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Abstract. Implementing reflective teaching enables teachers to enhance their professional development. Considering this role, this study aimed to find out how much EFL teachers have practiced reflective teaching and its relation with gender, length of teaching, and brain hemisphere dominance. This is a quantitative study which followed the correlational approach. The data collection was obtained by distributing the instruments of this study namely: the questionnaire and the quiz. The data in this study were collected from the EFL public Senior High School teachers in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The reported result reveals that the EFL teachers are mostly in the level of pedagogical reflection (33.01%) and all of the chosen variable predictors seemed to have no influence in determining the teachers’ reflection practice level.
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INTRODUCTION

In the world of education, learning is a continuous process that makes every teacher evolve. There are always many new things to learn and to understand more which elevate them to expand. This long-life learning becomes the journey of how teachers can increase their excellence and ease their growth. Hence, by looking upon the role of being persistent in gaining knowledge, teachers can decide which path they choose to accommodate the process. One of the options is by reflecting on knowledge and experience.

Adopting reflection as an approach will make a major contribution to the enhancement of learning to improve the quality of teaching and develop their professionalism (Ma & Ren, 2011). For that reason, being reflective can enrich the personal experience, and teachers will become more aware of what they do while making a better change as well as becoming adaptive to the changing situation. It is in line with Kayapinar (2013) describing that reflection enables teachers to form a habit of continually learning from their own experiences by framing problems of practice in light of various perspectives, critiquing and reframing problems within broader perspectives, and taking action that is fostered by such reframing”.

Furthermore, reflection can promote teachers’ awareness in observing the classroom situation, which also changes the students’ behavior (Fatemipour, 2009). Their practice will be articulated into action and grounds into the sense of understanding of why teachers do what they do (Brookfield, 2017). As a result, they will recognize more of their teaching and will be able to advance their practice.

The concept of reflective practice has been encouraged in Asia, including in Indonesia (Lubis, 2017). It is chained as an aspect of teachers’ professionalism. Teachers’ professionalism has always been an important concern for the Indonesian government in its education. For instance, in the implementation of the Curriculum 2013, it mentions teachers must be reflective. Doing reflection by self-evaluation and self-observation will keep them develop their quality as a teacher. The Ministry of National Education No. 16/2007 also asserts the academic qualification standard and teachers’ competence should be reflective to advance the teaching progression. Based on those parameters, teachers are expected to do a reflection on their own teaching in the class and utilize the reflection result as the improvement tool. The continuous reflective practice they do will help them to improve their obligation and tasks.

In the EFL education program context, reflective practice has already become a relatively familiar concept for teachers to report on what is going on in the classroom. It also becomes a standard requirement for them to do (Cohen-Sayag & Fischl, 2012). The Indonesian government expected teachers to perform reflective practice by keeping a teaching journal, conducting action research, and putting their effort into engaging the classroom lesson (Cirocki & Widodo, 2019). However, many in-service teachers have already implemented the practice, but they still do not know what they are doing is reflective teaching (Karnita et al., 2017). Other than that, their understanding is also only limited by the assumption that Class Action Research is the only way to do reflective practice (Yanuarti & Treagust, 2016). This limitation also happens because of a little record on how EFL teachers view, behave, utilize various
concepts, and reflective teaching model in the form of research as well as the teaching program based on the Indonesian government, they are more likely to explore how teachers reflect by journal writing (Lubis, 2017).

Moreover, even though reflective teaching is mandated as one of the important aspects in the academic qualification standards and teachers’ competences, its practice is not in line with the order from the government where they asked teachers to be so but does not encourage the schools to do self-management for professional development activities (Lubis, 2017). It becomes more crystal clear since there are no supporting elements for reflective teaching practice, such as the guidelines provided by the Ministry of National Education (Yanuarti & Treagust, 2016).

In some universities in Indonesia, they are not equipped with a curriculum that consists of reflective teaching practice. Consequently, they are not familiar with the concept and have not experienced being a reflective teacher. It is proved by the study of Nurkamto and Sarosa (2020), where they revealed that pre-teachers have a very limited understanding of reflective teaching since, from thirty teachers, only two of them know about the term reflective teaching.

