Reflective Teaching in Tertiary-Level EFL: Practices and Barriers

Ayşegül Özaslan[1] , Mevlüdiye Ucaçelik[2]

Abstract

The present study aims to reveal the reflective teaching practices and the barriers that the EFL instructors in Türkiye associate with reflective teaching. In this respect, the extent to which EFL instructors engage in reflective teaching, the EFL instructors' reflective teaching practices, the perceived barriers of EFL instructors to reflective teaching, and the extent to which EFL instructors' reflective teaching practices change depending on their gender, age, graduate degree, and work experience were investigated. Thus, a mixed-methods study design was adopted, and both qualitative and quantitative data were collected through a scale and an interview. The participants in the study were selected using a convenience sampling method, and 40 EFL instructors participated in the first stage of the study by completing the scale. Six instructors also volunteered for semi-structured interviews. The data obtained from the qualitative and quantitative means were analysed separately. Initially, SPSS 22 was used to analyse the quantitative data, and MAXQDA was used for the analysis of the interviews. The results demonstrated that reflective teaching is not a frequent practice employed by the EFL instructors in Türkiye, although they believe that reflective teaching is efficient in enhancing their teaching. The underlying reason for the lack of reflective practices among EFL instructors was based on the barriers that the participants encountered, such as heavy workload, lack of knowledge, and lack of motivation. Certain practical implications were presented to increase the reflectivity among EFL instructors as a result of the study. The study is valuable since it offers practical implications to improve reflective teaching. Additionally, it makes a unique contribution to the literature as it stands out as one of the rare investigations focusing on reflective teaching.

Keywords: *Reflective teaching, practices, effects, barriers, EFL instructors*

Recommended Citation: Özaslan, A. & Ucaçelik, M. (2025). Reflective teaching in tertiary-level EFL: Practices and barriers. *International Journal of Excellent Leadership, 5*(1), 1-20.

[1]Corresponding author: Lecturer, PhD candidate, Erciyes University, Kayseri/ Türkiye, aozaslan@erciyes.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0002-9523-6432

[2]Lecturer, Erciyes University, PhD candidate, Erciyes University, Kayseri/ Türkiye mucacelik@erciyes.edu.tr; ORCID: 0000-0002-1067-7811

Introduction

In today's highly globalized world, people tend to move beyond their borders more and more. This has given a path to the appearance of English as the lingua franca. Not surprisingly, the number of foreigners speaking English outweighs the number of natives, and approximately 15 million non-native English teachers worldwide teach this language (Freeman et al., 2015). Parallel to the great impetus of English education, the professional development of English teachers is of utmost importance since they play a pivotal role in raising competent speakers. This urges EFL teachers to catch up with the latest trends in their profession.

With a shift from ancient classroom practices to the novel methodology, learner and teacher roles and the functioning of schools have changed a lot. Contrary to the past, learners are now placed at the centre of the course, and teachers do their best to create the most peaceful environment for them. Here at this point, professional development is especially important for those who are seasoned in using conventional teaching forms (Lau, 2006). Moreover, as a result of common migration between countries, classrooms have become multicultural, and because of technological improvements, they are now equipped with several gadgets. Additionally, parent training programs and the abundance of guiding publications have led parents to be more involved in school work. All these changes oblige teachers to integrate multicultural students into the classroom, to make use of technology effectively, to address the needs of learners, to collaborate with parents, in addition to foster academic achievement. Furthermore, teachers should dwell on lifelong learning through which they can be good role models for the learners (Day, 1999).

Professional development can be defined as education or training for professionals to develop new skills, keep up-to-date, or advance their careers after entering the workforce. In an educational context, teacher professional development can refer to any activities that allow teachers to develop their knowledge or skills. According to Fullan (1995), professional development involves "learning how to bring about ongoing improvements" (p. 255), and thus, it needs to be an integral part of teachers' daily lives. Professional development is a long-term, ongoing, and lifelong process that lasts throughout career life (Bolam, 2000; Kennedy, 1995). Professional development (PD) of teachers can be achieved in several ways. Some PD activities aim at expanding understanding of language teaching such as seminars, workshops, conferences, journal subscriptions, and teacher support groups, while some aim at improving teacher skills like research projects, action research, observation visits to other schools, CELTA/DELTA courses, master/PhD programs, journals, portfolios, and critical incident analyses, with some fostering collaboration such as mentoring, peer observation, team teaching (Murray, 2010; Crandall, 2001; Boyle, While, & Boyle, 2004).

As declared by Bolam (2000), the majority of PD activities in the 20th century relied on one-shot workshops or short-term courses, but they led to a decline in progress. However, with the changing paradigms in the 21st century, English language teachers' professional development has moved from a transmission-oriented model to one that takes into account their realities (Giraldo, 2014). This century has witnessed an increased level of interest in both teachers and institutions in the professional development notion, which has led to the search for the best PD implementation.

Researchers examining effective PD assert that these kinds of activities should be specific to the teachers' needs, their instruction, real practices, and concrete classroom problems (Elmore& Burney, 1997; Anderson, 2008; Kohl, 2005) since PD is a continuous self-reflection process rather than a one-for-all event (Diaz-Maggioli, 2004). Moreover, González (2007) states that context-sensitive models where teachers' experiences are reflected should be employed instead of top-down approaches. Top-down approaches are generally structured and formal pieces of training organized by local administrations or nationwide ministries. All the teachers in an institution are regarded as having the same needs or lacks and are mandated to join the events where they are given some ready-made prescriptions. However, top-down approaches are not appealing. On the contrary, in bottom-up approaches, teachers are expected to create their PD activities around their fields of interest or classroom practices, hence allowing teachers to manage their learning. As these PD activities are self-regulated, teachers have an intrinsic motivation to sustain them voluntarily for a longer period. Farrell (2000) suggests the necessity of supporting bottom-up development by the top-down approach

because it is not always possible for teachers to maintain their development due to time and money constraints.

On the one hand, PD activities in teaching help teachers overcome their classroom or teaching practice problems by giving them a chance for reflection. Novice teachers, on the other hand, can sometimes find it challenging to apply what they learned at university in the classroom or to adapt to a teaching environment or administrative expectations. In such a case, expert-novice mentoring applications, or specifically tailored PD activities, can be beneficial. Additionally, the enhancement of teacher knowledge and skills results in increased student performance (Murray, 2010), a deeper understanding of the nature of teaching (Sadehgi & Richards, 2016), and teacher quality (Opfer & Pedder, 2011).

Problem Statement

A strong relationship has been reported between improved language teaching and reflective teaching in the prior literature (Ferdowsi & Afghari, 2015; Zahid & Khanam, 2019). Also, studies investigating the impacts of reflective teaching on language teaching have noted that both teachers and learners highlight the function of reflective teaching as an efficient tool to boost their performance. However, despite the widely acknowledged importance of reflective teaching in encouraging professional development and enhancing language teaching, there has been little research into the specific reflective practices used by EFL instructors at the tertiary level in Türkiye. The lack of a complete understanding of how EFL instructors participate in reflective processes impedes the development of evidence-based pedagogical techniques, reduces teaching efficacy, and limits the ability to serve the different needs of EFL learners. Thus, there is a need for an in-depth study into EFL instructors' reflective practices, intending to identify patterns, obstacles, and the perceived influence of reflective teaching on student learning.

