REFLECTIVITY THROUGH THE ANALYSIS OF TEACHER TALK: THE CASE OF PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS

S. İpek KURU GÖNEN
Anadolu University, Faculty of Education, Department of English Language
Teaching, ipekkuru@anadolu.edu.tr
Asuman AŞIK
Gazi University, Gazi Faculty of Education, Department of English Language
Teaching, asuman.asik@gazi.edu.tr

Abstract

Reflective practices are considered significant in terms of increasing the level of reflective and critical thinking of language teachers by promoting self-evaluation. Analysis of classroom interaction can be regarded as one of the ways to improve teacher reflection. This study aims at investigating reflectivity of pre-service English teachers by engaging them in the analysis of their language use through a framework that enabled them focus on self-evaluation of teacher talk and various aspects of classroom interaction. For this purpose, a total of 44 pre-service teachers in the English Language Teaching programmes of two universities in Turkey participated in the study. The participants consisted of a control group and a study group. The study group received training on the analysis of their own talk by using the self-evaluation of teacher talk framework. The study was conducted through mixed methods approach. Quantitative data were collected through a questionnaire while qualitative data were collected through reflective diaries. The results indicated that although both groups improved their reflectivity, pre-service English teachers in the study group were able move upwards in reflectivity levels compared to the control group through the use of a specific framework. The study might be of interest of teacher trainers, pre-service teachers and researchers as it provides useful implications for the role of reflection in teaching.

Key Words: *Reflection, Pre-service Teacher Education, Teacher Talk, Classroom Interaction.*

ÖĞRETMEN KONUŞMASI ANALİZİ İLE YANSITICILIK: HİZMET ÖNCESİ İNGİLİZCE ÖĞRETMENLERİNİN DURUMU

Özet

Yansıtıcı uygulamalar, öz-değerlendirmeyi destekleyerek dil öğretmenlerinin yansıtıcı ve eleştirel düşünme seviyesini arttırması açısından önemli bulunmaktadır. Sınıf etkileşimi analizi, öğretmen yansıtmasını geliştirmenin yollarından birisi olarak görülebilmektedir. Bu çalışma, öğretmen konuşmaları ve sınıf içi etkileşimin farklı yönleri üzerine öz değerlendirme yapmaya olanak veren bir çerçeve vasıtasıyla, hizmet öncesi öğretmen adaylarının kendi dil kullanımlarını analiz etmelerini sağlayarak yansıtıcılıklarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaç doğrultusunda, Türkiye'deki iki üniversitenin İngilizce Öğretmenliği programlarından toplam 44 hizmet öncesi öğretmen çalışmaya katılmıştır. Katılımcılar, bir kontrol grubu ve bir de araştırma grubundan oluşmaktadır. Araştırma grubu, öğretmen konuşmasının öz değerlendirmesi çerçevesini kullanarak kendi konuşmalarının analizi konusunda eğitim almışlardır. Araştırmada karma yöntem yaklaşımı uygulanmıştır. Nicel veriler bir anket ile toplanırken, nitel veriler yansıtıcı günlüklerle toplanmıştır. Sonuçlar, hem araştırma hem kontrol grubundaki öğrencilerin yansıtmalarında bir gelişim olmasına rağmen belirli bir çerçeve kullanan araştırma grubundaki hizmet öncesi İngilizce öğretmenlerinin yansıtıcı düşünme seviyelerinin kontrol grubuna göre daha üst seviyelere çıktığını göstermiştir. Çalışma, öğretimde yansıma hakkında yararlı çıkarımlar sağladığı için öğretmen eğitmenleri, hizmet öncesi öğretmenler ve araştırmacıların ilgisini çekebilir.

S. İpek KURU GÖNEN, Asuman AŞIK

Introduction

In order to handle the ever-changing dynamic nature of teaching and deal with diverse problems of the students in the 21st century, developing a reflective attitude is a necessity (Darling-Hammond, 2006; Garza & Smith, 2015; Lyngsnes, 2012). In its basic sense, Dewey (1933) defines reflection as an active process different from routine action, which requires responding to changes and adapting to these changes easily. Thus, reflection is considered as a basic condition to adapt to different teaching contexts, manage the complexity of teaching process and develop personal understanding (Liakopoulou, 2012). Fostering reflective thinking in pre-service teacher (PST henceforth) education is of crucial importance to promote personal growth and improve teaching practices before prospective teachers step into professional teaching life. Reflective practices of PSTs need to be investigated to find out how they reflect on current practices and whether they can critically look behind their actions.

To evaluate reflections of teachers, Taggart and Wilson (2005) propose a three-layered reflectivity pyramid including technical, contextual and dialectical levels. Teachers in the technical level focus on achieving the desired outcomes rather than the effects of these outcomes on student learning or their own professional improvement. The contextual level of reflectivity steps beyond the outcomes and prioritizes other interlocutors in the classroom such as the students and their needs. Teachers in this level look for alternative ways to promote improvement. The third and the highest level of reflectivity, dialectical level, involves critical reflection which necessitates analysing the rationale behind actions, evaluating theories and questioning experiences within a broader lens. Teachers in this critical reflectivity level question the effects of the outcomes in a wider social perspective (Gale & Jackson, 1997).

A move from technical to higher levels of reflectivity is quite important for PST development as these teachers have more chances to improve their current practices and evaluate themselves with a critical eye before they embark into professional life. Developing such an attitude in the pre-service period would contribute much to self-confidence (Mergler & Spooner-Lane, 2012) since teachers who are involved in critical reflection are able to see their strengths and weaknesses (Fairbanks & Meritt, 1998) and are engaged in the continuous cycle of self-observation and self-evaluation (Cunningham-Florez, 2001; Kaminski, 2003). However, moving from technical to critical levels of reflectivity requires time, training, personal involvement, and opportunities for reflective practices (Chen, Lumpe & Bishop, 2013).

