INDONESIAN JOURNAL OF APPLIED LINGUISTICS
Vol. 15 No. 1, May 2025, pp. 1-19

Available online at:
https://ijal.upi.edu/index.php/ijal/article/view/288

https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v15i1.80324

Reflection levels and teaching practices of in-service English teachers in Indonesia

Sisilia Setiawati Halimi
Linguistics Study Program, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus UI, Depok 16424, West Java, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Despite the recognized importance of reflective practice for teacher professional development, there is limited empirical evidence on how in-service teachers sustain and apply reflective practices following structured training interventions, particularly in the Indonesian context. This study explores the relationship between reflection levels and teaching practices among in-service English teachers in Indonesia, following their participation in a structured teacher camp designed to promote reflective practice. Using a multi-phase mixed-methods approach, the research analyzed 460 reflective writings from 92 teachers, alongside questionnaire and follow-up survey data. The findings reveal that the majority of participants engaged in dialogic reflection, with a significant minority reaching critical reflection, while none demonstrated reflection-in-action. A strong correlation was identified between higher levels of reflection and more frequent, deeper engagement with innovative teaching strategies, including the integration of technology, critical thinking activities, and formative assessment. Teachers at the critical reflection level were more likely to adapt their classroom practices and sustain reflective habits post-camp, whereas those at lower levels reflected less frequently and made fewer changes. The study highlights the effectiveness of structured reflective prompts and immersive professional development in fostering meaningful teacher growth. Recommendations include targeted support for teachers to deepen their reflective skills and further research into the long-term impact of reflection on classroom decision-making.

Keywords: In-service EFL teachers; levels of reflection; teachers' perceptions; teacher professional development; written reflections

Received:	**Revised:**
4 December 2024	28 March 2025
Accepted:	**Published:**
12 April 2025	2 May 2025

How to cite (in APA style):
Halimi, S. S. (2025). Reflection levels and teaching practices of in-service English teachers in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *15*(1), 1-19. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v15i1.80324

INTRODUCTION

Reflective practice in teaching is very important not only for student teachers during initial preparation for teaching but also for in-service teachers because it helps them make more informed decisions about their teaching—decisions that are based on concrete evidence systematically collected over a period of time (Farrell, 2013). Historically, Dewey (1993) has been acknowledged as a key originator of the concept of reflection in the twentieth century (Hatton & Smith, 1995). While Dewey's work laid the groundwork, critical examinations of his original work (1993) and its subsequent interpretation have highlighted at least four key concerns (Hébert, 2015; Higgins, 2007; Rodgers, 2002; Simpson et al., 2004), including: the difficulty in defining the term 'reflection,' the design and methodology of studies examining reflection, the role of reflection in practice, and whether reflection leads to tangible improvements. While defining the term 'reflection' has been largely resolved, with Hatton and Smith (1995, p. 40) offering a working definition of "deliberate thinking about action with a view to its improvement," the present study focuses on other concerns, particularly the effectiveness of various reflection methodologies and the sustainability of reflection practices following trainings or workshops.

Email: sshalimi@gmail.com

A range of theoretical models informs the understanding of reflective practice. Kolb's (1984) Experiential Learning Cycle, for instance, emphasizes a four-stage process: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. This cyclical model underscores the importance of not only engaging in teaching activities but also systematically reflecting on and learning from these experiences. Similarly, Schön (1983) distinguishes between reflection-in-action (thinking on one's feet during teaching) and reflection-on-action (thinking after the event), highlighting the dynamic nature of professional learning. These models, along with the concept of a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991), which posits that learning is enhanced through social interaction and collaborative engagement, provide a robust theoretical foundation for understanding how teachers develop professionally through reflection.

Despite the availability of various approaches to foster reflection, not all are equally effective in stimulating meaningful engagement. In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) contexts, writing tasks-particularly journaling-are commonly employed (Altalhab et al., 2021; Hung & Thuy, 2021; Yee et al., 2022). Journaling is believed to help teachers articulate their thoughts and actions, thereby fostering deeper reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995). However, the effectiveness of journaling as a reflective practice technique depends heavily on prior structuring. Farrell (2019) emphasizes the importance of providing guidance to help teachers implement reflective practices effectively, suggesting four principles for reflective practice: be evidence-based, involve dialogue, link beliefs and practices, and be a way of life. Velasco (2024) also notes that both pre-service and in-service ESL teachers need to be taught how to reflect and suggests simple self-reflection tools for teachers to identify relevant professional development strategies.

This study takes a different approach by integrating reflective practice into an English teacher camp, where journal writing is used alongside a variety of other activities, including workshops, sharing sessions, micro-teaching, and teaching reflections. The camp's design provides a more immersive and structured environment than traditional reflection training. Scholars such as Salih et al. (2022) and Cirocki et al. (2024) emphasize the importance of incorporating multiple training methods, like workshops and collaborative activities, to enhance reflective practice. Participants engaged in reflection sessions every day, both individually through journal writing and collectively after teaching practice. This integration of reflection into a comprehensive, multi-faceted camp experience, as recommended by these scholars, aims to not only encourage thoughtful reflection but also to bridge the gap between theoretical learning and classroom implementation. Cirocki et al. (2024) specifically highlight the effectiveness of professional development programs that combine structured reflection with other interactive activities, a concept that is central to the camp's design. In addition, the camp's design draws on Lave and Wenger's (1991) community of practice theory, which posits that learning is most effective when it occurs within a social context of shared knowledge and collaborative engagement. By offering both individual and collective reflection opportunities, the camp mirrors a community of practice that fosters deeper learning and application of reflective practices.

Another aspect that emerged was related to measuring the effectiveness of the reflective practice training in the English camp, specifically in terms of evaluating the teachers' levels of reflectiveness. In relation to teachers' reflective levels, Akbari et al. (2010) suggested that the depth of teachers' reflection is influenced by their teaching practices. To explore this, they developed a questionnaire to help teachers examine their actual teaching practices. Using a similar approach, Torabzadeh and Tavassoli (2021) found a significant difference in reflectivity among novice, experienced, and highly experienced teachers.

Although Akbari et al. (2010) and Torabzadeh and Tavassoli (2021) explored the relationship between reflection levels and teaching experience, there remains a gap in understanding how teachers maintain and apply their reflective practices after short-term training interventions. Sustainable or ongoing reflective practices are necessary, aligning with Schön's (1983) idea of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action. The follow-up in this study, conducted a few weeks after the English teacher camp, addresses this gap by examining how teachers with different reflection levels continue to implement the reflective practices they learned during the camp in their classrooms.

Three research questions were formulated to achieve the objectives of the study:

1. What are the reflection levels of in-service English teachers in Indonesia who participated in an English teacher camp?
2. Is there any significant difference in teaching practices between teachers with different reflection levels?
3. How did the teachers with different reflection levels utilize what they reflected upon and wrote in their journal entries in their classroom?

By answering the three research questions, the study will provide more information related to Indonesian in-service English teachers' reflection levels, their teaching practices, and the impact of the training.

