Exploring the Content and Depth of Structured Video-Based Self-Reflection among EFL Pre-service Teachers during Microteaching

Nuri Emmiyati – Muhammad Syukri – Jumharia Djamereng

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2026.19.04.16

Abstract
This study explores the content and depth of structured video-based self-reflection among EFL pre-service teachers following microteaching. Using an interpretive qualitative design, the study analyzes written reflections produced after participants reviewed their recorded teaching performances and responded to ten structured prompts covering instructional planning, lesson opening, teaching delivery, classroom interaction, classroom management, feedback and assessment, lesson closing, strengths and weaknesses, and theory into practice. The analysis integrates thematic analysis of reflection content with reflection-level analysis and a cross-matrix perspective. The findings show that participants reflected on teaching as a multidimensional practice involving planning, implementation, interaction, assessment, classroom management, and professional learning. They demonstrated awareness of constructive alignment and the importance of learner engagement, but also recognized persistent challenges, particularly teacher-centered instruction, limited learner-to-learner interaction, time management, confidence, and the use of specific formative feedback. Reflections concerning strengths and weaknesses and theory into practice were comparatively more analytical and demonstrated stronger connections between pedagogical knowledge and classroom experience. Overall, structured video-based self-reflection appeared to help pre-service teachers move beyond simply judging whether their teaching was good or bad. By reviewing their own recorded lessons, they were able to identify specific aspects of their teaching and consider how these could be improved in future practice.
Key words: video-based reflection, reflective practice, microteaching, teacher education, EFL, pre-service teachers

Introduction

The rapid changes taking place in twenty-first-century education have reshaped what is expected of teachers as professionals. In addition to having strong subject knowledge and instructional skills, teachers are increasingly expected to adapt to changing classroom conditions and continuously reflect on and improve their teaching practices. This is particularly important as they work with increasingly diverse learners, evolving curricula, new technologies, and changing societal expectations (Brunker, 2025; Groenier et al., 2025). In English as a Foreign Language (EFL) education, these demands can be even more complex. Language teachers need to consider not only linguistic and pedagogical aspects of teaching but also communicative and socio-cultural factors when creating learning experiences that support students' communicative competence (Hymes, 1972; Canale & Swain, 1980; Celce-Murcia, Dörnyei, & Thurrell, 1995; Richards & Rodgers, 2014; Harmer, 2014). Therefore, teacher education should not focus solely on providing pre-service teachers with pedagogical knowledge. It should also prepare them to examine their own teaching critically, learn from their classroom experiences, and continue developing their professional practice throughout their careers (Arslan, 2019; Amalia, Widiati, Basthomi, & Cahyono, 2020).

Reflective Practice in Contemporary Teacher Education

Teacher education has undergone significant changes over the past few decades. Traditional models often positioned teachers as recipients of pedagogical knowledge acquired through coursework and practicum, with competence largely measured by their ability to implement prescribed methods. Contemporary perspectives, however, conceptualize teachers as reflective professionals who actively construct professional knowledge by examining their own experiences, questioning instructional decisions, and learning from classroom practice (Guite, Savi, & Seyie, 2025). Within this view, teaching is not simply the application of prescribed methods but an ongoing process of professional inquiry that requires continuous observation, analysis, evaluation, and adaptation. Teacher learning is therefore increasingly understood as a dynamic, lifelong process in which professional growth emerges through engagement with authentic teaching experiences, rather than through theoretical instruction alone (Webster-Wright, 2009; Salo, Francisco, & Olin Almqvist, 2024; Groenier et al., 2025).

Reflective practice has become one of the cornerstones of this contemporary model of teacher learning. Rather than being a single instructional activity, it is a deliberate and evidence-informed process through which teachers examine their instructional actions, interpret classroom events, evaluate pedagogical decisions, and identify ways to improve their practice. This conception can be traced back to Schön's (1983) distinction between technical, routine-based professional practice and reflective practice. Through reflection-on-action, practitioners revisit completed experiences to understand why particular decisions were effective or ineffective and to consider how alternative approaches might better serve their clients, or in the context of teaching, their students. Reflection therefore transforms teaching experience into professional learning by connecting practice with critical analysis and informed decision-making.

The value of reflective practice in teacher education is well established in the literature. Beyond functioning as self-evaluation, reflection enables teachers to develop pedagogical reasoning, strengthen professional judgment, and build the adaptive expertise needed to respond effectively to diverse teaching contexts (Guite, Savi, & Seyie, 2025). Empirical studies across different educational settings have shown that reflective practice can contribute to improvements in instructional planning, classroom interaction, pedagogical decision-making, self-efficacy, and professional identity (Li, 2025). Reflective practice also enables teachers to recognize discrepancies between intended and enacted instruction, identify contextual factors that shape classroom learning, and make evidence-based improvements to their teaching practice. Taken together, these findings suggest that reflective competence is not simply an additional skill but a fundamental capacity that supports continuous professional development throughout a teacher's career.