Regardless of the reflective teaching importance in education, there are factors that are believed to contribute to teachers’ reflective practice. To date, demographic factors such as gender (Afshar & Farahani, 2018; O’Connell & Dyment, 2011; Blaise et al., 2004, Rahimi & Asadollahi, 2012) and years of teaching (Farrel 2007; Kini & Podolsky 2016) are noticed to be the factors that might influence it. In the relation between the practice of reflective teaching practice and gender, Rahimi and Asadollahi (2012) explained that the teachers’ gender in the classroom affected their characteristics, personality, and preference in the way of teaching. The characteristic of teachers will affect their actions in teaching.

Considering the characteristics of reflective practitioners where they are aware of their actions and have a pure intention that comes within themselves, teachers are proactive in determining what will they do in the future; it supports that women tend to be more reflective. Moreover, the gender psychologists (Belenky et al., 1986) says that women tend to be more to pour their thought into a discussion, which is becoming the indication of implementing the practice of reflective teaching. Supporting that, the study of Blaise et al. (2004) mentioned it as one of the strategies in applying reflective practice, and women tend to have a more positive attitude towards journaling comparing to men.

The next is in terms of how years of teaching could impact reflective teaching. Logically, the more experienced the teacher, the more reflective they will be. It is in line with Farrel (2007), where they believed that the length of teaching experience would determine the way how they teach, including their strategies and their reflective teaching because the teaching experience is a significant factor in determining the teaching effectiveness.

Other than that, another factor that is suspected of having a relationship with teachers’ reflective practice is their brain dominance (Afshar et al., 2018). Arul (2012) asserts that the brain hemisphere dominance can be seen as one of the important aspects in determining their teaching practice. It is assumed that left-brained
teachers are more reflective than right-brained ones (Tavakoli, 2013; Ghinea, 2012). It is based on the characteristic of left-brain person where they are more systematic, and it makes them more reflective than those who are more into their right brain. It is because the right-brain person is more impulsive, whereas it is the opposite of a systematic person.

There are many studies that put their interest on finding out whether, for instance, length of teaching experience and gender have a role in the teachers’ reflection (Afshar & Farahani, 2018; Ansarin et al., 2015; Arshad & Malik 2018), as well as the brain hemisphere dominance (e.g., Tavakoli, 2013; Ghinea, 2012). However, there is no solid ground to stand on because it is also found that none of these three factors have an effect on doing reflective practice. As reported by Kini and Podolsky (2016), not every experienced teacher is less effective and not every experienced teacher is more effective and Afshar and Farahani (2018) noted that male teachers outperformed the reflective practice of the female teachers. Moreover, regarding brain hemisphere dominance, there is still a little study that investigated the influence of brain dominance on teachers’ reflective practice.

Based on the elaborated cases above, firstly, related to the situation where the reflective teaching practice becomes uncommon for the pre-service teacher and in-service teacher in Indonesia is quite contradictory with the demand from the government’s line which already stated in the curriculum and the national education regulation. Arrose from that point, this study intends to seek the quality of the teachers’ reflective practice by investigating and exploring the level of their reflection. Since their understanding of reflective teaching will be translated into how they perform their instructional setting, it can be the monitor of the level of reflection they are in, and it is affected by their comprehension of what responsibility they have (Burton, 2009). Moreover, considering the relation between reflective teaching practice and the demographic background such as years of teaching, gender, and the factor of brain hemisphere dominance, some previous studies does not seem to have the tendency whether or not all those variables can be used as the predictors in determining the reflective teaching practice.

With this regard, this study is intended to reveal the practice of reflective teaching practice in the Indonesian context, specifically in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. It is because none of the previous works of literature seemed to put their interest to what extent teachers have practiced their reflective teaching in this particular province of Indonesia. Furthermore, most of the studies conducted in the Indonesian context revealed the practice of reflective teaching by discovering their level based on their journal writing by involving only a few participants. It is different from this study where this wanted to capture the level of teachers’ reflection on the larger scale of respondents. In addition, examining the connection between the teachers’ reflection and demographic' factors (length of teaching experience & gender) as well as the brain hemisphere dominance, there are still no works that appear to tackle the connection between these variables.

