiştirilmediğine inandıklarından, katılımcılar yazılı üretimde söz yeterliliğine odaklanma konusunda fikir birliğine vardılar. Ayrıca söz sorunlarını anlam, eşdizimlilik ve sözcük oluşumu açısından tanımlamaya karar verdiler. Bu kategoriler, kullandıkları düzeltme sembollerinde bulunan söz alanındaki üç tür geribildirimden türetilmiştir: uygunsuz sözcük, eksik sözcük / fazla sözcük ve sözcük biçimi.

Yansıtıcı Düşünme Süreci

Öncesinde eğitim ve pilot uygulama olan 12 haftalık yansıtıcı düşünme süreci, beş kez tekrarlanan ve çeşitli yansıtıcı düşünme araçlarını içeren iki aşamalı prosedürleri içeriyordu. İlk aşamada katılımcılar, öğrencilerinin metinlerini analiz ederek söz sorunlarını teşhis ettiler. Her şeyden önce, ne tür problemlerin sıklıkla meydana geldiğini görmek için her bir söz sorunu türü (anlam, eşdizimlilik ve kelime oluşumu) için bir hata listesi yaptılar. Daha sonra kalıpları görmek, sonuç çıkarmak ve öğretimlerini buna göre şekillendirmek için listeleri incelediler. Katılımcılardan analizleri dikkate alarak İngilizce bir günlükte ve ardından grup tartışmasında sorunların nedenleri ve olası çözümleri üzerinde düşünmeleri istenmiştir. Görüşmeleri istedikleri gibi ofislerinde İngilizce olarak yaptılar ve ses kaydına aldılar.

İkinci aşamada amaç, sınıf uygulamaları üzerinde düşünmekti. Öğretmenlerden tespit edilen problemlerin üstesinden gelmek için etkinlik yaptıkları derslerde ses kaydı yapmaları istenmiştir. Dersleri kaydetmek için cep telefonlarını kullandılar. Ayrıca, her ihtimale karşı, sınıf uygulaması sırasında ya da hemen sonrasında not almaları veya fazladan kopya almaları önerildi. Her uygulamanın sonunda öğrencilerden küçük kartlara yazarak geri bildirim vermelerini istediler. Ses kayıtlarını ve öğrenci geri bildirimlerini inceledikten sonra, katılımcılar sorunların üstesinden gelmek için ne yaptıklarına ve ne gibi sonuçlar beklediklerine odaklanan İngilizce bir günlük yazısı daha yazdılar. Daha sonra araştırmacı tarafından aynı konuda birebir görüşme yapıldı. Yarı yapılandırılmış bir yaklaşımla açıklama ve detaylandırma amaçlı irdelemeler ile yapılan görüşmeler, tanıdık ve rahat bir ortam olarak katılımcının ofisinde İngilizce olarak yapıldı ve araştırmacı tarafından ses kaydı alındı.

Veri hem katılımcılar hem de araştırmacı tarafından saklanmıştır. Her işlemin sonunda, öğretmenler araştırmacıya öğrenciler tarafından yazılan metinlerin fotoğraflarını, hata listelerini, sınıf uygulamalarının ses kayıtlarını, öğrenci geri bildirim kartlarının fotoğraflarını, dijital veya el yazısı günlükleri ve grup tartışmalarının ses kayıtlarını verdi. Bu sayede araştırmacı süreci de izleyebilmiştir. Görüşmelerin ses kayıtları sadece araştırmacı tarafından saklanmıştır.

Veri Analizi

Ho ve Richards (1993) ve Farrell'de (1999) betimleyici ve eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme için sunulan sınıflandırmalar, günlükler, grup tartışmaları ve görüşmeler için verilen soruların içeriğiyle yakından örtüşmektedir; böylece bu sınıflandırmalar bu araştırma için uyarlanmış ve kodlanmıştır.

Katılımcıların günlüklerindeki, grup tartışmalarındaki ve görüşmelerdeki yansıtıcı düşünmelerinden elde edilen veriler SPSS 23 veri belgelerine manuel olarak girildi. Ana odak, katılımcıların yansıtıcı düşünmeyi nasıl yaptığı olduğundan, yansıtıcı düşünmenin temeli (yani öğrenciler tarafından yazılan metinler, hata listeleri, sınıf uygulamalarının ses kayıtları ve öğrenci geri bildirimleri) analize dahil edilmedi. Daha sonra, Betimleyici İstatistikler kullanılarak frekans sayıları ve yüzdeleri elde edildi.

Araştırmanın nitel kısmı için, sonuçlar örüntüleri ve nedenlerini bulmak amacıyla incelenmiştir. Her şeyden önce, genel sonuçlar, betimleyici ve eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme açısından karşılaştırılarak sunulmuştur. Daha sonra, sonuçlar betimleyici ve eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme konularına göre derinlemesine analiz edilmiştir. Son olarak, Farrell'de (1999) sunulan eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmede gelişimin yedi özelliğini aradık ve Ho ve Richards'ın (1993) yaptığı gibi ilk ve son prosedürde her özelliğin yüzdesini karşılaştırdık.

Nitel verileri bir noktaya kadar genelleştirebilmek için istatistiksel bir test olan tek yönlü uyum iyiliği ki-kare kullanılmıştır. Test, sonuçların .05'teki alfa seviyesi için istatistik açıdan anlamlı olup olmadığını gösterdi ve bulunan kalıpları açıkladı.

Verilerin %10'u bağımsız bir araştırmacı tarafından kodlanarak veri kodlamanın güvenilirliği artırıldı. Anlaşma sayısı / toplam anlaşma sayısı + anlaşmazlık (Miles & Huberman, 1994, s. 64) şeklinde hesaplanan güvenirlik formülü iki kodlayıcı arasında %92 uyum olduğunu ortaya çıkardı.

Sonuçlar

Süheyla'nın yansıtıcı düşünmesinin genel bir analizi, Ho ve Richards (1993) ve Farrell'deki (1999) konuların %83'üne atıfta bulunduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bu konuların dağılımı tek yönlü uyum iyiliği ki-kare testi sonuçlarına göre istatistik açıdan anlamlıdır (x^2= 734.609, df= 23, p=.000). Ki-kare sonuçlarına göre, istatistik açıdan beklenen düzeyden daha sık dokuz konu dile getirildi. İlk üçü öğrencilerin sorunları, bir yaklaşım veya prosedür ve derslerin olumlu değerlendirilmesiydi. Eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmenin, yüksek konu çeşitliliğinin (%90) yanı sıra, betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmeden (%31) daha yüksek frekansa (%69) sahip olduğu ortaya çıktı. Betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmede gözlemlenen bu düşük frekanstan bağımsız olarak, konu çeşitliliği yarıdan fazlaydı (%67). Katılımcı, betimleyici konulara özellikle görüşmelerde ve sınıf içi uygulamalarla ilgili günlüklerde değindi. Bir yaklaşım/prosedür ve bir inanç/kanı, istatistik açıdan beklenenden daha sık kullandığı betimleyici konulardır. Süheyla'nın eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmesi her tür araçta, ancak çoğunlukla görüşmeler ve grup tartışmalarında gözlemlendi. İstatistiksel olarak Süheyla, yedi eleştirel konuya beklenenden daha sık değinmiş ve ilk ikisi (öğrencilerin sorunları ve derslere yönelik olumlu değerlendirmeler) diğerlerine göre çok daha yaygın kullanılmıştır. Süheyla'nın eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmede gelişimi açısından, uzman ve kendi kuramlarının tartışılmasında, eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme özelliklerinin çeşitliliğinde, hem olumlu hem de olumsuz olarak değerlendirebilmede, sınıfın ötesinde daha geniş bağlamlara geçebilmede ve öğretim deneyimi yoluyla yansıtıcı düşünebilme özelliklerinde artış gözlemlenmiştir.