The present study seeks to unearth the reflective practices employed by EFL instructors and the barriers hindering the prevalent implementation of reflective teaching. To this end, the following research questions were addressed;

1. To what extent do EFL instructors engage in reflective teaching?

2. What are EFL instructors' reflective teaching practices?

3. What are the perceived barriers of EFL instructors to reflective teaching?

4. To what extent do EFL instructors' reflective teaching practices change depending on their gender, age, graduate degree, and work experience?

Limitations of the Study

There are certain limitations of the study. Firstly, the sample size is limited to 40 instructors, which hinders to reach generalizable results. Secondly, since the data was obtained through the utilization of the questionnaire and interviews, it is difficult to ascertain the level of objectivity and sincerity of the participants. Moreover, the participants might interpret the term reflective teaching differently. Moreover, the results cannot be generalized because the study was conducted at only one institution.

Literature Review

During the teaching process, teachers can simply fall into a rut where they appear to be giving lessons automatically. Teachers may sometimes feel that they are being monotone and question the effectiveness of their teaching, experiencing a vicious circle of giving overaged explanations and activities. One way through which educators can gain their self-confidence and motivation back is through the use of reflective teaching practices. Reflective stands for the act of turning back, as the name suggests, it allows teachers to look back at their practices critically and evaluate their teaching to make the necessary alterations for more effective teaching. Actually, as teachers, we generally share our opinions and feelings about our lessons with our colleagues during short chit-chats or corridor walks. We kind of look back at our lesson, basically, and make very general conclusions about it.

However, reflective teaching is a lot more than this, with an implication of systematic collection, recording, and analysis of our observations.

Reflective teaching was defined by different researchers with similar meanings. Whereas Richards and Lockhart (1994) define reflective teaching as collecting data about teaching and using these data as the basis of critical reflection, Tice (2004) underlines the self-observation and self-assessment processes. Brookfield (2017), on the other hand, considers the data gathered from students, colleagues, personal experiences, and theoretical literature the main sources in reflective teaching. The common point of these definitions is that they all emphasize the occupational improvements that teachers make by revising their classroom applications systematically.

Schön (1983) emphasized that teachers reflect during and after practicing and specified three types of reflection: reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, and reflection-for-action. In the reflection-in-action step, teachers make decisions while teaching. It stresses the importance of teacher awareness during work since problems arising in class should be dealt with immediately upon their onset. Instructors use their background repertoire to make quick decisions when they face tough situations. The next step, reflection-on-action, takes place after the action has been completed. It is time for the teacher to spend time reflecting upon his/her experience by analysing actions and questioning for professional growth. In the last step, reflection-for-action, teachers think actively to draw a road map for their future actions. By using their knowledge and experience, teachers guide their future actions by developing new ideas or making necessary alterations in their current practice.

Reflective teaching can be achieved through the utilization of many different tools such as journal writing, self-reporting, diary keeping, peer observation, and finally, audio and video recordings. As Richards (1991) points out, a lot happens in the classroom at once, and the teacher may not remember every detail of the lesson. These techniques can all bring to light elements of the lesson and the teacher's approach that they are unaware of. They encourage instructors to evaluate their instruction, receive new ideas, and give reflective practices significant consideration.

The benefits of reflective teaching have been proven by many researchers around the world. In a Turkish setting, Tok and Dolapçıoğlu (2013) aimed to explore the dominance of teaching practices among Turkish primary school teachers. Employing mixed-method research, they worked with 328 primary school teachers working in 30 primary education institutions in Hatay. Data was collected through a questionnaire and an observation form. Study findings indicate that reflective teaching practices include learner-centred instruction, developing a reflective classroom environment, appreciating feedback, self-evaluation, making future decisions, problem-solving, and being receptive to professional growth are generally used by teachers. However, observational data shows that most teachers fall short of putting reflective teaching practices into practice. These include recognizing students who speak up for themselves, encouraging students to voice their criticism of teachers and instructional procedures verbally or in writing, identifying issues that arise in the classroom, and maintaining a journal to track their growth as a teacher and spot areas for improvement.

Another research from the Turkish context was conducted by Korumaz and Karakaş (2014), who desired to find out the attitudes of English instructors towards reflective teaching in Türkiye. Fifty-six Turkish instructors were given a scale. The analysis of the data showed that all instructors had positive attitudes towards the reflective practices, and a total of 27 variables in the study did not lead to any significant differences.

Ferdowsi and Afghari (2015) tried to determine the impact of reflective teaching on different aspects of teaching. Five female EFL teachers from Iran took part in the research. The data was collected through a questionnaire, and teachers were both audio-recorded and interviewed. According to the results, reflective practice was observed to affect communication patterns in the classroom, the affective climate of the class, classroom management, error correction, teachers' techniques and strategies, and professional development.

Farrell (2016) conducted a study with three novice teachers in Canada. They reflected on their teaching for one semester with the facilitating role of the researchers. It was seen that reflective teaching helped the participants overcome the challenges they faced during the initial years of teaching.

Zahid and Khanam (2019) from Pakistan investigated the effect of reflective teaching on the performance of prospective teachers. Action research, including 40 students, 20 of whom were in the experimental group and the rest in the control group, was conducted. The experimental group was given training, applied a post-test, and all the prospective teachers were sent to different schools for practice, which was recorded. The findings revealed that the experimental and control groups were different from each other substantially after the training in terms of their reflective skills. Also, the experimental group had better lesson planning, communication skills, feedback, and assessment strategies compared to the control group. They concluded that reflective thinking improved the quality of teaching.

However, it should be noted that reflective practices are not free of challenges since they all require teachers' commitment, patience, and engagement. There are pedagogical, ideological (Kumaravadivelu, 2006), and administrative barriers (Akbari, 2008) in reflective teaching. Especially for ESL/EFL teachers, it can be daunting and perplexing to consider every potential factor that could influence the teaching and learning process while we are instructing or reflecting in action. As you would appreciate, it is almost impossible to deal with all the issues related to teaching simultaneously, and reflective teaching is not a one-shot remedy for our troubles. On the contrary, it is a time-consuming process. Among the other challenges are insufficient teacher training and lack of skills (Farrell, 2012; Calderhead,1989), teacher personalities (Dewey, 1933), the nature of reflection (Schön, 1988; Burns, 2010), heavy workload (Stanley, 1998), and culture-related resistance (Gunn, 2010).

Moradkhani and Shirazizadeh (2017) conducted interviews with ten teachers—five from private institutes and five from state schools—to investigate the variables influencing their use of reflective practice. The results of this small-scale study showed that there was no discernible difference between the two groups in terms of higher levels of reflection (i.e., metacognitive and critical reflection), but teachers in the private sector reported considerably more active involvement in lower levels of reflection (i.e., practical, cognitive, and affective reflection). Besides, five major context-specific elements influenced teachers' participation in reflection, which are teachers' attitudes toward teaching, institutional demands, resources' availability, knowledge of reflection, and collegial support.