This growing emphasis has also shaped international teacher-preparation standards. Structured reflection is increasingly embedded within practicums, mentoring, professional portfolios, classroom observation, and microteaching courses, reflecting a growing recognition that effective teacher education should cultivate teachers' capacity to learn systematically from their own instructional experience, rather than merely evaluate their performance. Reflection is therefore increasingly framed as both a learning process and a professional disposition that helps pre-service teachers connect pedagogical theory with classroom practice, a concern that remains central to contemporary EFL teacher education.

Reflective Practice in EFL Teacher Education

Within EFL teacher education, reflective practice has evolved from a supplementary post-teaching activity into a core component of teacher learning and professional identity development. Language teaching demands more than linguistic knowledge or familiarity with instructional methods. EFL teachers must make continuous decisions

about lesson objectives, classroom interaction, learner engagement, language use, and assessment, all of which are shaped by the specific teaching context. Professional competence therefore depends not only on what teachers know but also on their capacity to critically interpret their teaching experience and use it to improve their teaching practice. Reflective competence is therefore increasingly regarded as an essential learning outcome in EFL teacher preparation.

Recent scholarship increasingly frames reflection as a means of developing pedagogical reasoning rather than simply evaluating teaching performance. Reflective teachers are expected to examine the reasons underlying instructional success or failure, connect classroom experience with relevant theory, consider alternative strategies, and develop evidence-informed plans for improvement. Through this process, they can integrate the theoretical knowledge gained through coursework with the practical knowledge constructed through authentic teaching experience. This integration is particularly important in EFL contexts, where theoretical principles often need to be adapted to unpredictable classroom situations (Balıkçı & Ataş, 2026).

Research consistently indicates that reflection is more productive when supported by structured learning environments than when left to occur spontaneously. Guided reflection, mentoring, collaborative dialogue, peer feedback, and technology-enhanced reflection can encourage more analytical and evidence-based interpretations of teaching experience. A recurring conclusion across this literature is that novice teachers need explicit scaffolding to move beyond descriptive accounts of classroom events towards deeper pedagogical analysis (Balıkçı & Ataş, 2026). In other words, reflection is a professional competence that needs to be systematically developed rather than viewed as an innate ability.

Recent empirical work also links reflective practice with multiple dimensions of EFL pre-service teachers' development, including pedagogical reasoning, confidence in instructional decision-making, professional identity, and self-efficacy (Ubaidillah et al., 2025; Arslan, 2019). Reflective activities can help pre-service teachers recognize gaps between intended lesson plans and enacted practice, identify factors that shape learner participation, and critically evaluate their own instructional strategies. In this way, reflection can support continuous professional learning rather than serving merely as a retrospective evaluation of teaching performance. Despite this consensus, meaningful reflection rarely develops automatically. Pre-service teachers commonly produce descriptive narratives of classroom events without deeper pedagogical interpretation or theoretical grounding (Arslan, 2019). This has led the literature to advocate reflection activities that incorporate systematic guidance, authentic classroom evidence, and repeated opportunities for analysis. This suggests that the value of reflection depends not only on learners' willingness to reflect but also on the instructional design that supports the reflective process.

Microteaching as a Context for Reflective Learning

Among the pedagogical approaches used in teacher education, microteaching has long been recognized as an effective environment for developing teaching competence before pre-service teachers enter authentic classroom settings. Although originally designed as a scaled-down teaching exercise, contemporary microteaching has evolved into a reflective learning environment in which pre-service teachers integrate pedagogical knowledge, instructional decision-making, classroom communication, and professional identity development (Karlström & Hamza, 2019). Rather than merely rehearsing teaching techniques, microteaching allows novice teachers to experience the complexity of teaching within a supportive setting that encourages experimentation, feedback, revision, and continuous improvement.

In EFL teacher education, the value of microteaching extends beyond skills practice. Language teaching requires teachers to make simultaneous decisions about language

input, classroom interaction, scaffolding, comprehension monitoring, corrective feedback, and sustaining meaningful target-language communication. These demands cannot be fully developed through coursework alone. Instead, they require repeated cycles of enacting, observing, evaluating, and refining teaching. Contemporary perspectives increasingly frame microteaching as an iterative cycle of planning, teaching, observation, feedback, reflection, and redesign, consistent with experiential learning theory. Technology-enhanced microteaching can further strengthen this cycle by expanding opportunities for observation, feedback, collaboration, and reflective inquiry (Marhaban et al., 2023). From this perspective, microteaching is increasingly understood as a context for inquiry into practice, where pre-service teachers examine how they interpret their instructional decisions and develop their pedagogical understanding, rather than simply completing a one-off performance assessment.