Reflective practices of PSTs and how to foster more reflectivity in the pre-service period have been investigated in various contexts. Cohen-Sayag and Fischl (2012) focused on the effects of reflective writing to find out links between these writings and teaching experiences with emphasis on investigating the levels of

reflection. The results put forward that the PSTs' reflections were mainly descriptive and there were fewer instances of critical reflection. Although the participants increased their level of reflectivity through reflective writing, their teaching behaviours seemed not to change accordingly. In another study, Liakopoulou (2012) investigated the effects of field experience on the reflective practices of PSTs. This study showed that the PSTs generally reflected superficially and their reflections lack critical evaluations. In order to promote higher levels of reflectivity, providing PSTs with some opportunities for reflection is highly recommended. Garza and Smith (2015) pinpoint the necessity of facilitating reflective practices of PSTs via different tools. They suggest blogging as a platform to foster such practices in which PSTs challenge and reinforce social, emotional and political aspects of teaching. Other tools such as guided observations (Hrevnac, 2011), action research (Odhiambo, 2010), guided reflections of recorded teaching assignments (Downey, 2008), reflections on micro-skills teaching videos and online blogs (Tan et al., 2010), structured classroom activities (Rodman, 2010) and blogging portfolios (Chen et al., 2013) were reported to promote increased self-awareness and foster critical inquiry into teaching practices.

It is obvious from the aforementioned studies that deliberate reflections guided by designed tools or environments support PSTs' professional growth. Opportunities for reflectivity in teaching contexts are of crucial importance to foster further knowledge, skills and attitudes (Lee, 2005). Such opportunities; thus, need to be incorporated into the existing field experience courses to expand the potential of field experience for PSTs. Lee (2005) underlines the importance of engaging PSTs in reflective activities for the progress of professional growth. Similarly, Rodman (2010) suggests using structured reflection in PST education to help them understand the nature of teaching and learning. In this respect, systematic training in reflective practices is assumed as a requirement to cultivate reflectivity in the pre-service period (Liakopoulou, 2012). One way to foster such reflectivity is using specific instruments or frameworks that would enable PSTs to make self-evaluations by reflecting on their experiences, and providing opportunities for systematic training and applications of these frameworks. Based on this need, a framework designed to promote reflection through self-evaluations of teacher talk was implemented in this study.

Self-evaluation of teacher talk: A framework for reflection

Teacher Talk (TT henceforth) is acknowledged as one of the crucial elements of classroom interaction, management and language acquisition in language classrooms. Recently, the quality of TT is considered more influential than its quantity (Kumaravadivelu, 1999; Walsh, 2002, 2003); thus, TT should be analysed in detail in order to find out its correspondence with the pedagogic objective of a particular context. Particularly, foreign language classrooms are TT-led environments where teachers usually lead students to a discussion or elicitation in the target language. Therefore, language teachers need to increase their

awareness about their talk in terms of contribution to communicative language learning.

In this sense, a framework for reflection of language teachers about their use of TT, called Self-Evaluation of Teacher Talk (henceforth SETT) is developed by Walsh (2006). SETT is based on four classroom modes and thirteen interactional features. These modes are managerial, materials, skills and systems, and classroom context modes which are specified according to micro classroom contexts to investigate the relationship between language used and pedagogic purpose. Managerial mode is related to the organization of the classroom and activities while materials mode includes actions for material-based practices such as eliciting and clarification. Skills and systems mode involves the practices of students about a particular skill while classroom context mode refers to actions that learners conduct during classroom environment. There are thirteen interactional context modes listed in SETT which are *display and referential questions, form-focused and content feedback, direct repair, extended teacher/learner turn, turn completion, teacher echo, teacher interruptions, extended wait-time, scaffolding and seeking clarification* (See Appendix A). Walsh (2002) underlines the potential of these interactional features as teachers can increase student participation and interfere less into interaction patterns when they pay attention to their own talk during interaction.

Studies (Huan & Wang, 2011; Incecay, 2010; Mann & Walsh, 2013; Seedhouse, 2008; Sert, 2015) stress the importance of raising awareness of language teachers towards classroom interaction. To these ends, SETT framework was suggested to be used by language teachers as a reflection tool in both in-service and PST training (Walsh, 2013). It was revealed that SETT helped teachers use meta-language and develop a more critical reflection towards classroom discourse (Walsh, 2006). Moreover, when used as a tool, SETT would lead to a more data-led reflective practice to systematically evaluate classroom interactional process (Walsh & Mann, 2015).

Research Questions

Along with the literature provided, more studies are required to investigate the effects of different reflective practices on the teacher development (Garza & Smith, 2015). The aim of this study was to investigate whether there was an increase in the reflectivity of the PSTs when they were engaged in a systematic application of SETT experience. The research questions guiding the study were as follows:

1. Is there a change in the reflectivity of the PSTs before and after the SETT experience?
2. What are the reflectivity levels of the PSTs before and after the SETT experience?

Method

Participants

A total of 44 PSTs from the ELT Departments of two respected universities in Turkey participated in the study. The participants were in their final years of a four-year education program. They were chosen according to the non-probability convenience sampling method suggested by Creswell (2005) since all of them were available and voluntary at the time of the study. The PSTs participated in the study on a voluntary basis and signed consent forms that guaranteed the confidentiality of their participation. There were two groups of participants in the study: a control group and a study group, and each group consisted of 22 participants. The participants were conducting their field experience by discussing their experiences with their mentors and supervisors regularly. Different than the control group, the study group was trained on the analysis of TT, classroom interaction, and used SETT grid, which are explained in detail below.

