

<https://doi.org/10.34142/2709-7986.2023.28.2.06>

EXAMINING ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS' PRACTICE OF REFLECTIVE TEACHING COMPONENTS IN ETHIOPIA

Received: 01/09/2023

Accepted: 30/09/2023

Nigatu HABTAMU¹, & Badima BELAY²



¹ PhD student at Addis Ababa University; Wachemo University, Hossana, Ethiopia.

✉ E-Mail: nigatuhabitamu@gmail.com
nigatu.habtamu@wcu.edu.et

🆔 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3979-9502>



² Senior Editor, Addis Ababa University Press; Assistant Professor, Department of English Language & Literature, Ethiopia.

✉ E-Mail: badima.belay@aau.edu.et

🆔 <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-7134-6395>

ABSTRACT

Reflective teaching, which has attracted attention globally as an integral component of teacher pedagogy, is still a difficult concept to understand. Probably, because it is attainable only when the practitioners are committed to practice it, seeing it as the best opportunity for their professional development through critical thinking about their teaching.

*The **aim** of this study is to examine the opportunities for English language instructors to engage in the practice of reflective teaching.*

*Adopting convergent descriptive case study **method**, the study was conducted utilizing both qualitative and quantitative data sources. The quantitative data were collected through the administration of a questionnaire. It was adopted from a Reflective English Language Teaching Inventory developed by Akbari et al for forty-one English language instructors taken through comprehensive sampling in Ethiopia from Wachemo*

© Nigatu HABTAMU, & Badima BELAY, 2023

Examining English Language Instructors' Practice of Reflective Teaching Components in Ethiopia © 2023 by Nigatu HABTAMU, & Badima BELAY is licensed under **Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International**. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

University. The qualitative data was collected using interviews and reflective journal writing from four instructors taken through convenience sampling among the surveyed instructors on the basis of their willingness to participate. The interview data was transcribed and analyzed applying various stages of coding, employing software called Open Code 4. The journal entry data was analyzed using content analysis method. The quantitative data was analyzed using descriptive statistics applying SPSS version 24.

The **results** revealed that the instructors engaged in the cognitive, practical, affective and meta-cognitive reflections to a greater extent. The findings of the study further demonstrated that although the instructors are relatively good at practicing the four domains of reflection, they rarely engage in critical reflective construct.

This leads to the **conclusion** that the instructors have a gap in dealing with broader socio-cultural factors affecting their teaching practice and students' language learning beyond the classroom context.

KEYWORDS: Reflection Domains, Practice, Reflective Teaching, Instructors, Professional Development.

INTRODUCTION

Since the 19th century English Language teaching methods have evolved substantially in a search for the best method of teaching (Brown, 2007). During that time, English language teachers used to passively apply the methods channeling theoretical content knowledge without any role of adapting the content considering contextual factors (Crandall, 2000; Kumaravadivelu, 2003).

In the 20th century, however, the notion of method faced objection and declined as scholars challenged this approach (Allwright, 1991). The collapse of method era was accompanied by post-method and reflective teaching emerged as a result of this debate gaining more influence in English language education contexts since early 20th century (Akbari, 2007, 2008).

Consequently, there has been a general shift from the concept of the teacher as a technician to the teacher as a reflective practitioner and reflective teaching has become a main paradigm in English language teaching (Schön, 1983; Schön, 1987). The concept of reflective teaching entered the area of English Language teaching making instructors actively engage in the process of self-observation through keeping teaching journals, video/ audio recordings, peer suggestions and reading journals in the course of enriching their profession (Dewey, 1933; Schön, 1983).

John Dewey conceptualized reflective teaching as a method of teaching which requires thinking critically instead of passively transmitting knowledge using routine procedures established over time (Dewey, 1933). He noted that reflective teachers need to look back critically and imaginatively with logical thinking in order to derive helpful ideas (p.13). In short, reflective teaching is all about learning from experience and corroborative observation through analyzing critical events (Farrell, 2013; Farrell, 2018; Widodo, 2018). Accordingly, teachers, as reflective thinkers, need to monitor and be conscious of what

they learn, what they already know, what they are expected to know, and know how to bridge their knowledge gap (Darling-Hammond et al., 2020).

Akbari et al., (2010) developed a reflective English Language teaching model comprising practical, cognitive, affective, meta-cognitive and critical domains of reflection used to measure teachers' reflectivity. The practical reflection incorporates instructors' use of reflective activities like keeping teaching journals/portfolios, audio/video recordings, observations, analysis of critical incidents and group discussions with colleagues (Akbari, et al., 2010; Gudeta, 2022, p. 12).

The cognitive reflection deals with practitioners' self-initiated activities like conducting research, attending research conferences, and reading journals (Ibid). The affective reflection signifies instructors' reflections about their students' cultural and cognitive aspects and their emotional states (Akbari, et al., 2010). Metacognitive reflection represents instructors' knowledge and regulation of cognition having awareness on their way of learning, strengths and weaknesses. (Metzger, et al., 2018).

Finally, critical reflection requires teachers to have broader ethical, moral, social, or historical implications of teaching learning for both their classroom practices and their profession as lifelong learners (Ferrell, 2015; Lee, 2008; Larrivee, 2008). Here, it is important to note that the extent of instructors' engagement in each reflection domain may vary possibly due to various contextual factors like institutional support, professional development opportunities, and personal beliefs and values (Fonkamo, & Zeru, 2022).

Recent studies disclosed that teachers are expected to develop their reflective activities by questioning and reviewing their actions so as to build their cognitive/meta-cognitive skills as practitioners (Lundgren et al., 2017). Aalto et al., (2019) noted that the length of experience without continuous reflection doesn't genuinely provide awareness on instructors' teaching practice. This implies that in-service instructors find it difficult to directly apply the theoretical knowledge acquired during pre-service training unless they reconstruct their knowledge regularly, engaging in various domains of reflection.