In a different study, Aliakbari and Adibpour (2018) tried to find out the current status of reflective teaching among EFL teachers in Iran as well as their perception of reflection challenges. They conducted a mixed-method study, which included the application of a questionnaire and an open-ended survey to 176 high school teachers. Their findings showed that there were significant differences between participants' expected and observed behaviours. Additionally, educational-system-related and teacher-relevant obstacles were the most frequent categories of barriers.

Farahian and Rajabi (2022) investigated EFL teachers' level of reflection and barriers with an inventory applied to 98 teachers. The analysis of the quantitative data showed that teachers had low levels of reflection practice. Additionally, the top-down curriculum, disrespect for teachers' authority, teachers' inclination to the conventional teaching practice, lack of appropriate context for reflection, teachers' workload, and lack of appropriate training courses were the most important barriers to reflection. The findings revealed that for each of the 28 teacher reflection dimensions that were part of the instrument, there were notable differences between the behaviours that were expected and those that were observed. As for the obstacles, students, the educational system (macro and micro level), the political system, and parents were listed.

Methodology

In this study, a mixed-method study design was employed to reveal the reflective practices of EFL instructors. To this end, both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. The following sections present the setting, participants, sampling, data collection, and data analysis procedures in detail.

Setting and Participants

This study was conducted at the School of Foreign Languages (SFL), Erciyes University, which is one of the largest state universities in the Central Anatolia Region. The School of Foreign

Languages delivers a one-year preparatory school education to students from different majors offered by Erciyes University. 85 lecturers work at SFL, all of whom should have at least a bachelor's degree in English Language Teaching, English Language and Literature, American Language and Literature, Linguistics, and Translation and Interpreting departments. Each lecturer is subject to several oral and written examinations before they are accepted as a faculty member. Each lecturer is expected to teach a minimum of 12 hours a week, but this lesson is usually longer in parallel with the surplus of students. The commissions about teaching skills and the testing office are also run by the lecturers.

The school lacks systematic professional development activities, but some lecturers have a master's or PhD. However, neither these academic attempts nor participation in other country-wide events is financially supported. Moreover, the administration does not guarantee to provide people with free days to participate in the postgraduate education lessons. For the last year, one of our colleagues continuing their Ph.D. education, has been holding some workshops introducing some useful games or activities for classroom use. Other than that, it is not possible to mention big-budget, systematic, or needs-based PD organizations, which are especially needed for the lecturers working in the testing and evaluation office of the school. However, there is a well-working PD procedure at SFL, which is mentoring novice teachers. The Professional Development Commission is made up of some experienced teachers, each of whom is assigned three or four novice teachers at the beginning of the term. These experienced teachers guide them throughout the year. Novice teachers, on the other hand, both observe other experienced teachers at school and are observed by their mentors, followed by a feedback session at the end. Novice teachers keep reports about their observations and reflect on their experience.

Sampling

Since both of the researchers have been teaching at Erciyes University School of Foreign Languages, the convenience sampling method was used to determine the participants of the study. Among a total of 85 EFL instructors working at the School of Foreign Languages, Erciyes University, 40 instructors participated in the study. According to the demographic information of participants in Table 1, 27 of them were females, and 13 of them were males. 15 of them were between the ages of 21-35, 16 between 36-50, and the remaining 9 over 50. As for their graduate degrees, 18 of them had a bachelor's, 18 with a master's, and 4 had with PhD. Their teaching experience also varied. Only five of them were novice teachers with 0-5 years of experience, 22 had 6-20 years of experience, and 13 of them had 13 years of experience.

The participants were all given an informed consent form. Besides, the necessary ethical permission to conduct the investigation was obtained from the Erciyes University Social and Human Sciences Ethics Committee.

Table 1
Participants' Demographic Information

	Background	Frequency	Percent %
Gender	Female	27	67.5
	Male	13	32.5
Age	21-35	15	37.5
	36-50	16	40.0
	Over 50	9	22.5
Graduate Degree	Bachelor's Degree	18	45.0
	Master's Degree	18	45.0
	Doctorate Degree	4	10.0

Work Experience	0-5 years	5	12.5
	6-20 years	22	55.0
	Over 20 years	13	32.5

Data Collection Tools

To investigate tertiary-level English teachers' attitudes towards reflective teaching practices and their perceived barriers, this study has adopted a mixed-method research approach. Since the researchers desired to both explore the underlying motivations of reflective practices and reveal statistically generalizable results, a mixed-method study is preferred in the present research. The mixed-methods approach allows an in-depth understanding of the problem since it combines the strengths of both qualitative and quantitative research approaches (Creswell & Clark, 2018). To provide the necessary quantitative data, a 5-point Likert scale about reflective practices was utilized. Additionally, a semi-structured interview form was used for the qualitative data.

As a quantitative data collection tool, a two-part scale is included. In the first part of the scale, a demographic information form appears. They aim to find out learners' genders, ages, graduate degrees, and work experience. The second part consists of the scale developed by Akbari et al. (2010). The scale included 29 items and five subdimensions. The developers tested the reliability of the scale, which was accepted in the same way in this study. According to their evaluation, the reliability score of the survey was .73-.84. The scale comprises five sub-dimensions, each of which was assessed independently. The five sub-dimensions of Cronbach's Alpha scores were .73,.78,.84,.82, and.83 for the initial study that yielded the inventory. The reflective practice scale's reliability coefficient was determined to be .87 based on the responses provided in this study. The five sub-dimensions' respective reliability scores were .77,.77,.64,.79, and.76. Using STATISTICA, Akbari et al. (2010) used Confirmatory Factor Analysis during development, following expert opinions on items.

In Akbari et al.'s scale, participants are expected to answer 29 Likert-type items ranging from "never" to "always". Parallel to the developers' coding system, never is coded as 0, and always is coded as 5 during the analysis phase. The sub-dimensions of the scale are Practical, Cognitive, Learner, Metacognitive, and Critical (Table 2). The practical dimension is about using teaching diaries, course reports, and research tools like surveys, observation group discussions, and reflective teaching practices (items: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6). The sub-dimension of cognitive is concerned with efforts for professional development, extensive classroom research (Action Research), conferences, and seminars related to the field, to follow the developments in the field. Items 13–15 in the sub-dimension of Learner deal with how teachers mirror their students, how they learn, and what kind of behaviour and attitude they exhibit in the classroom. Items 16–22 in the Meta-cognitive sub-dimension deal with the attitudes, beliefs, and personalities of teachers regarding their line of work. The final sub-dimension is called Critical, and it covers subjects such as socioeconomic class, gender, and race as well as the socio-political elements of education and its practices (items: 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29).

Table 2
Sub-dimensions and items belonging to them

Sub-dimensions	Frequencies	Items
Practical	6	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
Cognitive	6	7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12
Learner	3	13, 14, 15
Meta-cognitive	7	16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22
Critical	7	23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29

The second phase of the study aimed to provide an opportunity for the participants to explain their perceptions in more detail. As such, for the qualitative data collection instrument, the researchers

prepared a semi-structured interview including 6 questions aligning with the questionnaire. The questions investigated the participants' perceptions and practices of reflective teaching as well as the challenges regarding its implementation and their willingness for further engagement in reflective teaching. Expert review and member checking were utilized to ensure the questions were not ambiguous or irrelevant, and that they accurately reflected the research questions of the study.

