On the Impact of an EFL Reflective Practicum on Teachers' Self-Efficacy

Maryam Maleki [*]

M.A in TEFL, Islamic Azad University, Takestan Branch, Iran

Abstract

After the disappearance of the method and with the emergence of post-method condition, the English language teachers were required to make improvised decisions in the world of classroom. In absence of any method to be adhered to in this era, the seemingly left-alone teachers were supported by the principles of reflective teaching. In other words, the ELT profession has witnessed a heightened interest directed towards teachers and teacher-related variables over the past few decades. As one of the key variables of teachers, self-efficacy has been given a lion share of the variance accounting for the performance of teachers in the classroom. The purpose of the current study is to investigate the effect of an EFL reflective teaching practicum on the teachers' sense of self-efficacy. In so doing, a sample of 30 practicing English teachers were divided into two experimental and control groups based on their scores on self-efficacy pre-test. The participants of the experimental group (n=16) underwent a reflection course during 10 weeks while, the control group (n=15) participated in a regular teacher training course based on the review of the traditional methods in ELT. The statistical analysis of the collected data revealed that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and posttest for the experimental group while for the control group the results of both tests did not differ significantly. The findings of the present study offer both theoretical and pedagogical implications for teacher education program.

Keywords: teacher reflection, self-efficacy, post-method condition

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of language teaching, we have witnessed dramatic changes and shift of orientations in second language teaching and teacher education including "a shift from transmission, product-oriented theories to constructivist, process-oriented theories of learning, teaching and teacher education" (Crandall, 2000, p. 34). One of the greatest effects of this shift has been the emergence of post-method. As an attempt to mitigate the burden upon the shoulders of teachers, reflective teaching was introduced as a solution to the problems teachers face in the beyond method era.

---

* Correspondence: Maryam Maleki, Email: m_maleki23@yahoo.com

With the incremental significance of English as an international language, ELT teachers, both pre-service and in-service, need to be careful of the busy teacher syndrome whereby they just stick to the textbook because they are too busy to reflect on what they are doing. Pre- service teachers follow the textbook because they have little teaching experience; however experienced teachers have their years of teaching experience and many are already firmly set in their own ways of teaching. Nevertheless, as Fanselow (1988) has pointed out, these experienced teachers are often unaware of their teaching routines and beliefs; consequently, they may not actually do what they think they do in the classroom (Farrell, 1999).

Historically and theoretically, reflection has been influenced by many trends and philosophies which make the term reflection open to different interpretations (Akbari, 2006). According to Richards and Schmidt (2002) Reflective Teaching is an approach to teaching and to teacher education which is based on the assumption that teachers can improve their understanding of teaching and the quality of their own teaching by reflecting critically on their teaching experiences. In teacher education programs, activities which seek to develop a reflective approach to teaching aim to develop the skills of considering the teaching process thoughtfully, analytically and objectively, as a way of improving classroom practice.

This may involve the use of; (1) journals in which student teachers or practicing teachers write about and describe classroom experiences and use their descriptions as basis for review and reflection, (2) audio and video taping of a teacher's lesson by the teacher, for purposes of later review and reflection, (3) group discussion with peers or a supervisor in order to explore issues that come out of classroom experience.

Recent research on reflective practice has used different and conflicting terms to define reflective teaching. However, the major approaches to the study of reflective practice are presented below:

- Reflection-in-action through which the teacher has to have a kind of knowing-in-action. It includes visions, understandings, and awareness that teachers capture in the moment of teaching (Schon 1983).
- Reflection-on-action which deals with thinking back on what we have done to discover how our knowing-in-action may have contributed to an unexpected action" (Schon, 1987).

Reflective teaching will make teachers question clichés they have learned during their early formative years and will enable them to "develop more informed practice, [make] tactic beliefs and practical knowledge explicit... leading to new ways of knowing and articulating" (Crandall, 2001, p. 40). Those who do not reflect upon their practices will be likely to teach as they were taught and thus ineffective teaching strategies... will be replicated (Braun & Crumpler, 2004, p.61).

Reflection, in the words of a layman, "... simply means thinking about something," but for some, "it is a well-defined and crafted practice that carries very specific meaning and associated action" (Loughran, 2002, p. 33). In a review of the literature on reflective

teaching, one discovers that there is much variance in the definition. As Gimenez (1999) puts it, "... the meanings of reflection are not clear cut...there is such a variety of uses for this word that it is imperative to specify what one really means when referring to reflection".