Coming to the local context, Ethiopia is striving to implement reflective teaching learning in higher education, devising a platform of producing "reflective practitioners" (Ministry of Education, 2010). In this manner, teachers are expected to meet five standards of competence. Realization of reflective and inquiry teaching methods through training reflective practitioners and enriching their critical reflective capacity applying various on-job trainings is one of the standards (Ibid).

To do so, instructors should apply various strategies of reflectivity such as "reflective practitioners" as per to the competence standard of the Ministry of Education of Ethiopia (Ministry of Education, 2013; Ministry of Education, 2016). In this fashion, all Ethiopian teacher education colleges and government universities have been providing various on-job trainings including Higher Diploma Program for academic staffs to help them engage in various components of self-reflection so that they can enrich their capacities and develop their professional knowledge (Ministry of Education, 2011).

As it is discussed previously, the Ethiopian Ministry of Education has designated reflective teaching as one of the standards of competence at the policy level; however, research shows that only a few studies were conducted regarding in-service instructors' practical engagement on various domains of reflection in their teaching.

Specifically, the question “To what extent have the instructors actually been implementing various domains of reflection in their English Language teaching?” has received little attention of researchers in the local context. Overall, unlike wide-range investigation of pre-service teachers’ reflective teaching practices, the investigation of on-job instructors’ reflectivity in their teaching was taken for granted although it is worth studying as it is believed to promote instructors’ professional development to a large extent. Therefore, the present study seeks to answer the following major research question:

To what extent do English Language instructors engage in the practice of various domains of reflection (Practical, Cognitive, Affective, Metacognitive or Critical component) in their teaching?

METHODS

1. Research Design

This study employed a descriptive convergent case study research design which can lend itself to data collection from both qualitative and quantitative sources (Yin, 2018). The existing literature acknowledges mixed methods with a rationale of exploiting the strengths and compensating the inadequacies of both in single research and across studies (Johnson, & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 15). In view of that, both qualitative and quantitative data were collected and analyzed independently and then merged and interpreted to more deeply substantiate the data in this study.

2. Participants

This study required both quantitative and qualitative data. Thus, to secure quantitative data from self-reflective questionnaire, all forty-one English language instructors were taken employing comprehensive sampling from Wachemo University in the 2022 academic year as the sample size was manageable. As well, with the aim of finding subjects who can provide qualitative data, four English language instructors, selected from those surveyed, took part in the interview and journal writing process being selected through convenient sampling on the basis of their consent to participate.

3. Instruments

As the present study required both qualitative and quantitative data, interview and reflective journal writing and self-reflective questionnaires were employed as tools to collect the data. After receiving their consent, interviews were held face to face with four instructors and teaching journals were kept by those. Quantitative data was collected by administering a questionnaire adopted from English language teaching reflection inventory developed by Akbari et al. (2010) to forty-one English language instructors from Wachemo University. The aim was to determine the extent to which the instructors engage in various domains of reflection. Content validity of the tools was ascertained by the supervisor of the research and experts from the university. While checking reliability of the responses, a questionnaire was piloted with fifteen English Language instructors selected via convenience sampling from Wolkite University.

The results of the pilot study were analyzed using SPSS version 24 applying a method called internal consistency, as it is suitable to be used with single administration. The result of the Cronbach Alpha for the questionnaire was calculated as 0.706 which is interpreted as good enough/ reliable since the coefficient (0.706) lies between 0.7 and 0.8 according to the cut off points put by Hair et al. (2016). Reliability of the interview guide was tested via the technique of repeating questions in slightly different forms during the interview sessions as stated by Best and Kahn (1986).

4. Procedures of Data Collection

Before collecting the data, the researchers sought the consent of participants. Upon receipt of consent, w interview sessions were held with the sample instructors and audio-recorded. Subsequently, the four instructors prepared journal entries of their lessons, having been provided with a short training on it. After all, the questionnaire was administered to all forty-one English language instructors including those who were interviewed and kept the teaching journals.

5. Method of Data Analysis

The qualitative data collected from the interviews was transcribed into a textual form. Then, initial, axial and selective coding was conducted before starting the analysis of the data by means of Open Code4 software. Thematic data analysis was employed based on grounded theory principles, moving data from one category to another, looking for commonalities and differences within the categories. As the categories became clearer, themes emerged from the data.

Besides this, content analysis was applied to analyze journal entry data. The quantitative data obtained from the instructors' self-reflective questionnaires were analyzed for mean and standard deviation descriptively using SPSS software version 24. Finally, both quantitative and qualitative data were merged and interpreted to answer the research question.

RESULTS

In this section, quantitative and qualitative data collected from English Language instructors concerning their engagement in the components of reflection were presented.

Analysis of Quantitative Data on English Language Instructors' Reflective Domains in Their Teaching.

Akbari et al.'s (2010) questionnaire was employed to find out the extent to which instructors engage in various domains of reflection. Accordingly, the data of descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) English Language instructors' self-reported survey questionnaire on the components of reflective teaching are presented in the tables 1-4 below:

Table 1

Mean and Standard Deviation of Instructors' Practical Domain Reflective Teaching

Domain	N	Statements	Mean	Std. Dev
Practical Domain	1	I have a file where I keep my accounts of my teaching for reviewing purposes.	3.88	.739
	2	I talk about my classroom experiences with my colleagues and seek their advice / feedback.	3.52	.740
	3	After each lesson, I write about the accomplishments / failures of that lesson or I talk about the lesson to a colleague.	3.00	.625
	4	I discuss practical / theoretical issues with my colleagues.	3.93	.712
	5	I observe other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices.	4.21	.750
	6	I ask my peers to observe my teaching and comment on my teaching performance.	3.95	.795
Total			3.75	0.726

Source: Survey data (2022)

As to the practical component, the highest means (4.21 & 3.95) belong to items 5 & 6 signifying “observing other teachers’ classrooms to learn about their efficient practices” and “asking peers to observe one’s teaching and comment on teaching performance”. Whereas the lowest mean (3.00) belongs to item 3 regarding “writing about the accomplishments/ failure of the lesson, and talking about the lesson to colleagues. This tends to indicate that the instructors seem to engage in observing each other’s lesson and exchange feedback with colleagues.