Thus, to cover up the points previously discussed, this study formulated research question and hypotheses as follows:
1. Does the length of teaching experience differentiate EFL teachers’ level of reflective teaching practice?
2. Does gender differentiate EFL teachers’ level of reflective teaching practice?
3. Does brain hemisphere dominance relate to EFL teachers’ level of reflective teaching practice?

**Reflective Teaching Definition**

The origin of reflective teaching is believed born from a United States educational philosopher John Dewey (1933) where he considers teachers as reflective practitioners. He states that teachers doing reflective practice starts when they experience difficulty, troublesome event, or experience that cannot be immediately resolved (Zeichner & Liston, 1996:8). Another literature work comes from Kolb (1984) whereby he explained the relationship between experience and learning which known as experiential learning. Kolb’s theory elucidates that people learn from their experience and the way this happened is through reflection on things we do (concrete experiences); and experimentation (action) in similar situation at another time, in order to gain further experience; reflect again, and so on.

Furthermore, Finlay (2008) also adds that reflective practice as an action where experience is very important to be the source of learning in order to access new perspective of own personal practice. From these literature reviews, the role of past experience in reflection is crucial. As Dewey (1933) expresses that, on the experience is what people reflect on.

“Reflection is learning and developing through examining what we think happened on any occasion, and how we think others perceived the event and us, opening our practice to scrutiny by others, and studying data and texts from the wider sphere.” Bolton (2010: 13).

This particular definition can be derived as reflective teaching is a practice where teachers need to review their own teaching by also asking the help of others to examine his/her practice and also relate it with another field. For instance, teachers might ask for a supervisor to observe their teaching and to relate the teaching process with another aspect such as social and cultural aspects.

According to Mathew et al., (2017), reflective teaching in general means as thinking about one’s teaching or as a process of teachers’ thinking about the way they teach, and then trying to figure out how to improve it. The points that are emphasized to be the consideration of the reflection process are what and why something is being done, and how well the learner outcome is. In order to reflect their teaching practice, teachers could collect information about what is going on in the classroom, analyze and evaluate the information, and then identify and explore their own practices. This might improve or change the teaching and learning process and the outcomes reach the better result (Bailey, Curtis & Nunan, 2004 in Liu & Zhang, 2014).

In other words, reflective teaching is more than only to change the action in the classroom but also have to see what problems arise that teachers could use as the mirror in language teaching since most of the teachers usually use a monotonous teaching methods and strategies because of their teaching beliefs or lack of professional development (Olaya Mesa, 2018). To conclude, reflective teaching is
looking back at what has been done and then figuring out a better way by combining it with previous knowledge and experience as well as another aspect to support the next action by means to change and improve the behavior, practice, and thinking. Specifically, it deals with teaching and learning process to access a better outcome for both teacher and students and to gain teachers professional development.

The Level of Reflection

Based on the levels of reflection from those previous literature, this study adapted a new termination of Larrivee (2008) framework where he also divided the level into four, namely: (1) pre-reflection; (2) surface reflection; (3) pedagogical reflection; and (4) critical reflection.

**Pre-reflection.** In pre-reflection phase, teachers tend to be passive since there is no further action done after finding a certain case in the classroom. The teachers do not relate their experience with theory or literature and believe that is out of their control and there is nothing they can do about that. The way how to teach tend to be generalized and does not based on source or experience since his position views students are the same related to their learning and do not need any specific treatment.

**Surface reflection.** This is the level two of the reflection where teachers mirror their action with their experience. In this level, the teachers exploring what they might feel “the best” way to accommodate the students learning. However, they do not lie on the theory or literature but experience. Furthermore, the students are not considered to be the same but trying to accommodate the difference learning needs.

**Pedagogical reflection.** In this level, teachers possess a goal where they continuously want to improve the students learning experience by searching for what strategies or activities that might covered the students’ needs. Therefore, the teachers consider all the students’ different needs and try to reach out the preference in the learning process. This reflection is backed up with the framework that comes from the experience and theory or literature.

**Critical Reflection.** This is the highest level of reflection where a teacher is continuously reflecting on his teaching considering the action and the process of thinking. The teacher realizes that ideology in teaching and the belief in teaching would affect the students learning. Since every teacher holds a certain believe about teaching, but still when having critical reflection, teacher would verify what he has in order to examine the impact to the student in term of ethical, social, cultural aspects.