Data Analysis

Including both quantitative and qualitative data, this research required performing both quantitative and qualitative analyses. For the quantitative part of it, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 22.0 was used. The statistical analysis was done by an expert in statistics. As the initial step, the data was checked in terms of normality distribution in order to decide on the type of analysis. The normality check was done with a Q-Q plot and histogram graphs, whereas variance homogeneity was checked via the Levene test. It was seen that total scale, practical, and cognitive sub-dimensions were normally distributed, while learner, meta-cognitive, and critical sub-dimensions were without normally distributed. Hence, both parametric tests (t-test and ANOVA) and non-parametric tests (Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis) were included in the data analysis. To make group comparisons, t-tests and one-way ANOVA were utilized for the groups with normal distribution. On the other hand, Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests were used for the groups without normal distribution. Additionally, mean, standard deviation, and frequency values were presented for an overall view of teachers' attitudes towards reflective teaching. The statistical significance value was set as $p < .05$.

For the qualitative data analysis, after recording the interviews conducted in English, the researcher transcribed them verbatim. MAXQDA was then used to assess the transcriptions about the research questions. The many features of MAXQDA enabled the researcher to undertake a thorough study of the data, including displaying and carefully analysing the transcriptions to provide themes, categories, and codes. During the formation of themes, categories, and codes, an iterative process was followed (Charmaz, 2006). Also, member checking was employed to determine the accuracy of the analysis. Finally, tables demonstrating the frequency of the codes were created, and certain parts of the interviews were utilized to illustrate the themes and codes thoroughly.

Findings

In this section, the findings obtained from the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data are presented in the tables. Also, in-depth explanations are presented for each table.

Turkish EFL Instructors' Reflective Teaching Practices

With an aim to investigate EFL instructors' reflective teaching practices, the participants were expected to respond to a 29-item 5-point Likert scale. According to the statistical analysis, it is seen that 30% (n=12) of the participants reported that they never have a file where they keep their accounts of teaching for reviewing purposes, 32,5% (n=13) of them sometimes have such a file, 17.5% (n= 7) often, 17.5% (n=7) rarely, and 2.5% (n=1) of them always have a file to keep their teaching accounts. It is understood that keeping a track of teaching activities is not a highly preferred activity for lecturers, and it may be because it is time-consuming.

Half of the participants (n=20) declared that they often talk about their classroom experiences with their colleagues to seek feedback/advice, while 27.5% (n=11) verified that they sometimes do it. 15% (n=6) of lecturers always, 5% (n=2) rarely, and 2.5% (n=1) lecturers never talked about their teaching with their colleagues. This result shows that there is a high tendency for peers to share teaching experience with colleagues with the intention to benefit from their knowledge and experience.

As for writing about the accomplishments/ failures of the lesson, 50% (n=20) of lecturers stated that they never do it, whereas 35% (n=14) rarely, and 15% (n=6) sometimes do it. This result can be linked to the tiring and time-consuming nature of such activities.

An equal number of participants, 37.5% (n=15), stated that they sometimes/ often discuss practical/theoretical issues with their colleagues. 15% (n=6) always and 10% (n=4) rarely discussed

such kind of issues with their colleagues. Nobody said never to this item on the scale. This finding may imply that teachers like sharing professional issues, and it may be because it is both socializing for them and easy to do. They can discuss a short corridor walk or a coffee break.

About observing other teachers' classrooms to learn about their efficient practices, 40% (n=16) said rarely, 25% (n=10) said never, 30%(n=12) said sometimes, and only 5% (n=2) said often. This activity is not a popular one, apparently; however, 12 people, a relatively high number in this group, stated 'sometimes', which can be related to the mentoring activities conducted in the institution.

Most of the teachers, 52.5% (n=21), declared that they never ask their peers to observe their teaching and comment on their teaching performance. It is followed by 'rarely' with 30% (n=12), 'sometimes' with 12.5% (n=5), 'often' and 'always' with 1% (n=1) each. It is not surprising, as classrooms are sacred places for teachers, and in Türkiye, it is not a common practice.

The findings of items 7 and 8 are quite similar. Item 7 searching for an article/book reading about effective teaching was answered as never by 5% (n=2), rarely by 32.5% (n=13), sometimes by 30% (n=12), often by 27.5% (n=11), and always by 5% (n=2). Item 8, searching for participation in teaching workshops/conferences got 5% (n=2) never, 32.5% (n=13) rarely, 47.5% (n=19) sometimes, 12.5% (n=5) often, and 2.5 % (n=1) always. These results can be linked to the fact that both of these activities put a burden on lecturers who all have heavy workloads.

The majority of teachers, 45% (n=18), declared that they never think of writing articles based on their classroom experiences. 30% (n=12) declared rarely, 15% (n=6) sometimes, and 10% (n=4) often think of article writing.

For item 10, the analysis revealed that 7.5% (n=3) of teachers never, 35% (n=14) of them rarely, 37.5%(n=15) sometimes, 12.5% (n=5) often, and 7.5% (n=3) of them always look at journals or search the Internet to see what the recent developments in their profession are. It is possible to say that less than half of the participant lecturers follow the novelties in their profession through publications or the Internet.

Findings of item 11 were quite similar to that of item 9. 45% (n=18) lecturers never, 25% (n=10) rarely, 15% (n=6) sometimes, 12.5% (n=5) often, and 2.5% (n=1) always carry out small scale research activities in their classes to become better informed of learning/teaching processes.

For item 12, I think of classroom events as potential research topics and think of finding a method for investigating them. 27.5 % (n=11) answered never, 22.5% (n=9) rarely, 32.5 (n=13) sometimes, 12.5% (5) often, and 5% (n=2) always.

Half of the teachers, 50% (n=20) sometimes, 35% (n=14) often, 10% (n=4) always talked to their students about their learning styles and preferences. However, only 2.5% (n=1) said never and rarely to this statement. It is good to see that teachers mostly show interest in their students' learning preferences. Similarly, the analysis of the next item also implies that teachers are interested in their students' backgrounds and hobbies. It is apparent from the fact that never and rarely were marked by only 5% (n=2) for each, but sometimes were marked by 42.5% (n=17), often by 40% (n=16), and always by 7.5% (n=3) of the participants.

In item 15, it is presented that 42.5% (n=17) of respondents sometimes asked students whether they liked a teaching task or not. It is followed by often with 32.5% (n=13), 12.5% (n=5), 7.5% (n=3), and 5% (n=2) by never.

42.5% (n=17) of lecturers stated that they often think about their teaching philosophy and the way it is affecting their teaching. 27.5% (n=11) sometimes, 20% (n=8), 5% (n=2) rarely, and 5% (n=2) never think about it.

I think of the ways my biography or my background affects the way I define myself as a teacher, addressed to 45% (n=18) of the participants who responded as 'often'. 30% (n=12) said sometimes, and 10% (n=4) said always. 10% (n=4) of the participants said they rarely do this, and 5% (n=2) declared never doing it. It might be concluded that teachers are aware that their teaching is shaped by what they experience as learners. The analysis of item 18 also supports the findings of the

previous item. 52.5% (n=21) of participants asserted that they often think of the meaning and the significance of their job as a teacher. It was followed by 22.5% (n=9) sometimes, 15% (n=6) always, 5% (n=2) rarely, and 5% (n=2) never.