METHOD

This research employed a multi-phase mixed-methods design (Cresswell, 2014), which included a quasi-longitudinal approach. In the first phase of the study, qualitative and quantitative data were collected to examine differences in teaching practices between teachers with different reflection levels. In the second phase of the study, qualitative data were collected several months later to investigate if teachers with different reflection levels implemented what they had learnt during the camp in their classrooms. This design was selected because it facilitated the collection of data at a time when teachers' reflective practices could be expected to have developed, providing a clearer picture of the sustainability of the reflective practices introduced during the camp. Often missing in previous research, this follow-up stage of the research could reveal data that offer valuable insights into the long-term application of reflective practices after an intervention.

The English Camp

This study used journal writing as a technique to assess the levels of reflection of novice in-service teachers who joined a five-day teacher camp that offered alternative ways of teaching English in schools. The activities during the camp included teacher workshops, sharing sessions, fun activities, micro-teaching, and reflections. The use of reflective sessions during the camp was to help the participants relate theories/beliefs to practice. The session was integrated into the program based on a belief that when a teacher reflects, he/she increases his/her knowledge of the subject, enabling him/her to evaluate what they have learnt. The ability to observe behaviour and meaningful patterns will contribute a lot to his/her overall professional development. Every night during the camp the teachers were asked to reflect on what they had learnt and how they would implement it in their teaching contexts. Reflection sessions were also held after they conducted teaching practice.

Participants

A total of 92 high school teachers participated in the five-day novice English language teacher camps, which were held three times with different groups of participants. The first camp consisted of 17 participants, the second camp had 39 participants, and the third camp involved 36 participants. During the camps, participants were involved in various activities, including workshops, sharing, teaching, and reflecting. The reflective sessions were designed to help the teachers relate theories to practices. Every night during the camp, the teachers were asked to reflect on what they had learnt and how they would implement it in their teaching context. There were 460 teachers' reflective writings. However, since not all of the teachers participated in the second phase of the research, only data from 48 participants were analysed to answer the second and third research questions. These participants gave their consent to participate in the study by completing an individual consent form. For ethical consideration, the data are presented without mentioning the teachers' real names.

Data Collection

To answer Research Question 1, participants were required to write one journal entry each night after the training and it is presented in this paper without any editing. Before beginning their reflections, an information session was held to explain how to structure their entries and what to include, based on guidance from several scholars (Bradbury et al., 2020; Farrell, 2019; Gudeta, 2022; Ong et al., 2021; Velasco, 2024). These scholars emphasized the importance of providing support to both pre-service and in-service teachers to facilitate reflection. One such form of support is the use of question prompts as a tool for reflection. This approach aligns with the findings of Bradbury et al. (2020), which highlight the effectiveness of question prompts in helping pre-service teachers engage in self-reflection. Participants were given guiding questions for each journal entry, but they were also encouraged to include information beyond the questions if they felt it was relevant and necessary. Each of the guiding questions were written by paying attention to the topic of each session of the training plus a question on how the participants would apply it in the class. The questions can be seen in Table 1.

A rubric devised by adapting the existing models of reflection was used to analyze teacher reflective writings. The rubric incorporates elements from several well-established frameworks: Hatton and Smith's (1995) types of reflective writing, Schön's (1983) distinction between reflection in-action and reflection on-action, Ward and McCotter's (2008) focus on inquiry and change, and Mackenzie's (2018) evidence of reflection levels. There are four levels of reflection: descriptive, dialogic, critical, and contextual. Each level reflects increasing depth and complexity in teacher's engagement with their teaching practices. The rubric was reviewed by an experienced teacher educator and after some minor corrections were piloted to 2 experienced teachers. They were asked to use the rubric to analyze some samples of teacher reflective writings and an interview was conducted to identify any parts of the rubric that were unclear or confusing. The results of the interview confirmed that the rubric was clear and identify the levels clearly. The rubric is provided in Appendix 1.

To answer Research Question 2, a questionnaire developed by Akbari et al. (2010) was distributed to the participants to investigate the relationship between the teachers' reflection levels

and their teaching practices. The 5-point Likert Scale questionnaire consists of 5 adverbs of frequency, that is Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often, and Always. There are 29 items that address five factors of Practical, Affective, Cognitive, Critical, and MetaCognitive aspects. This questionnaire was designed by conducting research with a big number of participants and has been adopted in some research in different countries in the world; therefore, it is adopted in this study. See Appendix 2 for the questionnaire.

To answer Research Question 3, a list of 11 open-ended and closed questions was sent to each participant to explore how the two groups of teachers implemented the knowledge and skills that they had learnt and reflected upon during the training in their classrooms. The questions were written carefully, taking into account the guiding questions for reflection in Table 1. They were reviewed by a Master Teacher Trainer who was involved in the training to guarantee clarity of the questions and to avoid the possibility of ambiguous meaning in each question. The questions were distributed a few months after the camps were held to ensure high-quality data for answering Research Question 3 (see Appendix 3 for the list of questions). A data comparison was subsequently conducted to identify any similarities or differences between teachers with varying reflection levels in how they implemented what they had learned and reflected upon.

Table 1
Guiding Questions (Adapted from Bradbury et al., 2020)

Day	Questions
1	1. What did you learn about critical thinking today?
	2. What do you expect to learn from this camp?
2	1. What did you learn about interactive teaching and using authentic materials today?
	2. What did you learn about using technology, social media, and digital learning tools today?
	3. How can you apply what you learnt today in your own class?
3	1. What did you learn about assessments today?
	2. What did you learn from the Continuous Professional Development session today?
	3. How can you apply what you learnt today in your own class?
4	1. What did you learn from the micro-teaching sessions today?
	2. What ONE teaching activity from today's micro-teaching sessions you can apply in your classroom?
5	1. What do you plan to do after the camp to share what you have learnt so far from the camp?
	2. Have your expectations about the camp been met by the end of the camp?

Data Analysis

Using the rubric, a qualitative data analysis was conducted to identify the teachers' reflection levels. To ensure reliability, eight lecturers were trained to use the rubric, and each journal entry was evaluated by two assessors. After the results were received, a correlational analysis was performed to measure the level of agreement between the two assessors' evaluation of the teachers' reflection levels. This approach enhances the consistency and validity of the analysis, as supported by Creswell (2014), who discussed the importance of using correlational analysis to assess inter-rater agreement. A total of 460 reflective writings written in English were analyzed.

For the quantitative analysis, a paired *t*-test was conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in the actual teaching practices of teachers with different reflection levels. The data from the questionnaire were analyzed to compare the two groups of teachers identified through the qualitative analysis, ensuring that the comparison was grounded in the reflection levels established earlier.

To analyze the responses to the follow-up questions, content analysis (Cohen et al., 2007) was employed. First, the data were transcribed, and then themes were extracted from each response and categorized. This systematic approach allowed for a clear identification of the patterns. The results were subsequently compared to identify similarities and differences between the two groups of teachers in how they applied the knowledge and skills they had gained and reflected upon during the camp.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Reflection Levels of In-Service English Teachers

A total of 460 journal entries, written by 92 participants, were assessed by eight trained lecturers. These eight lecturers were organized into five pairs: three pairs consisting of two lecturers each and two pairs consisting of a lecturer and a teacher. Each journal entry was evaluated by two lecturers, and to assess the consistency of the evaluations, a Pearson correlational analysis was conducted to examine the level of agreement between the two assessors in each pair regarding the identification of reflection levels. The analysis revealed a high rate of agreement between the two assessors in each pair, with a significant positive relationship ($p<0.01$), indicating that the evaluations of the reflection levels were consistent across all pairs.