RESEARCH METHOD

**Research Design**

This study follows a descriptive quantitative method. A quantitative research deals with numerical data where this study also will obtain the information from the respondents in the form of statistical data. The involvement of analytical data in a research would help in minimizing the time and effort where it can be used in maximizing the description of the research result (Eyisi, 2016). Since quantitative method is in specific way proving theories (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001), this study adapted the correlational approach. Correlational approach was chosen because this
study intends to investigate the topic of this research; the reflective teaching practice of EFL teachers and its correlation with length of teaching experience, gender, and brain hemisphere dominance.

Participants
Since the purpose of this study is to find out the level of the teachers’ of EFL in their reflective practice and considering the variables of this research (length of teaching, gender, their brain hemisphere dominance), there are 131 teachers EFL Public Senior High School teachers were selected by the criterion of they already know and understand the concept of reflective practice. There are 48 male and 83 female teachers with length of teaching varied 1-10, 11-20, and more than 21 years.

Table 1. Respondents’ Gender, Length of Teaching Experience, and Brain Hemisphere Dominance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/District</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of Teaching</th>
<th>Brain Hemisphere Dominance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogyakarta</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Male 48</td>
<td>&lt;5 years 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantul</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Female 83</td>
<td>5-10 years 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>11-20 years 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kulonprogo</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>21-30 years 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunungkidul</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;31 years 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Total 131</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instruments
There were two instruments utilized in this study namely reflective teaching level questionnaire and the brain hemisphere dominance quiz. The fifty-three items with likert-scale response questionnaire was adopted from Barbara Larrivee (2008). It covers the four level of reflection namely: (1) Pre-reflection; (2) Surface reflection; (3) Pedagogical reflection; and (4) Critical reflection. Furthermore, the brain hemisphere dominance quiz was from Education World (2000). It is a yes/no quiz which consists of 10 questions. Each of questions represents the characteristics of left or right brain hemisphere. The validity of the instruments was conducted by performing face validity and content validity were involved. For face validity test, where it is more into natural judgmental, a supervisor was asked to review the instruments to reassure the items of the questionnaire are suitable and relevant with the purpose of the study. Then, expert judgment was involved in judging the content of the instruments’ items for content validity. In addition, for the reliability test, the Cronbach Alpha test was chosen because it is viewed as the most appropriate tool to measure the consistency of the Likert scale questionnaire items. Conclusively, the result showed that the reliability test was 0.758, where Hinton et al. (2004) considered high reliability.
Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaire related to the level of reflective teaching practice was firstly counted and accumulated based on the classification related to the level of pre-service teachers’ reflection by using SPPS. In analyzing the questionnaire, there were two types of analysis, they are descriptive statistics analysis and regression analysis. Additionally, the data collected from the quiz was manually counted.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Table 2. The Level of Teachers Reflective Teaching Practice Result

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflection Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Reflection</td>
<td>2658</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>0.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface Reflection</td>
<td>2478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>0.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Reflection</td>
<td>5001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>33.01</td>
<td>0.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reflection</td>
<td>4046</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>0.580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the questionnaire related to the level of reflective teaching practice was scored based on the four points, they are: (1) Pre-reflection; (2) Surface reflection; (3) Pedagogical Reflection; and (4) Critical Reflection. It is scored based on a rating scale of Frequently (F)= 3; Sometimes (S)= 3; Rarely (R)=1. From the description in the Table 2 it reveals that the teachers are mostly doing their reflective teaching practice in the Pedagogical level with the mean value of 2.72. Following that, the teachers are considered to stepping on the highest level of reflection namely critical reflection (mean value=2.37). On the third row, the surface reflection came with the mean value of 1.71. Lastly, at the bottom of the list, pre-reflection was the least level of the teachers at (mean value=1.44).

In regard to the level of reflective teaching of EFL Senior High school teachers, the analysis appears with the result of they are mostly engaged in the pedagogical reflection level. This shares the exact same finding with the study of Kheirzadeh & Sistani (2018). Likewise, it also the same with study conducted by Tan (2010); Daley, Daley, et. al., (2019); Saylor (2013) where they also uncover that the majority of teachers are in the level of pedagogic reflection. Meaning that, the EFL teachers consider their pedagogical knowledge in EFL language teaching such as the teaching approach that based on theory, or the research that could accommodate the classroom practice (Jay & Johnson 2002 in Yanuarti & Treagust 2016). This allude that the EFL teachers focus on the reason behind their teaching, and the alternatives can be chosen based on for instance students’ needs (Farrell, 2004).