Context of the Study

All the participants were enrolled in a field experience course as a requirement of the four-year ELT program. In this course, PSTs are required to prepare lesson plans and teach once a week at the assigned state schools in pairs or triads. A cooperating mentor in that school guides them during their practice and a supervisor in the faculty conducts the course. The supervisor visits schools and observes PSTs' performances in order to evaluate their performance and give feedback. The research lasted for eight weeks of field experience. Control group went on the activities mentioned above while the study group received 10-hour training on the analysis of TT, classroom interaction and SETT. After training sessions, the PSTs audio recorded a maximum of 15-minute snapshots in their classes for three times. They analysed their own recordings using the SETT instrument to identify the different interactional features of their talk. Then, they gave peer feedback about each other's recordings regarding SETT items. After each analysis of TT and peer discussions, participants wrote reflective diaries for three times on this experience.

Data Collection Instruments

The Profile of Reflective Thinking Attributes

In order to find out whether there was any change in the reflectivity of the PSTs after SETT experience, a quantitative instrument, The Profile of Reflective Thinking Attributes (henceforth PRTA, see Appendix B) developed by Taggart and Wilson (2005) was used. The PRTA is based on different reflective levels on the Reflective Thinking Pyramid which are technical, contextual and dialectical reflectivity levels respectively. The instrument includes a total of 30 statements on a four point Likert type scale ranging from "Almost always" to "Seldom". The statements require the participants select the indicator that best reflect agreement about the situations when they face with problems and when preparing,

implementing and assessing a lesson. The PRTA is a self-scoring instrument specifically designed for teachers in pre-service or in-service period and aims at identifying the reflectivity levels of the teachers based on some attributes associated with reflective thinking and practice. This instrument was chosen as it allowed to create awareness on the current reflective thinking levels of the teachers and helped to detect any change in the reflectivity of the teachers when used before and after a reflective practice (Taggart & Wilson, 2005). Furthermore, the instrument was found reliable to be used with the PSTs in the Turkish EFL context with Cronbach Alpha coefficient of 0.77 (Kuru Gönen, 2012).

Reflective Diaries

In order to collect qualitative data and to support data triangulation, the participants were also required to keep reflective diaries about their opinions regarding the SETT experience. Keeping reflective diaries are found effective to promote habitual reflection on teaching experience and increase awareness about teachers' concerns and opinions (Lee, 2005). Thus, the PSTs in the study were asked to write reflective diaries upon their SETT experience biweekly according to the guiding questions provided (See Appendix C). These reflective diaries focused on their perceptions and feelings regarding recorded snapshots of their teaching experiences. In order to familiarize the participants with diary writing, sample diaries written by similar PSTs were analysed first.

Data Analysis

The study used a mixed methods approach to enhance and validate the results. The data collected with the survey of PRTA were analysed quantitatively. The minimum score that can be gained through the survey was 30 whereas the maximum score was 120. The numbers of the circled indicators were tallied, and then the indicators were multiplied by the tally number to arrive at a sub-total. The four sub-totals were added and the score gained as a result of this calculation was used to categorize the reflectivity levels of the participants. Taggart and Wilson (2005) provide the key for the categorization per each reflectivity level as in the following: Technical level: score below 75; Contextual level: scores between 75 and 104; Dialectical level: scores between 105 and 120. Following this key, participants' scores were classified according to the reflectivity levels, and the raw frequencies were calculated. All participants responded to this questionnaire two times: before and after the field experience. Despite the small number of the PSTs in control and study groups, paired-samples t-test was conducted for both groups since the data met the normality assumption. The results were displayed over mean scores per each group. Furthermore, first and last reflective diaries of the PSTs in the study group were analysed qualitatively by two raters to identify the reflectivity levels and detect any change. Raters decided on whether the PSTs' reflections were in the 'technical', 'contextual' or 'dialectical' levels of reflectivity. The instances of different levels of reflectivity in the initial diaries were compared with the ones in the final reflective diaries to see the difference in the level of reflectivity. These

data were used to support the quantitative findings pointing at the change in the level of reflectivity after SETT experience. Inter-rater reliability for this analysis procedure was measured as well and was found .90 which pinpointed a high degree of reliability.

Results and Discussion

RQ1. Is there any change in the reflectivity of the PSTs before and after the SETT experience?

In order to find out whether the SETT experience caused any changes in the reflectivity of the PSTs, a paired-samples t-test was applied to the pre and post-test mean scores participants got from PRTA. Same test was also conducted to detect any change between the pre and post test scores of the control group as well. Table 1 below shows mean scores and the results of paired-samples t-test conducted for both study and control groups respectively.

Table 1. *Paired-samples t-test Results of Study and Control Groups*

	Pre-test		Post-test		df	t	p
	M	SD	M	SD			
Study Group	81.59	10.47	95.68	12.58	21	- 8.722	.000*
Control Group	81,59	10.85	84,32	11.35	21	-2.212	.000**

As shown in Table 1, pre-test mean scores of study (M=81.59, SD= 10.47) and control groups (M=81.59, SD=10.85) were similar at the beginning of the study. As for post-test scores, the study group had a higher mean score (M=95.68, SD=12.58) than the control group (M=84.32, SD=11.35). Paired-samples t-test results yielded that there was a statistically significant difference between pre and post-test mean scores of both the study group (t(21)= -8.722; p< .01) and control group (t(21)= -2.212; p< .05). That is, both groups displayed advancement in terms of reflectivity. Although control group did not participate in the SETT experience, their reflectivity improved in course of their pre-service teaching experiences as a requirement of the field experience course.