Richards (1990, p. 5) sees reflection as a key component of teacher development. He says that self- inquiry and critical thinking can "help teachers move from a level where they may be guided largely by impulse, intuition, or routine, to a level where their actions are guided by reflection and critical thinking." He also believes that "Critical reflection refers to an activity or process in which experience is recalled, considered, and evaluated, usually in relation to a border purpose. It is a response to a past experience and involves conscious recall and examination of the experience as a basis for evaluation and decision-making and as a source for planning and action."

Dewey (1933, p.9) sees a further distinction in teaching when he says "routine teaching takes place when the means are problematic but the ends are taken for granted." However, he sees reflective action as entailing "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the further consequences to which it leads".

Compared with the traditional teacher education which "views teachers as passive recipients of transmitted knowledge rather than active participants in the construction of meaning ... and which does not take into account the thinking or decision-making of teachers" (Crandall, 2000, p. 35), the post-method condition is a practice-driven construct which calls into question the traditional conceptualization of teachers as a channel of received knowledge (Kumaravadivelu, 1994, 2003a). Within the pedagogy of particularity as one of the constituents of the post-method debate, teachers are entrusted with "observing their teaching acts, evaluating their outcomes, identifying problems, finding solutions, and trying them out to see once again what works and what does not" (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 539).

Each day practitioners face a host of complex, context-specific problems about which there are no easy answers. No singular right course of action is available although practitioners can envision certain courses as better than others. In facing these problems, they must take action. Underlying these actions is a personal, guiding theory. By pausing to reflect, by reaching inward and attempting to understand that personal theory of action, teachers... exercise the most professional aspect of practice (Mc Cutcheon, 1985, p.48) Dewey (1933) noted that teachers who do not bother to reflect on their work become slaves to routine and their actions are guided mostly by impulse, tradition and/or authority rather than by informed decision making. This decision making, Dewey (1933) insisted should be based on systematic and conscious reflections because teaching experience when combined with these reflections can only lead to awareness, development and growth. More recently, Zeichner and Liston (1987, p. 24) returned to Dewey's original ideas when they distinguished between routine action and reflective action and suggested that for teachers "routine action is guided primarily by tradition, external authority and circumstance" whereas reflective action "entails the

active, persistent and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge".

Low reflective teachers mostly focus their effort on finding the most effective means to solve problems and lose sight that their everyday reality is only one of the many possible alternatives and that there is more than one way to face a problem. On the other hand, they accept the view of the problem that is the commonly accepted one in a given situation. Kumaravadivelu implies the name "passive technicians" to these teachers because he believes that they lose sight of the purpose and end toward which they are working and simply become the agent of others. Scientific or theoretical knowledge, while not directly applicable because of the uniqueness of each situation, is somehow useful to practitioners as they engage in reflective practice and create professional knowledge.

Although a significant body of research on engaging EFL/ESL teachers with reflection has been developed over the past decades, few studies have focused on the effect of reflective practice on teachers' self-efficacy. In workplaces, there are indications that many EFL teachers do not seem to either have appropriate beliefs, attitudes, anxieties, and motivations or make a good use of proper language teaching strategies. EFL teachers in general and Iranian EFL teachers in particular should address these issues by engaging in critical reflections to provide their students with appropriate activities to face up to the emotional difficulties of social interaction and language learning, but more importantly, to open their own work to inspection and to construct valid accounts of their educational practices (Finch, 2005).

On the other hand, in recent years, with the postulation of post-method pedagogy which empowers language teachers "to theorize from their practice and practice what they theorize" (Kumaravadivelu, 2001, p. 541) and critical pedagogy which considers teachers as "transformative intellectuals" (Pennycook, 1989, p. 613), more attention has been paid to ELT teachers. As a result, some researchers have investigated different characteristics of language teachers. One of the features that has attracted a good deal of attention recently is teachers' sense of self-efficacy which is a crucial parameter in determining teachers' opinion about their job, their classroom activities, and their influence on students' outcomes.