Video-Based Reflection as Evidence-Informed Practice

Digital technology has substantially transformed reflective practice through the use of video-based reflection. This approach addresses a key limitation of conventional, memory-based reflective journals. Teaching is cognitively demanding, and novice teachers must divide their attention between content delivery and immediate classroom management. As a result, many instructional events may go unnoticed during teaching and may not be recalled during later reflection.

Video recordings preserve classroom events as observable evidence, allowing pre-service teachers to pause, replay, and repeatedly examine specific episodes rather than relying on selective memory. Repeated observation can reveal previously overlooked aspects of teaching, including classroom language, questioning techniques, non-verbal communication, learner participation, wait time, and responses to unexpected situations. Video therefore functions as a reflective artifact that supports the systematic analysis of authentic teaching practice (Rothe & Gobel, 2024). By making classroom interaction visible, it can enhance teacher noticing and encourage evidence-based interpretation rather than general impressions, enabling pre-service teachers to identify specific episodes, consider why they occurred, and explore alternative approaches. In this way, video-based reflection can move beyond recollection towards evidence-informed inquiry.

Research from the past several years reinforces this view. Studies in second-language teacher education report that video-supported reflection promotes dialogic reflection, collaborative professional learning, and stronger links between theory and practice, particularly when teacher educators provide structured guidance (Balıkçı & Ataş, 2026). Similarly, research in EFL microteaching shows that repeated engagement with teaching video can move pre-service teachers from simple description towards analytical reconsideration of instructional decisions. However, deeper reflection is more likely to occur when video observation is supported by pedagogical scaffolding, peer dialogue, guided questioning, or structured reflection tasks. Technology alone does not automatically produce deeper reflection (Alamri & Alfayez, 2023; Odo, 2022). More recent work also links video-based reflection to broader outcomes, including professional identity, instructional confidence, and adaptive expertise. Watching one's own teaching from an observer's perspective can encourage pre-service teachers to reflect not only on what they taught but also on how they positioned themselves as teachers and responded to instructional challenges (Lewis, 2024).

Research Gap and Conceptual Framing

Despite this substantial evidence base, most studies emphasize the outcomes of video-based reflection, such as its effects on teaching competence, confidence, or professional identity. Comparatively few examine reflective texts themselves as data that can reveal how pre-service teachers construct professional knowledge. Fewer still

examine both what pre-service teachers reflect on and how deeply they reflect. This gap matters because reflection is not a uniform activity. Contemporary scholarship distinguishes between reflection content, or the pedagogical aspects teachers attend to, and reflection depth, or the cognitive sophistication demonstrated in the reflective account. Reflection content may include aspects such as planning, teaching delivery, classroom interaction, classroom management, and assessment. Two pre-service teachers may reflect on the same teaching event but demonstrate markedly different levels of reasoning. One may simply describe what happened, while another may analyze the underlying decisions, connect the experience with theory, and propose evidence-informed alternatives.

Among the frameworks used to evaluate reflective depth, the coding scheme developed by Kember and colleagues has gained wide recognition in higher education research for providing operational criteria for analyzing written reflection (Kember, 1999; Kember et al., 2000). The framework distinguishes four progressively sophisticated levels: habitual action, understanding, reflection, and critical reflection. Higher levels involve greater explanation, theoretical integration, evaluation of alternatives, and planning for future improvement. Considering reflection content and reflection depth together, rather than separately, can therefore provide a richer account of how pre-service teachers construct pedagogical knowledge from experience than either dimension alone.

Structured reflection, which uses carefully designed prompts rather than open-ended journals, has shown particular promise for improving reflective quality. The prompts can function as cognitive scaffolds by directing pre-service teachers' attention to specific pedagogical dimensions and encouraging analysis rather than simple description. When combined with video evidence, structured prompts allow pre-service teachers to revisit authentic classroom events while guiding them to interpret their pedagogical significance, justify their evaluations, and propose strategies for improvement. For research purposes, this approach also produces more comparable data because participants respond to the same set of prompts.

Three gaps therefore remain in the literature: (1) a predominant focus on the outcomes rather than the content of video-based reflection; (2) limited attention to reflection depth alongside reflection content, with reflection often treated as a single, undifferentiated construct; and (3) very few studies, particularly in Indonesian EFL teacher education, that integrate structured video-based self-reflection with both thematic analysis of reflection content and level-based analysis of reflection depth. Addressing these gaps requires moving beyond simply demonstrating that reflection occurs. It requires examining which pedagogical aspects receive reflective attention, which remain neglected, and whether pre-service teachers reflect descriptively or critically across different components of teaching. Such knowledge can inform the design of reflection activities that more effectively promote pedagogical awareness.