The summary of the reflection levels of the participants can be found in Table 2.

Table 2
Teachers' Reflection Levels

Reflection Levels	Number of Teachers & Percentages
1 (Descriptive Reflection)	1 (1.09%)
2 (Dialogic Reflection)	60 (65.22%)
3 (Critical Reflection)	31 (33.69%)
4 (Contextualization of Multiple Viewpoints Reflection)	0 (0%)

As shown in Table 2, 1.09% of the participants were at the descriptive reflection level, 65.22% of the participants were at the dialogic reflection level, and 33.69% of the participants were at the critical reflection level. It is worth noting that no participants were identified at reflection level 4, which is categorized as reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983). This is not surprising because reflection-in-action involves real-time reflection during classroom teaching when teachers confront problems or challenges. According to Griffiths (2000), it happens when ''professionals are faced with a situation which they experience as unique or contain an element of surprise. Rather than apply theory or past experience in a direct way, professionals draw on their repertoire of examples to reframe the situation and find new solutions'' (p. 542). In contrast, reflection-on-action, which occurs after an event, is the type of reflection which was encouraged and practiced in this study. Since the journal entries written by the teachers in this study involved reflection-on-action, it is understandable that no teachers were identified at Reflection Level 4. This clarification is important to avoid the misconception that no Indonesian English teachers reach this level of reflection.

To better understand how teachers' reflections align with these levels, the following examples from their reflective writings illustrate each of the identified levels—descriptive, dialogic, and critical. These excerpts highlight the different ways in which teachers engaged with their teaching practices and provide insight into the nature and depth of their reflections.

Starting with the descriptive reflection level, this level involves an analysis of a teacher's performance based on personal judgement and an explanation of reasons for actions taken (Hatton & Smith, 1995). This type of reflection contrasts with dialogic reflection, which involves self-discourse exploring possible reasons, and critical reflection, which includes decision-making that considers broader historical, social, and political contexts. The findings show that there is one participant whose level of reflection is at level 1. An example of a descriptive reflection can be seen in one of the journal entries written by Teacher TF.

> **Day 3**
> *Speaking frankly, the sessions about assessments today failed to give me additional insights but succeeded in amazingly refreshing my existing comprehension on the topic. I adequately gained some fruitful insights in my classes when pursuing my postgraduate degree and completing my thesis dealing with the educational evaluation. The presentation about assessments today had so many things in common with my thesis literature review. Assessing the students' proficiency of English language must urgently pay close attention to the need of separating the four language skills into two categories, namely receptive and productive skills. This concept is then brought into an ideal practice, which requires the implementation of traditional tests and performance tests. Theoretically, the receptive skills, namely listening and reading, rely much on the use of the traditional tests, the test formats of which are multiple choice, cloze, true/false, etc. Furthermore, the productive skills, namely writing and speaking skills, use the performance tests as the instruments to measure the students' writing and speaking capabilities.*
>
> *Before I attended this camp, I have actively and productively been applying the concept of assessment as I have elaborated above. To show a perfect reflection of a student's English proficiency, I realize that the four English skills should be separately measured. Moreover, I am also aware of the major challenge I face when applying the assessment. It is the time allocation of the English subject that becomes the most challenging issue to cope with.*

In the example, teacher TF provides a reflective account of the assessment session. While the entry goes beyond a simple description of events, it remains largely descriptive. Teacher TF reflects on the content of the session, making connections to prior knowledge from his/her postgraduate degree and thesis on education evaluation. The reflection explains the importance of separating receptive and productive skills in assessment, but it remains focused on the teacher's perspective without exploring broader implications or questioning existing practices. Though there is some analysis of past experiences, such as the challenge of time allocation for English assessments, the reflection lacks depth in exploring alternative methods or future improvements. This shows that while the teacher engaged with the material, the reflection is self-oriented, offering little indication of a desire to change or improve practices. Thus, this type of reflection aligns with the descriptive reflection level (Hatton & Smith, 1995), where the focus is more on recounting and justifying actions rather than critically engaging with them.

In contrast, the majority of teachers in this study demonstrated dialogic reflection. This type of reflection typically focuses on specific teaching tasks and is more analytical (Chung, 2023). Teachers engaged in dialogic reflection often recognize inconsistencies in their reasoning and explore possible alternatives. The following entry from Teacher SE exemplifies this reflection level.

Day 4

Lesson plan for me is very important. In my lesson, I always bring it with me. It is like guidance for me to conduct the lesson. It will always remind me to the objectives of my teaching. It also helps me in making my activities in order, so that the goal can be achieved. Therefore, lesson plan has to be made as clear as I can. In my lesson plan, I always put steps on how to do this and that. I do that in order to remember every single thing I have to do in the class. Though sometimes it is a bit time consuming at the beginning, but in the end, it helps me a lot.

For the micro teaching experience, I feel that it is quite challenging. First of all, it is because we have to deliver an impromptu topic. For me, I actually need at least a week before to prepare everything. However, here we are asked to think critically about methods, types of questions and activities to teach in the class. But it's okay. By doing this task, my critical thinking and creativity suddenly appeared and my group and I could work well with the task. Second thing is that I had to work with other teachers whom I have never met before. It is quite difficult because we come from different background. However, from these differences, we could mingle well and share more ideas to be applied in the micro teachings.

Not just the micro teaching that is actually super challenging, but also the feedback given by the facilitators. One thing I learnt is that not to teach grammar by showing students the pattern of the grammar first, instead, let them figure it out by themselves through fun activities. So, after I get back to the school, I am going to directly change my teaching style and I will also make a meeting with the Language Arts teachers under my supervision immediately to change the way we usually teach. I will teach them how to make fun activities like Bingo, Pattern Writing (which is totally awesome), read and race and the question bridge.

Teacher SE's journal entry exemplifies this level, as she explores teaching experience using qualities of judgment and considers various alternatives for explaining concepts. As seen in the second paragraph of her reflection, Teacher SE engages in a dialogue with the situation itself, reflecting on her practice and questioning her decisions. This type of reflection reveals new insights and potential changes stemming from the reflective process, as illustrated in the third paragraph of her entry.

On the other hand, teachers at critical reflection level are able to make decisions based on reasoning and consider broader contexts, beyond the immediate teaching situation (James et al., 2023). This can be seen in the journal entry written by Teacher YE, who reflected after a session on creative thinking.

Day 1

Today, the second day of the English camp, I reflect on what critical thinking and creativity means to me. It means that we don't just accept fact and information as it is. Critical thinking always craves for the answer of why you say that or I say that. It is based on sound logic that supports the statement we make. Creative thinking is higher order of learning and thinking. We do not just spoon-feed our students with out-dated or unverified information. We equip our students to be aware of themselves and their surrounding and quick at noticing things. This will make them able to adapt themselves to the fast-changing world and do not get lost in the sea of information i.e. the Internet. As a teacher, it is vitally important to be creative because in this current era of IT, the teacher position as the only source of learning is getting increasingly replaced by the technology. If they are not creative and keep using their same old method from year to year, the students will soon lose their interest of learning. Younger students need a teacher who is up-to-date with current information and development so they can lead their students to identify problems in their environment and find solution. Learning today is more than memorizing words and then forgetting it after the exam is over as we have witnessed in the past times. Rote and meaningless drill or rules and grammatical formula have lost its effectiveness in enabling the students to communicate with each other or people from foreign cultures. Depending on their place and context of teaching, a teacher can use anything in their surrounding as sources of learning, whether it is mass media, mall, the zoo, school environment, tourism objects and their gadgets.