The purpose of the present study is to investigate the effect of an EFL reflective program on their sense of self-efficacy. In doing so, the researcher examines that how expanding teachers' understanding of the concept of reflection and action research will contribute to teachers' degree of self-efficacy and bring about effective teachers. From reflective teaching perspective, effective teachers are characterized as possessing attitudes of open-mindedness, responsibility, and wholeheartedness, along with the technical skills for inquiry and problem solving. This combination of attitudes and skills is what Dewey (1933) used to portray his ideal for the reflective teacher (Farrell, 1999). In order to accomplish the purpose of the current study, the following research question was formulated:

- ▪ Does a reflective EFL teacher education course affect the self-efficacy of Iranian EFL teachers significantly?

METHOD

Participants

To accomplish the purpose of the current study, a sample of practicing teachers were recruited. The participants of this study were selected from practicing EFL teachers teaching at state and private schools in Tehran. The sampling procedure employed was convenient sampling. The participant teachers' teaching experience ranged from 3 to 11 years with the average experience of 5.6 years. There were 13 male and 17 female teachers among the participants. Participation in this study was totally voluntary. Their age ranged from 19 to 38 with mean age of 25.3. All of the participants were from English major backgrounds.

Measures

Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale

Teachers' sense of efficacy was measured by using the Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale (previously called the Ohio State Teacher Efficacy Scale, Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). This measure consists of 24 items, assessed along a 9-point continuum. Previous factor analyses (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001) have identified three 8-item subscales in this construct: Efficacy for Instructional Strategies, Efficacy for Classroom Management, and Efficacy for Student Engagement. The instrument has been frequently used in various studies (Eslami & Fatahhi, 2008; Knobloch, 2006; Grammatikopoulos, Tsigilis, & Koustelios, 2007).

Procedure

The study was carried out in three main phases; administering the self-efficacy instrument as a pre-test, conduction of the ten-session treatment of the reflective teaching course for the experimental group, collecting data from the same self-efficacy questionnaire once more, as a post-test.

- • Phase 1: after the selection of the participant teachers for the study, the self-efficacy instrument was first administered to the participants by the researcher.

- • Phase 2: then upon scoring the collected instruments, those teachers (15 teachers) whose scores were lower on the administered scale were selected as the participants of the treatment which was a reflective course. These participants who were regarded to be less self-efficacious participated in a 30-hour reflective course conducted by the researcher. The treatment for the experimental group lasted about ten weeks- three hours per week. According to the scrutiny of the available literature on reflective teaching, a framework consisting of two major strands for an ELT curriculum was developed by the researcher. These strands include *content and tool/strategy*. Moreover, the

course content was based on: a) Introducing the forums, b) Reviewing methods of teaching, c)Exploring the principles of methods, d) Providing an opportunity to reflect on the methods being used, e) Familiarizing the participants with post-method era, f) Introducing reflective practice, g) Exploring the ways to engage in reflective practice, h) Promoting further reflection.

The aforementioned information was gathered based on the related published articles, linked theses, and well-known university course books. Each session used to be started by a warm-up activity and reviewing the previously practiced lessons. Then, it was followed by the main lesson of the day. In the end, the participant teachers tried to explore their own ways to engage in reflective practice and develop further reflection. Such practices involved; thinking aloud, classroom discussions, grouping practices, cooperative learning, brainstorming, consensus building, buzz groups, role-playing, questioning, etc.

The other 15 participants who served as the control group underwent a regular training course in which the traditional methods of language teaching were covered. Conducted by the researcher, the method-based training was similarly a 30-hour course that lasted about ten weeks- three hours per week. However, the content was totally different in a sense that it mainly focused on teaching the four skills and grammar based on a given exact method with no reflection on what they were being told. Phase 3: after ten weeks the whole participants including the experimental and control group were required to respond the self-efficacy scale.

The filled out instruments were converted to numerical data and were fed into statistical data analysis software (e.g., SPSS). The final stage of the study concluded analyzing the data gathered, and interpreting it in order to be able to answer the research questions. The numerical data obtained from the administered questionnaires were subjected to data analyses. To analyze the collected data, independent-samples t-tests were run.

RESULTS

In data analysis, first of all the normality of the data was investigated. One of the key assumptions of parametric tests is that the data should be normally distributed. This normality of the distribution, in fact, means that the sample is significantly representative of the population. In order to check this normality assumption in this study, one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test was conducted on both pre-test and post-test scores of self-efficacy instrument. In this test, if the significance level is larger than .05, then we can claim that the data are normally distributed and there is no significant difference between the sample and the population. In other words, we can say that our sample is representative of the population. As it is shown in Table 1, the results of K-S test indicated that the data is normally distributed; hence, this assumption of parametric tests was not violated.