The issue motivating this study, then, is that although structured video-based reflection is widely promoted in EFL teacher education, little is known about what pre-service teachers actually attend to when reflecting under such structured conditions, and how deeply they process what they notice. Without this understanding, it remains unclear whether structured prompts merely broaden the range of pedagogical aspects that pre-service teachers notice, or whether they also support more analytical engagement with those aspects, and whether these two dimensions vary together or independently across different components of teaching. This issue provides the rationale for the present study, which examines both the content and the depth of EFL pre-service teachers' structured video-based reflections following microteaching and considers how these two dimensions relate to one another. Specifically, the study addresses the following research questions: (1) what pedagogical domains of teaching do EFL pre-service teachers attend to in their

structured video-based reflections; (2) what levels of reflective depth are demonstrated across these domains; and (3) how do reflection content and reflection depth relate to one another across the domains of the reflection protocol?

Method

Research Design

This study used an interpretive qualitative design to explore how EFL pre-service teachers constructed meaning from their video-recorded microteaching experiences through structured written reflection. Rather than evaluating teaching effectiveness, the study examined both the content and depth of participants' reflections using an integrated three-stage analytical framework consisting of thematic analysis, reflection-level analysis, and cross-matrix analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Kember et al., 2000).

Context and Participants

The study was conducted in the Principles of TEFL course at the Department of English Language and Literature of an Indonesian university. The course covers lesson planning, classroom management, teaching techniques, instructional media, assessment, and communicative language teaching. As a course requirement, students conducted an individually video-recorded microteaching lesson.

Forty-eight undergraduate pre-service English teachers enrolled in the course participated in the study. Purposive sampling was used because all participants had completed the microteaching lesson, reviewed their own recordings, and submitted structured written reflections (Palinkas et al., 2015). The entire class was included because the study aimed to develop an in-depth understanding of participants' reflective thinking rather than achieve statistical generalization.

Data Sources and Instrument

The primary data consisted of 48 reflection papers written after participants watched recordings of their own microteaching. Reflection was guided by a researcher-developed Structured Video-Based Reflection Protocol covering ten domains: lesson planning, lesson opening, teaching delivery, classroom interaction, teaching techniques and media, classroom management, feedback and assessment, lesson closing, strengths and weaknesses, and theory into practice. Participants were asked to support each evaluation with video evidence and, where relevant, connect their reflections to relevant TEFL principles.

The protocol was developed based on two considerations. First, it reflects core domains of instructional competence in EFL teacher education. Second, each prompt aligns with the intended learning outcomes of the Principles of TEFL course. Unlike open-ended journals, which may produce uneven reflections, structured prompts scaffold participants to examine multiple pedagogical dimensions systematically and support their evaluations with observable evidence. The protocol therefore functioned as both a data collection instrument and a pedagogical tool.

Data Collection

Data collection followed six stages: microteaching performance, video recording, self-viewing, completion of the reflection protocol, collection of reflection papers, and qualitative analysis. This process ensured that participants' reflections were grounded in observable evidence rather than memory alone.

Data Analysis

Data analysis followed an Integrated Three-Stage Framework. In Stage 1, Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis was used to identify the major pedagogical aspects of teaching that participants reflected on. In Stage 2, reflection depth was assessed using Kember and colleagues' four-level framework of Habitual Action,

Understanding, Reflection, and Critical Reflection (Kember, 1999; Kember et al., 2000). In Stage 3, the results of the first two stages were integrated through cross-matrix analysis by mapping reflection content against reflection depth to examine which pedagogical domains tended to elicit descriptive, analytical, or critical reflection.

Coding Procedures

Reflection papers were segmented into meaning units, defined as the smallest text segments expressing one complete reflective idea (Graneheim & Lundman, 2004), which served as the basic units of analysis. Coding then proceeded through four steps: assigning an initial descriptive code to each meaning unit, grouping similar codes into categories, synthesizing categories into themes, and independently classifying each unit according to Kember and colleagues' four levels of reflection. Using meaning units rather than whole paragraphs allowed finer-grained analysis, since participants often expressed different reflection levels within a single response.

Results

This section presents the findings, organized according to the ten domains of the Structured Video-Based Reflection Protocol and grouped into four broader categories: instructional planning, teaching implementation, assessment practices, and professional learning. The analysis examines two dimensions of reflective practice: reflection content, identified through thematic analysis across the ten domains, and reflection depth, assessed using Kember and colleagues' (1999, 2000) framework of Habitual Action, Understanding, Reflection, and Critical Reflection. Illustrative excerpts from the reflection papers of 48 participants support each theme. Table 1 summarizes the reflection content, predominant reflection level, and general pattern across the ten domains, followed by a cross-theme synthesis.