Table 2

Mean and Standard Deviation of Instructors' Cognitive Domain Reflective Teaching

Domain	N	Statements	Mean	Std. Dev
Cognitive Domain	7	I read books / articles related to effective teaching to improve my classroom performance.	3.64	.485
	8	I participate in workshops / conferences related to teaching/learning issues.	3.14	.521
	9	I think of writing articles based on my classroom experiences.	3.83	.660
	10	I look at journal articles or search the internet to see what the recent developments in my profession are.	4.10	.656
	11	I carry out small scale research activities in my classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes.	4.10	.656
	12	I think of classroom events as potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them.	3.83	.660
Total			3.77	0.606

Source: Survey data (2022)

Concerning the cognitive component, the highest mean (4.10 each) is obtained for items 10 & 11, regarding “looking at journal articles or search the internet to see what the recent developments in one’s profession are” and “carrying out small scale research activities to become better informed of learning/teaching processes” respectively. The lowest mean (3.14) is for item eight representing “participating in workshops/conferences related to teaching/learning issues”. This tends to show that the instructors engaged in conducting small scale researches and in reviewing journals.

Table 3

Mean and Standard Deviation of Instructors’ Affective Domain Reflective Teaching

<i>Domain</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev</i>
Affective Domain	13	I talk to my students to learn about their learning styles and preferences.	4.10	.656
	14	I talk to my students to learn about their family backgrounds, hobbies, interests and abilities.	3.83	.660
	15	I ask my students whether they like a teaching task or not.	3.64	.485
Total			3.86	0.600

Source: Survey data (2022)

Regarding the affective/learner component, item 13, suggesting “talking to students to learn about their learning styles and preferences” received the highest mean (4.10) whereas items 14 & 15 dealing with “talking to students’ family background, hobbies, interest, and abilities”, and “asking students whether they like teaching task or not” received means 3.83 & 3.64 respectively. This depicts that the instructors engage in learner factors to a greater extent.

Table 4

Mean and Standard Deviation of Instructors’ Metacognitive Domain Reflective teaching

<i>Domain</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Statements</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std. Dev</i>
Metacognitive Domain	16	As a teacher, I think about my teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting my teaching.	3.83	.660
	17	I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher.	3.95	.795
	18	I think of the meaning or significance of my job as a teacher.	4.05	.697
	19	I try to find out which aspects of my teaching provide me with a sense of satisfaction.	4.21	.750
	20	I think about my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.	4.24	.692

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.	4.12	.504
22	I think of inconsistencies and contradictions that occur in my classroom practice.	4.10	.656
Total		4.10	0.679

Source: Survey data (2022)

Coming to the metacognitive component, the highest mean (3.67) is achieved by item 20 concerning “thinking about one’s strengths and weaknesses as a teacher”, and the lowest mean (3.83) is achieved by item 16, symbolizing “thinking about ones teaching philosophy as a teacher and the way it affects ones teaching”. Here, the respondents appear to hold thought of their own strengths and limitations, table 5.

Table 5

Mean and Standard Deviation of Instructors’ Critical Domain Reflective Teaching

Domain	N	Statements	Mean	Std. Dev
Critical Domain	23	I think about instances of social injustice in my own surrounding and try to discuss them in my classes.	1.95	.795
	24	I think of ways to enable my students to change their social lives in fighting poverty, discrimination, and gender bias.	2.00	.826
	25	In my teaching, I include less-discussed topics, such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty.	2.00	.826
	26	I think about the political aspects of my teaching and the way I may affect my students’ political views.	2.05	1.081
	27	I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and in the society in general.	2.00	.826
	28	I think about the ways gender, social class, and race influence my students’ achievements.	2.05	1.081
	29	I think of outside social events that can influence my teaching inside the class.	1.95	.795
Total			2.01	0.91

Source: Survey data (2022)

Concerning the moral/critical component, the highest means (2.05 each) are obtained from items 26 & 28 respectively, signifying “thinking about the political aspects of teaching and the way he may affect his students’ political views” and “thinking about the ways gender, social class, and race influence students’ achievement”. On the other

hand, the lowest means (1.95 each) are obtained from items 23 & 29 respectively, which are related to “thinking about instances of social injustice in one’s own surroundings and try to discuss them in classes” and related to “thinking of outside social events that can influence his teaching inside the class”.

The total mean and standard deviation of each component of reflection are also calculated and presented earlier. Consequently, the highest mean (4.10) goes to the metacognitive component followed by affective / learner component (M=3.86), cognitive component (M=3.77), the practical component (M=3.75) and critical component with the least mean value (M=2.01) respectively. This data implied that instructors engage in metacognitive, affective and cognitive and practical reflection domains to a greater extent, yet they are relatively the least in terms of implementing critical reflection domain dealing with worth of socio-cultural and moral dimensions of teaching.

Analysis of Qualitative Data on English Language Instructors’ Reflective Domains in Their Teaching

With the intention of triangulating the quantitative data under this theme, interviews were held with four instructors (among the surveyed ones) who were currently teaching English Language courses in Wachemo University to elicit detailed information on various components of reflection using guiding questions. Besides the interview, the four instructors willing to participate in qualitative data collection process prepared their teaching journal.

Thus, the qualitative data collected using interview and the journal entry were summarized in the next sections. To begin with presentation of the interview, the first guiding question which says, “How do you see your practices of writing reflective journal/diary of classroom events; sharing your practical/theoretical classroom experiences with your colleagues and observing other instructors’ classroom lessons to get feedback on your teaching practices?” deals with the practical component comprising the reflective tools such as journal writing, lesson reports, surveys and self-reflective questionnaire, audio and video recordings, observation, action research, teaching portfolios, group discussions, analyzing critical incidents as stated by (Lee, 2008; Farrell, 2018).