Table 1. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Pre-Self-efficacy	Post-Self-efficacy
N		30	30
Normal Parameters[a]	Mean	90.9667	97.1667
	Std. Deviation	8.50754	8.44489
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.121	.213
	Positive	.121	.213
	Negative	-.106	-.157
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.661	1.166
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.774	.132

Results of the Pre-test

As previously mentioned, the pre- test of this study was an instrument measuring teacher's sense of efficacy, the purpose of this pre-test was to specify the teacher's level of sense of efficacy. This test was administered to both teachers of control and experimental groups. The results of the pre-test for both control and experimental groups are presented in the table below.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the Results of the Pre-test

	group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Self-efficacy	experimental	15	90.1333	9.36457	2.41792
	control	15	91.8000	7.79377	2.01234

As Table 2 indicates, the total number of participants was 30. According to the table, the mean score of 91.80 with a standard deviation of 7.79 was obtained for the control group on the self-efficacy scale, while the mean score of 90.13 with a standard deviation of 9.36 was gained for the experimental group. Regarding the statistical data presented in table 4.2, we can conclude that the two groups of teachers were homogeneous in terms of their self-efficacy before conduction of the experiment and there was no significant difference between the two groups before the teacher education program.

To ensure that there wasn't a statistically significant difference between the control group and experimental group in terms of self-efficacy prior to the conduction of the treatment, two independent samples t-test were run for each variable the results of which are presented below in table 3.

Table 3. Independent t–test for Control Group and Experimental Group Performance on the Pretest

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Self-efficacy	Equal variances assumed	2.924	.098	-.530	28	.600
	Equal variances not assumed			-.530	27.106	.601

As shown in the table 3 for the teacher self-efficacy variable, the t-critical value is higher than the t-observed - 0.530 at 0.05 level of significance, i.e. t (28) = - 0.530. The Sig (2-tailed) value is .098 which is higher than the assumed level of significance 0.05, this reveals that there was not any statistically significant difference between control and experimental group in terms of teacher self-efficacy variable prior to the conduction of the treatment of the study. Therefore, it can be concluded that two groups of in-service teachers were of the same level of self-efficacy before the treatment of the study which was specified teacher education program for each group.

Results of the Post-test

After the conduction of the specified treatment which was teacher reflection course for the experimental group, the post-tests of the study which were the same instrument measuring teacher self-efficacy was administered to the in-service teachers in both groups in order to measure their gains and degree of improvement in self-efficacy. The results of the post-tests have been presented in table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics of the Results of the Post-test

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Self-efficacy	experimental	15	100.5333	8.89516	2.29672
	Control	15`	93.8000	6.65690	1.71880

With regard to the teacher self-efficacy variable, Table 4 indicates that there has been a significant improvement in the mean score of experimental group after receiving reflection treatment. A mean score of 100.53 with a standard deviation of 8.89 was gained for the experimental group, while the mean score of 93.80 with a standard deviation of 6.65 was obtained for the control group.

Investigating the Research Question

The research question investigated the effect of a reflective EFL teacher education course on the self-efficacy of Iranian EFL teachers. In fact, the purpose of the study was to explore the efficacy of an EFL reflective course in enhancing self-efficacy of in-service Iranian EFL teachers. Simply said, the traditional package of teacher education program and the reflective teaching course were compared with each other. In so doing, since the two groups' mean scores were not statistically different on pre-test, the two groups were compared in terms of their post-test mean scores. The descriptive statistics for control group and experimental group have been presented in table 5 below. As the table indicates, the mean score for experimental group is higher than that of control group.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Control and Experimental Group on the Self-efficacy Post-test

	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Scores	Control	26	13.00	5.028	.986
	Experimental	25	16.28	5.748	1.150

Nevertheless, in order to make sure that the difference between these two groups is statistically significant an independent samples t-test was carried out. The results of the t-test are presented in table 6 below:

Table 6. Independent t–test for Control Group and Experimental Group Performance on the Self-Efficacy Posttest