Ayhan'ın yansıtıcı düşünmesine genel bir bakış, Ho ve Richards (1993) ve Farrell'deki (1999) konuların %76'sına atıfta bulunduğunu göstermektedir. Bu konuların dağılımı tek yönlü uyum iyiliği ki-kare testi sonuçlarına göre istatistik açıdan anlamlıdır (x^2= 641.945, df= 21, p=.000). Ki-kare sonuçlarına göre, dokuz konu istatistik açıdan beklenen düzeyden daha sık dile getirildi. En yaygın üç konu, bir yaklaşım veya prosedür, bir inanç/kanı ve derslerin olumlu değerlendirilmesiydi. Sonuçlar, hem eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmede (%75) hem de betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmede (%78) konu çeşitliliğinin oldukça fazla olduğunu göstermektedir. Eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünme (%56) betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmeden (%44) daha fazla olmasına rağmen frekansları çok yakındı. Bu öğretmen, betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmeyi en çok görüşmelerde ve grup tartışmalarında

kullanmıştır. İstatistiksel olarak beklenenden daha sık bahsettiği üç betimleyici konu, bir yaklaşım/prosedür, bir inanç/kanı ve dersin içeriği idi. Ayhan'ın eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmesi her tür araçta, ancak çoğunlukla görüşmeler ve grup tartışmalarında gözlemlendi. Ayhan yedi eleştirel konuyu istatistik açıdan beklenenden daha sık kullandı ve ilk ikisi derslere ilişkin olumlu değerlendirmeler ve öğrenci sorunları idi. Ayhan'ın eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmedeki gelişimi açısından, uzman ve kendi kuramlarının tartışılmasında ve öğretim deneyimi yoluyla yansıtıcı düşünebilme özelliklerinde artış gözlenmiştir.

Star'ın yansıtıcı düşünmesine genel bir bakış, onun Ho ve Richards (1993) ve Farrell'daki (1999) konuların %72'sine atıfta bulunduğunu ortaya koymaktadır. Bu konuların dağılımı tek yönlü uyum iyiliği ki-kare testi sonuçlarına göre istatistik açıdan anlamlıdır (x^2= 463.269, df= 20, p=.000). Ki-kare sonuçlarına göre sekiz konu istatistik açıdan beklenen düzeyden daha sık dile getirilmiştir. En yaygın üç konu, derslerin olumlu değerlendirilmesi, bir yaklaşım veya prosedür ve öğrencilerin arka plan bilgileriydi. Katılımcının eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmesinin konu çeşitliliğinin (%80) fazla olduğu ve frekansının (%71) betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmesinin frekansından (%29) çok daha yüksek olduğu bulundu. Bu düşük sıklığa rağmen, betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmesinin konularının çeşitliliği yarıdan biraz fazlaydı (%56). Star'ın betimleyici yansıtıcı düşünmesi çoğunlukla görüşmelerde ve grup tartışmalarında bulundu. İstatistiksel olarak, beklenenden daha sık kullandığı iki betimleyici konu bir yaklaşım/prosedür ve bir inanç/kanı idi. Star'ın eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmesi her tür araçta, ancak çoğunlukla görüşmeler ve grup tartışmalarında gözlemlendi. İstatistiksel olarak, Star bu konulardan yedisini beklenenden daha sık dile getirdi. İlk ikisi, derslerin olumlu değerlendirilmesi ve öğrencilerin arka plan bilgileriydi. Star'ın eleştirel yansıtıcı düşünmedeki gelişimi açısından, öğretim deneyimi yoluyla yansıtıcı düşünebilme, sınıfın ötesinde daha geniş bağlamlara geçebilme ve uzman ve kendi kuramlarını tartışabilmede bir artış gözlendi.

Tartışma

Süheyla'nın bu araştırma sırasındaki yansıtıcı düşünmesi, onun öğretmenliği hakkında bazı bilgiler verdi. Her şeyden önce, öğrencilerin kelime dağarcığını zenginleştirmek ve yaygın sorunları çözmek için yapmaya karar verdiği şey, çevrimiçi bir eşdizim sözlüğünü sınıf uygulamasının bir parçası olarak kullanmaktı. Bu yeni

etkinlik, sınıfa doğru kelime kombinasyonlarıyla güvenilir ve pratik bir kaynak getirmenin yanı sıra titiz bir hazırlık süreci gerektirdi. İkinci nokta onun çok boyutlu bakış açısıdır. Örneğin, Yeşilbursa'daki (2008) bulgulara benzer şekilde, öğretmenin gözlem ve değerlendirmeleri sadece derslere değil, aynı zamanda öğrencilere ve öğretmenin kendisine de odaklanmıştır. Ayrıca, Süheyla öğrencilerin arka plan bilgilerini sunduğunda bunu akademik geçmiş ve ruh hali olmak üzere iki açıdan yaptı. Öğretmenin çok boyutlu bakış açısı eylem planlarında da kendini gösteriyordu. Ayrıca Süheyla olumlu bir öğretmen olarak öğrencilerin "heyecanlı" ya da "istekli" olduklarında ruh hallerini gözlemlemede başarılıydı. Çözüm odaklı yaklaşımı da benzer şekilde olağanüstüydü çünkü Richards ve Farrell (2005)'te bahsedildiği gibi sorumluluk almasına ve özerklik kazanmasına yardımcı oldu. Süheyla'nın öğretimi ile ilgili bir diğer dikkat çekici nokta, sınıfın ötesindeki arka plan faktörlerinin farkında olmasıdır. Daha net olmak gerekirse, katılımcı tekrarlayan sorunlardaki kalıpları fark etti ve alternatif sunum yolları bulabilmesi veya bir eylem planına karar verebilmesi için sorunların köklerini belirledi. Son olarak, "daha hoşgörülü", "daha mutlu", "daha ilgili" ve "gururlu" hale gelen bir öğretmen olarak Süheyla İngilizce öğretmeni olarak mesleki gelişim yolculuğundan memnun gibi görünmektedir (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Bu sonuçlar, Süheyla'nın uzman bir öğretmen olduğunu ve yansıtıcı uygulamadaki üç önemli tutuma (içtenlik, açık fikirlilik ve sorumluluk) sahip olduğunu ima etmektedir.

Yansıtıcı düşünme sürecinde Ayhan'ın öğretmenliğine ilişkin içgörüler, bazı ayırt edici nitelikleri ortaya koymaktadır. İlk olarak, kelime öğretimi veya öğrenimi üzerinde düşünürken üretken becerilerin ve dilbilgisinin öne çıkan rolü, onun dil kullanımına verdiği önemi gösteriyordu. İkinci olarak Ayhan'ın olumlu tutumu dikkat çekiciydi. Öğrencilerin ve öğretmenin sorunları sık karşılaşılan konular olmasına rağmen hem öğrenciler hem de öğretmenler hakkında olumlu değerlendirmeler bunlardan daha fazlaydı. "İyi bir gözlemci" olarak öğrencilerin ruh halleri, performansları ve tutumları hakkındaki ayrıntıları keşfetmenin yanı sıra Ayhan, kelime öğrenme konusundaki kendi deneyimlerini sıklıkla yansıttı. Ayrıca, öğretimle ilgili gözlemlerinin birçoğunda "biz" öznesi yer almıştır. Bu, Bailey'de (1997) belirtildiği gibi yansıtıcı düşünmenin profesyonel diyaloga faydaları, Richards ve Farrell'de (2005) belirtildiği gibi sahiplenme duygusu ve/veya büyük bağlamı dikkate alma yeteneği ile ilgili olabilir. Ayhan'ın öğretimi ile ilgili bir diğer dikkat çekici nokta ise, çalışmanın başında Ayhan'ın kelime

öğretme-kelime öğrenme ikilemini sorgulamasıdır. Bunun cevabı üçüncü grup tartışmasında "Kelime bilgisi öğrencilerin öğrenmesi gereken bir şey, öğretmenlerin öğretmesi gereken bir şey değil… Belki öğretmenlerin öğrencilerinin bir şeyler öğrenmelerine yardımcı olabileceği bazı şeyler ya da bazı kısımlar vardır" şeklinde ifade edilmiştir. Öğretmenlerin bunu nasıl yapabileceklerinin ayrıntıları, katılımcının uygulama aşamasında kullandığı üretime dayalı çeşitli etkinliklerde ve paylaştığı söz stratejileri yelpazesinde ortaya çıktı. Ayrıca Ayhan'ın mesleki gelişim konusundaki tutumu, "daha iyi bir öğretmen" olma niyetinde kendini göstermiştir. Bu açıdan öğretmenin "deneme ve keşfetme" hevesi de dikkat çekicidir. Sık sık "bazı yeni yollar aradı" veya bir aktiviteyi ilk kez denedi, bu da yeni seçenekleri test etme konusundaki güvenini geliştirmesine yardımcı olmuş olabilir. "Meraklı olma", araştırma yapma ve fikir paylaşma eğilimi sayesinde kendisine, meslektaşına ve araştırmacıya bazı sorular sordu. Çok sık kullanmasa da Ayhan öğretimle ilgili düşündürücü sorular da sordu. Ayrıca, sınırlamaları sorguladı. Bu sorular öğretmeni, teknik becerilerden ziyade ilkelere odaklanıp mevcut durumu, değerleri ve alternatifleri sınırlamalarını göz önünde bulundurarak araştırmaya teşvik eder. Sonuçlar, Ayhan'ın uzman bir öğretmen olduğunu ve içtenliğin, açık fikirliliğin ve sorumluluğun Ayhan'ın öğretmenliğinin bir parçası olduğunu gösteriyor.