Answering this question, the instructors indicated that they prepare their lesson before their class and tend to document classroom events/experiences after their class, though this practice is not fully developed. For example, instructor 1 stated: “I sometimes write what I experienced after class as it helps me become more informed by providing me with feedback”.

In addition, instructor 2 added his reflection saying: “I try to jot down classroom events. I mean, if I have time, I write my classroom experiences in my diary book so that I can learn something about my weaknesses and strengths later on”. Yet instructor 3 reacted to the issue by saying: “I’m not good at documenting things I have been experiencing in my teaching learning process although I understand it is vital to do so”. And still instructor 4 narrated that he has a portfolio where he documents his students results, keeps copies of remedial classes and tutorials, but he disclosed that he rarely refers back to this file as he doesn’t have enough time to do so (See appendix-I).

This implies that instructors spend some time thinking about and reflecting on their own teaching practices in order to improve their teaching practice. The instructors in their reflection refer to past experiences to help them improve their performance. They reflect on what they did in lessons which helps them to teach progressively. The responses of the instructors' stress the main importance of talking with colleagues about class experiences and seeking their feedback and comments on teaching performance.

From their responses, one can perceive that the instructors ideally believe that they provide and acquire practical feedback and ideas to and from others or share experiences with colleagues and improve their teaching by identifying problems they have with their lessons and advancing their practices (See appendix-I). The researchers learned from the interviews on this specific issue that the instructors only occasionally have observation sessions because of time constraints and fear of criticism or dread of fault finding among each other (See appendix-I).

Concerning the cognitive component of reflective practice, Richards and Farrell, (2005) stated that reflective practitioners are expected to conduct action researches, attend conferences or workshops, and review literature in order to improve their teaching competence. Accordingly, the second interview question which asked: "How do you see your practice of conducting action researches, reading journals/books and attending research conference?" is aimed at gaining an insight into instructors' cognitive component of reflection with respect to their at professional development.

The instructors' reaction to this specific interview guide indicated that they are willing to learn from their review and use it to advance their practice. Likewise, instructors tried to express in their responses that they need to improve teaching practice and develop their profession through participation in workshops and conferences which in turn shows that instructors tend to be interested in participating in conferences to enrich their teaching performance and enhance student learning. Nevertheless, the researchers realized from their responses that the instructors are unable to engage in such research as a result of personal reasons and time constraints (See Appendix-I).

The third interview question asked "How often do you talk to your students to learn about their learning styles/preferences, interests and to identify whether they like the way of teaching or not?" addresses the instructors awareness of affective components of reflective teaching. Concerning this component, the instructors tried to elicit their reflection.

Their responses in the transcribed data portrayed that the instructor tries to pay some attention to learners' factors, including their cultural and linguistic background, their level of understanding, interest and readiness for a given task so that they create smooth interaction and interpersonal relationship with students in their English Language classrooms (See Appendix-I).

The fourth interview question asked "How do you see your self-awareness about your knowledge of subject matter, strengths, weaknesses/deficits, and situational teaching-learning techniques/strategies?" This question was posed to determine the instructors' self-awareness of meta-cognitive element. The sample instructors tried to reflect their feeling as it can be seen from the data transcribed in appendix-I.

This implies that the instructors make an effort to learn from their mistakes in order to move forward. They seemed to perceive that their overall performance in the classroom could influence their students' performance (See Appendix-I). Concerning this component of reflection, Akbari (2007) states that teachers' self-awareness about their personality, beliefs, and values and particularly their affective factors affect their tendency to engage in reflection and will affect their reaction to their own image.

From this, the researchers understood that the instructors tend to be aware of their own strengths and weaknesses, which would influence the way they teach helping them to think more about their own actions. It further denotes those teachers who have meta-cognitive element in teaching would reflect on their own affective factors in attaining alternative ways to improve students' results fostering learning.

The last interview question asked: "To what extent do you consider students' socio-cultural and moral issues in your English classroom?" The respondents indicated that socio-cultural issues affect learning directly and indirectly. The researchers concluded that although instructors have an intention to incorporate socio-cultural issues in their teaching, they rarely if ever do so because of various reasons they tried to raise (See Appendix-I). Hence, it can be said that the critical reflection component is missing in instructors' reflection process.

Besides this, the four sample instructors prepared reflective journal entries (See Appendix-II). When the researchers examined the overall journal entries, it was realized that the sampled instructors narrated only about what and how they did in class.

The contents of the instructors' journal entries heavily focus on technical aspects of teaching which proves that the instructors were striving to achieve educational objectives with mere concern of realizing the technical application of educational knowledge and basic curriculum principles (examining the skills, strategies, methods, and principles used to achieve predetermined goals or objectives focusing on the success/effectiveness of their teaching and learning experiences in classroom teaching.

In short, it was indicated in the journal entries that the instructors did not attempt to critically reflect upon the worth of teaching broadly apart from focusing on the effectiveness of their teaching with the aim of achieving the preset educational outcomes.

DISCUSSION

Merging of the quantitative and qualitative data suggests that the instructors in the study have been practicing various domains of reflection to a varying degree. That is, although the participants engage at practical, cognitive, metacognitive and affective domains to a greater extent, they were the least reflective in terms of critical domains of reflection. This was an indication of the instructors' lack of sound reflectivity in the broader socio-economic and cultural contexts which plays a vital role in the course of their professional development making teaching more effective in the wider context of education.

Interpreting the results of the present study in terms of this, the researchers realized that the instructors typically focused on their own actions of successfully completing their daily lesson (to achieve instrumental outcome). However, they were less reflective in

terms of analyzing their beliefs and contextualizing their actions in the wider socio-economic contexts justifying goals behind the teaching tasks designed to achieve the educational objectives beyond technical classroom aspects. In short, the data supports the argument that instructors rarely engage in critical reflection in connection with the broader instructional issues affecting their job directly or indirectly.