In order to create creative environment we can give assignment, project or task that encourage students to get engaged with others in lively conversation that activate their imagination and sense of humour and original ideas. Group work like listing things in the order of importance and explain the reason, finding someone with certain traits or possession, developing creative questions related to the lyrics of a song, asking question about someone based on the key information they provide will challenge students to think out of the box. As far as I am concerned, I am getting more and more creative from time to time after attending so many training and workshop as well as receiving feedback from the other teachers and students. I use different method and material of teaching to different classes depending on their level of ability, style of learning and interest. The main problem I have is that I get desperate and stressed very easily when students show slow progress in their learning. It makes me mad when they can't digest simple information or do easy task like performing short conversation. To face the above problem, I will try to get students more relaxed and open to me.

As can be observed in the entry, teacher YE's reflection on creative thinking leads to systematic questioning of practice and demonstrates an evaluative attitude (see Paragraph 1). In his reflection, he also incorporates the perspectives of both students and teachers as well as insights from another culture. In addition, there is evidence of a desire to change or improve (see Paragraph 2).

From analysis, it is clear that low-level reflection (Level 1) tends to be self-oriented and lacks a clear intent to change or improve. In contrast, high-level reflection (Level 3) is more other- oriented and is characterized by a desire for change and improvement. Unlike the reflections at Level 1 which are descriptive, reflections at Level 3 are more evaluative. Mid-level reflection (Level 2) contains elements of both Level 1 and Level 3, reflecting a transitional stage between self-focused descriptions and evaluative, change-oriented reflections.

The findings of this study align with those of Le et al. (2023) and Soisangwarn and Wongwanich (2014), revealing similarities in teaching practices and reflection patterns across various cultural and educational contexts in Asia. These consistencies may suggest that certain teaching practices and reflective approaches are universally prevalent. However, the results differ from those of Hatton and Smith (1995) and Mackenzie (2018), who found that the majority of teachers' reflections in their studies were at the descriptive level. In contrast, more than 65% of the teachers in this study demonstrated dialogic reflection (Level 2).

One possible explanation for this difference is the use of guiding questions, as indicated by the data from the closed and open-ended questions. All participants (100%) reported that the guiding questions helped them in writing their journal entries. This finding suggests that the inclusion of these guiding questions facilitated a more thoughtful and structured reflection process for the teachers in this study. This finding reinforces the claim made by Bradbury et al. (2020), who argued that question prompts are not only effective for guiding pre-service teachers' self-reflections but also for helping in-service teachers engage in meaningful reflective practices.

The responses to both the closed and open-ended questions further reveal that the guiding questions helped teachers focus their reflections and provided clear, straight-to-the-point details. The guiding questions also assisted teachers in structuring their thoughts, resulting in more cohesive reflections. This finding confirms the claim made by Shavit and Moshe (2019) that systematic reflective practices can generate meaning by connecting teachers' past experiences with new experiences, knowledge, and insights from others.

Alignment between reflection levels and teaching practices

Building on the findings related to the role of guiding questions in enhancing teachers' reflective practices, it is important to explore how these reflection levels translate into actual teaching practices. While the guiding questions facilitated reflective thinking, the next question to address is whether there is a connection between teachers' reflection levels and their teaching practices.

This question aligns with the study by Torabzadeh and Tavassoli (2021), which examined the differences reflectivity across novice, experienced, and highly experienced teachers. Similarly, the second question of this study aims to find out if there are significant differences in teaching practices between teachers at different reflection levels. Given that only 1.09% of participants were at the descriptive level, this study focuses primarily on two reflection levels: dialogic and critical.

To address this question, a questionnaire devised by Akbari et al. (2010) was administered to 48 willing participants in the second phase of the study via Google Docs. The purpose of the questionnaire was to investigate the relationship between teachers' reflection levels and their teaching practices across five factors addressed by the 29 items it comprises: Practical, Affective, Cognitive, Critical and Metacognitive. The responses were assessed using a 5-point Likert Scale, consisting of 5 adverbs of frequency: Never, Rarely, Sometimes, Often and Always. The means of the two reflection levels are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3
Group Statistics

	Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Mean	Level 2	24	3.2263	.58830	.12009
	Level 3	24	3.7542	.46028	.09395

Table 3 indicates that teachers at the dialogic reflection level had a higher mean score (3.7542) compared to those at the descriptive level, with a mean score of 3.2263. This result suggests that teachers with a dialogic level of reflection engage more frequently in reflective practices that involve deeper analysis of their teaching, including the exploration of alternatives and inconsistencies in their teaching methods. To assess whether this difference is statistically significant, a paired *t*-test was conducted, and the results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4
Independent Sample Test

		t-test for Equality of Means			
		Sig. (2-tailed)	**Mean Difference**	**Std. Error Difference**	**95% Confidence Interval of the Difference**
					Lower
Mean	**Equal variances assumed**	.001	-.52792	.15247	-.83483
	Equal variances not assumed	.001	-.52792	.15247	-.83531

The results, as presented in Table 4, show that the difference in the means between the two groups was statistically significant, with a *p*-value of 0.001 ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that teachers at the critical reflection level are more likely to engage in reflective practices that improve their teaching compared to those at the dialogic reflection level. This significant difference suggests that higher levels of reflection are associated with more frequent and deeper engagement in teaching practices, as measured by the questionnaire.

The findings indicate that teachers with a dialogic level of reflection (Level 3) reported higher engagement in teaching practices compared to those at a descriptive level (Level 2). As shown in Appendix 4, Level 3 teachers have consistently higher average scores across most items, reflecting more frequent engagement in practices such as participating in workshops, reflecting on their teaching philosophy, and discussing social justice issues. The scores, based on a 5-point Likert scale, reveal that Level 3 teachers "often" or "quite often" conducted these activities, while Level 2 teachers reported "sometimes" engaging in them. This finding suggests that higher levels of reflection are associated with more frequent and deeper engagement in teaching practices.

However, certain items, such as observing other teachers (Item 5), conducting research (Item 11), and discussing political aspects (Item 26), showed low average scores for both groups. These activities may be challenging due to practical constraints, such as limited time for observations or institutional restrictions on political discussions. Overall, the results imply that Level 3 teachers incorporate broader considerations, like students' social backgrounds and ethical issues, into their teaching, demonstrating a deeper and more reflective approach to their practice. This deeper level of engagement aligns with previous studies, which suggest that higher levels of reflection contribute to more dynamic, student-centered teaching and a greater sense of professional growth (Akbari et al., 2010; Bradbury et al., 2020).

Teachers' reflective practices after the camp

Following the analysis of the teachers' teaching practices before and after the training camp, the next question of interest concerns the extent to which the teachers applied the knowledge, skills, and reflective practices they developed during the camp into their actual classroom teaching. This was addressed through a follow-up survey sent a few months post-camp, where teachers were asked about the frequency and content of their reflections as well as how they implemented the learned concepts and activities. The data collected provided insights into how reflection levels influenced the application of these skills and knowledge.