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Self	Equal variances assumed	4.170	.041	2.347	28	.026	6.73333
	Equal variances not assumed			2.347	25.937	.027	6.73333

As presented in table 6., with 28 degrees of freedom the t-observed at 0.05 level of significance, i.e., t(28)= 2.347, exceeds the t-critical value and means that the observed difference between groups is statistically significant and meaningful. The Sig.(2-tailed) of 0.041 which is smaller than the assumed level of significance 0.05 supports the meaningfulness of the difference between the two groups, therefore, the null hypothesis can be rejected and it can be concluded that a reflective EFL teacher education course had a significant effect on the teacher self-efficacy of Iranian EFL teachers and it was significantly more effective than the traditional package of teacher education program. Therefore, it is concluded that the treatment has been effective and has increased the self-efficacy of teachers of the experimental group on the post-test.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Upon investigating the main research question of the study regarding "the effect of a reflective EFL teacher education course on the self-efficacy of Iranian EFL teachers", the statistical analysis revealed that the null hypothesis of the study was rejected. In other words, it was revealed that the difference between the means of the scores of the control group and the experimental group was significant. Then, to empirically investigate the significance of the difference between the mean scores, the researcher ran an independent samples T-Test using SPSS software. The result of the T-Test revealed that the difference between the means of the control group and that of the experimental group was statistically significant. This means that the reflection practicum did have a significant effect on the self-efficacy of Iranian EFL teachers. Therefore, it can be argued that Iranian EFL teachers benefited from reflection teacher education package more than the method teacher education package. As a matter of fact, such a progress in self-efficacy was not observed in the control group, which was taught based on method package of teacher education. To generalize the results, it might be concluded that if we train teachers by engaging them in reflective practice, they grow in terms of self-efficacy. As a matter of fact, reflective teaching might be an effective teacher education program in the Iranian context.

As far as self-efficacy of teachers is concerned, the results of this study somehow chime with the results of those studies in which teacher education programs and practicums have positively impacted confidence levels through successful participation in field experiences that are connected to course work (Busch, Pederson, Espin, & Weissenberger, 2001; Goddard & Foster, 2001; Hebert & Worthy, 2001; Yost, Forlenza-Bailey & Shaw, 1999).

The more successful experience a teacher has with being engaged in reflection and reflective practice, the higher the confidence level of the teacher, which in turn, positively affects self-efficacy. Therefore, if the environment is conducive to positive growth and provides the inexperienced teacher with opportunities for success, then the likelihood is that his/her self-efficacy will increase. On the other hand, if the practicing teacher experiences little success early or while student teaching, judgments of low efficacy may determine how long the teacher will persist in developing a strong teaching repertoire.

In the context of the current study a "reflective practicum" (Schon, 1987) in which Iranian EFL teachers were provided opportunities for "learning by teaching, learning by doing and learning by collaborating" (Darling-Hammond, 1994) grew in terms of their self-efficacy. The current findings might also support the claim by Ross (1992) who believed that a change in perspective is the basis for developing a reflective practitioner. In other words, the reflection practicum in the current study might have changed the perspectives of the practicing teachers and have resulted in higher level of self-efficacy.

The findings and the outcome of this study might have both theoretical and pedagogical implications. Theoretically speaking, this study might contribute to research on teacher education in general and the reflective teaching in particular. From the theoretical point of view, the findings of the current study will enhance the body of literature on reflective teaching and teachers' professional development in terms of self-efficacy. Given the pervasive appeal of methods in the first place, this study may illuminate some facts regarding the applicability and appropriacy of both method and post-method debate in the Iranian context.

As far as the implications of the study are concerned, it can be claimed that the post method era has not done much for practitioners and ELT teachers, since as Bell (2003) states, language teachers have never been that much engaged with post method; method has been an academically invented and has been of little practical value for individuals who had to deal with the day to day problems of real teaching. Moreover, as many scholars believe the reality of the post method era itself can be questioned since in spite of teachers' apparent freedom of action, standard tests designed by education departments and textbooks which require adherence to even the smallest details through their teacher guides mean that, in reality, not much freedom is given to teachers (Bell, 2003).

Given the limitations inherent in both method and post-method as stated above, reflective teaching is regarded as a plausible teacher education model or framework.