Most lecturers, 47.5% (n=19), claimed that they often try to find out which aspects of their teaching provide them with a sense of satisfaction. 27.5 % (n=11) responded sometimes, 17.5% (n=7) always, 5% (n=2) never, and 2.5% (n=1) rarely.

Item 20 aimed to explore whether teachers think about their strengths and weaknesses as teachers and revealed that it is applied commonly by teachers. 55% (n=22) claimed they often do it, while 25% (n=10) always, 15% (n=6) sometimes did it. It shows that participants use their metalinguistic skills by thinking about self-trait.

The next item, I think of positive/negative role models I have had as a student and the way they affected me in my practice, was often applied by 47.5% (n=19), sometimes by 25% (n=10), always by 17.5% (n=7), rarely by 5% (n=2), and never by 5% (n=2). This finding reveals that lecturers' previous role models affect their present teaching styles at different rates.

Thinking of inconsistencies and contradictions in classroom practice is often considered by 40% (n=16) participants, sometimes by 37.5% (n=15), always by 17.5% (n=7), rarely by 2.5% (n=1), and never by 2.5% (n=1) participants.

Item 23 was marked as sometimes by 35% (n=14), rarely by 25% (n=10), often by 22.5% (n=9), never by 15% (n=6), and always by 2.5% (n=1) of the participants. Considering the frequencies, it can be concluded that discussing social injustice issues is not highly favored by EFL instructors in this study.

The majority of teachers, 40% (n=16), declared that they sometimes try to find ways to help learners change their social lives in fighting poverty, discrimination, and gender bias. 22.5% (n=9) declared rarely, 20% (n=8) sometimes, and 17.5% (n=7) never doing that.

Considering the frequencies of item 25, an equal percentage of participants, 30% (n=12), marked rarely and sometimes. 17.5% (n=7) of participants stated they never included less-discussed topics such as old age, AIDS, discrimination against women and minorities, and poverty. 10% (n=4) often and 12.5 (n=5) participants always included such topics. This is not surprising in Turkish contexts, as some topics are regarded as 'unfavourable' in our culture.

As for political issues in teaching, the supermajority of participants expressed that they never (40%, n=16), and rarely (35%, n=14) think about the political aspects of their teaching to affect students' political views. Only 17.5% (n=7) said sometimes, and 7.5% (n=3) said often. Nobody said always to this statement. It is a well-predicted finding as politics is not an easily disputable matter in our context.

'I think of ways through which I can promote tolerance and democracy in my classes and the society in general' is the next item of the scale which is practiced often by half of the lecturers (50%, n=20), sometimes by 25% (n=10), rarely by 12.5% (n=5), never by 10% (n=4), and always by 2.5% (n=1). The majority of teachers care about increasing tolerance and democracy in their classes and society, which implies a tendency to create a free and open classroom environment.

37.5% (n=15) lecturers stated that they sometimes think about ways gender, social class, and race influence students' achievements. These ways are often thought by 27.5% (n=11), never by 15% (n=6), rarely by 12.5% (n=5), and always by 7.5% (n=3) of the participants.

Findings of the last item revealed that 32.5% (n=13) lecturers often, and the same percentage of lecturers sometimes, think of outside social events that can influence their teaching inside the class. It was followed by 15% (n=6) rarely, 10% (n=4), and 10% (n=4) always. It is possible to say that teachers mostly do not confine education to the classroom; besides, they reap the benefit of extra-curricular settings and activities.

Turkish EFL Teachers' Reflective Teaching Practices Depending on the Demographic Variables

This study aimed to reveal whether there is a significant difference in participants' reflective teaching practices depending on certain variables, as reflected in the research question below:

"To what extent do EFL instructors' reflective teaching practices change depending on their gender, age, graduate degree, and work experience?"

In order to see group comparisons, parametric and non-parametric tests were used depending on the distribution types of the data. Accordingly, for practical and cognitive sub-dimensions with normal distribution, t-test, and ANOVA; for learner, meta-cognitive, and critical without normal distribution, Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis tests were implemented.

Table 3

Turkish EFL teachers' reflective teaching practices depending on gender

Gender	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	P
Female	27	87.41	15.86	0.404
Male	13	81.30	23.27	
Total	40	85.42	18.51	

Data is given as n (%), mean±standard deviation, or median (1st-3rd quantiles). Statistically significant p values are given in bold. (p< .05)

As the table above indicates, no significant difference between participants' reflective teaching practices and the gender variable was found. This shows that being male or female does not have an effect on the participants' reflective teaching practices.

In order to analyse participants' answers in terms of each sub-dimension of the scale, a t-test was implemented to see if gender creates a difference in sub-dimensions of the scale. For the sub-dimensions with normal distribution mean and standard deviation values, for the dimensions without normal distribution, percentile values are presented in the table below.

Table 4

Turkish EFL teachers' reflective teaching practices in five sub-dimensions depending on gender

Subdimension	Gender	Mean ($\bar{x}$) and SD	P
Practical	Female	15.30 ± 3.26	0.923
	Male	15.15 ± 4.71	0.923
Cognitive	Female	15.19 ± 5.46	0.555
	Male	14.15 ± 4.33	0.555
Learner	Female	10.00(9.00-12.00)	0.083
	Male	9.00(8.00-11.00)	0.083
Meta-cognitive	Female	27.00(23.00-30.00)	0.475
	Male	28.00(20.50-28.00)	0.475
Critical	Female	21.00(15.00-23.00)	0.754
	Male	21.00(13.50-24.50)	0.754

Data is given as n (%), mean±standard deviation, or median (1st-3rd quantiles). Statistically significant p values are given in bold. (p< .05)

As presented in Table 5 above, none of the p-values indicates a significant difference. This means that there is not a statistically significant difference between male and female instructors in their reflective teaching practices on the Practical, Cognitive, Learner, Meta-Cognitive, and Critical levels of the scale.

Table 5

Turkish EFL teachers' attitudes towards reflective teaching depending on age

Age	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	P
21-35	15	86.13	20.24	0.152
36-50	16	90.38	12.10	
Over 50	9	75.4	22.75	
Total	40	85.42	18.51	

Data is given as n (%), mean±standard deviation, or median (1st-3rd quantiles). Statistically significant p values are given in bold. (p< .05)

Regarding the other variable, the ANOVA test yielded no significant difference between the ages of participants and their reflective teaching practices as seen in Table 6 (p = 0.152> α = 0.05).

Each sub-dimension of the scale was investigated to see if there was a significant difference in terms of participants' age groups. ANOVA, for the first two sub-dimensions, and Kruskal-Wallis for the remaining sub-dimensions, presented the findings in Table 7. According to the table, there is a significant relationship between the Critical sub-dimension of the scale and participants' ages (p = 0.029< α = 0.05).