Both Level 2 and Level 3 teachers reported that they continued to reflect on their teaching, with 87.5% of teachers in each group indicating that they did so. However, as shown in Table 6, a significant difference emerged in the frequency of reflection writing. While Level 2 teachers mostly reported reflecting "seldom" (66.67%) or "rarely" (19.05%), a notable portion of Level 3 teachers reflected "often" (25%) or "very often" (12.50%). This finding suggests that teachers with higher levels of reflection continue to engage in reflective practices more consistently and with greater frequency, aligning with the findings from earlier stages of the study. See Table 5 for more information.

Table 5
Frequency of Reflection Writing & Percentage of Teachers

Frequency	Level 2 Teachers (%)	Level 3 Teachers (%)
Very often	4.76	12.50
Often	9.52	25.00
Seldom	66.67	45.83
Rarely	19.05	4.17
Never	0.00	0.00

The contents of these reflections, as detailed in Table 6, also varied significantly. Level 3 teachers provided more detailed, thoughtful accounts of their reflections, often linking their teaching strategies to

student outcomes and lesson planning. In contrast, Level 2 teachers provided shorter, more general reflections, which suggests that their engagement with reflection may be less critical and more surface-level. This difference further corroborates the notion that Level 3 teachers engage in deeper, more meaningful reflection, which may support their ability to implement learned practices more effectively. To help Level 2 teachers improve their reflective practices, Orakci (2021) suggested in-service training programs focused on critical thinking, problem-solving, and decision-making skills, which could strengthen their ability to reflect more deeply and improve their teaching approaches.

Table 6
Contents of Reflections

Frequency	Level 2 Answers	Level 3 Answers
Very often	No example was provided.	What I have written was basically regarding the teaching process occurred in my class; the reflection and evaluation that could improve the output of my students' learning. Besides reflecting, I also juxtaposed the academic activities to the teaching approaches and methods in order to achieve my own authentic materials suit to my class and fulfill the differentiated learning implementation for my students. – ED
Often	I did reflections in small notes after teaching. Those notes were used to improve the process of teaching. I sometimes wrote it in best practice. - DA	I wrote about my experiences in class such as how my students reacted to certain topics, whether or not the methods I used in class were successful, and the next strategy for the next meeting. – SE
Seldom	I write reflections when I create or apply new learning methods in class. - CP	I wrote about how I felt after teaching, how far thus I applied what I was planning on my lesson before, how was the response of my students and what should I do next. – RA
Rarely	Things that going well and things that I need to readjust - HA	I wrote the activities that I have done in my teaching practice and also the response that I got from the students. If the students were not motivated enough, I would reflect on my way of teaching. - DA

Both groups of teachers (100%) reported applying the knowledge, skills, activities, and materials learned during the camp in their classrooms. However, the types of practices implemented varied between the groups, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7 indicates that while Level 3 teachers utilized a broader range of strategies, particularly those related to critical thinking (95.83%), technology (91.67%), digital learning tools (83.33%), and assessment (70.83%), Level 2 teachers focused more on interactive teaching (79.17%) and authentic materials (75.00%). These differences suggest that Level 3 teachers not only incorporated more diverse and higher-order teaching strategies but also demonstrated greater integration of technological tools and innovative assessment techniques into their teaching practices.

Table 7
Types of Activities and Number of Teachers

Types of Knowledge/Skills /Activities/Materials	Level 2 Teachers (%)	Level 3 Teachers (%)
Activities related to critical thinking	50.00	95.83
Activities related to interactive teaching	79.17	75.00
Using authentic materials	75.00	79.17
Using technology	75.00	91.67
Using social media	62.50	58.33
Using digital learning tools	62.50	83.33
Changing how I assess my students' performance	50.00	70.83
Changing how I write the multiple-choice questions	20.83	45.83

The teachers also provided concrete examples of how they applied what they had learned. These examples offer further insight into the types of strategies employed and the challenges faced during the implementation phase.

> *Promoting critical thinking in an English class involves creating an environment that encourages students to analyse, evaluate, and synthesize information rather than simply memorizing facts or accepting information at face value. One strategy was using open-ended questions to ask thought-provoking questions that required students to think deeply about the text, its themes, characters, and implications. These questions should not have straightforward answers and should encourage students to explore different perspectives.* - (Teacher AS)

> *I have been using such platforms as Kahoot!, Quizzes, Jamboard, Google Doc and Wordpad to apply interactive teaching. By using these media, students can collaborate and at the same time have fun. In the meantime, I can monitor their work and even provide comments or feedback. As for digital learning tools, fortunately, our school use a textbook from Pearson which provides a digital book. This enables us teachers to display the digital book on the screen while teaching. This also gives another advantage to present authentic materials to the students not only the passages for reading but also the recordings and videos for listening.* - (Teacher PL)

The examples suggest that Level 3 teachers demonstrated a strong focus on fostering critical thinking in their students. Teacher AS, for instance, explained that s/he encouraged students to engage in deep analysis and evaluation by using open-ended questions that prompted him/her to explore various perspectives on the texts being studied. Similarly, Teacher PL emphasized the use of digital platforms such as *Kahoot!*, *Jamboard*, and *Google Docs* to foster interactive learning, combining technology with authentic materials to enhance student engagement.

On the other hand, Level 2 teachers encountered specific challenges in adopting similar practices. As the following responses show, Teacher DH and Teacher DA mentioned the difficulty of implementing critical thinking activities, as they were still in the process of acquiring the necessary skills. This finding is unexpected and this shows that teacher education program in Indonesia needs to integrate more activities that can develop student teachers' critical skills. Unlike Teacher DH and Teacher DA, Teacher S pointed out that the lack of internet access in some schools posed a barrier to the effective use of technology in their lessons. Despite these challenges, it is worth noting that Level 2 teachers were still motivated to experiment and reflect on their teaching, albeit at a slower pace.

> *I had difficulties implementing activities related to critical thinking because I was and am still in the process of acquiring the skills. So, I am learning by doing.* - (Teacher DH)

> *I had difficulties when implementing activities related to critical thinking skills. Also in arranging HOTS multiple-choice questions.* - (Teacher DA)

> *For me the challenging part of using the technology is the availability of internet connection . Not all classes could access the school WIFI and many students could not afford the personal internet data.* - (Teacher S)

The differences between the two groups were also evident in the changes they made to their teaching materials and activities. Level 3 teachers were significantly more likely to adapt their practices post-camp, with 94.12% reporting changes compared to 57.14% of Level 2 teachers. This suggests that Level 3 teachers were more proactive in incorporating new methods and tools into their teaching, demonstrating a greater capacity to apply the knowledge gained from the camp effectively.

Overall, these findings highlight what Tsui (2009) in Karimi and Nazari (2019, p. 55) observed, that is, "experienced teachers are able to interpret classroom events, provide a deeper analysis of problems, and justify their practices in a principled manner." However, the level of reflectivity influences how they translate their newly learned knowledge, skills, and insights into practice. While both groups of teachers—Level 2 and Level 3—implemented what they had learned during the camp, the frequency of their reflectivity and the quality of their reflection were significantly different. Level 3 Teachers demonstrated a higher frequency of reflection and offered more detailed, thoughtful insights into their teaching, which, in turn, positively impacted their ability to apply higher-order thinking skills and integrate technology into their classrooms. On the other hand, Level 2 Teachers reflected less frequently and with less depth, leading to a more limited application of the strategies they had learned. For example, Level 3 Teachers were more likely to incorporate activities that promoted critical thinking, whereas Level 2 Teachers focused less on these areas and were slower to adapt to using new technologies in their teaching.