Table 1: Reflective Content and Depth across the Ten Microteaching Domains

Reflection Domain	Dominant Reflective Content	Predominant Level/Depth	General Pattern
Lesson Planning	Alignment of objectives, materials, activities, and assessment; organization; time allotment	Understanding (54.2%)	Participants recognized alignment among lesson components and identified weaknesses in planning and assessment, but reflection generally remained at describing alignment and identifying areas for improvement.
Lesson Opening	Motivation, activating prior knowledge, communicating objectives	Understanding (58.3%)	Participants recognized the importance of rapport, prior knowledge, and objectives, while some evaluated weaknesses in

			motivation and learner engagement.
Teaching Delivery	Explanations, demonstrations, classroom language, and instructions	Reflection (75.0%)	Participants commonly identified clear explanations as a strength while recognizing weaknesses in speaking speed, confidence, classroom language, and instructions.
Classroom Interaction	Teacher questioning techniques, pair/group work, or whole-class interaction	Understanding (60.4%)	Participants recognized the importance of learner participation and questioning, but reflections generally provided limited analysis of interaction patterns and effects on learning.
Teaching Techniques and Media	Visual aids, PPT, pictures, games, questioning, repetition	Understanding (56.3%)	Participants explained how techniques and media supported comprehension and engagement, while some identified limited variety and suggested more interactive alternatives.
Classroom Management	Time, voice, eye contact, movement, attention	Understanding (52.1%)	Participants demonstrated awareness of classroom-management practices and identified weaknesses in time, confidence, voice projection, movement, and maintaining attention.
Feedback and Assessment	Monitoring, correction, praise, questioning,	Understanding (70.8%)	Participants recognized monitoring and

	assessment		positive feedback, but reflection was generally limited in analysis of feedback specificity and systematic assessment.
Lesson Closing	Summary, comprehension check, homework, closure	Understanding (62.5%)	Participants recognized the importance of summarizing and checking understanding, while some identified weaknesses such as sudden endings or insufficient checks.
Strengths and Weaknesses	Explanation, interaction, confidence, language, management	Understanding (81.3%)	Participants demonstrated strong self-awareness but predominantly descriptive rather than analytically developed.
Theory into Practice	CLT, student-centred, active learning, scaffolding	Reflection (55.8%)	Participants more frequently connected TEFL Principles with observed practices, identified mismatches, and proposed improvements.

Reflective Content across the Ten Domains

The first stage of analysis examined the reflection content of 48 participants across the ten domains of the Structured Video-Based Reflection Protocol. As summarized in Table 1, participants reflected on a range of pedagogical aspects of their microteaching, from instructional planning and teaching implementation to assessment practices and professional learning. Overall, reflection content was concentrated on observable aspects of teaching performance, although participants also reflected on broader aspects of their pedagogical development.

Lesson Planning

Participants frequently reflected on the relationships among learning objectives, materials, activities, and assessment. Many recognized that these components were aligned, while others identified weaknesses in organization, assessment criteria, or time allocation. For example, one participant stated that the lesson plan was "well-structured because the objective, materials, activities, and assessments were

interconnected," but also acknowledged that the activities could have been "more interactive." Another participant identified more specific weaknesses, noting that the lesson plan lacked "a detailed assessment rubric" and alternative activities for students with different learning abilities. Thus, reflections on lesson planning focused not only on whether the components were aligned but also on the quality and specificity of planning, particularly in relation to assessment and activity design.

Lesson Opening

Participants reflected on greetings, rapport building, motivation, activation of prior knowledge, and the introduction of lesson objectives. Several described using greetings and questions to establish a friendly classroom atmosphere. For example, one participant reported, "I started the lesson by greeting the students and asking about their condition to build a friendly classroom atmosphere," followed by a review of previous material to activate prior knowledge. However, participants also identified limitations in the motivational component of their lesson openings. One participant acknowledged that the opening did not include "a more engaging Ice breaker" and that the motivational component was "quite brief." Another similarly recognized that the opening was friendly but needed stronger motivational support to encourage students to become "more enthusiastic and confident in class."

Teaching Delivery

Reflections on teaching delivery focused primarily on clarity of explanation, classroom language, demonstrations, instructions, speaking pace, and confidence. Clear explanations and the use of simple English were frequently identified as strengths. One participant stated, "I explained the lesson clearly and used simple English that students could understand," and noted that demonstrations and examples were provided before practice. At the same time, reviewing the video enabled participants to identify several limitations in their teaching delivery. Speaking too quickly was a recurring concern, as illustrated by the statement, "I explained the material using simple language... However, I need to speak more slowly so the students can understand my explanation better." Other participants noticed their excessive use of Indonesian. One participant reported, "I usually using Indonesian instead of English," identifying classroom language as an area requiring improvement. Overall, the responses reveal an important pattern: participants were generally aware of the characteristics of clear teaching delivery, but video viewing also enabled them to recognize discrepancies between their intended delivery and their actual performance.