Table 6
Turkish EFL teachers' reflective teaching practices in five sub-dimensions depending on age

Sub-dimensions	Age	Mean ($\bar{x}$) and SD	P
Practical	21-35	14.80 ± 3.78	.593
	36-50	16.00 ± 3.30	
	Over 50	14.67±4.50	
Cognitive	21-35	14.53 ± 6.10	.722
	36-50	15.62 ± 4.54	
	Over 50	14.00 ± 4.47	
Learner	21-35	11.00(9.00-12.00)	.250
	36-50	10.00(9.00-11.75)	
	Over 50	9.00(6.00-11.50)	
Meta-cognitive	21-35	25.00(21.00-32.00)	.420
	36-50	28.00(25.25-28.00)	
	Over 50	27.00(20.00-28.00)	
Critical	21-35	21.00-(15.00-24.00)	
	36-50	22.50(17.25-24.00)	
	Over 50	14.00(10.00-21.00)	,029

Data is given as n (%), mean±standard deviation, or median (1st-3rd quantiles). Statistically significant p values are given in bold. (p< .05)

This study searched whether there is a statistically significant difference in participant lecturers' reflective teaching practices depending on their graduate degrees. As can be seen in the table below, no significant difference was indicated (p = 0.322> α = 0.05).

Table 7
Turkish EFL teachers' reflective teaching practices depending on educational degree

Degree	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	P
Bachelor	18	80,72	19,24	0,322

Master	18	90,11	17,54
PhD	4	85,50	18,72
Total	40	85,42	18,52

Data is given as n (%), mean±standard deviation, or median (1st-3rd quantiles). Statistically significant p values are given in bold. (p< .05)

Additionally, each sub-dimension was analysed to reveal a significant difference between participants' reflective teaching practices and their graduate degrees, if any. However, no meaningful difference was indicated, as can be seen in the table below.

Table 8
Turkish EFL teachers' reflective teaching practices in five sub-dimensions depending on educational degree

Sub-dimensions	Graduate Degree	Mean ($\bar{x}$) and SD	P
Practical	Bachelor	14,55 ± 3,97	,428
	Master	16,11 ± 3,50	
	PhD	14,50 ± 3,70	
Cognitive	Bachelor	13,05 ± 4,15	,129
	Master	16,39 ± 5,36	
	PhD	16,00 ± 6,38	
Learner	Bachelor	10,00(9,00-12,00)	,721
	Master	10,50(9,00-11,25)	
	PhD	9,00(7,25-12,25)	
Meta-cognitive	Bachelor	26,50(21,00-28,00)	,490
	Master	24,50(28,00-30,50)	
	PhD	24,50(20,25-30,25)	
Critical	Bachelor	20,00(14,00-23,00)	,672
	Master	20,00(15,00-25,00)	
	PhD	21,50(16,50-23,50)	

Data is given as n (%), mean±standard deviation, or median (1st-3rd quantiles). Statistically significant p values are given in bold. (p< .05)

The last variable investigated in this study is the work experience of teachers. It was aimed to reveal whether the seniority or novicehood of teachers leads to a significant difference in tertiary-level EFL instructors' reflective teaching practices. However, no significant difference was indicated in Table 10. This may stem from the fact that the number of novice teachers who participated in the study was quite low.

Table 9
Turkish EFL teachers' reflective teaching practices depending on experience

Degree	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	P
0-5 years	5	88,20	28,54	0,778
6-20 years	22	86,55	14,11	
Over 20 years	13	82,46	21,88	
Total	40	85,43	18,52	

Data is given as n (%), mean±standard deviation, or median (1st-3rd quantiles). Statistically significant p values are given in bold. (p< .05)

Participants' reflective teaching practices were analysed for each sub-dimension to find out if there was a significant difference based on their work experience. When the table below is examined, the statistical analyses did not uncover any significant difference. Teachers' practices of reflective teaching were not affected by their years of teaching in this study.

Table 10

Turkish EFL teachers' reflective teaching practices in five sub-dimensions depending on experience

Sub-dimensions	Work Experience	Mean ($\bar{x}$) and SD	P
Practical	0-5 years	15,20 ± 5,89	,874
	6-20 years	15,00 ± 2,89	
	Over 20 years	15,69 ± 4,30	
Cognitive	0-5 years	15,20 ± 7,98	,945
	6-20 years	15,00 ± 4,64	
	Over 20 years	14,46 ± 4,99	
Learner	0-5 years	11,00(9,00-13,00)	,685
	6-20 years	10,00(9,00-11,00)	
	Over 20 years	9,00(8,00-12,50)	
Meta-cognitive	0-5 years	30,00(17,00-33,00)	,766
	6-20 years	26,00(23,00-28,50)	
	Over 20 years	28,00(21,00-28,00)	
Critical	0-5 years	19,00(16,50-26,00)	,418
	6-20 years	21,00(15,00-24,00)	
	Over 20 years	21,00(13,00-23,00)	

Data is given as n (%), mean±standard deviation, or median (1st-3rd quantiles). Statistically significant p values are given in bold. (p< .05)

Findings of the Qualitative Data

This section demonstrates the results of the data obtained from the semi-structured interviews, along with the frequency of the codes and quotations taken from the interviews. The analysis of the qualitative data revealed two themes: 'instructors' present and future engagement in reflective teaching' and 'instructors' perceptions of the impacts and barriers of reflective teaching'. The categories and codes that emerged from these themes are presented in detail in the following section.

Table 11

Instructors' present and future engagement in reflective teaching

Category	Code	f
PD practices	I engage in PD	4
	I don't engage in PD	2
Reflective practices	I use reflective practices	4
	I don't use reflective practices	2
Future Engagement	Would like to	6
	Wouldn't like to	0
	Interested in learning more	2
	Total	20

As presented in the table above, the majority of the participants (n=4) claimed that they engage in professional development activities such as workshops and online seminars. Only two of the participants stated that they do not engage in professional development activities because they do not have enough time. The excerpts below reveal the instructors' views:

Also, after the pandemic, many online seminars are available. I sometimes attend these online personal development programs that could contribute to my teaching. (1)
I cannot say that I truly engage in PD activities. I do my best to improve my teaching, but some problems, such as workload and opportunities in terms of PD activities, do not let me take part in PD activities. (2)
Personally, I do not have time for this because of my teaching for very long hours, and because of this tiring routine, I couldn't have had any chance lately to be engaged in any professional development activities. (3)

I don't have time, but if there's something that the school wants us to attend, I do not usually have extra time to do so; it's more like workshops. (5)

Considering the reflective practices of the participants, most of them (n=4) declared that they use reflective practices, and two of them do not use reflective practices due to their busy schedules. Critical friends, student feedback, journal writing, peer observation, and self-observation are among the methods used by instructors to reflect upon their teaching. The instructors articulated their reflective practices as follows:

I guess I use reflective teaching quite frequently. In my teaching context, I have the chance to teach the same content several times with different groups of students. I call it a "chance" because I think it helps me reflect on my own teaching easily. (1)

When I was a novice teacher, I used to make use of video recording and audio recording. I have always wanted to keep journals, but I have never had the time or energy to keep them. I am not sure if it counts, but observation by my peers and mentor also helped me a lot to reflect on my teaching. (2)

Not very often, but each term, I make one of my colleagues observe my class. While observing my lesson, I make my colleagues write down what they observe. After that, I read it, and if I need to, I try to apply different strategies to improve myself further. (6)

When they were asked whether they would like to exploit reflective teaching more in the future, all of them were quite positive about it; they stated that, because of the advantages it brings along, they were willing to engage further with it. Moreover, two of the instructors emphasized that to employ reflective practices more, they need training on how to use them properly.