Reflective teaching is viewed as a teacher education program by which teachers are endowed with a sort of improvisational power and reflective ability to make instantaneous decisions in the classroom. However, in this context, promoting reflective teaching without properly appraising its consequences will add to the confusion of our time (Britzman, 2000). Though reflection is supposed to be a plausible model, at its best, reflective teaching can provide language teachers with a repertoire of techniques to become more conscious of their own actions and feelings in and outside classrooms; at its worse, it can lead to isolation from the discourse community.

This study, employing a quantitative research methodology, was the only empirical study which investigated the efficacy of reflection practicum in enhancing self-efficacy. In order to give credibility to the findings of the current study, similar studies had better to be replicated employing mixed method designs. In such studies the perceptions of the practicing teachers towards the implementation of reflection practicum could be investigated. The present study needs to be followed by further research projects in future. Future studies can be carried out in order to investigate the effect of reflective teaching teacher education program on the professional development of teachers. Since professional development of teachers is a hot topic nowadays, the conduction of such studies might have much to offer. Moreover, the relationship between the English teachers' degree of reflection and their degree of self-efficacy is another topic worth being investigated. It may be hypothesized that more self-efficacious English teachers may be more willing to implement post-method pedagogy in their classes.

REFERENCES

Akbari, R. (2006). Post method debate and foreign language teacher education. Paper presented at *TESOL Arabia's Annual Conference.* Dubai: United Arab Emirates.

Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System*, *35* (2), 192-207.

Ary, D., Jacobs, C. L., & Razavieh, A. (1990). *Introduction to research in education*. Montreal: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bejarano, C., (2000*). Personal teacher efficacy and Mexican-American student math achievement*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Northern Arizona University, US.

Bell, D.M. (2003). Method and post method: are they really so incompatible? *TESOL Quarterly*, *37*, 325–336.

Braun, J.A., & Crumpler, T. P. (2004). The social memoir. An analysis of reflective ability in pre-service methods course. *Teaching and teacher Education, 20*, 59 – 75.

Britzman, D.P. (2000). Teacher education in the confusion of out times. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *51*, 200–205.

Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2000). A longitudinal study of teacher burnout and perceived self-efficacy in classroom management. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *16*, 239-253.

Busch, T.W., Pederson, K., Espin, C.A., & Weissenberger, J.W. (2001). Teaching students with learning disabilities: Perception of a first-year teacher. *The Journal of Special Education, 35*(2), 92-99.

Chacón, C. T. (2005). Teachers' perceived efficacy among English as a foreign language teachers in middle schools in Venezuela. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 257-272.

Crandall, J. A. (2000). Language teacher education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 34-55.

Crandall, J.A. (2001). Keeping up to date as an ESL or EFL professional. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 535-552) Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cunningham, F. M. (2001). Reflecting Teaching Practice in Adult ESL Settings. *ERIC Digest*, 1-7.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Developing professional development schools: Early lessons, challenges and promises. In L. Darling-Hammond, *Professional development schools* (pp.1-27). New York, Teachers College Press.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How We Think*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Eslami. R. Z. & Fattahi, A. (2008). Teachers' sense of self-efficacy, English proficiency, and instructional strategies: A study of nonnative EFL teachers in Iran. *TESL EJ, 11*(4).

Fanselow, J. F. (1988). Let's see; Contrasting conversations about teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *22*, 113-120.

Farrell, T. (2001). Tailoring Reflection to Individual Needs: a TESOL Case Study. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *27*(1), 23-38. doi:10.1080/02607470120042528,

Farrell, T. (2003), Reflective teaching: Principles and practice. *English Teaching Forum, 41*(4), 14-21.

Farrell, T. (2004). *Reflective Practice in Action: 80 Reflection Breaks for Busy Teachers*. California: Corwin Press.

Farrell, T. (2010). Reflective Language Teaching From Research to Practice. *TESL Canada Journal, 27*, 2.

Fendler, L. (2003). Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors. Historical Influences and Political Reverberations. *Educational Researcher, 32*, 16 – 25.

Finch, A. E. (2005). Action Research: Empowering the Teachers. Pleiades: Journal of Teaching Young Learners of English, *1*(1), 30-48. Retrieved August 4, 2006 from http://www.eslteachersboard.com/cgi-bin/articles/index.pl?read=950.