The current study through the journal entry data still proved that instructors rarely keep advanced journals reflecting their performance in terms of their strengths and gaps seemingly due to being tied up with longer working hours and lack of time for peer observation and self-reported reflection having video-recorded their teaching journal. It can be deduced from this that the instructors were the least reflective in their journal writing taking the larger context of education in to account and critically questioning their teaching practice bearing moral, ethical and socio-cultural issues in mind.

The present study is consistent with the study conducted by McGarr and Moody (2010) which found that pre-service teachers focus more on the quantity of journal entry including simple descriptions of classroom routines rather than the quality producing deep reflection. Instructors are expected to consider both breadth (content of the reflection where various aspects of personal experiences, emotions, classroom teaching, and social contexts are discussed) and depth (interpretation and analysis of broader aspects of education outside the classroom) of the reflection process with a more critical lens so that they are said to be reflective practitioners (Tiainen et al., 2018; Thompson, & Pascal, 2011).

In this regard, the sampled instructors in the study area are found at the lower descriptive journal writing level without endeavoring to provide reasons or justifications for the situations with little narration of the influences of socio-political issues affecting students' learning. This can be an indication of the lack of engagement in critical reflection in the context of the present study.

CONCLUSION

The current study was carried out with the aim of examining the extent to which ELT instructors engage in practicing various components of reflectivity (Practical, cognitive, affective, meta-cognitive and critical reflective components) in their teaching. The quantitative data showed that instructors have been engaging in metacognitive, affective/learner, practical, and cognitive components of reflection relatively to a greater extent. However, the data disclosed that the status of instructors' engagement in the critical reflection domain is said to be the lowest. This is also confirmed by the interview and self-reflective journal entry data provided by the sample instructors under this theme.

It can be deduced from the findings of the current study that although the instructors are relatively better at practicing the four domains of reflection, they are poorer at practicing critical reflective construct. This further leads to the conclusion that the instructors have a gap in dealing with broader cultural and socio-economic learner factors (norms and values of society) affecting instructors' teaching practice and students' language learning beyond the classroom context.

Therefore, it can generally be concluded from the results of the study that English Language instructors in the study area have not developed the culture of engaging in

critical reflection which considers the worth of broader educational aspects in English language classrooms.

Indeed, it has been broadly indicated in the literature that teachers endowed with various domains of reflection are very likely to improve their teaching using variety of engaging teaching strategies which have key roles in learner' mastery of the subject matter as there is significant relationship between teachers' degree of reflectivity and students' achievement (Rezaeyan, & Nikoopour, 2013). This implies that domains of reflection influence instructors' behaviors, attitudes, and their practice having direct correlation with their professional development and students' mastery of the instructional contents.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data that supports the findings of this study can be obtained from the corresponding author up on reasonable request.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I am grateful to the enumerators at the English Language and Literature Departments of Wachemo University and Addis Ababa University, as well as to the participants of the study who took part in this research.

FUNDING

The authors received no direct funding for this research.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no potential conflict of interest reported by the authors.

REFERENCES

- Aalto, E., Tarnanen, M., & Heikkinen, H. L. (2019). Constructing a pedagogical practice across disciplines in preservice teacher education. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 85, 69–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.06.006>
- Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System*, 35(2), 192-207. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2006.12.008>
- Akbari, R. (2008). Postmethod discourse and practice. *TESOL Quarterly*, 42(4), 641-652. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00152.x>
- Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Dadvand, B. (2010). Development of English language teaching reflection inventory. *System*, 38(2), 211-227. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.003>
- Allwright, R. L. (1991). *The death of the method (Working Paper #10)*. The Exploratory Practice Center, University of Lancaster, England.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (1986). *Research in education*. A Division of Simon & Schuster, Inc.
- Jürgen, R. (2019). Brookfield, D. S. (2017). Becoming a critically reflective teacher (2nd ed.). *Journal of Applied Learning & Teaching*, 2(2), 122-124. <https://doi.org/10.37074/jalt.2019.2.2.22>
-

- Crandall, J. A. (2000). Language teacher education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 34-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500200032>
- Darling-Hammond, L., Flook, L., Cook-Harvey, C., Barron, B., & Osher, D. (2020). Implications for educational practice of the science of learning and development. *Applied Developmental Science*, 24(2), 97-140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2018.1537791>
- Gudeta, D. (2022) Professional development through reflective practice: The case of Addis Ababa secondary school EFL in-service teachers. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), Article 2030076. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2030076>
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the education process*. Chicago: Henry Regnery.
- Fonkamo, D., & Zeru, A. (2022). Exploring the impediments on the application of reflective teaching in EFL paragraph writing classes. *Cogent Education*, 9(1), Article 2109648. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2022.2109648>
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2013). Critical incident analysis through narrative reflective practice: a case study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 1(1), 79-89. https://ijltr.urmia.ac.ir/article_20454.html
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Promoting teacher reflection in second language education. A framework for TESOL professionals*. Routledge.
- Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). It's not who you are! It's how you teach! Critical competencies associated with effective teaching. *RELC Journal*, 46(1), 79-88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688214568096>
- Ferrell, T. S. C. (2018). *Research on reflective practice in TESOL*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315206332>
- Farrell, T. S., & Kennedy, B. (2019). Reflective practice framework for TESOL teachers: one teacher's reflective journey. *Reflective Practice*, 20(1), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2018.1539657>
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C.M., & Sarstedt, M. A. (2016). *Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, CA.
- Johnson, R. B., & Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2004). Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189x033007014>
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). Critical Language Pedagogy: A Post method Perspective on English Language Teaching. *World English*, 22(4), 539-550. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.2003.00317.x>
- 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>
- Lee, I. (2008). Fostering pre-service reflection through response Journals'. *Teacher Education Quarterly: San Francisco*, 35(1), 117-139. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ810661.pdf>