This result may be attributed to teaching practices of all the PSTs in both groups. Throughout PST practices, it was possible that all the PSTs involved in some sort of reflection by looking back at their actions, and evaluating teaching practices. In course of field experience, the PSTs planned lessons, taught accordingly and had chances to receive feedback from their peers. Thus, PSTs in both the study and the control group might have opportunities for self-awareness through reflection. Being involved in teaching practices with a chance to be observed and get feedback from peers might likely to improve the reflectivity of all the PSTs in the study. It has been widely acknowledged that, field experience may serve as a bridge between theory and practice and has a potential to provide a valuable context in which PSTs develop a personal competence (Al-Hassan, Barakat & Al-Hassan, 2012; Kauffman, 1992; Puckett & Anderson, 2002; Smith & Lev-Ari, 2005). What is more, field experience may provoke reflectivity for PSTs with chances of guided observation,

self-awareness and critical evaluation (Arrastia et al., 2014, Garza & Smith, 2015). It can be assumed that all the PSTs in this study benefited from the field experience opportunities for reflection. They did not merely go to assigned schools and taught lessons, but they were involved in some sort of reflective action in which they were more likely to think about what happened to them and make evaluations to take action (Jasper, 2003). In this respect, cooperation with the mentor teachers in the schools, continuous support from the supervisor in the faculty and their peers might help to foster reflectivity for both groups of PSTs.

Although statistical findings did not display a visible treatment effect on behalf of the SETT experience the study group was involved in, when the differences between the pre and post-test mean scores of the study group (14.09) and control group (2.73) were taken into consideration, the gain of the study group became visible. That is, the PSTs in the study group had more gains than the ones in the control group in terms of reflectivity. The PSTs in the study group were enrolled in the SETT experience in which they continuously evaluated their own talk and had chances to gain self-awareness about the effects of their own talk on student involvement. Griffin (2003) and Anderson, Barksdale and Hite (2005) put forward that when the PSTs were given chances to reflect more on their practices accompanied by sufficient time and effectively implemented activities, reflective potential of field experience could be expanded. The SETT experience described in this study may have served as an effective reflective activity in which the PSTs developed a critical eye to look beyond their teaching practices and analyze different dimensions of their own talk. One reason the PSTs in the study group had higher gain in reflectivity may be related to systematic design of SETT experience implemented into the field experience course. Throughout this practice, analyzing their own talk from various perspectives, focusing on the interactional features of the classroom, finding out their strengths and weaknesses related to their language use and reflecting on all these might have an effect on the increase in their reflectivity. When the difference between the mean scores of study and control groups were considered, being engaged in the SETT experience with a reflective perspective might have helped the PSTs in the study group surpass the mean scores of the control group.

RQ2. What are the reflectivity levels of the PSTs before and after the SETT experience?

The quantitative instrument used to identify the reflectivity of the participants, namely PRTA, categorized the reflectivity levels as technical, contextual and dialectical. Due to the small number of the participants and categorical nature of the levels, no statistical test was run and the results related to the change in the reflectivity levels of the PST were given in a descriptive manner. Table 2 below shows the differences between the study group and the control group for the change in reflectivity levels.

Table 2: *Levels of Reflectivity Before and After the SETT Experience for Study and Control Groups*

Levels of Reflectivity	Study Group		Control Group	
	Before*	After*	Before*	After*
Technical	9	2	10	8
Contextual	13	12	12	14
Dialectical	-	8	-	-
TOTAL	22	22	22	22

* Number of the participants

As seen in Table 2, before the SETT experience for the study group, nine PSTs were in the technical level whereas majority of them (13 PSTs) were in the contextual level of reflectivity. As for the control group, similar tendency was detected. 10 of the PSTs in this group had technical level of reflectivity wheras 12 of them had contextual level. For both groups, none of the participants had dialectical level of reflectivity at the beginning of the study. When we compare the number of the PSTs in the study and control groups in terms of their reflectivity levels after the SETT experience, a descriptive difference could be seen. That is, following the implementation of SETT for the study group, only two of the PSTs resided in the technical level and eight PSTs moved into dialectical level of reflectivity which was the highest reflectivity level in the hierarchy. On the contrary, for the control group there were eight PSTs in the technical level, and majority of the PSTs (14 PSTs) in this group were in the contextual level of reflectivity at the end of the study. No PST in the control group was able to move to dialectical level of reflectivity.

This finding shows that the PSTs in the study group advanced in their levels of reflectivity compared to the ones in the control group. Although the findings of both groups did not show a statistically significant diffrence in the paired-samples t-test for reflectivity, it was evident that the PSTs in the study group improved their reflective skills and thus were able to move upwards in the reflectivity hierarchy. This result highlighted that at the beginning, the PSTs were more concerned about achieving their outcomes without reference to student learning and questioning alternative practices from a broader social perspective. However, as the PSTs in the study group were involved in the SETT experience, self questioning of their language use in a rather sytematic way with the help of an instrument might have helped them to focus more on students and their needs as well as to question the effects of their own actions on classroom interaction. Although the control group participants improved their reflectivity during their field experience, there were still PSTs in the technical level of reflectivity who used minimal schema to deal with problems in the classroom. It was noteworthy to mention that there were no PSTs in the control group who critically evaluated their actions and deepened the merit of their reflection at the end of field experience.

The change in the reflectivity levels of the PSTs in the study group was also supported by the qualitative data gathered through reflective diaries. When the

first and the last reflective diaries of the PSTs in the study group were compared, the change could be tracked. The following excerpts taken from the same PSTs first and final reflective diaries display how they advanced in reflectivity hierarchy with the help of the SETT experience.