Friedman, I. A., & Kass, E. (2002). Teacher self-efficacy: A classroom-organization conceptualization. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18,* 675-686.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 569-582.

Gimenez, T. (1999). Reflective Teaching and Teacher Education Contributions from Teacher Training. *Linguagem & Ensino*, *2*(2),129-143.

Goddard, J.T., & Foster, R.Y. (2001). The experiences of neophyte teachers: A critical constructivist assessment. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 349-365.

Hansen, D. T. (1998). The Moral is in the Practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *14*(6),653-655.

Hanson, W. E., Creswell, J. W., Plano Clark, V. L., Petska, K. S., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mixed methods research designs in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *52*(2), 224–235.

Hebert, E., & Worthy, T. (2001). Does the first year of teaching have to be a bad one? A case study of success. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 879-911.

Hillier, Y. (2005*). Reflective Teaching in Further and Adult Education*. London: Continuum.

Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *21*, 343-356.

Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E., (1993). Teachers' sense of efficacy and the organizational health of schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, *93*(4), 355-372.

Ixer, G. (1999). There's No Such Thing as Reflection. *British Association of Social Workers*, *29,* 513-527.

Jackson, M. (2006). In M. Jackson, D. D. Ignatavicius, & B. Case. (Eds.), *Critical Thinking and Clinical Judgment* (pp. 3-17). London: Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Inc.

Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: a typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *18*, 73-85.

Killon, J. & G. Todnew. (1991). A process of personal theory building. *Educational Leadership, 48*(6), 14-16.

Knobloch, N. (2006). Exploring relationships of teachers' sense of efficacy in two student teaching programs. *Journal of Agricultural Education, 47*(2), 36-47.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The Post-method Condition: (E)merging Strategies for Second/Foreign Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, *28*(1), 27-48.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2001). Toward a Post-method Pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, *35*(4), 537-560.

Lee, V. E., Dedrick, R. F., & Smith, J. B. (1991). The effect of the social organization of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction. *Sociology of Education*, *64*(3), 190-208.

Loughran, J. J. (2002). Effective Reflective Practice: In Search of Meaning in Learning about Teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53* (1), 33-43.

McFee, G. (1993). Reflections on the nature of action-research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *23*, 173-183.

Meiers, M. (2003). Reflective Teaching Builds Learning Communities. *Teaching Today for Tomorrow*, 1-7.

Grammatikopoulos, V., Tsigilis, N., & Koustelios, A. (2007). Influential factors of an educational programme implementation evaluation: A cross-validation approach. *Evaluation & Research in Education*, *20*(2), 100-113.

Pennycook, A. (1989). The Concept of Method, Interested Knowledge, and the Politics of Language Teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(4), 589-612.

Pickett, A. (2000). *Reflective Teaching Practices and Academic Skills Instruction*. Retrieve from http://www.indiana.edu/~l506/mod02/pickett.html.

Pollard, A. et al. (2006). *Reflective Teaching. London*: Continuum.

Richards, J. C. (1990). Beyond training: approaches to teacher education in language teaching. *Language Teacher*, *24*(2), 3-8.

Richards, J. C. & Lockhart, C. (1999). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. (2005). *Professional Development for Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ross, J. A. (1992). Teacher efficacy and the effects of coaching on student achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *17*(1), 51-65.

Schon, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. London: Temple Smith.

Schon, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reyective practitioner.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*, 1-22.

Schulz, A. R. (2000). Foreign Language Teacher Development: MLJ Perspective-1916-1999. *The Modern Language Journal*, *84* (4), 495-522.

Stanley, C. (1998). A Framework for Teacher Reflectivity. *TESOL Quarterly*, *32*(3), 584-591.

Tschannen-Moran, M, & Hoy, W, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17*, 783–805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research*, *68*, 202-248.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of ESL teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tsui, A. B. M. (2007). Complexities of identity formation: A narrative inquiry of an EFL teacher. *TESOL Quarterly*, *41*(4), 657 – 680.

Veenman, S. (1984) .Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 54*(2), 143-178.

Yost, D.S., Forlenza-Bailey, A., & Shaw, S.F. (1999). Teachers who embrace diversity: The role of reflection, discourse, and field experiences in education. *The Professional Educator, 21*(2), 1-14.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An Introduction*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Zeichner, K. & O. Liston. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *HER*, *57*(1), 22-48.