- Lundgren, H., Bang, A., Justice, S. B., Marsick, V. J., Poell, R. F., Yorks, L., Clark, M., & Sung, S. (2017). Conceptualizing reflection in experience-based workplace learning. *Human Resource Development International*, 20(4), 305–326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13678868.2017.1308717>
- McGarr, O., & Moody, J. (2010). Scaffolding or stifling? The influence of journal requirements on students' engagement in reflective practice. *Reflective Practice*, 11(5), 579–591. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2010.516968>
- Metzger, K. J., Smith, B. A., Brown, E., & Soneral, P. A. G. (2018). SMASH: A diagnostic tool to monitor student metacognition, affect, and study habits in an undergraduate science course. *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 47(3), 88–99. http://dx.doi.org/10.2505/4/jcst18_047_03_88
- Ministry of Education. (2011). *Higher Diploma Program for Teacher Educator: Handbook*. Addis Ababa: Mimeographed.
- Ministry of Education. (2010). *Competencies for secondary school English language teachers*. Ethiopia.
- Ministry of Education. (2013). *Secondary School Teacher Training Implementation*. Haramaya University.
- Ministry of Education. (2016). *The Status of Secondary School Teacher Education in Ethiopia*. Ethiopia: Ministry of Education.
- Razaeyan, M., & Nikoopour, J. (2013). The relationship between reflectivity of foreign language teachers with Iranian students' achievement. *Journal of Language Sciences & Linguistics*, 1(1), 9–20. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344268821_The_Relationship_between_Reflectivity_of_Foreign_Language_Teachers_with_Iranian_Students'_Achievement
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge University Press.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner: Toward a new design for teaching and learning in the professions*. Jossey-Bass.
- Thompson, N., & Pascal, J. (2011). Reflective practice: An existentialist perspective. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 12(1), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2011.541089>
- Tiainen, O., Korkeamäki, R.-L., & Dreher, M. J. (2018). Becoming reflective practitioners: A case study of three beginning pre service teachers. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 62(4), 586–600. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2016.1258673>
- Widodo, P. H. (2018). Needs assessment in professional development (PD). In J. I. Liontas, M. DelliCarpini, & J. C. Riopel (Eds.), *The TESOL Encyclopaedia of English Language Teaching* (pp. 1–7). Wiley & Sons.

Yin, K.R. (2018). *Case Study and Applications: Design and Methods* (6th Ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX-I: *Transcribed Interview Data*

1. Researcher: Welcome to this interview session. Coming to the first question, how do you see your practices of writing reflective journal/diary of classroom events; sharing your practical/theoretical classroom experiences with your colleagues and observing other instructors' classroom lessons to get feedback on your teaching practices?

Instructor 1: *Actually, I sometimes write what I experienced after class as it helps me become more informed by providing me with feedback. Sometimes I talk with my colleagues about the parts that I am not sure about that and we share our experience and materials one another and up-to-date information. Although I have much interest to observe other teacher classrooms to get their experiences on teaching approaches, I rarely do it as I hardly have enough time since I am loaded throughout the week*

Researcher: Thank you very much. Let's go to the next question. How do you see your practice of conducting action researches, reading journals/books and attending research conference?

Instructor 1: *Well, I read books or articles that relate to method of teaching and learning English Language because I want to stay updated with the contemporary pedagogical aspects. As well, I try to attend some research conferences and educational workshops prepared by the university and acquire insights on my way of teaching. However, to be honest, I am not good at conducting action researches due to lack of time and research experience*

Researcher: Okay. The next question: How often do you talk to your students so as to learn about their learning styles/preferences, hobbies/interests and to identify whether they like your way of teaching or not?"

Instructor 1: *I often ask students to reflect their comment on my way of teaching, what they learned, what they liked and what they didn't understand, what is clear and what is ambiguous seeking further explanation. As well, I often advise my students to approach me as their father or immediate person so that they share their needs, lacks and preferences freely.*

Researcher: How do you see your self-awareness about your knowledge of subject matter, strengths, weaknesses/deficits, situational teaching-learning techniques/strategies?

Instructor: *I often think in advance of my goals of teaching as a teacher, how I can teach a specific content of lesson better using appropriate teaching approach for my students in connection with their achievement. I plan ahead what specific teaching technique I am going to employ being aware of which teaching technique I use will be most effective. I ask myself if I have considered all possible techniques after teaching a lesson as well. If the chosen specific teaching technique is unsuccessful, I will learn from my weaknesses and try to modify my teaching technique*

Researcher: Coming to the last question, to what extent do you consider students' socio-cultural and moral issues in your English classroom?

Instructor 1: *Frankly speaking, although I think about the influences of social issues such as gender and other aspects having direct or indirect impact on their achievements, I rarely practice them in reality. Let alone considering such outside classroom issues, it is quite difficult to cover the portion effectively unless you rush as much as you can*

2. Researcher: Welcome to this interview session. Shall we start? How do you see your practices of writing reflective journal/diary of classroom events; sharing your practical/theoretical classroom experiences with your colleagues and observing other instructors' classroom lessons to get feedback on your teaching practices?

Instructor 2: *Indeed, I try to jot down classroom events. I mean, if I have time, I write my classroom experiences in my diary book so that I can learn something about my weaknesses and strengths later on. I talk about my experience (practical issues) I have with my students and the lesson I taught to them and how to integrate a specific topic into the tasks that would be useful for them and ask for their feedback. Most of the time I have a plan to conduct observation of my friends' classroom in order to share their way of teaching and other related issues. However, I occasionally do this ahead of my plan on account of lack of enough free time to do so. And even I ask my staff members to observe my lesson, but they have hardly any time to do so.*

Researcher: Thank you very much. Let's go to the next question. How do you see your practice of conducting action researches, reading journals/books and attending research conference?

Instructor 2: *As far as I am concerned with teaching English language, I want to read a number of language related books or journals or review literature so that I could have new innovative teaching approaches and authentic contents for my students to improve my class routine. I often participate in annual conferences and workshops prepared by my institution and I learn something new more about my teaching practice from such meetings which is one of the cognitive component of reflection. But I haven't conducted action research yet there is big experience and skill gap to conduct such researches.*

Researcher: Well done. The next question: How often do you talk to your students so as to learn about their learning styles/preferences, hobbies/interests and to identify whether they like your way of teaching or not?"