Additionally, in pedagogical level, Van Manen (1977) stated that teacher examine the behavior of him/herself and the student as an action to see how will the goal of teaching can be accomplished. Accompanying that, this phase of reflection is
basically based on the theories of teaching (Day, 1993). All in all, in more specific dimension, in this level, the EFL teachers thoroughly take an important note on the all of teaching aspects, the internal and the external aspects including the students, the curriculum, instructional strategies and the rules and organization of the classroom (Valli, 1997 in Minot, 2008: 56).

Thus, teachers have the persistent willingness in maintaining the learning continuously and consciously try to find out the effectiveness of the classroom practice by bearing in mind the consequences of the instructional methods used in the classroom. Seeing the relation of the teaching practice and the students learning by taking into account the effect of what students bring into their classroom (wants and needs) and how to link students’ prior knowledge with concept being taught. (Larrivee, 2008 in Campoy, 2010).

Following pedagogical reflection, critical reflection is on the second position in terms of the number of respondents mentioned themselves practicing the characteristic of this particular level of reflection. Since this is the highest level on Larrivee’s (2008) reflective teaching practice hierarchy, it hints that the EFL teachers also have taken into account the broader aspects of language teaching, for instance social, political, and ethical features or the external aspect of language teaching. Since students may come with different background of values, beliefs, and assumption, teachers are able to considering these facts. As teachers successfully taking an important note on that, it will approach student to view their classroom condition by challenging their assumption, beliefs, and values where in the end the process may help students in changing their view of the world or even improve their behavior (Harvey, et.al. 2010).

The next is surface reflection which comes in the third row. Different from Daley, Sydnor & Davis (2019), they found out the that critical reflection are in the third place while surface reflection occurs to be the teachers are on the second place. Based on the order of reflection where the surface reflection is in the second place, it signifies that there are not many of the EFL teachers who reflect their practice based on what they have experienced only. Otherwise, they ponder what they can do more, which is a good thing, relate to their teaching by seeking other alternatives besides the experience alone. However, being reflective can be started firstly by looking back at a certain event, and along the way, the teachers can move to the higher state of reflective teaching level.

Lastly, pre-reflection level stands on the last line to be the characteristics of the EFL teachers in this study. In accordance with Nurfaidah et al., (2017), the teachers are in the descriptive writing level or the lowest level in Hatton and Smith framework where it also become the least level to be represented here. Even though this study adopts a different framework, however Larrive’s and Hatton and Smith’s share the same concept at the lowest level of their reflection stages. Both pre-reflection and descriptive writing leave the situation as it is without considering any possibilities to sort out specific event in the classroom. Nevertheless, the teachers merely describe it on their thought or their writing without making any justification on it. For the reason, it is because teachers think that the situation in the classroom is beyond their control.
Since pre-reflection becomes the least level of the EFL teachers, it is assumed that they are conscious about bringing the reflective approach to expand further of their quality. Making the decision of what is not working by reframing and executing new action based on the alternatives view (Jay & Johnson, 2002 in Yanunarti & Tregast, 2016). Moreover, the teachers will be more confident in facing new situation that might occur in the classroom because they already have a positive attitude toward it by engaging the reflective practice (Hillier, 2005). By the end, this will accelerate the EFL teachers’ flexibility in substitute things that do not run well in the classroom, increase their sustainability by regularly reviewing their practice, and finally develop their capabilities and responsibilities which lead to professionalism. (Tarjana, 2003).