Star'ın bu araştırma sırasındaki yansıtıcı düşünmesi, öğretisine dair bazı bilgiler verdi. Başlangıç olarak, öğretmen sınıfta "doğal" olmaya değer verdiği için sınıf içi etkinlikleri "görev gibi" yapmaktan hoşlanmadığı görüldü. Öğretmenliğiyle ilgili bir diğer önemli detay ise, olumlu bir öğretmen olarak Star'ın öğrencilerin "heyecanlı", "ilgili" veya "istekli" olduklarında onların ruh hallerini fark etmede başarılı olmasıdır. Star, mesleki gelişime dair tutumu sayesinde, daha önce "farkında olmadığı" "sınıfta yaptığı şeylerin çoğuna" farkındalığını artırdı. Bu nedenle Star, çalışmadaki yansıtıcı süreci "faydalı" buldu, çünkü "zaten kafasında planladığı ve gerçekten yapmak istediği şeylerin çoğunu denemek" artık mümkündü ve öğretmeyi öğrenmede "en iyi yol kullanmaktır" diye düşünmekteydi. Bu süreçte daha önceki deneyimlerinin, çeşitli kaynakların, meslektaşlarının, öğrencilerinin ve mesleki gelişim faaliyetlerinin, onun mesleki bilgisinin şekillenmesinde katkılarını da kabul etti. Bu bulgular, Star'ın uzman bir öğretmen olarak mesleki gelişiminden memnun göründüğünü ve yansıtıcı

uygulamadaki üç hayati tutuma (içtenlik, açık fikirlilik ve sorumluluk) sahip olduğunu ima etmektedir.

Sonuç

Yansıtıcı uygulama, bu katılımcıların yansıtıcı düşünmelerinde de gözlemlenebilen çeşitli özelliklere sahip, uzun vadeli ve zorlu bir süreçtir. İlk olarak, kendi bağlamlarından gelen verileri sistematik bir şekilde araştırarak (Bartlett, 1990; Farrell, 2020; Rodgers, 2002), gerçekliğin kendilerine ait versiyonlarını oluşturdular (Pritchard & Woollard, 2010), bu da bilinçli kararlara ve teori ve uygulamanın biraraya getirilmesine yol açtı (Farrell, 2020; Pultorak, 1996; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Rodgers, 2002; Tsui, 2009). İkincisi, öğretmenler başkalarıyla (öğrencileri ve meslektaşlarıyla) iş birliği yaptı (Farrell, 2020; Rodgers, 2002), böylece sınıftaki rollerini, öğrencilerinin bu noktadaki beklentilerini ve bu ikisi arasındaki farklılıkları inceleyebildiler (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Üçüncüsü, katılımcılar "çözülecek soruna ilgi" (Bartlett, 1990, s.207) ve "kendilerinin ve başkalarının kişisel ve entelektüel gelişimine değer veren tutumlar" (Rodgers, 2002, s. 845) sergilediler. Buna ek olarak, katılımcılar öğrencilerin hatalarıyla karşılaştıklarında "(…) dan başka bir şey değil" türünde akıl yürütmeden (Kelly, 1991, s. 108) kaçınmışlardır. Öğretmenler otomatik olarak olumsuz yanıtlar vermek yerine, bunlar üzerinde düşündüler ve hatta ne kadar yardımcı olabileceklerini keşfettiler. Ek olarak, bu araştırmadaki araçlar eylem üzerine yansıtıcı düşünmeyi içerse de katılımcıların sınıf uygulamalarına ilişkin açıklamaları, eylem sırasında yansıtıcı düşünme (Schön, 1983) örneklerini de ortaya çıkardı. Son olarak, katılımcılar yansıtıcı öğretimi "yapmanın, düşünmenin ve ne yapacağını bilmenin bir uyumu" (Freeman, 1996'dan aktaran Bailey, 1997) olarak deneyimlemişlerdir. Tüm bu ortak noktalara rağmen, katılımcıların yansıtıcı düşünmeleri arasında bireysel farklılıklar vardı ve bu da "yansıtıcı düşünmede 'son' aşama olmadığı, yalnızca yansıtıcı düşünmenin farklı yolları olduğu" (Watanabe, 2016, s.32) sonucuna götürdü.

A CASE STUDY OF REFLECTIVE PRACTICES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS

EXTENDED ABSTRACT

Introduction

Learning to teach is "a long-term, complex, developmental process" (Freeman & Johnson 1998, p. 402). During this process teachers might be unaware of some incidents; however, reflection-on-action can help them realize what is happening and why by investigating their own context, integrating theory and practice, and thus enhancing teacher learning. With a sequential exploratory mixed methods design, this case study aims to investigate descriptive and critical reflection of three EFL teachers based on data from journals, peer discussions, audio records of lessons, student feedback, and interviews. The study aims to answer these research questions:

1. What type of reflection (descriptive or critical) do English teachers commonly use?

2. What kind of descriptive reflection do English teachers employ? What kind of critical reflection do English teachers employ?

3. Does this process develop the use of critical reflection over time?

Literature Review

Teachers have a vital role in language education as practitioners of programs. Thus, teacher development has benefits not only for the teacher but also for the institution and the students. Firstly, it brings senior positions, better performance, and enhanced retention for the teacher. In the institution, it improves learning outcomes and its success and popularity. Finally, the level of student learning is enhanced (Richards & Farrell, 2005).

Adopting either an outsider or insider approach, teacher development programs can help teachers to improve in specific areas. Outsider approaches value knowledge outside the institution, especially knowledge of experts based on general theories and principles (Richards & Farrell, 2005). These approaches have content-based pre-determined programs, ready-made solutions, and short-term results (Yaman, 2004). On

the other hand, insider approaches prioritize institutional knowledge in order to promote self-directed learning. They enable teachers to analyze their own contexts and construct their own knowledge and understanding of their classroom practices (Richards & Farrell, 2005).

Reflection has a significant role in teacher development as it enables teachers to "integrate the two processes, 'practicalizing theoretical knowledge' and 'theorizing practical knowledge'" (Tsui, 2009, p. 432). They can do this through investigation of their own practice based on data from their classrooms and the changes they make based on this investigation (Gün, 2010). In this way, teachers "can gain new insight of their practice" (Farrell, 2016, p. 224). Farrell (2011) reported how a novice ESL teacher benefited from moving from a "descriptive reflective phase" to "a more critical stance on her practice" since "she could now make an informed decision about certain aspects of her teaching … and as a result there is more of a convergence of her beliefs and classroom practices" (p. 272).

Reflection is classified in different ways. Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999) presented subcategories of critical and descriptive reflection and explored them in teachers' journals and group discussions respectively. Descriptive reflection is procedural in nature answering, 'What do I do as a teacher?' (Ho & Richards, 1993, p. 32). Description of the content of a grammar lesson is an example of descriptive reflection. On the other hand, critical reflection refers to "evaluation, self-analysis, theory building, and planning" (Ho & Richards 1993, p. 32). Expressing an opinion about the value of classroom observation is an example of critical reflection. Traits of development in critical reflectivity are also listed in Ho and Richards (1993) as (1) "a greater variety of types of critical reflectivity", (2) "being more able to come up with new understanding of theories", (3) "being more able to reflect across time span and experiences", (4) "being more able to go beyond the classroom to broader contexts", (5) "being more able to evaluate both positively and negatively", (6) "being more able to solve problems by the teacher", and (7) "being more focused on "why" questions" (p. 35). They found no great change in the participants' degree of critical reflectivity, and they suggested training teachers in reflective writing.