Moreover, while Level 3 Teachers readily made changes to their materials and methods based on their reflections, only about half of the Level 2 Teachers made similar adjustments, highlighting the difference in their ability or willingness to modify their practices. This finding aligns with previous research distinguishing experienced teachers from novice teachers (Torabzadeh & Tavassoli, 2021), where the former group is often more adept at critically evaluating and adjusting their teaching methods. Additionally, this result is consistent with research by Le et al. (2023), which emphasized that teachers at different stages of their careers prioritize distinct aspects of teaching, with more experienced teachers typically focusing on higher-order strategies such as critical thinking, technology integration, and student-centered learning.

CONCLUSION

Research on teacher experience has often focused on comparing novice and experienced teachers in language teaching (Fallah & Nazari, 2019; Karimi & Norouzi, 2019). This study contributes to the field by highlighting the importance of reflectivity levels as a significant variable influencing teachers' knowledge base. By focusing on the differences

between teachers with a descriptive level of reflection (Level 2) and those with a dialogic level of reflection (Level 3), this study enhances our understanding of how reflective practices shape teaching decisions and cognitive processes (Karami & Nazari, 2019; Torabzadeh & Hashmandar, 2022). The findings of this indicate that teachers with a dialogic level of reflection (Level 3 Teachers) engage in reflection more often and with greater depth, considering various aspects of their teaching practice. In contrast, teachers with a descriptive level of reflection (Level 2), reflect less often and make fewer adjustments to their teaching materials and strategies.

Although the study involved a relatively small sample size (48 teachers), the insights provided are valuable for identifying key areas where reflection practices can be strengthened. The findings underscore the need for structured scaffolding to help Level 2 teachers to transition to a more critical and analytical form of reflection. The findings suggest that teacher training programs, both for pre-service and in-service teachers, are necessary to foster critical reflection skills. Specifically, teachers at the descriptive level should be provided with targeted scaffolding to help them engage in deeper, more thoughtful analyses of their instructional process.

To achieve this goal, training programs should integrate evidence-based strategies that have been shown to foster reflection. According to Hatton and Smith (1994), these strategies include action research projects; case studies and ethnographic studies of students, teachers, classrooms, and schools; microteaching and other supervised practicum experiences; and structured curriculum tasks. These strategies should be encouraged in the context of teacher education in Indonesia, as the responses to the distributed questionnaire show that these are the areas where Indonesian teachers currently lack proficiency.

The limitation of this study lies in the fact that it only asked the teachers to answer some question about their practices. To obtain thorough data about practices in class after a training, it is important to observe teachers in their classroom.

For further research, it is important to further explore how levels of reflectivity impact decision-making in classroom settings, particularly among experienced teachers. Additionally, as highlighted in Farahian and Rajabi's (2022) study, exploring the influence of EFL teachers' motivation, which often serves as a barrier to their reflective practice, would provide valuable insights for enhancing reflective practices across diverse contexts.

.

REFERENCES

Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Dadvand, B. (2010). Development of English language teaching reflection inventory. *System, 38,* 211-227. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.003

Altalhab, S., Alsuhaibani, Y., & Gillies, D. (2021). The reflective diary experiences of EFL pre-service teachers. *Reflective Practice*, *22*(2), 173-186. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2020.1865903

Bradbury, O. J., Fitzgerald, A., & O'Connor, J. P. (2020). Supporting pre-service teachers in becoming reflective practitioners using conversation and professional standards. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 45*(10), 18-34. http://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2020v45n10.2

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education*. Routledge.

Chung, E. (2023). Eleven factors contributing to the effectiveness of dialogic reflection: Understanding professional development from the teacher's perspective. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 18*(2), 268-288. https://doi.org/10.1080/1554480X.2021.2013234

Cirocki, A., Indrarathne, B., & Calderón, V. E. A. (2024). Effectiveness of professional development training on reflective practice and action research: a case study from Ecuador. *Reflective Practice*, *25*(5), 676–694. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2024.2384124

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Dewey, J. (1993). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process.* D. C. Heath.

Fallah, N., & Nazari, M. (2019). L2 teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback: The mediating role of experience. *English Teaching & Learning, 43,* 147-164. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42321-019-00020-7

Farahian, M., & Rajabi, Y. (2022). An investigation into the level of reflection and barriers to EFL teachers' reflective practice. *International Journal of Research in English Education 7*(2), 81-100. https://doi.org/10.52547/ijree.7.2.81

Farrell, T. S. C. (2013). *Reflective teaching*. TESOL International Association.

Farrell, T. S. C. (2019). *Reflection-as-action in ELT.* TESOL International Association.

Griffiths, V. (2000). The reflective dimension in teacher education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 33*, 539-555. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0883-0355(00)00033-1

Gudeta, D. (2022). Professional development through reflective practice: The case of Addis Ababa secondary school EFL in-service teachers. *Cogent Education, 9,* 1-26.

https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2030076

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11*(1), 33-49. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(94)00012-U

Hébert, C. (2015). Knowing and/or experiencing: A critical examination of the reflective models of John Dewey and Donald Schön. *Reflective Practice, 16*(3), 361-371. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2015.1023281

Higgins, C. (2007). Reflections on a line from Dewey. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education* (pp. 389-394). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-3052-9_23

Hung, D. M., & Thuy, P. T. (2021). Reflective teaching perceived and practiced by EFL teachers--A case in the South of Vietnam. *International Journal of Instruction, 14*(2), 323-344 .https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14219a

James, T., Griffin, H., Johnston, K. S., & Armstrong, F. (2023). Reflective minds, brighter futures: Empowering critical reflection with a guided instructional model. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice, 20*(6), 1-27. https://doi.org/10.53761/1.20.6.9

Karimi, M. N., & Nazari, M. (2019). L2 teachers' representations of classroom management events: Variations across experience levels. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *22*(1), 27-72. https://ensani.ir/fa/article/445506/l2-teachers-representations-of-classroom-management-events-variations-across-experience-levels

Karimi, M. N., & Norouzi, M. (2019). 'Cognitive aging' in teachers: L2 teachers' cognitive performance across various stages in their teaching career. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 13*, 371-388. https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1466893

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

Le, T. T., Pham. T. T., Nguyen, A. T., Phuong, H.Y., Huynh, T. A. T. & Nguyen, H. T. (2023) An insight into reflective teaching levels of Vietnamese EFL teachers in a premier language center. *Cogent Education, 10*(2), 1-16. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2023.2243118

Lave J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355

Mackenzie, L. (2018). Investigating reflection in written assignments on CELTA Courses. *ELT Journal*, *73*(1), 11-20. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccy037

Ong, W. A., Swanto, S., AlSaqqaf, A., & Ong, J. W. (2021). Promoting reflective practice via the use of 5-step Copora reflective model: A case study of East Malaysian ESL pre-service teachers. *TEFLIN Journal 32*(1), 72-96. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v32i1/72-96

Orakci, Ş. (2021). Teachers' reflection and level of reflective thinking on the different dimensions of their teaching practice. *International Journal of Modern Education Studies, 5*(1), 117-145. http://doi.org/10.51383/ijonmes.2021.88