**Table 3. The summary of regression analysis model for variables Years, Gender, and Brain Hemisphere Dominance predicting the level of reflection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Predictors</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Years of teaching</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-992</td>
<td>.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Years of Teaching; Gender</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-983</td>
<td>.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Years of Teaching; Gender; Brain Hemisphere Dominance</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Revealing the result of the predictors influence on the level of reflection, Table 2 provides how each model of the predictors touching out upon the relationship with the dependent variable. The simple linear regression was used in examine the analysis of the Model 1. Furthermore, for Model 2 and 3, Multiple regression was utilized. To translate the result above, it can be seen on the R Square value of: firstly, Model 1 is 0.08, Model 2 is 0.09, Model 3 is 1.00. Then, they were transcribed into percentage and turned into 0.8 %, 0.9 %, and 1.0%. With these R Square value, it tells that the percentage are low. That being said, the models give a very little impact on explaining the dependent variable. For that reason, it can be assumed that the variable of years, gender, and brain hemisphere dominance have no relationship with the target variable since their influence were no more than 1 %.

**Teachers' reflective teaching practice level and the length of teaching experience.**

The impact of teachers' experience on their effectiveness and productivity has been widely examined throughout decades. Kini and Podolsky (2016) summarize 30 studies where they conclude teachers' experience has a positive connection with students' outcome. Quoting Ladd (2008) in Rice (2010:2),

“on average, teachers with more than 20 years of experience are more effective than teachers with no experience, but are not much more effective than those with five years of experience.”

Alternatively stated, the teachers with less experience does not mean all of them are less effective, or the other way around. Every experienced teacher also does not mean all of them are effective.
Teachers do increase their effectiveness as they gain more years in their teaching practice. However, it also reveals that there is also variation found where the effectiveness of teachers is on different stages. For instance, novice teachers in the early period of their practice seemed to have the enthusiasm and open to all new insight in developing their teaching so that they can enhance their ability in mastering new approaches (Mcgreggor & Cartwright, 2011). As a result, it can be concluded that it is in the early, middle, or post or their career period. As the range of the teachers' teaching period varies from one year to fifty-five years, the result does not serve positive indication of teaching experience and the reflective teaching practice (Kini & Podolski, 2016).

Relating to the result of this study, the length of the EFL teachers teaching experience does not seem to have an impact on their level of reflective teaching. It agrees with Rashidi and Javidanmehr (2012), Rezaeyan and Nikoopour (2013), and Ansarin et al. (2015), where they exposed teaching experience does not show a significant influence on the level of revel of teaching practice. However, it is in contrast with Saylor (2013) where he believed that reflective teaching level is strongly associate with teaching experience. Supporting that, Impedovo and Malik (2016) reported that the experienced teachers show a critical attitude toward their practice, and their effort is mainly to improve the students’ performance. Moreover, Saylor (2013) underlined that less experienced teachers do not always mean the teachers are on the lowest level (pre-reflection) since the subject of the study also shows that in the early year, teaching experience could perform a higher level of reflection.

Thus, it can be concluded that even though length of teaching does not affect the teacher effectiveness, but in term of reflective teaching practice, the result indicates a contrast side with the theory. That is, the more experienced teacher in their teaching practice, the more reflective they will be. Therefore, in this study it can be said that, teachers who have longer experience do not seem maximally reflect on their teaching practice. It is because the result showed that there is no difference with the senior teacher and novice teachers in terms of their reflective teaching practice.

**Teachers reflective teaching practice level and gender**

This study revealed that gender does not seem to have any influence in the teachers' reflective teaching practice. Male and female share the same quality in implementing the practice. Related to the story of any girls keep a personal private diary writing, Wicks (2015) come with the idea of this is a gendered activity. Blaise et al. (2004) and Belenky et al. (1986) also agree that compared to men, women show a positive attitude in pouring their thought through journal writing. However, writing a journal is not the only strategy in doing reflective teaching practice. There are many others activities such as peer-observation, Class Action Research, recording oneself, and so forth. Therefore, even though women are seemed to be more reflective if looking at their tendency in writing their thought, it can be neglected that there are many also other ways in performing reflective teaching practice which implies men also can be reflective as well.

In this study, it is proved that both male and female teachers shared the same activities; write notes about what happens when they teach and record their teaching
in the form of video. Denoting these cases demonstrates that, to start the reflective practice related to a specific occasion or event that happens, both male and female teachers need to be the focus on by thinking or writing it down. As someone only writes about a certain situation, they are considered to be on the lowest level of being reflective (Hatton & Smith, 1995).