I would like to use it more because I think I will have to do it in the future, and next year my students are gonna change and we're gonna have different technological developments, so I feel like we should always be a part of an ongoing process to stay updated. (5)

I would love to engage in reflective practices more in the future. However, I would love to learn more about self-reflective practices. I would love my administration to help me in terms of these practices. I would love to have more free time to take part in these activities and have a PD unit in my school to guide me when I need help. (2)

Table 12
Instructors' perceptions of the impacts and barriers of reflective teaching

Category	Code	f	
Effects	Error Correction	2	
	Change in Practices	6	
	Improve Learners	3	
	Being up-to-date	3	
	Student attraction	2	
	Knowledge	4	
Barriers	Lack of self-confidence	2	
	Lack of teachers' motivation	5	
	Lack of knowledge	3	
	Busy schedule		5
	Data collection permission		1
	Total	36	

The instructors were asked the evaluate the effectiveness of reflective teaching, the results indicated that all of the participants found it quite efficient in terms of error correction, changes in their teaching practices, gaining more knowledge, catching up with trends, grabbing students' attention, and improving students' learning.

The impacts of reflective teaching on my teaching are countless. To be more specific, I may offer some examples. Once I recorded my whole lesson, and listened to it later. I found out that I used some words (fillers) very often. (2)

It's like a mirror, you see yourself and for the good practices, of course, you go on doing maybe some practices not bad practices, mainly the practices that do not work in your classroom, you think that maybe you have to change such kind of practices and find new ways, new techniques. (5)

With regard to the barriers hindering the reflective practices of EFL instructors, busy schedules, lack of teachers' motivation, lack of knowledge, lack of self-confidence, and privacy concerns stood out as the major issues. The instructors emphasized that they would engage in reflective teaching more if they had more time and fewer responsibilities.

There are certainly some barriers to reflective teaching. It is difficult to judge your own teaching. When I observe other teachers, I might write pages of observations. However, when it comes to my own teaching, I may be more conservative. (2)
You need to get all the students' permission, and some of them may not let you. For that reason, it is not possible to record your classes. (6)

Discussion

The first and second research question of the study investigates the extent to which EFL instructors engage in reflective teaching and the types of reflective practices they employ. The results uncovered the complex landscape of the reflective practices of EFL instructors at Erciyes University. Although certain practices of reflective teaching, including keeping teaching files and participating in formal observations, are not popular implementations among the instructors, other positive trends in terms of reflective teaching have also been observed. It is noteworthy that there is a strong preference for peer collaboration among EFL instructors, indicating that the instructors are willing to foster a professional community by asking for guidance and offering help from one another. This result is in line with the study conducted by Dağkıran (2015).

Moreover, findings focused on the teacher-student relationship might indicate that EFL instructors tend to pay attention to the opinions of students, signaling a dedication to customizing instructional strategies to meet the unique needs and preferences of students, which enhances the effectiveness and student-centeredness of the learning environment in return. In addition, the EFL instructors seem like they are inclined to be reflective practitioners as they underscored their frequent engagement in assessing, evaluating, and questioning their approaches and techniques in order to enhance the way they teach, which confirms the results in another study conducted in Rize (Yıldırım, 2020).

Overall, it is apparent that the EFL instructors are aware of the potential of reflective teaching and they are positive about implementing it, although their current practices are quite limited. The limited engagement might be attributed to the problems that the participants expect to experience during the process.

The third research question attempted to unearth the barriers that the EFL instructors associated with reflective teaching. The results revealed that instructors do not employ reflective teaching sufficiently, as most of them appear hesitant to embrace reflective teaching, despite its proven advantages in enhancing instructional effectiveness and encouraging ongoing professional development. The major challenges mentioned by the instructors are motivational and confidence issues, lack of expertise, heavy workloads, and privacy concerns. The findings indicated that the instructors are mostly concerned about their schedules, in line with the studies of Farahian and Rajabi (2022) and Aliakbari and Adibpour (2018). In their studies, the teachers did not use reflective practices because they had busy schedules similar to the participants of the present study. This finding suggests that in order to increase reflective teaching, teachers should be allowed to have some room to explore professional development activities. Motivational issues were also seen as a significant barrier, with several participants indicating a perceived or actual lack of enthusiasm in reflective teaching, resonating with the study of Afshar and Farahani (2017). Moreover, some of the participants stated they do not feel confident in welcoming an observer into their classes or criticizing themselves. This result might be attributed to impostor syndrome, as it is obvious that in spite of their experience and qualifications in teaching, their confidence prevents them from critically reflecting on themselves.

This phenomenon could also stem from the cultural context in Türkiye. Another noteworthy result was the shortage of information or abilities needed to reflect effectively, suggesting a possible gap in the curriculum for teacher education. The lack of expertise in terms of reflective teaching was also highlighted in the research of Aliakbari and Adibpour (2018) and Afshar and Farahani (2017). Finally, another factor that limits reflection is data collection procedures for self-observation. The teachers claimed that it is difficult to perform certain reflective practices due to restrictions on data collection. In order to encourage the broad adoption of reflective teaching and, eventually, create a more dynamic and reflective teaching atmosphere, it will be essential to recognize and address those obstacles as education systems continue to transform.

The last research question investigated the relationship between the demographic variables and the instructors' reflective practices. The result showed that the variables age, gender, educational degree, and teaching experience are not significant in affecting the reflective practices of EFL instructors. The only variable affecting the critical sub-dimension is age. This finding might indicate that the instructors' practice of critically reflecting on social and political issues changes depending on their age.

Implications

As reflective teaching is a powerful tool to enhance teaching, it is of paramount importance for EFL instructors to benefit from it effectively. Therefore, considering the results of the present study, certain practical implications are presented in this section. Initially, the first step should be to eliminate identified barriers related to reflection. In order to eliminate the barriers, it is essential to find out the underlying reasons behind these obstacles. Addressing these barriers might foster a more positive environment for the instructors to be efficient reflective practitioners. Also, both for pre-service and in-service teachers, proper training on reflective teaching should be offered because the instructors obviously lack expertise in this field. Moreover, the instructors should be allowed some time to engage in professional development activities to improve themselves and their students' learning since it seems that their current schedules do not let them do much in terms of reflection. Lastly, reflective practices such as critical friends, observations, and action research must be encouraged by the institutions to create a reflective school culture. In this way, instructors might feel more motivated and confident to better understand the issues related to their teaching.

Conclusion

The current research attempted to shed light on reflective teaching methods and the obstacles that Turkish EFL instructors believe stand in the way of such approaches. A scale and interviews were used to gather both qualitative and quantitative data as a result, and a mixed-method study design was used. 40 EFL instructors participated in the first stage of the study by filling out the scale, and six instructors volunteered for the semi-structured interviews. The study's participants were determined using a convenience sampling approach. Analyses were conducted independently on the data derived from the qualitative and quantitative means. In the beginning, the quantitative data was analysed using SPSS.22, while the interview data was analysed using MAXQDA. The findings showed that although EFL instructors in Türkiye think reflective teaching is effective in improving their instruction, they do not often use this technique. The main causes of the participants' lack of reflective behaviours among EFL instructors were their obstacles, which included hectic schedules, a lack of expertise, and a lack of enthusiasm.