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

Salih, A. A., & Omar, L. I. (2022). Reflective teaching in EFL online classrooms: teachers' perspective. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 13*(2), 261-270. https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1302.05

Shavit, P., & Moshe, A. (2019). The contribution of reflective thinking to the professional development of pre-service teachers. *Reflective Practice*, *20*(4), 548-561. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2019.1642190

Simpson, D. J., Jackson, M. J. B., & Simpson, J. C. (2004). *John Dewey and the art of teaching: Toward reflective and imaginative practice.* Sage Publications. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452232386

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

Swatevacharkul, R. (2019). Promoting pre-service EFL teacher reflection: An investigation of reflection levels in Thai context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *9*(2), 463-471. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20244

Torabzadeh, S., & Tavassoli, K. (2021). Exploring differences in novice, experienced, and highly experienced teachers' reflectivity: A mixed methods study. *The Journal of Asia TEFL, 18*(3), 1040-1048. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2021.18.3.24.1040

Torabzadeh, S., & Hashamdar, M. (2022). Exploring differences in novice and experienced teachers self-efficacy: A mixed methods study. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *46*(1), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v46n1-6

Tsui, A. B. M. (2009). Distinctive qualities of expert teachers. *Teachers and Teaching:*

Theory and Practice, *15*, 421–439. https://doi.org/10.1080/13540600903057179

Velasco, E. (2024). Reflective practice: A corpus-based analysis of in-service ESL teachers' reflective discourse. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *12*(1), 83-105. https://doi.org/10.30466/ijltr.2024.121419

Ward, J. R., & McCotter, S.S. (2004). Reflection as a visible outcome for pre-service teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *20*(3), 243–257. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2004.02.004

Yee, B. C., Abdullah, T., & Mohd Nawi, A. (2022). Exploring pre-service teachers' reflective practice through an analysis of six-stage framework in reflective journals. *Reflective Practice*, *23*(5), 552-564. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2022.2071246

APPENDIX
Appendix 1
Reflection Rubric

Reflection Types	**Reflection Levels**							
	Reflection-on-action addressing TASK and IMPACT concerns						**Reflection-in-action** addressing IMPACT concerns	
Level of Reflection	**Descriptive (1)**		**Dialogic (2)**		**Critical (3)**		**Contextualization of multiple viewpoints (4)**	
	Nature of reflection	Possible content	Nature of reflection	Possible content	Nature of reflection	Possible content	Nature of reflection	Possible content
	Descriptive (social efficiency, developmental, personalistic), seeking what is seen as 'best possible' practice	Analysing one's performance in the professional role (probably alone), giving reasons for actions taken	Dialogic (deliberative, cognitive, narrative) weighing competing claims and viewpoints, and then exploring alternative solutions	Hearing one's own voice (alone or with another) exploring alternative ways to solve problems in a professional situation	Critical (social reconstruct-ionist), seeing as problematic, according to ethical criteria, the goals and practices of one's profession	Thinking about the effects upon others of one's actions, taking account of social, political and/or cultural forces (can be shared)	Contextual-ization of multiple viewpoints as applied to situations as they are actually taking place	Dealing with on-the-spot professional problems as they arise (thinking can be recalled and then shared with others later)
Focus (What is the focus of concerns about practice?)	Focus is on self-centered concerns (how does this affect me?) or on issues that do not involve a personal stake. Primary concerns may include control of students, time and workload, gaining recognition for personal success (including grades), avoiding blame for failure.		Focus is on specific teaching tasks such as planning and management, but does not consider connections between teaching issues. Uses assessment and observations to mark success or failure without evaluating specific qualities of student learning for formative purposes.		Focus is on students. Uses assessment and interactions with students to interpret how or in what ways students are learning in order to help them. Especially concerned with struggling students.		Focus is on personal involvement with fundamental pedagogical, ethical, moral, cultural, or historical concerns and how these impact students and others.	
Inquiry (What is the process of inquiry?)	Questions about needed personal change are not asked or implied; often not acknowledging problems or blaming problems on others or limited time and resources. Critical questions and analysis are limited to critique of others. Analysis tends to be definitive and generalized.		Questions are asked by oneself about specific situations or are implied by frustration, unexpected results, exciting results, or analysis that indicates the issue is complex. Stops asking questions after initial problem is addressed.		Situated questions lead to new questions. Questions are asked with others, with open consideration of new ideas. Seeks the perspectives of students, peers, and others.		Long-term ongoing inquiry including engagement with model mentors, critical friends, critical texts, students, careful examination of critical incidents, and student learning. Asks hard questions that challenge personally held assumptions.	
Change (How does inquiry change practice and perspective?)	Analysis of practice without personal response—as if analysis is done for its own sake or as if there is a distance between self and the		Personally responds to a situation, but does not use the situation to change perspective.		Synthesizes situated inquiry to develop new insights about teaching or learners or about personal teaching strengths		A transformative reframing of perspective leading to fundamental change of practice.	

	situation.		and weaknesses leading to improvement of practice.	
Examples/Evidence	1. I've been told that it was a very intense course, but I couldn't imagine that it would be so demanding. 2 came up with concept checking questions so quickly and effectively that he made it look easy. It most definitely is not. 3. As I am in a training program, my strengths have had their ups and downs. 4. Imperatives should be used when giving instructions. 5. I´ve never thought about all the criteria and techniques that you are supposed to know as a teacher.	1. Depending on the level of students and the complexity of the task, it seems that I need to give an example in open class or demonstrate the exercise. 2. It appears that language should be graded depending on how much vocabulary and how many grammatical structures students know, otherwise getting the message across will be impossible.	1. Establishing rapport is an essential part for the setting and development of the activities in the classroom because this is the fuel for students to learn. 2. The students appreciate when the teacher monitors them, especially at the elementary level, since they can see the teacher's interest regarding their progress. 3. Depending on the level of students and the complexity of the task, it is necessary to give an example in open class or demonstrate the exercise. 4. Language should be graded depending on how much vocabulary and how many grammatical structures students know, otherwise getting the message across will be impossible.	Wow, in the middle of my unit I then began to question the success of the unit. Am I really meeting the needs of all of my students or is this too easy? Finally, after weeks of teaching, reflecting and questioning the unit it was over and I spent hours grading countless persuasive essays. After looking over the drafts and then the final essays I found a correlation between what was occurring in the classroom and what the students were writing; they were making the connection … First, I would never just do a persuasive writing unit again (even though it was in conjunction with westward expansion). I would love to make a connection between a relevant issue in student's lives and how they can utilize persuasive writing to assist them with it.

Notes: Descriptive Writing in which there is no reflection (Description of events that occurred/report of literature and no attempt to provide reasons/justification for events) will be scored 0.

Appendix 2

Questionnaire

This questionnaire is devised with the aim of looking into your actual teaching practices as a professional teacher. To that end, your careful completion of the questionnaire will definitely contribute to obtaining real data which is crucial for accurate findings. Therefore, please check the box which best describes your actual teaching practices.

1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Often 5 = Always

No.	Items	1	2	3	4	5
1.	I have a file where I keep my accounts of my teaching for reviewing purposes.					
2.	I talk about my classroom experiences with my colleagues and seek their advice/feedback.					
3.	After each lesson, I write about the accomplishments/failures of that lesson or I talk about the lesson to a colleague.					
4.	I discuss practical/theoretical issues with my colleagues.					
5.	I observe other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices.					
6.	I ask my peers to observe my teaching and comment on my teaching performance.					
7.	I read books/articles related to effective teaching to improve my classroom performance.					
8.	I participate in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues.					
9.	I think of writing articles based on my classroom experiences.					