For some scholars, critical reflection does not outweigh descriptive reflection. For instance, Watanabe (2016) claims it is unlikely "for an individual to move in the linear fashion through these levels of reflectivity" (p.32). She adds that because the elements teachers focus on at different stages of their career might vary based on their goals and context, reflection at different times might involve different directions – the past, inner world, or outer world. As she concludes, "there is no 'final' stage of reflection, only varying ways to reflect" (p.32). In the same vein, being a reflective teacher does not mean being reflective all the time. Ölçü-Dinçer (2022) reports some teachers who used to be reflective but had to turn into a "passive technician" because of national exams, curricular requirements, and the political system. She concludes that "teacher roles are situated", and teachers can adjust themselves depending on the contextual needs (p.331).

There are very few studies that analyze teachers' reflection in terms of the two subcategories – descriptive and critical. For instance, using blogs to promote reflection among pre-service teachers, Yang (2009) found their descriptive reflection outnumbered their critical reflection and emphasized the role of facilitator intervention in critical reflection. Another research is a case study by Farrell (2001) of an EFL teacher. His findings showed that the participant's reflections were mostly descriptive. A partial replication of Farrell's (1999), Liou (2001) revealed that pre-service teachers were able to do more critical than descriptive reflection but failed to show development in critical reflection. However, none focused on investigation of reflection based on lexical problems. In Turkish context there are only studies that revealed the benefits of reflective teaching (Kuru-Gönen, 2012; Şanal-Erginel, 2006; Şire, 2004) for teacher development. Yeşilbursa (2008) and Yeşilbursa (2011) analyzed types of reflection but using categories she developed herself.

This case study aims to contribute to literature by investigating three EFL teachers' descriptive and critical reflection, specifically on lexical problems in written production, besides their development in critical reflectivity as part of their professional development.

Research Design

This study is designed as a multiple instrumental case study that focuses on three participants' reflection process revealed through their journals, peer discussions and

interviews. A sequential exploratory mixed methods design helped to analyze the data first qualitatively and then quantitatively.

The study took place at a state university which runs two EFL preparatory programs: one for students of departments whose main medium of instruction is English, and another for students of various departments which provide 30 % of their courses in English. When this research was conducted in spring semester in 2017, the participants were working in the latter.

The method of participant selection was convenience sampling. In order to protect participants' privacy, we used pseudonyms, Süheyla, Ayhan, and Star, suggested by the participants.

The Reflection Topic

The participants were required to reflect on a common topic in order to keep them on the same track. For this reason, before the process started a meeting was held with these participants to specify the topic. Their first decision was to analyze students' written production as it would be more practical for the participants to observe than spoken data and could be improved through activities both during and after class.

During writing classes in the institution, the students are regularly given a common task according to their level and asked to write without consulting any materials or dictionaries. The teachers check students' texts, give written feedback on use of English, content, and organization using correction symbols, and then they grade the texts and return them. As a result, the students are supposed to take the tasks seriously and produce texts rich in content. This is why the participants decided to obtain written data from these texts. Moreover, this process was expected to be practical for the participants as they would not have to do extra work to collect data.

The final outcome of the meeting was the focus of analysis. As they believe the students in the institution are provided with sufficient practice on grammar but not vocabulary, the participants agreed to focus on lexical competence in written production. They also decided to define lexical problems as those related to meaning, collocations, and word formation. These categories were derived from the three types of lexical feedback included in the correction symbols they use – inappropriate word, missing word / redundant word and word form.

The Reflection Process

Preceded by training and piloting, the 12-week reflection process included two-phase procedures repeated five times and involved a variety of reflective tools. In the first phase, the participants diagnosed their students' lexical problems by analyzing their texts. First of all, they made a list of errors for each type of lexical problem (meaning, collocations, and word formation) to see what kind of problems occurred frequently. Then, they examined the lists to see the patterns, draw conclusions, and shape their teaching accordingly. Considering their analyses, the participants were asked to reflect on the causes of the problems and possible solutions in a journal in English and then in a peer discussion. They held the discussions in their offices, as they preferred, in English and audio recorded them.

In the second phase the aim was to reflect on classroom practice. The teachers were asked to audio-record classes in which they did an activity to overcome the diagnosed problems. They used their mobile phones to record the lessons. They were also recommended to take notes or extra copies while/immediately after the classroom practice just in case. At the end of each practice, they asked the students to give feedback on small cards. After examining the audio-records and the student feedback, the participants wrote another journal entry in English focusing on what they had done to overcome the problems and what outcomes they had expected. Then, they were interviewed one-on-one by the researcher on the same topic. With a semi-structured approach and relevant probes for clarification and elaboration, the interviews were conducted in English in the participant's office as a familiar comfortable setting and audio recorded by the researcher.

The data were stored both by the participants and the researcher. At the end of each procedure, the teachers gave the researcher photos of the texts written by students, lists of mistakes, audio-records of classroom practice, photos of student feedback cards, digital or handwritten journals, and audio-records of peer discussions. In this way, the researcher was also able to monitor the process. The audio-records of the interviews were only stored by the researcher.

Data Analysis

The taxonomies for descriptive and critical reflection presented in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999) coincide closely with the content of the questions provided for the journals, peer discussions, and interviews; thus, they were adapted and coded for this research.

The data from the participants' reflections in the journals, peer discussions, and interviews were entered manually on SPSS 23 data sets. As the main focus was how the participants reflect, the basis for reflection (i.e., texts written by students, lists of mistakes, audio-records of classroom practice, and student feedback) was not included in the analysis. Next, frequency counts and percentages were obtained using Descriptive Statistics.

For the qualitative part of the study, the results were examined to find out the patterns and reasons for them. First of all, the overall results were presented contrasting descriptive and critical reflection. Next, the results were analyzed in depth according to the topics for descriptive and critical reflection. Finally, we searched for the seven traits of development in critical reflection presented in Farrell (1999) and compared the percentage of each trait in the first and last procedure as Ho and Richards (1993) did.

To be able to generalize the qualitative data, to a certain extent, a statistical test, one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square, was used. The test showed if the results were statistically significant for the alpha level at .05, and explained the patterns found.

Reliability of data coding was improved by having 10% of the data coded by an independent researcher. The result of the reliability formula, number of agreements / total number of agreements + disagreements (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 64), revealed 92% concurrence between the two coders.

Results

An overall analysis of Süheyla's reflection reveals that she referred to 83% of the topics in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999). The distribution of these topics is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 734.609, df= 23, p=.000). According to chi-square results, nine topics were mentioned more frequently than the statistically expected level. The top three were students'

problems, an approach or procedure, and positive evaluations of lessons. Besides a great variety of topics (90%) her critical reflection (69%) far outnumbered her descriptive reflection (31%). Regardless of this low frequency, the variety of the topics was over half (67%) in her descriptive reflection. She referred to descriptive topics especially in interviews and journals on classroom practice. An approach/procedure and a belief/conviction are the descriptive topics she used more frequently than statistically expected. Süheyla's critical reflection could be observed in all types of instruments but mostly in interviews and peer discussions. Statistically, Süheyla referred to seven critical topics more frequently than expected, and the top two, students' problems and positive evaluations of lessons, were much more prevalent than the others. In terms of Süheyla's development in critical reflection, an increase was observed in discussing theories of expert and own, variety of traits of critical reflection, being able to evaluate both positively and negatively, being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, and being able to reflect through teaching experience.

A global look at Ayhan's reflection shows that he referred to 76% of the topics in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999). The distribution of these topics is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 641.945, df= 21, p=.000). According to chi-square results, nine topics were mentioned more frequently than the statistically expected level. The three most common topics were an approach or procedure, a belief/conviction, and positive evaluations of lessons. Results show quite a high variety of topics in both her critical reflection (75%) and descriptive reflection (78%). Although critical reflection (56 %) outnumbered descriptive reflection (44%), their frequencies were very close. The teacher used descriptive reflection mostly in interviews and peer discussions. The three descriptive topics he mentioned more frequently than statistically expected were an approach/procedure, a belief/conviction, and the content of the lesson. Ayhan's critical reflection could be observed in all types of instruments but mostly in interviews and peer discussions. Statistically, Ayhan used seven critical topics more frequently than expected, and the top two were positive evaluations of lessons and students' problems. In terms of Ayhan's development in critical reflection, an increase was observed in discussing theories of expert and own and being able to reflect through teaching experience.