Classroom Interaction

Participants reflected on questioning, student participation, whole-class interaction, pair work, and group work. Many reported using questions to encourage student participation, while others described guessing games, individual responses, pair work, and group activities. For example, one participant stated that "students were encouraged to participate through question-and-answer activities, guessing games, pair work and speaking practice in front of the class." However, a recurring concern was that interaction remained teacher-led. One participant explicitly acknowledged:
"Classroom interaction are still dominated by communication between the teacher and the entire class. I have not yet given students the opportunity to discuss or practice in pairs or small groups, so interactions among students remain limited."
Similarly, another participant noted that the lesson relied heavily on whole-class interaction and that more extended pair work was needed to increase student talking time. Overall, participation was widely recognized as important, but the reflections also revealed a teacher-centred pattern of interaction in some lessons.

Teaching Techniques and Instructional Media

Participants described using pictures, PowerPoint, flashcards, whiteboards, games, demonstrations, repetition, questioning, and pair work. These resources were primarily used to facilitate comprehension and promote learner engagement. For example, one participant explained that "PowerPoint and pictures were used to make the lesson more interesting and easier to understand and helped students remain focused and participate actively." Another participant recognized the usefulness of pictures but suggested using a greater variety of instructional media in future teaching. A participant who used drilling and a whiteboard noted that these techniques were effective but that "flashcards or songs could make the lesson more interesting." Overall, the reflections indicate an awareness of the relationship between instructional resources and learner engagement, while also revealing a perceived need for greater variety and interactivity.

Classroom Management

Reflections on classroom management focused on time management, voice projection, eye contact, movement, confidence, and maintaining learner attention. Participants commonly regarded eye contact and a clear voice as strengths, while identifying confidence and time management as areas for improvement. For example, one participant stated that "the lesson was managed according to the planned time and that eye contact and classroom movement helped maintain students' attention," but added that confidence and movement still needed improvement. Another reported that "voice projection and eye contact were strong, but finishing early resulted in poor time management and awkward dead time at the end." These responses show that participants understood classroom management not simply as maintaining discipline but as coordinating time, physical presence, voice, and learner attention.

Feedback and Assessment

Participants reported monitoring students through questioning, observation, speaking activities, pair work, and worksheets. Positive reinforcement and error correction were particularly common. One participant stated, "When a student made a mistake, I corrected it politely and asked the student to repeat the correct word. I also praised the students when they answered correctly." However, participants also identified limitations in the specificity of their feedback. One participant observed:

"The feedback I provide consist mostly of general Praise such as 'Very good' and 'excellent'. I have not yet provided more specific feedback on students' answers or conducted individual assessment."

Similarly, another participant recognized that "corrections were given but feedback was not detailed enough because I did not always explain the reasons." Thus, while participants demonstrated awareness of formative feedback practices, their reflections revealed limitations in feedback specificity, individual assessment, and the explanation of errors.

Lesson Closing

Participants generally reported summarizing the lesson and checking students' understanding through questions, repetition, or short activities. For example, one participant stated that "the lesson was closed by reviewing the main points and asking students whether they understood the material." Another reviewed vocabulary and asked students to produce examples before ending the class. However, several participants also recognized weaknesses in lesson closure. One acknowledged that the closing was hurried and that there was "no time left for individual reflection." Another recognized that although understanding was checked through questioning, the lesson ended without a brief summary.

Reflection on Strengths and Weaknesses

The ninth domain elicited extensive self-evaluation. Participants frequently identified clear explanation, communication, learner participation, rapport, teaching media, confidence, speaking pace, time management, and classroom interaction as central aspects of their teaching performance. For example, one participant identified "clear explanation, good communication, and giving positive feedback" as strengths while naming "time management, confidence, and creating more interactive activities" as weaknesses. Another identified confidence, classroom interaction, and teaching fluency as areas requiring improvement. These responses demonstrate considerable self-awareness, although most reflections focused on identifying strengths and weaknesses rather than explaining their pedagogical consequences.

Theory into Practice

The final domain generated reflections connecting teaching performance with TEFL principles, particularly Communicative Language Teaching, student-centered learning, scaffolding, active learning, meaningful communication, and positive reinforcement. Several participants described successful applications. For example, one participant stated that CLT was reflected in students' opportunities to practise "real communication through pair work and introducing their partners," while student-centered learning was reflected in active participation.