First Reflective Diary	Last Reflective Diary
Excerpt 1. PST 12 **Technical level of reflectivity** *'I was so upset today that the copied materials were not in the way I wanted them to be. The letters were rather small and parts were not visible. Therefore, I had to write some parts on the board and my handwriting was awful. The board was in a total mess at the end of the lesson'*	**Excerpt 2. PST 12** **Contextual level of reflectivity** *'I definitely began using less teacher echo. I was always repeating what the students said, but today I paid attention not to use it in inappropriate times. Instead, I tried to involve other students and let them talk. This way the lesson was more enjoyable I think'*
Excerpt 3. PST 9 **Technical level of reflectivity** *'My lesson was OK today. I did all the activities as I planned. The students were fine they were quite good at understanding my instructions and I finished the lesson a little bit earlier. Maybe the lesson paced somehow in haste but I'm glad that I finished on time.'*	**Excerpt 4. PST 9** **Contextual level of reflectivity** *'The students need more opportunities to talk. Now, I know that they don't talk because they feel anxious when they are talking. There are a few students in the class, they laugh at others and this affects the students. I tried to stop them today and encouraged other students to talk.'*

From the excerpts 1 and 2, how the same PST (PST12) improved his level of reflectivity can be seen. Mostly technical levels of reflectivity dominated this PST's first reflective diary. PST12's main concern was about the materials, board use and how she handled the necessary materials in the classroom. Teachers in technical level simply describe observations and focus primarily on behaviors, content or skills to meet the outcomes (Lee, 2005; Taggart & Wilson, 2005). In this level of reflectivity, lack of appropriate schema to deal with educational problems dominates reflections since the teacher's main aim is to handle technical aspects of teaching rather than dealing with value commitments. However, throughout the SETT experience, the same PST focused more on her language use, analyzed various aspects of TT and reflected how her language use had effects on student involvement. As a result, the final reflection of PST12 involved more instances of contextual level of reflectivity. In the extract above, her final reflection mirrored her inclination to deal with student related issues. This time, the PST evaluated the consequences of her own actions on student involvement rather than reflecting on technical issues. As exemplified by PS12, teachers in the contextual level of reflectivity are assumed to understand the meanings of educational experiences within a particular context (Lee, 2005).

Similarly, excerpts 3 and 4 above exemplify a change in the reflectivity level of a PST in the study group (PST9). This PST was, too, reflected at a technical level at the beginning of the SETT experience. In the first reflective diary PST9's only aim was to finish the lesson as planned and doing so was a success. He admitted that the lesson was hasty in pace, but that was not the main concern. However, in the final reflective diary the same PST dealt with students' needs. This time the focus was not on instructional management issues, but on the issues related to student participation. He reflected on solving some problems to create a better classroom environment rather than finishing on time. There were also PSTs in the study group who moved to the highest level of reflectivity, namely the dialectical level. The following excerpts show advancement in those PSTs' reflectivity.

First Reflective Diary	Last Reflective Diary
Excerpt 5. PST 5 **Contextual level of reflectivity** *'There are some problems in this class. They wanted me to shift back to Turkish all the time. No matter what I did they did not want to talk in English. There was silence all the time today and it was really disappointing. Then I stopped the lesson. I talked to them in Turkish and tried to explain why they had to use English and why it was important for them…just try it. After the talk, some students tried to participate and whenever they uttered a word in English I motivated them'*	**Excerpt 6. PST 5** **Dialectical level of reflectivity** *'I realized that I am interrupting my students so much. While I was filling in the SETT instrument I found out that while students are talking I can't be patient. I want to intervene and tell the correct thing. I think I forget how kids need chances to express themselves. Parents at home do this, teachers at school do this. In the end, we have kids who can't articulate what they think. I will try to put an end to this habit'.*
Excerpt 7. PST 10 **Technical level of reflectivity** *'I make frequent pronunciation mistakes. I am too excited while talking and I find myself pronouncing incorrectly. There were one or two grammatical mistakes while I was writing on the board. Other than these, the lesson was good.'*	**Excerpt 8. PST 10** **Dialectical level of reflectivity** *'I want to be a good teacher. Not one who comes to the class do activities and write on the board. I think understanding yourself, how you use language and how much importance you give to their involvement will make the long-term differences. If the teacher can't understand herself then she can't understand the students.'*

In excerpts 5 and 6 above, PST5 was talking about how to solve a problem related to L1 use in the classroom. This PST reflected on a strategy she used to motivate the students and encourage especially the silent ones. This reflection was at the contextual level since the PST's concern was pedagogical problems and creating alternative ways to solve them. In the final reflection, the same PST was able to reflect at a critical level. According to Taggart and Wilson (2005), this highest level of reflectivity deals with questioning moral and ethical issues. In

extract 6, PST5 moved beyond the classroom issues and criticized his behaviors from a critical perspective. He dealt with a macro problem the students were experiencing and this PST was determined to solve such problem by questioning the ethical concerns prevailing it. PST5 mentioned about his moment of realization while filling in the SETT instrument. This instrument served as a tool for this PST to become aware of some considerations for student involvement. Based on this point, he was able to reflect on an ethical issue. Hence, SETT experience opened a way to reflect more on critical levels rather than the technical aspects for PST5.

Quantitative findings put forward that no PST was left in the technical level of reflectivity at the end of the SETT experience. This finding was further supported qualitatively in the reflective diary entries. This is visible in excerpts 7 and 8 above. PST 10 started at a technical level and her initial reflection displayed her focus on grammar and pronunciation mistakes. She was mostly concerned about the past experiences and her own behaviors were all she reflected on. However, the same PST progressed in the level of reflectivity in her final reflection. She no longer referred to past experiences in the classroom, but analyzed the events from a broader perspective with reference to self-understanding. Her involvement in questioning her own talk and its effects on student involvement created a kind of self-awareness with the help of the guided analyses about her language use throughout the SETT experience.

All in all, the qualitative findings put forward that at the beginning of the SETT experience, the PSTs mainly highlighted the occurrence of past experiences related to technical aspects with the use of past time markers. As they were involved in analyzing their own talk, they began to deal with strategies to solve problems, paid attention to students and their needs, and shifted their attention from micro cosmos of the classroom environment to more macrocosmic issues. They underscored social and ethical considerations dominated by present and future time markers. It does not mean that the PSTs who displayed dialectical levels of reflectivity never reflected at the technical level afterwards. Rather, the nature of their reflections changed and they tended to reflect deeply by critically analyzing their experiences. PSTs' advancement in reflectivity through the SETT experience correspond to findings of previous studies which highlight that with the help of various reflective practices such as reflective journals, reflective interactions between PSTs and reflective activities, an increase in reflectivity is most likely to take place (Dervent, 2015; Erginel, 2006; Lee, 2005).