A global look at Star's reflection reveals that she referred to 72% of the topics in Ho and Richards (1993) and Farrell (1999). The distribution of these topics is statistically significant according to one-way goodness-of-fit chi-square test results (x^2= 463.269, df= 20, p=.000). According to chi-square results, eight topics were mentioned more frequently than the statistically expected level. Three most common topics were positive evaluations of lessons, an approach or procedure, and the learners' background information. With a great variety of topics (80%) her critical reflection (71 %) far outnumbered her descriptive reflection (29 %). Despite this low frequency, the variety of the topics was just over half (56%) in her descriptive reflection. Star's descriptive reflection was found mostly in interviews and peer discussions. Statistically the two descriptive topics that she used more frequently than expected were an approach/procedure and a belief/conviction. Star's critical reflection could be observed in all types of instruments but mostly in interviews and peer discussions. Statistically, Star mentioned seven of these topics more frequently than expected. The top two were positive evaluations of lessons and the learners' background information. In terms of Star's development in critical reflection, an increase was observed in being able to reflect through teaching experience, being able to go beyond the classroom to greater context, and discussing theories of expert and own.

Discussion

Süheyla's reflection during this research provided some insights into her teaching. First of all, what she decided to do to enrich the students' vocabulary and solve common problems was to use an online collocation dictionary as part of her classroom practice. As well as bringing a reliable and practical resource with right word combinations to the classroom, this new activity required meticulous preparation on the teacher's side. The second point is her multi-dimensional perspective. For example, the teacher's observations and evaluations focused not only on the lessons but also on the students and the teacher herself, which is similar to the findings in Yeşilbursa (2008). Besides, when Süheyla presented learners' background information, she did this in two ways – academic background and mood. The teacher's multi-dimensional perspective was also evident in her plans of action. Moreover, as a teacher with a positive attitude, Süheyla was good at observing the students' mood when they were "excited" or "eager". Her solution-oriented approach was similarly outstanding because it helped her to shoulder responsibility and

gain autonomy (as mentioned in Richards & Farrell, 2005). Another noteworthy point about Süheyla's teaching is her awareness of background factors beyond the classroom. To be more specific, she noticed patterns in recurrent problems and identified their roots so that she could find alternative ways of presentation or decide on a plan of action. Finally, as a teacher who became "more tolerant", "happier", "more interested", and "proud" of herself, Süheyla seemed to be satisfied with her professional development journey as an EFL teacher as mentioned in (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). These results imply that Süheyla is an expert teacher and has the three important attitudes in reflective practice – whole-heartedness, open-mindedness, and responsibility.

Insights into Ayhan's teaching during the reflective process reveal some distinctive qualities. To begin with, the prominent role of productive skills and grammar while reflecting on teaching or learning vocabulary indicated the importance that he attached to language use. Secondly, Ayhan's positive attitude was remarkable. Although students' and the teacher's problems were both frequent topics, positive evaluations about both students and teachers outnumbered them. In addition to discovering details about the students' mood, performance, and attitudes as "a good observer", Ayhan frequently reflected on his own experience in learning vocabulary. Besides, many of his observations about teaching involved "we" as the subject. This might be related to the benefits of reflection for professional dialogue as mentioned in Bailey (1997), the feeling of ownership as indicated in Richards and Farrell (2005), and/or his ability to consider the big context. Another noteworthy point about his teaching is that at the beginning of the study, Ayhan questioned learning vocabulary versus teaching vocabulary. In the third peer discussion the answer was expressed as, "Vocabulary is something that students should learn, it is not something teachers should teach… Maybe there are some things or there are some parts in which teachers can help their students learn something". The details of how teachers can do this were revealed in the variety of productive tasks he used during the practice phase and the range of lexical strategies he shared. Moreover, Ayhan's attitude to professional development was manifested in his intention to be "a better teacher". In this respect, the teacher's enthusiasm for "experimentation and exploration" is also noteworthy. He often "look[ed] for some new ways" or tried an activity for the first time, which might have helped him improve his confidence in testing new options. Thanks to his tendency to "be inquisitive", do research, and share ideas, he

asked some questions to himself, his peer, and the researcher. Although he did not use them very frequently, Ayhan asked some thought-provoking questions about teaching. Furthermore, he questioned the limitations. These questions encourage the teacher to investigate the current situation, values, and alternatives along with their limitations focusing on the principles rather than technical skills. The results imply that Ayhan is an expert teacher, and whole-heartedness, open-mindedness, and responsibility seem to be part of Ayhan's teaching.

Star's reflection during this research provided some insights into her teaching. To start with, as the teacher valued being "natural" in the classroom, she seemed to dislike doing classroom activities "like a duty". Another important detail about her teaching is that as a positive teacher, Star was good at noticing the students' mood when they were "excited", "interested" or "eager". Thanks to her attitude towards professional development, Star raised her awareness of "most of the things [she had] been doing in the class" as she had not "realize[d] [she had] been doing them". Thus, Star found the reflective process in the study "helpful" since "trying most of the things [she had] already planned in [her] mind and [she] really wanted to do" was now possible and she believed "using is the best way" in learning to teach. During this process she also acknowledged the contribution of her previous experience, various resources, her peers and students, and professional development activities in shaping her professional knowledge. These findings imply that Star seemed to be satisfied with her professional development as an expert teacher and that she has the three vital attitudes in reflective practice – whole-heartedness, open-mindedness, and responsibility.

Conclusion

Reflective practice is a long-term and demanding process with various features which could be observed in the participants' reflections. First, they built their own versions of reality (Pritchard & Woollard, 2010) through investigation of data from their own context in a systematic way (Bartlett, 1990; Farrell, 2020; Rodgers, 2002), which led to informed decisions and convergence of theory and practice (Farrell, 2020; Pultorak, 1996; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Rodgers, 2002; Tsui, 2009). Second, the teachers collaborated with others – their students and peers (Farrell, 2020; Rodgers, 2002), so they were able to examine their role in the classroom, their students' expectations in this

respect, and differences between these two (Richards & Lockhart, 1996). Third, the participants displayed "interest in the problem to be resolved" (Bartlett, 1990, p.207) and "attitudes that value the personal and intellectual growth of oneself and of others" (Rodgers, 2002, p. 845). In addition, the participants avoided "nothing-but type of reasoning" (Kelly, 1991, p. 108) when they faced students' mistakes. Rather than giving automatically negative responses, the teachers reflected on them and even discovered how helpful they could be. In addition, although the instruments in this research involved reflection-on-action, the participants' accounts of their classroom practices also revealed instances of reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983). Last but not least, the participants experienced reflective teaching as "a harmony of doing, thinking, and knowing what to do" (Freeman, 1996 cited in Bailey, 1997). Despite all these common points, there were individual differences between the participants' reflections, which leads to the conclusion that "there is no 'final' stage of reflection, only varying ways to reflect" (Watanabe, 2016, p.32).

REFERENCES

Bailey, K. M. (1997). Reflective teaching: Situating our stories. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, *7*(1), 1-19.

Bartlett, L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J.C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 202-214). Cambridge University Press.

Borg, S. (2011). Language teacher education. In J. Simpson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 235-248). Routledge.

Collins, I., & Gün, B. (2019). CPD and accreditation of EFL programs: A quasi-symbiotic relationship. In D. F. Staub (Ed.), *Quality assurance and accreditation in foreign language education* (pp. 167-178). Springer.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Pearson Education.

Dewey, J. (1910, reprinted in 2010). *How we think*. D.C. Heath & Co.

Farrell, T. S. C. (1999). Reflective practice in an EFL teacher development group. *System*, *27*(2), 157-172. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00014-7

Farrell, T. S. C. (2001). Tailoring reflection to individual needs. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 27*, 23–38. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607470120042528

Farrell, T. S. C. (2011). "Keeping SCORE": Reflective practice through classroom observations. *RELC Journal: A Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 42*(3), 265–272. https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688211419396

Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Promoting teacher reflection in second language education: A framework for TESOL professionals*. New York: Routledge.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2018). *Research on reflective practice in TESOL*. Routledge.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2020). *Reflective teaching* (Revised Edition). *TESOL Press*.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(3), 397-417. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588114

Gün, B. (2010). Quality self-reflection through reflection training. *ELT journal*, *65*(2), 126-135.https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq040

Hewson, C. (2006). Mixed methods research. In V. Jupp (Ed.), *The Sage dictionary of social research methods* (pp.179-181). Sage.