The original contribution of this study is that it is one of the few studies that examines Turkish EFL teachers' perceptions and practices of reflective teaching in both qualitative and quantitative dimensions. The findings prove the need for restructuring teacher training programs and in-service training to systematically support reflective practices. From a policy and practice perspective, teachers should be provided with training on time management and reflective teaching techniques, participation in workshops and seminars should be encouraged, and reflective practices should be made a mandatory component of professional development programs. In this way, reflective teaching will be able to enhance teachers' classroom decision-making skills, pedagogical creativity, and student achievement.

References

Akbari, R. (2008). Postmethod discourse and practice. TESOL Quarterly, 42(4), 641–652. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1545-7249.2008.tb00152.x

Aliakbari, M., & Adibpour, M. (2018). Reflective EFL education in Iran: Existing situation and teachers' perceived fundamental challenges. Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 77, 129–144. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ejer/issue/42545/512705

Afshar, H. S., & Farahani, M. (2017). Inhibitors to EFL teachers' reflective teaching and EFL learners' reflective thinking and the role of teaching experience and academic degree in reflection perception. Reflective Practice, 19(1), 46–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2017.1351353

Akbari, R., Behzadpoor, F., & Dadvand, B. (2010). Development of English language teaching reflection inventory. System, 38(2), 211–217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.03.003

Anderson, C. A. (2008). A quantitative study of the perceived professional development needs of foreign language teachers employed in rural school districts within the state of South Carolina [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. Capella University.

Bolam, R. (2000). Emerging policy trends: Some implications for continuing professional development. Journal of In-service Education, 26(2), 267–280. https://doi.org/10.1080/13674580000200113

Boyle, B., While, D., & Boyle, T. (2004). A longitudinal study of teacher change: What makes professional development effective? The Curriculum Journal, 15(1), 45–68. https://doi.org/10.1080/09243450500114819

Brookfield, S. (2017). Becoming a critically reflective teacher (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Burns, A. (2010). Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners. Routledge.

Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5(1), 43–51. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(89)90018-8

Charmaz, K. (2006). Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis. Sage Publications.

Crandall, J. (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). Heinle & Heinle.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Dağkıran, I. (2015). Postmethod pedagogy and reflective practice: Current stance of Turkish EFL teachers [Unpublished master's thesis]. Ihsan Doğramacı Bilkent University.

Day, C. (1999). Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning. Routledge Falmer.

Dewey, J. (1933). How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the education process. D.C. Heath and Company.

Díaz-Maggioli, G. (2004). Teacher-centered professional development. ASCD Publications.

Elmore, R. E., & Burney, D. (1997). Investing in teacher learning: Staff development and instructional improvement in Community School District #2, New York City (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 4162). National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. https://publications.iadb.org/en/investing-teacher-learning-staff-development-and-instructional-improvement-community-school

Farahian, M., & Rajabi, Y. (2022). An investigation into the level of reflection and barriers to EFL teachers' reflective practice. International Journal of Research in English Education, 7(2), 81–100. https://ijreeonline.com/article-1-665-en.html

Farrell, P. (2000). The impact of research on developments in inclusive education. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 4(2), 153–162. https://doi.org/10.1080/136031100284867

Farrell, T. S. (2012). Reflecting on reflective practice: (Re)visiting Dewey and Schön. TESOL Journal, 3(1), 7–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.10

Farrell, T. S. C. (2016). Surviving the transition shock in the first year of teaching through reflective practice. System, 61, 12–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.07.005

Ferdowsi, M., & Afghari, A. (2015). The effects of reflective teaching on teachers' performance. International Journal of Educational Investigations, 2(6), 20–31. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1201647

Freeman, D., Katz, A., Garcia Gomez, P., & Burns, A. (2015). English-for-Teaching: Rethinking teacher proficiency in the classroom. ELT Journal, 69(2), 129–139. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccu074

Fullan, M. G. (1995). The limits and the potential of professional development. In T. R. Guskey & M. Huberman (Eds.), Professional development in education: New paradigms and practices (pp. 253–267). Teachers College Press.

Giraldo, F. (2014). The impact of a professional development program on English language teachers' classroom performance. Profile, 16(1), 63–76. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1053740.pdf

González, A. (2007). Professional development of EFL teachers in Colombia: Between colonial and local practices. Íkala, Revista de Lenguaje y Cultura, 12(18), 309–332. https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/2550/255020488012.pdf

Gunn, C. (2010). Exploring MATESOL student 'resistance' to reflection. Language Teaching Research, 14(2), 208–223. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810363940

Kennedy, J. (1995). Getting to the heart of the matter: The marginal teacher. The Teacher Trainer, 9(1), 10–14.

Kohl, A. G. (2005). The professional development needs of K–12 ESL and foreign language teachers: A descriptive study [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Korumaz, M., & Karakaş, A. (2014). An investigation of EFL language instructors' attitudes towards reflective teaching. Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction, 4(1), 27–46. https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/209621

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lau, K. (2006). Implementing strategy instruction in Chinese language classes: A school-based Chinese reading strategy instruction programme. Educational Research, 48(2), 195–209. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880600732280

Moradkhani, S., & Shirazizadeh, M. (2017). Context-based variations in EFL teachers' reflection: The case of public schools versus private institutes in Iran. Reflective Practice, 18(2), 206–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2016.1267002

Murray, A. (2010). Empowering teachers through professional development. English Teaching Forum, 48(1), 2–11. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ914883

Opfer, V. D., & Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. Review of Educational Research, 81(3), 376–407. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311413609

Richards, J. C. (1991). Toward reflective teaching. The Teacher Trainer, 5(3), 4–8. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265934213_Towards_Reflective_Teaching

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). Reflective teaching in second language classrooms. Cambridge University Press.

Sadeghi, K., & Richards, J. C. (2016). The idea of English in Iran: An example from Urmia. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 37(4), 419–434. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2015.1080714

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

Schön, D. (1988). Coaching reflective teaching. In P. Grimmett & G. Erickson (Eds.), Reflection in teacher education (pp. 19–29). Teachers College Press.

Stanley, C. (1998). A framework for teacher reflectivity. TESOL Quarterly, 32(3), 584–591. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3588129

Tice, J. (2002). Reflective teaching: Exploring our own classroom practice. BBC/British Council Teaching English. https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/professional-development/teachers/taking-responsibility/articles/reflective-teaching-exploring-our

Tok, Ş., & Doğan-Dolapçıoğlu, S. (2013). Reflective teaching practices in Turkish primary school teachers. Teacher Development, 17(2), 265–287. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2012.753940

Yıldırım, S. (2020). Reflective teaching in ELT: Obstacles and handling strategies [Unpublished master's thesis]. Akdeniz University.

Zahid, M., & Khanam, A. (2019). Effect of reflective teaching practices on the performance of prospective teachers. The Turkish Journal of Educational Technology, 18(1), 32–43. http://www.tojet.net/articles/v18i1/1814.pdf

****

Ethical Declaration and Committee Approval

In this research, the principles of scientific research and publication ethics were followed.

****

Proportion of the Author Contribution
Researchers contributed equally to this study.