Garza and Smith (2015) call for a deliberate approach to guide PSTs reflect on their teaching practices, and underline the importance of facilitating structured reflective thinking opportunities for PSTs. Subramaniam (2012) further highlights the importance of observation, documentation and reflection during the field experiences of the PSTs. The SETT experience in this study might likely to offer an opportunity for structured reflection since the PSTs had a chance to observe themselves from a critical point of view, document those observations with the use

of SETT instrument and reflect on their own language use. Hence, SETT experience enabled the PSTs in the study group to reflect effectively on their own talk with respect to student involvement and classroom interaction. As a result, using instruments like SETT and engaging PSTs in similar experiences with a focus on reflection might help to improve levels of reflectivity and guide PSTs evaluate their language use with a more critical and broader perspective. PSTs improved their questioning skills with the help of the SETT experience and deepened their understanding about classroom environment.

Taggart and Wilson (2005) claim that reflective thinking abilities of the teachers can be promoted by using some techniques such as brainstorming, cooperation with others and questioning. The PSTs in this study also worked in groups to reflect on their teaching practices, filled in the SETT instrument by reflecting on their language use, and wrote reflective diaries throughout this experience. Although it is beyond the scope of this study to investigate the gains and related perceptions of the PSTs about the SETT experience, it is important to mention that another study was published (Aşık & Kuru Gönen, 2016) on the same PSTs. Results of that study put forward that the PSTs gained awareness about their teaching practices, developed more understanding about the effects of their language use and developed a habit of critically analyzing themselves as teachers. Hence, it is evident that engaging PSTs in the habit of reflection via various tools and instruments can help them climb the ladder of reflectivity in time.

One important finding of this study was that although the PSTs in the control group increased their reflectivity, they failed to show a similar tendency to move upwards in reflectivity levels as the PSTs in the study group. Liakopoulou (2012) asserts that PSTs fear evaluation and find it difficult to think more critically and in this respect field experience can contribute to the development of PSTs when it is based on a reflection-based philosophy. Thus, specific pedagogic strategies are required to involve PSTs into more critical in-depth reflection. The SETT experience initiated in this study is likely to help PSTs overcome their fear of evaluation, and lead them develop a self-awareness embedded in a process of reflection. As the PSTs may lack maturity to bridge the gap between theory and practice, being engaged in a continuous analysis of their own talk and its effects on student involvement may have provided them a ground to foster professional growth in a more secure way. As a result, the study reported here underlines engaging PSTs into reflective practices embedded in guided self-analysis opportunities, like the SETT experience, in order to foster more critical inquiry into teaching experiences.

Conclusion

Designing field experiences to meet the challenges of complex teaching contexts necessitates promoting reflective practices for PSTs while they are transformed from students to teachers (Smith & Garza, 2015). However, PSTs' reflectivity development during field experience depends on various factors such as

PSTs' personal background, mode of communication, and features of the field experience contexts (Lee, 2005). Hence, they may need guidance and chances to make meaning out of teaching experiences in the pre-service period. The aim of this study was to provide a chance for PSTs to engage in reflective practices by analysing their own talk through a reflective framework called the SETT experience, and to investigate change in the reflectivity of the PSTs before and after SETT experience.

Recent studies have put forward that reflection in the pre-service period is mostly at technical levels focusing on simple descriptions of teaching experiences and lack in-depth analysis of the rationales behind events related to teaching contexts (Cohen-Sayag & Fischl, 2012; Garza & Smith, 2015; Liakopoulou, 2012; Lyngsnes, 2012). A significant finding of this study is suggesting SETT experience as a way to promote reflectivity that help PSTs develop self-understandings about the interactional features in classroom contexts. Throughout this practice, along with gains in reflectivity the PSTs were able to reflect more on deeper levels of reflectivity. Krim (2009) claims that with the implementation of reflective practices, PSTs may change direction of their reflections from teacher-self to teacher-student. Results of this study imply a similar finding as the PSTs who were enrolled in systematic analysis of their language use through the SETT experience were able to shift their focus from simply describing what they did towards the effects of their language use on student involvement and creating different alternatives to solve problems related to classroom interaction. Thus, one implication of this study is to engage PSTs in similar practices during field experience in order to deepen their understanding of themselves and their students, and to increase their awareness of classroom interactional features in a reflective way.

It is a responsibility for teacher education programs to implement the habit of reflection to improve PSTs' pedagogical abilities (Lyngsnes, 2012; Rodman, 2010; Tan et al., 2010). When PSTs develop a better understanding of personal orientation through reflection, they are more likely to improve their professional skills to meet the needs of their students and the challenges derived from the complexity of teaching processes. Reflective practices in the pre-service period may expand understandings about teaching and learning (Gelfuso, 2013). However, PSTs may not know how to reflect critically on their experiences or may not find the ground to foster such reflection that will help them move from self-centered concerns (Chen et al., 2013). Thus, engaging PSTs into reflection is not an easy task for teacher educators and it takes time and experience (Mergler & Spooner-Lane, 2012). Careful guidance, structured tools and chances for self-analysis need to be provided. The SETT experience in this study would likely to provide such chance since increase in reflectivity level was visible both quantitatively and qualitatively. Hence, this study offers SETT experience as an opportunity to critically reflect on TT in the PST education contexts.