Ho, B., & Richards, J. C. (1993). Reflective thinking through teacher journal writing: Myths and realities. *Prospect*, *8*(3), 7-24. https://search.informit.org/doi/10.3316/aeipt.67855

Hunt, C. (1998). Learning from Lerner: Reflections on facilitating reflective practice. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 22*(1), 25-31, https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877980220103

Kelly, G. (1991). *The psychology of personal constructs: Volume one: Theory and personality*. Routledge.

İskenderoğlu-Önel, Z. (1998). *The effect of action research as a teacher development model on becoming reflective in teaching: A case study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University Institute of Social Sciences.

Jay, J. K. & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(1), 73-85. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0742-051X(01)00051-8

Jumpakate, T., Wilang, J. D. & Kong, C. (2021). Exploring the reflective typology of novice EFL teachers in a Thai university. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 10*(2), 668-675.   https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i2.21122

Korkmazgil, S. (2018). How can blogging support critical reflectivity in foreign language teacher education? *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, 47*, 85-104. https://doi.org/10.21764/maeuefd.384765

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. Yale University Press.

Kuru-Gönen, S. İ. (2012). *A study on reflective reciprocal peer coaching: An application in pre-service English language teaching context* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Anadolu University Graduate School of Educational Sciences.

Larrivee, B. (2008). Development of a tool to assess teachers' level of reflective practice. *Reflective Practice, 9*(3), 341-360, https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940802207451

Liou, H. C. (2001). Reflective practice in a pre-service teacher education program for high school English teachers in Taiwan, ROC. *System, 29*(2), 197-208. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(01)00011-2

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage.

Nguyen, H. T. M., & Nga, N. T. H. (2018). Learning to reflect through peer mentoring in a TESOL practicum. *ELT Journal, 72*(2), 187-198. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccx053

Ölçü-Dinçer, Z. (2022). The optimal role for English teachers: Reflective practitioner. *Gazi Üniversitesi Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi, GEFAD-YABDİLSEM*, 311-338. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/gefad/issue/68130/976641

Öniz, A. S. (2001). *Reflection and action as a means of initiating change in teacher educators: A study involving three teacher educators* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Özkan, Y. (2019). Reflectivity of pre-service language teachers echoed through blogs. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences, 40*(1), 155-163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2017.09.007

Öztürk, G. (2015). *Language teacher cognition, classroom practices and institutional context: A qualitative case study on three EFL teachers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

Pritchard, A., & Woollard, J. (2010). *Psychology for the classroom: Constructivism and social learning*. Routledge.

Pultorak, E. G. (1993). Facilitating reflective thought in novice teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(4), 288-295. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487193044004007

Pultorak, E. G. (1996). Following the developmental process of reflection in novice teachers: Three years of investigation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 47*(4), 283-291. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487196474006

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd edition). Pearson Education.

Rodgers, C. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers' College Record*, *104*(4), 842-866. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9620.00181

Sadeghi, K. & Richards, J. C. (2021). Professional development among English language teachers: Challenges and recommendations for practice. *Heliyon*, *7*(9), e08053. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08053

Şanal-Erginel, S. (2006). *Developing reflective teachers: A study on perception and improvement of reflection in pre-service teacher education* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University Graduate School of Social Sciences.

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

Shousha, A. I. (2015). Peer observation of teaching and professional development: Teachers' perspectives at the English Language Institute, King Abdulaziz University. *Arab World English Journal, 6*(2), 131–143. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2834383

Şire, E. (2004). *Reflecting on teaching: Interactive thoughts and decisions of experienced and novice EFL teachers* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2009). Distinctive qualities of expert teachers. *Teachers and Teaching, 15*(4), 421-439. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600903057179

Van Manen, M. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum inquiry*, *6*(3), 205-228. https://doi.org/10.1080/03626784.1977.11075533

Watanabe, A. (2016). *Reflective practice as professional development: Experiences of teachers of English in Japan*. Multilingual Matters.

Widdowson, H.G. (2003). *Defining issues in English language teaching*. Oxford University Press.

Wallace, M. J., & Bau, T. H. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Yaman, Ş. (2004). *An action research study on teacher development: A constructivist approach* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Çukurova University Institute of Social Sciences.

Yang, S. (2009). Using blogs to enhance critical reflection and community of practice. *Educational Technology & Society, 12*, 11–21. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/jeductechsoci.12.2.11

Yu, W. M. (2018) Critical incidents as a reflective tool for professional development: an experience with in-service teachers. *Reflective Practice, 19*(6), 763-776, DOI: 10.1080/14623943.2018.1539652

Yeşilbursa, A. (2008). *Reflective foreign language teacher development: A case study* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Gazi University Institute of Educational Sciences.

Yeşilbursa, A. (2011). Descriptive versus dialogic reflection and positive versus negative stance in the reflective writing of Turkish prospective English language teachers. *Novitas-Royal*, *5*(2), 169-182. Retrieved from https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/novroy/issue/10814/130366

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

CORRECTION SYMBOLS

CORRECTION SYMBOLS

SYMBOL	TYPE OF ERROR	EXAMPLE
Cap	Capitalization	he is a Student at Erciyes university.
Pun	Punctuation	I've got books cassettes and CDs.
Sp	Spelling	The maneger is a woman.
Ord	Word order	I like very much skiing.
Wf	Word form	He learns quick. He is interest in books. I have forgot. It is unpossible.
sing/pl	Singular-plural forms	There are three man in the room.
S≠V	Subject-verb agreement	My parents is on holiday.
T	Tense	He goes to bed when he was tired.
↑	Missing-verb (v), preposition (prep), article (art), adverb (adv), adjective(adj), pronoun (pron), connector (con), etc	I am going Istanbul. He's doctor. The workers always on time. It has got a table, chairs a rug.
( )	Redundant word, preposition, article, etc.	He went (to) abroad.
inapp.	Inappropriate word	We looked at the TV last night.
Rw	Rewrite	(When a sentence contains errors that cannot be corrected in isolation)
P	Start a new paragraph	
→	Indent	
?	I don't understand	
1 2 3 4	Footnotes	It may be necessary to give students further explanation or feedback using footnotes indicated by circled numbers at the bottom of the page.

135

APPENDIX B SAMPLE JOURNAL ENTRY

A JOURNAL ON CLASSROOM PRACTICE FROM STAR

16. 03.2017   Star

In one of my writing classes today, I recorded myself when I was revising the vocabulary of common mistakes. The class was aware of the study, so they had more attention than they usually had. Even they felt excited because of the voice record. When I listened to the record, I realized that sts were ready to revise and learn vocabulary. I should have done it more frequently. Since the study was from the students' paper, they were interested and looked for the word on their papers. Real life situation always work!

The vocabulary I had chosen from their papers were all "form" of a word. After discussing the word with the students, I wrote different sentences in the different forms of the word, skipping the target word from the sentence so they could see how to use the word in a sentence. This is the technique I very often use. Students care for vocabulary learning. I always use questioning technique in vocabulary teaching since it has understanding and replying in it.

APPENDIX C SAMPLE PEER DISCUSSION

TRANSCRIPTION OF A PEER DISCUSSION AMONG SÜHEYLA AND HER OFFICEMATES – JOLLY AND FERIDE

S: This is the group discussion for the 2nd timed writing and we are going to talk about the common errors and what kind of improvements can we make by extra activities or what's our plan for the following classes in my writing lesson the topic of the writing task is a bit problematic because they asked about the definition of a perfect teacher but the students in fact were not ready to write it so we had some problems but still when I read their papers they were not very bad but some extra or extraordinary common mistakes appeared in my students' writings, I just grouped them into four, I think, one of them is the extra wording, they add double verbs or they add prep *to* a lot, e.g. they say *affect to somebody, affect somebody* is acceptable (?), or *they like to perfect teacher* . this is something really extraordinary for me because they know how to use the verb *like* but this time they used *like to a person* and sometimes they double the verb *who is help* e.g., in an adj clause so it's a bit surprising for me because such kind of mistakes were not so frequent in the previous writings and as in the other in the 1ˢᵗ timed writing there are still inappropriate usages and word formation in the students' writings as a mistake group