10.	I look at journal articles or search the internet to see what the recent developments in my profession are.					
11.	I carry out small scale research activities in my classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes.					
No.	**Items**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
12.	I think of classroom events as potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them.					
13.	I talk to my students to learn about their learning styles and preferences.					
14.	I talk to my students to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests and abilities.					
15.	I ask my students whether they like a teaching task or not.					
16.	As a teacher, I think about my teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting my teaching.					
17.	I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher.					
18.	I think of the meaning or significance of my job as a teacher.					
19.	I try to find out which aspects of my teaching provide me with a sense of satisfaction.					
20.	I think about my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.					
21.	I think of the positive/negative role models I have had as a student and the way they have affected me in my practice.					
22.	I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice.					
23.	I think about instances of social injustice in my own surroundings and try to discuss them in my classes.					
24.	I think of ways to enable my students to change their social lives in fighting poverty, discrimination, and gender bias.					
25.	In my teaching, I include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty.					
26.	I think about the political aspects of my teaching and the way I may affect my students' political views.					
27.	I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and in the society in general.					
28.	I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students' achievements.					
No.	**Items**	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
29.	I think of outside social events that can influence my teaching inside the class.					

Appendix 3

Investigating the Reflection Levels and the Teaching Practices of In-service English Teachers in Indonesia

Dear Teachers,

I know that it has been a long time since you joined the camp. I would like to invite you to recall your experiences in answering the questions that aim to find out what you have done after the camp. In addition to this, I also need your help to fill in the questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire is to find out your practices as a teacher.

Questions

There are 11 questions that you need to answer. Please provide as much information as you can in answering the questions. Your answers are needed to get more information about your teaching practices and the impact(s) of conducting reflective writing during the camp. The information will be kept confidential and will be used just for research purposes.

Question 1

Have you written reflections on your teaching/academic activities after joining the camp?

_____ Yes. Please continue to Question 2.

_____ No. Please go to Question 3.

Question 2

How often do you write it? Please choose one of the answers.

_____ 1. Very often

_____ 2. Often

_____ 3. Sometimes

_____ 4. Rarely

_____ 5. Never

If you choose to answer '1, 2, 3, or 4', please explain what you have written and then go to Question 3. If you choose to answer '5', please go to Question 3.

Written reflection/reflections

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 3

Have you utilized the knowledge/skills/activities/materials that you learnt in the camp in your class after the camp?

_____ Yes. Please continue to Question 4.

_____ No. Please go to Question 10.

Question 4

Which of the following knowledge/skills/activities/materials that you learnt in the camp have you utilized in your class after the camp? You can choose more than 1 answer. After you choose it/them, please continue to Question 5.

_____ Activities related to critical thinking

_____ Activities related to interactive teaching

_____ Using authentic materials

_____ Using technology

_____ Using social media

_____ Using digital learning tools

_____ Changing how I assess my students' performance

_____ Changing how I write the multiple-choice questions

Question 5

Could you explain 1 or 2 examples of the implementation of what you have chosen in Question 4 in your class? After explaining it/them please continue to Question 6.

Explain the example/examples of the implementation

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 6

Have you had any difficulties when you implemented the knowledge/skills/activities/materials in your class?

_____ Yes. Please explain 1 or 2 of the difficulties and then continue to Question 7.

_____ No. Please go to Question 8.

Explain the difficulty/difficulties

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 7

Since you had difficulty/difficulties when you implemented it/them, did you make any changes when you implemented it/them again?

_____ Yes. Please explain 1 or 2 of the changes that you made and then continue to Question 8.

_____ No. Please explain the reason/reasons why you did not make changes and then go to Question 8.

Explain the change/changes

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Explain the reason/reasons

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 8

Were there any activities/materials that you think were not suitable for your students?

_____ Yes. Please explain one or two of the activities/materials that you used and then go to Question 9.

_____ No. Please continue to Question 10.

Explain the activities/materials

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 9

Since they were not suitable when you used them, did you make changes when you used them again?

_____ Yes. Please explain the change/changes you made and then go to Question 10

_____ No. Please explain the reason/reasons why you did not make changes and then go to Question 10.

Explain the change/changes

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Explain the reason/reasons

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Question 10

Do you think the following questions:

1. What did you learn about critical thinking/… today?
2. How can I apply what I have learnt today in my classroom?

that you were given before you started writing your reflection during the camp helped you to write your reflections?

_____ Yes. Please go to Question 11.

_____ No. Please go to Question 12.

Question 11

The questions helped me to …. (You can choose more than 1)

_____ go beyond the surface level, with critical accounts of what I encountered in the sessions that I attended

_____ produce organized reflective writing

_____ focus on what I should reflect on and provide straight-to-the-point details

_____ assist me in structuring my thoughts and producing cohesiveness in my reflection

Appendix 4

Teacher Teaching Practices

No.	Items	Level 2	Level 3
1	I have a file where I keep my accounts of my teaching for reviewing purposes.	3.29	3.92
2	I talk about my classroom experiences with my colleagues and seek their advice/feedback.	3.50	3.96
3	After each lesson, I write about the accomplishments/ failures of that lesson or I talk about the lesson to a colleague.	3.04	3.33
4	I discuss practical/theoretical issues with my colleagues.	3.00	3.79
5	I observe other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices.	2.67	2.96
6	I ask my peers to observe my teaching and comment on my teaching performance.	2.46	2.33
7	I read books/articles related to effective teaching to improve my classroom performance.	3.54	4.13
8	I participate in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues.	3.42	4.17
9	I think of writing articles based on my classroom experiences.	3.00	3.63
10	I look at journal articles or search the internet to see what the recent developments in my profession are.	3.00	3.79
11	I carry out small scale research activities in my classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes.	2.54	2.96
12	I think of classroom events as potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them.	3.08	3.67
13	I talk to my students to learn about their learning styles and preferences.	3.63	4.08
14	I talk to my students to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests and abilities.	3.75	4.04
15	I ask my students whether they like a teaching task or not.	3.42	3.96
16	As a teacher, I think about my teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting my teaching.	3.67	4.08
17	I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher.	3.42	4.13
18	I think of the meaning or significance of my job as a teacher.	3.63	4.42
19	I try to find out which aspects of my teaching provide me with a sense of satisfaction.	3.63	4.42
20	I think about my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.	3.79	4.42
21	I think of the positive/negative role models I have had as a student and the way they have affected me in my practice.	3.75	4.00
22	I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice.	3.38	4.08
23	I think about instances of social injustice in my own surroundings and try to discuss them in my classes.	2.92	3.79
24	I think of ways to enable my students to change their social lives in fighting poverty, discrimination, and gender bias.	3.38	4.00
25	In my teaching, I include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty.	2.79	3.42
26	I think about the political aspects of my teaching and the way I may affect my students' political views.	2.17	2.42
27	I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and in the society in general.	3.58	4.17
28	I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students' achievements.	3.00	3.33
29	I think of outside social events that can influence my teaching inside the class.	3.17	3.67