Promoting reflective practices during field experience is so often a neglected issue in Turkish PST education context and this study proposes certain implications for implementing reflective practices as a habitual part of PST teaching experiences. One implication is creating similar opportunities for PSTs to foster more critical levels of reflectivity. Even before field experience, PSTs may be offered training on reflection, its importance and benefits for professional development. PSTs are inclined to fear of making judgments, evaluating themselves and reflecting critically as a result of lack of knowledge and experience about reflective practices. These negative inclinations towards reflection can be surpassed via the implementation of reflective frameworks, like the SETT framework used in this study, earlier in teaching education programs. Moreover, certain tools, activities or platforms can be introduced in PST education to show alternative ways of reflection on one's teaching experiences. SETT experience in this paper focused on PSTs' analysis of TT in relation to classroom interaction. Other frameworks focusing on various perspectives in the classroom can also be implemented to see their effects on the improvement of reflectivity in PSTs in different contexts.

This study has certain limitations as well. The results of the study regarding the change in the reflectivity levels of the PSTs were limited to the analyses of the reflective diaries of PSTs only in the study group. Control group was only administered the quantitative instrument and no qualitative data were gathered about their reflections. The rationale behind this was to see the effects of the SETT experience on the reflective practices of the participants in the study group. Including control group in reflective writing would provide another intervening variable as reflecting solely on experience would likely to serve as a catalyst to cause certain changes for reflection. Since this was the main concern, the nature of reflection in the control group was not detected. More qualitative data collection instruments such as dialogic reflections, interviews and reflecting on video recordings of actuals teaching experiences could have also been included to provide more insight into the issue under investigation.

Apart from the limitations mentioned so far, findings of this study may illuminate the way for further investigation into reflective practices of PSTs during field experience. Benefits of such practices are numerous and finding out alternative solutions to emerging problems and evaluating them with a critical eye lie in the heart of those practices. As Mergler and Spooner-Lane (2012) highlight, being a reflective practitioner is important for PSTs to find a balance between the ideals and the behaviours, provide sensitive responses to students and to engage students in meaningful and thought provoking experiences. Further studies in different contexts may shed more light into implementation of reflection in teacher education programs to see the actual implications of these benefits.

References

 Al-Hassan, O., Al-Barakat, A., & Al-Hassan, Y. (2012). Pre-service teachers' reflections during field experience. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *38(4)*, 419-434.

Anderson, N. A., Barksdale, M. A. & Hite, C. E. (2005). Preservice teachers' observations of cooperating teachers and peers while participating in an early field experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32(4)*, 97-117.

Arrastia, M. C., Rawls, E. S., Brinkerhoff, E. H., & Roehrig, A. D. (2014). The nature of elementary preservice teachers' reflection during an early field experience. *Reflective Practice*, *15*(4), 427-444.

Aşık, A. & Kuru Gönen, S. İpek. (2016) Pre-service EFL teachers' reported perceptions of their development through SETT experience. *Classroom Discourse*, 7(2), 164-183.

Chen, D., Lumpe, A. & Bishop, D. (2013). Assessment of teacher candidate reflection in e-portfolios. In J. Herrington, A. Couros & V. Irvine (Eds.), *Proceedings of EdMedia: World Conference on Educational Media and Technology 2013* (pp. 1872-1881). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE). https://www.learntechlib.org/p/112224. (Access Date: 10. 03.2016)

Cohen-Sayag, E. & Fischl, D. (2012). Reflective writing in pre-service teachers' teaching: what does it promote?. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, *37(10),* 20-36.

Cunningham-Florez, M. A. (2001). Reflective teaching practice in adult ESL settings. *ERIC Digest.* http://www.cal.org/ncle/digest/reflect.htm. 1-7. (Access Date: 11.05.2009)

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Publishing.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57(3)*, 300-314.

Dervent, F. (2015). The effect of reflective thinking on the teaching practices of preservice physical education teachers. *Issues in Educational Research*, *25*(3), 260-275.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educational process*. Lexington, MA: Heath.

Downey. J. (2008). 'It's not as easy as it looks': Preservice teachers' insights about teaching emerging from an innovative assignment in educational psychology. *Teaching Educational Psychology, 3(1)*, 1-11.

Erginel, S. Ş. (2006). Developing reflective teachers: A study on perception and improvement of reflection in preservice teacher education. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation,* Middle East Technical University.

Fairbanks, C. M. & Meritt, J. (1998). Preservice teachers' reflections and the role of context in learning to teach. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *25(3)*, 47-68.

Garza, R. & Smith, S. F. (2015). Pre-service teachers' blog reflections: Illuminating their growth and development. *Cogent Education*, *2(1),* 1-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2015.1066550

Gale, T. & Jackson, C. (1997). Preparing professionals: student teachers and their supervisors at work. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *25(2),* 177-191.

Gelfuso, A. M. (2013). Insights into reflection and pre-service teacher education: An hermeneutic phenomenology. *Graduate Theses and Dissertations.* http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/4894 (Access Date: 07.02.2016).

Griffin, M. L. (2003). Using critical incidents to promote and assess reflective thinking in pre-service teachers. *Reflective Practice, 4(2)*, 207-220.

Hrevnack, J. R. (2011). Guided development of reflective thinking in the observations of classroom teachers by pre service candidates. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal, 15*(2), 81–93.

Huan, F. & Wang, L. (2011). A Self-evaluation of Classroom Language Used When Teaching Grammar. *International Education Studies, 4*(4). http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v4n4p170

Inceçay, G. (2010). The role of teacher talk in young learners' language process. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 2*, 277–281.

Jasper, M. (2003). *Beginning Reflective Practice.* UK: Nelson Thornes.

Kaminski, E. (2003). Promoting pre-service teacher education students' reflective practice in mathematics. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, *31(1)*, 21-32.

Kauffman, D. (1992). Supervision of student teachers. http://www.ericfacility.net/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed344873.html. (Access Date: 11.10.2011)

Krim, J. S. (2009). Critical reflection and teacher capacity: The secondary science pre-service teacher population. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. Montana State University: Montana, 2009.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 453–484.

Kuru Gönen, S. İ. (2012). A study on reflective reciprocal peer coaching: An application in pre-service English Language Teaching context. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi.