F: Our writing topic was quite easy for the students because it was about an enjoyable day they had, so B group students had this topic and in their speaking classes or in their coursebook classes they met with this topic many times, so in terms of gram. they didn't have a lot of mistakes but in vocabulary they have some mistakes with the forms of the words e.g. they had some problems again with adjectives -ed adjectives and –ing adjectives some students had mistake, and also some students had mistake about using gerund inf forms and they didn't have many mistakes with collocation or meaning I think it was because of the topic, they didn't have much difficulties many difficulties

J: For A group students our topic is the same with the B class students and there was much fewer mistakes this time esp. in meaning there is only one mistake with the usage of *after* and when I talked to the student she said that by mistake, because of the excitement of the class or exam she made a mistake and she knew that how to use *after or after that,* and some collocation problems there were and like *childly friends or together was beautiful* they were thinking in their mother tongue, and the word form there were only two mistakes *I spend beautiful time, beautiful colours flower,* and in the class I make a correction or I taught them how to use the nouns with –ed form and *coloured flowers* and we made some more examples the same in the same way, and I want them again to write two sentences with the difference between *after and after that* and we ended the class in that way that's it

F: I haven't made the practice but I'm planning to do in our writing classes about the wrong use of the word forms

S: What are you going to do, do you have any plans

F: Yes basically related to their problems in on their papers

S: Just checking showing the correct use

F: ha ha

S: I forgot to say one more thing, the problem that appeared in my students' writings a bit different from the previous one, It might be related to the difficulty of the topic because at the very beginning when we announced the topic the students they were shocked because we haven't finished the unit yet and they were a bit shocked and I mean puzzled, actually I took out them by just letting them to use an online dictionary just for a while because they needed a definition to write there as a beginning as a topic sentence, it took 3 or 4 minutes for a short time, I tried to relax them down but still their affective side during the writing was not very I mean active let me say positive, these problems might have appeared because of that situation I think because of their psychology because these problems are not the problems that they normally have during the writing I don't know, my plan is for all of these mistakes my plan is to go on with the prev. activity that I started after the 1ˢᵗ writing, I introduced them how to use a collocation dictionary, we chose a collocation dictionary. Everybody is using the same one, an online dictionary you know they like just using their mobiles and I'll probably ask them to check their mistakes by using online dictionary collocation dictionary, and what's more I'll also ask them to improve their writings by adding some adverbs and adjectives into their writings because the collocation dictionary help them to do that, in one of the students' writings *good information* was used, *good information* but it's not appropriate. OK but they don't know any other adjectives that might be used with the word *information*. I'll introduce them that it will be a good way if you check the word *introduction* or sorry *information*. You can see maybe *crucial information, valuable information,* or other adjectives related to *information.* So I'm planning to use the collocation dictionary for all of these mistakes.

APPENDIX D SAMPLE TEACHER-RESEARCHER INTERVIEW

TRANSCRIPTION OF AN INTERVIEW WITH AYHAN

R: What did you do during your classroom practice

Teacher: Last week in our coursebook we had some reading passages, one of them was about the habits of men and women talking, their talking habits, how many words they use in a day, who speaks more – men or women, there was a passage about that, I wrote on the board the key words and I asked the students to write a composition a paragraph about it for the following day and likewise we had another reading passage, it was about baby minding or child minding and again I wrote some key words on the board and I did the same thing yani I asked them to write a paragraph maybe a short story because this time I gave the beginning of the 1st sentence you can see the sentence in the journal and then I asked them to write a paragraph, then I asked for their comments, and recommendations or comments, remarks and I read their feedbacks and comments and I usu. Saw positive things, there were some students who said this kind of study was useless there were a few students saying that and their sentences were short just one sentence saying "I didn't find it useful" and maybe I don't think that the student was very serious because writing just one sentence and expressing your remark or idea in one sentence shows how serious this student is but most of them gave + feedbacks so that's what I did. For the next week I'm thinking of doing something different in class

R: And what do you think were the strong points of your classroom practice

Teacher: I gave the keywords so maybe for each subject, each topic I gave 15 keywords so maybe it wasn't difficult for the students to memorize them so and I think they used well, they used them well in their compositions, so the strong point was maybe giving the words before the assignment and but I wonder whether they will remember the words next week and as I said before the point is making them remember or keep the words in their long term memory yani they can do it for the short term they can do it, but the problem is making them keep these things in their minds for a longer time. These were the strong points I mean giving the key words, asking them to write something using these words, it was a strong point but maybe it was also the weak point, I mean giving the words, asking them to memorize only these words

maybe when they wrote the composition maybe they used the words without memorizing them, maybe they just looked at their meanings, the strong point maybe was also the weak point

R: So which do you think outweigh

Teacher: outweigh outweighs I think the strong yani if they have learnt just one word that shows that the study was useful, so maybe I gave 10 or 15 words so yani if this study has made them learn only one word that shows that it's a good study, yani I think strong points outweigh the weak points

R: If you needed to repeat the same practice would you change anything

Teacher: I should think about it yani of course there might be some points some parts which should be changed or modified, now nothing comes to my mind but maybe I can give half of the sentences one part of the sentence and I can ask them to complete it, but you know it can be a good work I mean giving one part of a sentence and asking them to complete the 2nd half of the sentence using a certain word it might be a thing which can be added later

R: Do you think your practice could solve lexical problems

Teacher: To an extent every study, everything that you do, every strategy, every technique can solve a problem. To an extent yani I believe that all of them can have a part in solving the problem.

R: And what do you think about students' lexical mistakes in their writing? Sometimes in for example I think students tended to make fewer mistakes in the 2nd writing. What does this mean for you?

Teacher: Yani when they want to use more complex words when they want to use make longer sentences or when they want to use coll. Maybe they make more mistakes, yani if they use just one word in a short sentence, a word which they are used to seeing or a word which they always see always face they don't make many mistakes, but when they are asked to use a new word a collocation. they can make more mistakes and maybe sometimes when they want to use the words in a new gram. Grammatical structure maybe they make more mistakes

R: And do you think students sometimes avoid making mistakes by using basic phrases or

Teacher: Sure I think yani when they don't do it just only when writing maybe when speaking they always do it as you know they are afraid of making mistakes so they avoid making sentences when they speak, I think when they write they do the same thing but when they write they can change or they can change the sentences or they can see their mistakes and they can fix their mistakes so when they write maybe they are more courageous but when they speak I think they fear more

R: Did you have any unplanned outcomes

Teacher: No actually the things that we got or the outcomes we got were the things we expected I can't say we have much improvement in their vocabulary but as I said they can do well when we ask them to use some certain words when writing esp. if they are asked to do this one day later or 2 days later they can use it

R: What can you say when you compare your ideal performance and actual performance

Teacher: Actually it is not about my performance I think yani as I said I have this idea I believe in vocabulary learning not vocabulary teaching so the problem is more about the students' performance or the students' wish to learn something yani about my performance I can't say that I'm frustrated with my performance because I, some of my students said the same thing in their comments yani when I asked them to give their feedbacks some students wrote the same thing saying that vocabulary learning yani students should learn it so yani when you teach grammar maybe your burden is more yani you have you need to share a bigger part of the burden but in learning vocabulary most of the burden is on their shoulders so I don't think that a problem with my performance but always

APPENDIX E LISTS FOR WRITING TASKS

HOW TO PREPARE LISTS FOR WRITING TASKS

- ❖ lexical problems: meaning, collocation, word form
- ❖ manual (three different pages for each type of problem) or Microsoft Word Document (mean, coll, form)
- ❖ task number/student number/sentence/type of problem
- ❖ repetition of a problem can be marked with *

MANUAL

> 4/3/Because car and bike <u>drive</u>/coll
> 4/3/Because <u>go to travel</u>/coll

> 4/5/I was afraid of and <u>excited</u>/mean
> 4/6/<u>After</u>,* we danced and sang song/mean

> 4/6/I remember my most exciting day is my <u>graduate</u> day/form
> 4/4/We <u>loser</u> match/form

MICROSOFT WORD DOCUMENT

task number/student number	sentence	type of problem
4/3	Because car and bike <u>drive</u>	coll
4/3	Because <u>go to travel</u>	coll
4/4	We <u>loser</u> match	form
4/5	I was afraid of and <u>excited</u>	mean
4/6	<u>After</u>,* we danced and sang song	mean
4/6	I remember my most exciting day is my <u>graduate</u> day	form