More importantly, some participants identified mismatches between theoretical principles and their observed teaching practices. One participant wrote:

"Communicative Language Teaching was partly applied, but the lessons was still teacher-centered. More interactive and student-centered activities are needed."

Another recognized that "CLT had not been implemented effectively because I used Indonesian more than English during the lesson." These responses provide stronger evidence of analytical reflection because participants compared theoretical principles with their observed teaching practices rather than merely identifying or naming the principles.

Reflective Depth across the Ten Domains

The second stage of analysis examined reflection depth using Kember and colleagues' four-level framework: Habitual Action (HA), Understanding (U), Reflection (R), and Critical Reflection (CR). Table 2 presents the distribution of responses across the four levels, while the predominant reflection level reported in Table 1 provides an integrated indication of the dominant level of reflection within each domain. Representative excerpts illustrate the qualitative characteristics of each level.

Table 2: Depth of Reflection across Ten Domains

Domain	HA (%)	U (%)	R (%)	CR (%)
Lesson Planning	8.3	54.2	37.5	0.0
Lesson Opening	4.2	58.3	37.5	0.0
Teaching Delivery	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0
Classroom Interaction	0.0	60.4	39.6	0.0
Teaching Techniques and Media	12.5	56.3	31.3	0.0
Classroom Management	0.0	52.1	47.9	0.0
Feedback and Assessment	8.3	70.8	20.8	0.0
Lesson Closing	4.2	62.5	33.3	0.0
Strengths and	2.1	81.3	16.7	0.0

Weaknesses				
Theory into Practice	11.6	32.6	55.8	0.0

Overall, reflections were concentrated at the Understanding and Reflection levels. Understanding predominated across most domains, whereas Reflection was more prominent in Teaching Delivery and Theory into Practice. Habitual Action appeared in only a minority of responses, while Critical Reflection was absent across all ten domains. The qualitative data suggest that the key distinction between Understanding and Reflection lies in whether participants merely recognized or explained their practice, or moved beyond recognition to evaluate it and consider specific alternatives.

Understanding as the Predominant Level

Understanding predominated in eight domains: Lesson Planning (54.2%), Lesson Opening (58.3%), Classroom Interaction (60.4%), Teaching Techniques and Media (56.3%), Classroom Management (52.1%), Feedback and Assessment (70.8%), Lesson Closing (62.5%), and, most strongly, Strengths and Weaknesses (81.3%), which showed the highest proportion across all domains. Responses at this level typically identified specific practices or perceived strengths and weaknesses, such as "clear explanation, good communication, and giving positive feedback" as strengths and "time management" and "confidence" as weaknesses, without substantially explaining why these occurred or how they affected learning.

A similar pattern appeared in Feedback and Assessment, where 70.8% of responses were classified at the Understanding level. Participants commonly recognized practices such as praise, correction, and monitoring without evaluating their effectiveness. However, some responses in this domain reached the Reflection level. One participant explicitly critiqued the generality of their feedback, noting that it "consist mostly of general praise" and that they had not yet provided more specific feedback or conducted individual assessment. This illustrates the distinction between simply identifying a practice and evaluating its adequacy.

Reflection as the Predominant Level: Teaching Delivery and Theory into Practice

Teaching Delivery showed the strongest reflective engagement across the ten domains, with 75.0% of responses classified at the Reflection level and 25.0% at the Understanding level. No responses were classified as Habitual Action or Critical Reflection. Participants frequently used the video recordings to identify discrepancies between their intended and actual performance. Their reflections moved beyond positive self-assessment, such as "I explained the material clearly... in simple English," towards more evaluative observations, including "I sometimes spoke too fast. I was a little nervous. I need to improve my classroom management and confidence." Others noticed unintended first-language use, stating that they "usually [used] Indonesian instead of English." These responses went beyond description by identifying specific weaknesses and considering directions for improvement.

Theory into Practice showed the second-highest proportion of Reflection (55.8%), followed by Understanding (32.6%) and Habitual Action (11.6%). Because the prompt required participants to connect their observed teaching practices with TEFL principles, it appeared to elicit more evaluative responses. Participants identified mismatches between intended pedagogical principles and enacted practice. For example, one participant stated that "Communicative Language Teaching was partly applied, but the lesson was still teacher-centered," and concluded that "more interactive and student-centered activities are needed." Another acknowledged using Indonesian more frequently than English despite intending to apply CLT. One

participant also critiqued the depth of a specific technique, suggesting that prior-knowledge activation could be strengthened through "individual recall, not just choral." This reflection evaluated not only whether a principle had been applied but also how effectively it had been implemented.