Lee, H. J. (2005). Understanding and assessing preservice teachers' reflective thinking. *Teaching and teacher education*, *21(6)*, 699-715.

Liakopoulou, M. (2012). The Role of Field Experience in the Preparation of

Reflective Teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *37(6)*, 42-54.

Lyngsnes, K. M. (2012). Embarking on the Teaching Journey: Pre-service Teachers Reflecting upon Themselves as Future Teachers. *World Journal of Education, 2*(2), 2-9.

Mann, S. & Walsh, S. (2013). RP or 'RIP': A critical perspective on reflective practice. *Applied Linguistics Review 2013, 4*(2), 289–312. http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2013-0013

Mergler, A. G. & Spooner-Lane, R. S. (2012). What pre-service teachers need to know to be effective at values-based education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *37(8)*, 66-81.

Odhiambo, E. (2010). Classroom research: A tool for preparing pre-service teachers to become reflective practitioners. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*, *4*, 1-14.

Puckett, J. B. & Anderson, R. S. (2002). Assessing field experience. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *91*, 53-60. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/tl.66.

Rodman, G. J. (2010). Facilitating the teaching-learning process through the reflective engagement of pre-service teachers. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education (Online)*, *35(2)*, 20-34.

Seedhouse, P. (2008). Learning to Talk the Talk: Conversation Analysis as a Tool for Induction of Trainee Teachers. Chapter in *Professional Encounters in TESOL*, InS. Garton & K. Richards (Eds), 42–57.Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sert, O. (2015). *Social Interaction and L2 Classroom Discourse*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Smith, K. & Lev-Ari, L. (2005). The place of the practicum in pre-service teacher education: The voice of the students. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 33(3)*. 289-302.

Subramaniam, K. (2013). Examining the content of preservice teachers' reflections of early field experiences. *Research in Science Education*, *43(5)*, 1851-1872.

Taggart, G. L., & Wilson, A. P. (2005). *Promoting reflective thinking in teachers: 50 action strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Tan, A. L., Wettasinghe, C. M., Tan, S. C., & Hasan, M. (2010). Reflection of teaching: A glimpse through the eyes of pre-service science teachers. Paper presented at the *Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE) Conference*, Sydney, Australia, 5 - 8 December 2010.

Walsh, S. (2002). Construction or obstruction: Teacher talk and learner involvement in the EFL classroom. *Language Teaching Research, 6*(1), 3-23.

Walsh, S. (2003). Developing interactional awareness in the second language classroom through teacher self-evaluation. *Language Awareness, 12(2),* 124-142.

Walsh, S. (2006). Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom. *ELT Journal, 60* (2), 133-141.

Walsh, S. (2011). Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action. London: Routledge.

Walsh, S. (2013). *Classroom Discourse and Teacher Development.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Walsh, S. & Mann, S. (2015). Doing reflective practice: a data-led way forward. *ELT Journal*, 69(4), 351-362. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccv018

Appendix A. Classroom Modes and Interactional Features (Walsh, 2006)

Mode	Pedagogic goals	Interactional features
Managerial	To transmit information To organize the physical learning environment To refer learners to materials To introduce or conclude an activity To change from one mode of learning to another	A single, extended teacher turn which uses explanations and/or instructions The use of transitional markers The use of confirmation checks An absence of learner contributions
Materials	To provide language practice around a piece of material To elicit responses in relation to the material To check and display answers To clarify when necessary To evaluate contributions	Predominance of IRF pattern Extensive use of display questions Forum-focused feedback Corrective repair The use of scaffolding
Skills and systems	To enable learners to produce correct forms To enable learners to manipulate the target language To provide corrective feedback To provide learners with practice in sub-skills To display correct answers	The use of direct repair The use of scaffolding Extended teacher turns Display questions Teacher echo Clarification requests Form-focused feedback
Classroom context	To enable learners to express themselves clearly To establish a context To promote oral fluency	Extended learner turns Short teacher turns Minimal repair Content repair Referential questions Scaffolding Clarification requests

***Appendix B: Items of the Profile of Reflective Thinking Attributes (*Taggart & Wilson, 2005)**
When confronted with a problem situation,
1. I can identify a problem situation.
2. I analyze a problem based upon the needs of the student.
3. I seek evidence which supports or refutes my decision.
4. I view problem situations in an ethical context.
5. I use an organized approach to problem solving.
6. I am intuitive in making judgements.
7. I creatively interpret situations.
8. My actions vary with the context of situation.
9. I feel comfortable with a set routine.
10. I have strong commitment to values (e.g. all students can learn)
11. I am responsive to the educational needs of the students.
12. I review my personal aims and actions.
13. I am flexible in my thinking.
14. I have a questioning nature.
15. I welcome peer review of my actions.

When preparing, implementing, assessing a lesson,
16. Innovative ideas are often used.
17. My focus is on the objective of the lesson.
18. There is no one best approach to teaching.
19. I have the skills necessary to be a successful teacher.
20. I have the content necessary to be a successful teacher.
21. I consciously modify my teaching to meet student needs.
22. I complete tasks adequately.
23. I understand concepts, underlying facts, procedures and skills.
24. I try to guess what the content of the text is about when I read.
25. I consider the social implications of so-called best practice.
26. I self-monitor my teaching.
27. I evaluate my teaching effectiveness.
28. My students meet my instructional objective when evaluated.
29. I use a journal regularly.
30. I engage in action research.

Appendix C. Reflective Diary Questions
1. How did you feel about analysing your own talk?
2. Did you notice anything about your own teaching? If yes, explain briefly.
3. Which mode/modes was/were present in your video? Describe the pedagogic focus of your teaching in that specific snapshot?
4. How did the SETT instrument help you about your own teaching?
6. What do you think about analysing this lesson with your peer? What did you notice after discussion with your peer?
7. Did you have any difficulty in your analysis? If yes, explain briefly.