Instructor 2: *Sometimes, I make my students jot down whatever they feel, like, dislike, prefer, etc. about my teaching method and I collect their piece of papers so that I can learn from their feedback / response and improve my teaching practice. Here, it seems that this instructor is aware of the value of getting feedback from students about their teaching progress and in improving their classroom teaching (teaching in a better way). Additionally, instructor disclosed his idea that different students have different emotional needs, so he needs to spend more time with students to learn about their needs and interests so as to increase their engagement in classroom*

Researcher: How do you see your self-awareness about your knowledge of subject matter, strengths, weaknesses / deficits, situational teaching-learning techniques / strategies?

Instructor 2: *I often think of my positive/negative role model to my students and the way it affects my students while teaching as a university instructor. I take some time to think particularly about negative aspects of my teaching and try to find solution for the weaknesses. Regularly, I ask myself how well I am doing while I am teaching as well as I often try to ensure to what extent my students understand the concept while I am teaching and even, I try to use teaching techniques that were effective in the past. In short, as any teacher I have self-awareness especially on my deficiencies and I do my best to compensate my weaknesses updating myself regularly as effective teacher learning from my past teaching experiences*

Researcher: Okay, the last question, to what extent do you consider students' socio-cultural and moral issues in your English classroom?

Instructor 2: *Sometimes I suppose to pay attention to a number of social events generated from outside of classroom that can influence my English language teaching inside the class and adversely affect students' achievement, but practically I rarely consider them as I am loaded heavily by other tiresome and demanding tasks of planning and preparing teaching tasks for my students. Hence, I can say that I am not good at considering socio-cultural aspects of learning while teaching English for my students*

3. Researcher: Welcome to this interview session. Let's start the first question. How do you see your practices of writing reflective journal/diary of classroom events; sharing your practical/theoretical classroom experiences with your colleagues and observing other instructors' classroom lessons to get feedback on your teaching practices?

Instructor 3: *I'm not good at documenting things I have been experiencing in my teaching learning process although I understand it is vital to do so Yet I am not good at observing my colleagues' classroom experiences and how they teach their students and I haven't invited them to observe my teaching practice yet. This is my main gap I need to improve. Apart from sharing some educational materials and experiences with my staff mates, I don't have the experience of observing their classroom lesson, nor have I invited them to observe my classroom lessons formally*

Researcher: Thank you very much. Let's go to the next question. How do you see your practice of conducting action researches, reading journals/books and attending research conference?

Instructor 3: *Well, I enjoy reading academic or non-academic books both in hard and soft copies and even I advise my students to do so as I believe that reading is my world. However, I am not good at conducting basic as well as action researches apart from participating in annual research conferences and workshops as I have been loaded throughout the academic year*

Researcher: Well done. The next question: How often do you talk to your students so as to learn about their learning styles / preferences, hobbies/interests and to identify whether they like your way of teaching or not?"

Instructor 3: *As a matter of fact, I try to approach my students being friendly with them with main intention of getting their feelings, inner motives and needs/interests. Normally, I need to do away with my students' negative factors like boredom, nervousness, depression and lack of self-confidence adversely affecting their English Language learning using different strategies asking to participate calling by their names and appreciating for their participation*

Researcher: How do you see your self-awareness about your knowledge of subject matter, strengths, weaknesses / deficits, situational teaching-learning techniques / strategies?

Instructor 3: *I use different helpful teaching techniques depending on the content. That is, content of that specific lesson determines choose of each teaching technique I use in class. I often find myself assessing how useful my teaching techniques are while teaching and even I ask myself if I could have used different techniques after each lesson. I question myself repeatedly if I meet my teaching goals while or post teaching*

Researcher: Coming to the last question, to what extent do you consider students' socio-cultural and moral issues in your English classroom?

Instructor 3: *As far as my experience of teaching is concerned, I am quite aware of various internal and external factors like gender, socio-economic status and the like, which affect students learning. Accordingly, I sometimes guide female students and other male volunteer students having schedule how to read with plan and how to deal with other socio-cultural issues. However, I can't say that I fully address such aspects due to my own work load and time constraints.*

4. Researcher: Welcome to this interview session. Let's go to the first question, how do you see your practices of writing reflective journal/diary of classroom events; sharing your practical/theoretical classroom experiences with your colleagues and observing other instructors' classroom lessons to get feedback on your teaching practices?

Instructor 4: *I have a portfolio where I reserve my students results, copy of remedial and tutorials, yet I rarely refer back to such file as I don't have enough time to do so. I occasionally try to share experiences regarding academic issues by having formal or informal discussion time with my colleagues, but I feel that it is not adequate. We hardly try to observe each other's classroom formally most probably due to the fact that we wrongly think it as fault finding game or critics.*

Researcher: Thank you very much. Let's go to the next question. How do you see your practice of conducting action researches, reading journals/books and attending research conference?

Instructor 4: *As there is better access of internet in the institution, I often read a number of language related books or journals or review literature so that I could have current and up to date teaching experiences and contents for my students to improve their learning. I never miss whenever there is annual conference and educational workshops in the university as I want to learn something new more about my teaching practice from such meetings. Except participating in research conferences I couldn't conduct action researches due to lack of time*

Researcher: *That sounds great. The next question: How often do you talk to your students so as to learn about their learning styles/preferences, hobbies/interests and to identify whether they like your way of teaching or not?"*

Instructor 4: *I often try to find out students' emotional problems distracting their attention further ruining their learning and I try my best to alleviate their distractions having predetermined schedule for counseling and guidance per week.*

Researcher: How do you see your self-awareness about your knowledge of subject matter, strengths, weaknesses / deficits, situational teaching-learning techniques / strategies?