SAMPLE LIST FROM SÜHEYLA

Task-St.	Sentence	Type of mistake
Task1-1	I want to visiting	wf
Task1-2	!	!
Task1-3	want to travelling	wf
Task1-3	they travelling with crowded	wf
Task1-3	they love spend time	wf
Task1-4	have to think of money	col
Task1-5	You go to holiday	col
Task1-5	Each human want to	inapp
Task1-6	is better idea instead of travelling alone	inapp
Task1-7	.. Should travelling	wf
Task1-7	alone people	wf
Task1-8	!	!
Task1-9	we learn important something for	inapp
Task1-9	important something about travel	inapp
Task1-10	!	!
Task1-11	..is worse than go with a person	wf
Task1-11	see too much place	inapp
Task1-11	in my point of view	col
Task1-12	sleep easily much time	inapp
Task1-12	you can sleep very much	inapp
Task1-12	listen to music at travel	inapp
Task1-13	travelling isnt exciting	wf

APPENDIX F HANDOUT FOR TRAINING

A CASE STUDY OF REFLECTIVE PRACTICES OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE
TEACHERS

REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

reflective thought is not a random string of ideas, but rather an organized sequence of
thoughts; each thought acting as a starting point for the consequent one

Weekly Plan for the Tasks

Date	Procedure
27 February - 3 March 2017	Writing task
10-15 March 2017	Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion Classroom Practice Student feedback on cards
15-17 March 2017	Journal on Classroom Practice Teacher-researcher interview
20-24 March 2017	Writing task Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion
10-14 April 2017	Classroom Practice Student feedback on cards Journal on Classroom Practice Teacher-researcher interview
24-28 April 2017	Writing task Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion
2-5 May 2017	Classroom Practice Student feedback on cards Journal on Classroom Practice Teacher-researcher interview
8-12 May 2017	Writing task Journal on Lexical Problems Peer Discussion
15-18 May 2017	Classroom Practice Student feedback on cards Journal on Classroom Practice Teacher-researcher interview

JOURNALS

❖ Please be careful with accuracy and relevance.

❖ Collaboration among peers is acceptable, they may help you see things in a different way. However, please avoid copying somebody else's journal.

❖ Please keep your journals as Microsoft Word Documents.

❖ If you feel short of time to write your journal entry, you can audio-record it and then transcribe.

❖ The questions are given to guide you for what to reflect on. Please use relevant ones as the starting point for reflecting on your experiences.

❖ Please avoid responding in a question-answer format. Your analysis should be narrative.

JOURNAL ON LEXICAL PROBLEMS & PEER DISCUSSION

❖ Peer discussions are going to be audio-recorded.

❖ The questions for journal on lexical problems and peer discussion:

- Why do the students make such mistakes?

- What should be emphasized during vocabulary presentation to prevent these mistakes?

- What kind of practice do the students need? How can you provide opportunities for such practice?

- Do you need to prepare extra materials?

CLASSROOM PRACTICE

❖ It is going to be audio-recorded (video-recorded if possible). I am not going to analyze or listen to your records; they are only for your reflection.

❖ The aim of this practice is not to give students individual or group feedback on the mistakes found in the writing task; rather, you need to use the data from the task and your reflections in the journal and peer discussion to plan what to do. Please focus on types of problems instead of specific problems.

❖ Please take notes or extra copies while/immediately after classroom practice just in case.

STUDENT FEEDBACK ON CARDS

❖ Student feedback is going to be obtained in Turkish at the end of the class.
❖ They are going to use these titles:
- Kelime öğretimi açısından memnun olduğum noktalar
- Kelime öğretimi açısından değiştirilmesi/çıkarılması gereken noktalar
- Kelime öğrenmek için pratik yapmam gereken noktalar

JOURNAL ON CLASSROOM PRACTICE & TEACHER-RESEARCHER INTERVIEW

❖ It is a good idea to listen to/watch your practice once without taking notes. This will help you become accustomed to examining yourself.

❖ The questions for journal on classroom practice:

- What were the essential strengths of the lesson?

- What, if anything, would you change about the lesson?

- Do you think the lesson was successful in terms of solving lexical problems? Why?

- How is your vocabulary teaching in this lesson different from what you did previously?

- Think about the product of the lesson, if any. What are the conditions that have an effect on this outcome? You can consider teaching techniques, feedback, error correction, and questioning techniques.

- Do you think that there were unplanned outcomes in this lesson? If so, what are they? Why do you think so?

- What did you think about student behaviors?

- Can you think of another way you might have taught this lesson?

- Do you think that if you teach this lesson with a different approach, the students' learning would be better? If yes, what approach?

- Do you think that the content of this lesson was of interest for students? If you were to explain the relevance and importance of the content, what would you tell to an administrator and/or student to prove that the content was right?

- Also compare and discuss how you view yourself ideally and your actual performance.

- Ask yourself 'What have I learned about myself as a teacher through this practice?' and 'How will I apply to what I have learned to my future teaching experiences?'

- What do you think about this research as a whole? Do you think that it contributed to your learning and development? How?

SAMPLE JOURNALS FROM ŞANAL-ERGİNEL (2006)

Videotape Analysis Assignment

As I watched the video of our micro teaching, I thought that we were good. I think we achieved our aim and also the lesson was not boring. But one thing that I realized was that I did not smile much. After we finished our micro teaching, our classmates told is while they were giving feedback to us. When I watched the video, I understood that they are right. Our learner group was beginner- elementary at the age of nearly 10. For these students, a teacher should smile and talk in a kind manner. Because they are child. But I did not do so. I think it is because of my gender. It is easier for girls to behave like that. Another reason for this can be that our class was not a real class. If the students were really children at the age of 10, maybe I would smile and behave better. But because I know that it was not a real class and real children, I did not behave so. It can be the other reason.

I chose this area of focus because it is important. A teacher who teaches children should smile in the lesson and behave more kindly to the students. I think watching video become effective and useful for me. I saw my mistakes and I will try to be careful about these mistakes for my future teachings.

This week was again different from my normal observation weeks. Because, this week I had my second formal teaching session in one of the classes that I've been observing.

In this teaching process I've learned that one of the most important facts about teaching is; being always friendly and helpful to your students doesn't mean that you gain the students or they love you or this motivates them. I had many observations before, in the class that I had my 2nd formal teaching, and in all of my observations I tried to be as gentle as I can, as friendly as their friends, to the students but when it come to my teaching session I realized that if you behave friendly, it becomes really hard to manage the class. While I was teaching they were talking with their friends, and doing other tasks. When I told them to be quiet they ignored me. They didn't see me as a teacher there. They let me down so much and I lost myself during the lesson. Then I gave them a task to do and while they were doing the task I went near the E4 real teacher and ask for help. She told me that I had to shout and not to be very friendly. Otherwise they won't listen to me. When I told her that we learned to behave the students friendly and not to shout them she told me "ok. it is your choice! But don't forget they're all in the theory"! I turned back to my lesson and started to go around to help the students who couldn't do the task. When I went near a boy and asked how it was going he said "if you go away I can do, hoca" in an angry and rude way. That time I remembered what the teacher told me. I raised my voice a little bit and told the boy to talk me in a proper way and be respectful to me, because I am a teacher and he is a student in the class. From that time on, all of the sts listened the lesson silently, they all attended the lesson and made me feel as a teacher. And the boy came to me after the lesson and said sorry.

So, I think now the theories we learn in the courses may

This week is again informative and educational week for me in terms of teaching. I made my observation in real class and also micro-teachings that my friends did. In real class I tried to analyze some task questions during the lesson. And the theme in the task was giving feedback. So I, critically, and especially, focused on this item in real class. The questions in my mind were;

    — Where do we need to give Feedback?
    — Why is it needed?
    — How does it influence learning (Learners)?

All those questions in my mind, I tried to find the real answers and combine those answers with my own ideas existing. Also the theoretical knowledge about feedback in education was in my mind. The class was a reading class and students read aloud ... ...comprehension questions. Here the teacher was the controller and the students were doing the necessities. While the students were reading aloud the teacher found out that the students mis-pronounce some words and she immediately corrects the student with raising her tone of voice but with no explanation and with no time for self-correction. And the student didn't want to go on reading from that time. I found this as a blockage for students and it was a weak point of the lesson because students may also need some time for self-correction. This proves that the student is a shy student and he didn't like to be corrected he felt embarrassed. So I found out that when a student gets encouraged to read or to say or to perform something in front of the others feedback should be given in a positive manner or it should be kept recorded