Male and female teachers are also the same in ways how they involve others in helping them to improve their teaching practice. They asked their colleagues to observe their teaching and continuously thought about how they should improve their practice. Thus, teachers’ gender does not determine the level of reflective teaching practice. It can be said that both variables do not connect to each other by relying on the result. It is in accordance with the previous findings from Masoomi and Habibi (2016), Keshavarzi and Fumani (2015), Odeh et al. (2010), and Ferdowsi and Afghari (2015).

As some studies reported that female and male teachers act indifferently and do not affect their reflective practice, it is worth to note that gender should not be the matter of how teachers teach. The fact that there is sometimes the conventional assumption of whether each of the genders is in their teaching practice. It is important that teachers need to continuously reflect on their practice rather than focusing on the stereotype that will affect their own perceptions, interactions, and expectations (Islahi & Nasreen, 2013), since biases, indeed, can impress the quality of teaching and learning either in a positive way or a negative way (Rashedi & Naderi, 2012).

Teachers' reflective teaching practice level and teachers' brain dominant

People's behaviors can be defined by which part of their brain is dominant. If it is the left part of the brain, it is believed that the person is specialized in remembering names, responding to verbal instructions and explanations, experiments systematically with control, make an objective judgment, being planned and structured, and analytic reader. Meanwhile, those right-brained people are more into remembering faces, responding to demonstrated, illustrated, or symbolic instructions, relying on images in thinking and remembering (Torrance, 1980, cited in Brown, 2007: 125). These characteristics also agree with the teachers' brain hemisphere dominance. Connell (2005) brings that teachers' brain hemisphere dominance will affect the classroom situation since right-brained teachers will use the right brain strategies and vice versa; the left-brained teachers will use the left-brain strategies (Ashraf et al., 2017).

With regard to the teachers' brain hemisphere dominance and their reflective practice, apparently, it has not shown any correlation in this study. It uncovers that the domination of whether left, right, or whole-brain teachers were generally assumed could not predict the teachers' reflection level. In one way, it acknowledges Suzani’s (2018) opinion, where she exposed the brain hemisphere dominance of the teachers do not show a significant influence on the pedagogical strategy which one of which is the professional development strategy.

Since it is believed that the left-brained teachers are more reflective than those who are not, it is in the contrary with the result of this study. It might be because the teachers are not really dominant on their left-brain hemisphere. Even
though they are left-brained, there are some of the teachers who did not acknowledge themselves of being ‘systematic’ and ‘structured’. In which, those two characteristics of ‘systematic’ and ‘structured’ are the indicators of becoming reflective practitioners. Ashraf et al. (2017) further explained that left-brained teachers aspire to be reflective and believe they will be more likely to apply it in their classroom practice. Not only affecting the teachers' reflective teaching, it also influences the teachers teaching strategies.

Regardless of the effect of the brain hemisphere dominance on the teachers’ reflective practice, it is worth noting that it is also important to consider the students’ brain hemisphere dominance since they of course, will have a preference on how they perceive the learning. This will lead to the practice of reflecting as well since it will make the teachers aware that students come from different backgrounds by providing what students need. Likewise, considering the differences from the students will drive to the concern in how the teachers will run the classroom practice (Ghinea et al., 2012). Moreover, it is much more important to bring the reflective practice into reality by following the stage from being pre-reflective, to surface reflection, to pedagogic reflection, and finally to be at the phase of critical reflection.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the discussion, the EFL teachers are mostly in the level of pedagogical reflection. Pinpointing the relationship between the reflective teaching level with teachers’ gender shows no positive connection. It can be assumed that female and male teachers have no distinction features which affect the teachers’ reflection level. Moving to the association of the length of how long teachers have been teaching with their reflection level also does not show any significant impact. The novice teachers and senior teachers are more likely to share indistinct practice in their reflective teaching approach. The same case also happens for the last point, wherein the teachers’ brain hemisphere dominance also does not have any contribution in determining the practice of teachers’ reflection level. Regardless they are more into their left, right, or middle brain. It caused an indifferent effect on the teachers’ level of reflection as well. Overall, based on the three variables predictors of gender, length of teaching experience, and brain hemisphere dominance, which is proposed in this study, all of them do not appear to have a contribution in defining the reflective teaching practice level of the EFL teachers.
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