Instructor 4: *Well, I am used to setting my specific teaching goals earlier before I start teaching and organizing my time to best accomplish my teaching goals. I ask myself how well I have accomplished my teaching goals after I have finished the lesson. This way, I often evaluate my strengths and particularly my weaknesses. This way, I use my strengths to compensate for my weaknesses in my teaching. Thus, I can say that I am aware of the strengths and weaknesses in my teaching*

Researcher: Splendid. Finally, to what extent do you consider students' socio-cultural and moral issues in your English classroom?

Instructor 4: *As I have experienced from my past practices of teaching, learners come to English classroom with a lot of, socio-cultural barriers which adversely affect their learning. Gender difference is among other factors which make female students dependent on their male students lacking self-confidence and self-esteem. In view of that, I provide some remedial activities including makeup and tutorial programs for female students and I often make them alert that they would be successful as long as they are diligent in their learning having work schedule. Yet, there is still huge gap from me in employing more affirmative actions sufficiently to support them at least to help them not to lose hope in their education.*

APPENDIX-II: Journal Entry of the Four Sample English Language Instructors

Instructor-1:

In today's lesson, I mainly focused on components parts and types of paragraphs along with various stage of writing it. After that, I gave them sample paragraph on argumentation, exposition, narration and description types. Then, students are guided to produce argumentative texts on providing debatable issues like "Boys and girls are equal; women should stay at home and work on household work; female genital mutilation should be banned by law". I guided the students to collaborate and generate idea in group, but majority of students were not volunteer to take part in the group discussion instead they were trying to write independently. Some groups of students were arguing that the girls should work at home because house hold work is females' specialty.

Instructor-2:

The portion I covered today deals with a reading passage entitled "Reading for Study" which is found in Unit-1, page-9 of the new Communicative English Skills-I module. In Preparation stage of my lesson, I introduced the topic of lesson to the students and I provided them with the concept of scanning and skimming strategies of reading

shortly; then I made the students read silently and individually with the objective of guessing the contextual meanings of the new words and answer comprehension questions. The lesson was not completely successful due to the fact that students did not finish the exercise on time.

Instructor-3:

The topic I tried to impart today was “Active and Passive Voices” which was one of the grammar lessons on unit one of the new Communicative English Skills-II. In view of that, the lesson was started by asking students to define active and passive voice providing examples on each. Then after, the learners were guided to read an article provided on page-12 of the module and identify passive verb forms listed in the text. Finally, the students were supplied with correction on their answer. After all, the students were given home take assignment of paragraph completion which requires the students to write the correct active or passive forms of the verbs in brackets on page 14 of the new Communicative English Skills-II module prepared for Undergraduate students enrolled in Ethiopian universities.

Instructor-4:

The course I taught was “Basic writing Skills” given for second year English major students in Wachemo University. The main objective of this specific lesson was identifying basic structure/components of a Paragraph: the introduction (topic sentence), the body (detailed or supportive sentences), and the conclusion. Accordingly, the students were asked to identify the components of the text given underneath: Over the past thirty years, research in the health arena has attracted psychologists and sociologists. The focus of psychological research in this area is concerned with individual motives, attitudes and beliefs in relation to both health and illness. Anthropological studies, however, are concerned with culture and health care. Such studies concentrate on a conception of disease as a cultural product and on the way social and cultural life in the past affect beliefs about health and illness. In sociological studies the emphasis is similar, but focused more on social relations within a particular social structure with respect to medical care. It is rare that an individual study takes all three perspectives although this may yield the most beneficial results.

АНОТАЦІЯ / ABSTRACT [in Ukrainian]:**ВИВЧЕННЯ ДОСВІДУ ВИКЛАДАЧІВ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ ЩОДО
КОМПОНЕНТІВ РЕФЛЕКСИВНОГО НАВЧАННЯ В ЕФІОПІЇ**

Рефлексивне викладання, яке привернуло належну увагу в усьому світі як невід’ємний компонент педагогіки освітянина, все ще є важкою концепцією для розуміння. Ймовірно тому, що воно доступне лише тоді, коли досвідчені освітяни практикують його, вбачаючи в ньому найкращу можливість для свого професійного розвитку через критичне осмислення свого викладання.

Це дослідження мало на меті вивчити ступінь, у якому викладачі англійської мови залучаються до різноманітних практик у різних сферах рефлексії свого викладання.

Дослідження було проведено за допомогою конвергентного описового **методу** дослідження. Дослідження було проведено з використанням як якісних, так і кількісних даних. Кількісні дані були зібрані за допомогою опитувальника, взятого з «Рефлексивного переліку викладання англійської мови», розробленого Акбарі та співавторами для сорока одного викладача англійської мови, шляхом всебічної вибірки в університеті Ефіопії, у Ваchemo. Якісні дані були зібрані за допомогою інтерв'ю та рефлексивних записів у журналі чотирьох викладачів, відібраних шляхом практичної вибірки серед опитаних викладачів на основі їх бажання брати участь у дослідженні. Дані інтерв'ю були записані та проаналізовані із застосуванням різних етапів кодування із використанням програмного забезпечення Open Code 4. Дані журнальних записів були проаналізовані за допомогою аналізу їх змісту. Кількісні дані були проаналізовані за допомогою описової статистики із застосуванням SPSS, версія 24.

Результати показали, що викладачі здебільшого брали участь у когнітивних, практичних, афективних і мета когнітивних рефлексіях. Результати дослідження також показали, що хоча викладачі відносно краще практикують чотири види рефлексії, вони рідко беруть участь у критичній рефлексії.

Це приводить до **висновку**, що викладачі мають прогалину в роботі з ширшими соціокультурними факторами, які впливають на практику викладачів і вивчення мови студентами поза контекстом аудиторії.

КЛЮЧОВІ СЛОВА: види рефлексії, практика, рефлексивне навчання, викладачі, професійний розвиток

CITE THIS ARTICLE AS (APA style):

Habtamu, N., & Belay, B. (2023). Examining English Language Instructors' Practice of Reflective Teaching Components in Ethiopia. *Educational Challenges*, 28(2), 75-96. <https://doi.org/10.34142/2709-7986.2023.28.2.06>