Domains with a Narrow Understanding–Reflection Gap

Classroom Management was dominated by Understanding but showed a narrow gap between Understanding (52.1%) and Reflection (47.9%), suggesting that participants were almost evenly divided between identifying and evaluating their management practices. Responses such as "I'm not really confident... Sometimes I forget what I want to say. I'm in a hurry to explain something" showed self-evaluation of observable difficulties related to confidence, fluency, and pacing, although participants did not substantially explore their underlying pedagogical or contextual causes. Similarly, participants identified the need for more expressive intonation and better time management.

Lesson Planning showed a comparable pattern, with 54.2% of responses classified as Understanding and 37.5% as Reflection. While many participants recognized alignment among lesson components, some went further by evaluating the coherence of their plans and identifying specific gaps. For example, one participant described the lesson plan as well-structured but acknowledged the need for "more interactive" activities, while another identified the absence of "a detailed assessment rubric" and differentiated tasks for learners with different abilities.

Understanding-Dominant Domains

Classroom Interaction was primarily characterized by Understanding (60.4%), followed by Reflection (39.6%). Most responses described the interactional techniques used, such as "question answer activities, guessing games, pair works, & speaking practice." However, some participants evaluated the limitations of teacher-centred interaction. One participant acknowledged that classroom interaction was "still dominated by communication between the teacher and the entire class" and that students had not been given sufficient opportunities to discuss or practise in pairs or small groups. This represented a clearer move from identifying teaching practices towards evaluating their limitations.

Teaching Techniques and Media showed a similar pattern, with 56.3% of responses at the Understanding level, 31.3% at Reflection, and 12.5% at Habitual Action. Most responses described the instructional media or techniques used and their perceived benefits, such as using pictures "to help students understand the adjectives." More reflective responses, however, evaluated limitations in the existing approach and proposed alternatives or greater variety to improve learner engagement.

Habitual Action and the Absence of Critical Reflection

Habitual Action appeared in six domains: Lesson Planning (8.3%), Lesson Opening (4.2%), Teaching Techniques and Media (12.5%), Feedback and Assessment (8.3%), Lesson Closing (4.2%), and Theory into Practice (11.6%). It was most common in Teaching Techniques and Media but did not predominate in any domain. Its presence indicates that some responses simply reported familiar teaching practices without substantial evaluation.

Most notably, Critical Reflection was absent across all ten domains. Even when participants identified weaknesses, evaluated their practices, and proposed improvements, such as speaking more slowly, using more English, providing more individualized feedback, increasing pair or group work, varying instructional media, or improving time management, these reflections remained focused on observable teaching practices. Even the more analytical responses in Theory into Practice, such as recognizing partial implementation of CLT, focused on improving implementation rather than critically examining underlying assumptions about teaching and learning.

The absence of Critical Reflection therefore does not indicate an absence of reflective thinking. Rather, it suggests that participants' reflections remained primarily practice-oriented rather than transformative.

Relationship between Reflection Content and Reflection Depth

The cross-domain analysis revealed that reflection content and reflection depth did not necessarily develop in tandem. Frequently mentioned topics such as confidence, explanation, classroom interaction, and time management were typically discussed at the Understanding level, whereas reflections connecting theory to practice more consistently reached the Reflection level.

This pattern was particularly evident when comparing generic self-evaluation with theory-informed reflection. In the Strengths and Weaknesses domain, participants often produced brief, largely descriptive statements such as “clear explanation,” “good communication,” or “confidence” as a weakness. These responses demonstrated awareness but offered limited further analysis. By contrast, the Theory into Practice prompt required participants to relate a specific pedagogical principle to their observed teaching practice, and this structure appeared to elicit more analytically developed responses. One participant, for example, wrote:

"Communicative Language Teaching was partly applied, but the lesson was still teacher-centered. More interactive and student-centered activities are needed."

This response follows a clear sequence: identifying the theoretical principle, evaluating observed practice against it, identifying a discrepancy, and proposing an improvement. A similar pattern appeared in another participant's recognition that using Indonesian more than English limited the effective implementation of CLT. This reflection also moved from a theoretical principle to observed practice, an identified limitation, and a proposed improvement.

A similar contrast emerged in reflections on assessment. Rather than simply reporting that praise had been given, one participant acknowledged that their feedback consisted mainly of general praise and that more specific, individualized assessment was needed. This represented an evaluative judgment that went beyond describing the practice.

Taken together, these findings suggest that reflection depth was closely related to the cognitive demands embedded in each prompt. Prompts asking participants to identify strengths or weaknesses tended to elicit descriptive, Understanding-level responses, whereas prompts requiring participants to connect TEFL principles with observed teaching practice more consistently elicited analytical, Reflection-level thinking. This suggests that the design of reflection prompts, rather than the availability of video evidence alone, may play an important role in shaping the depth of pre-service teachers' reflective thinking.

Discussion

Structured Reflection Promoted Holistic Thinking About Teaching

Rather than limiting their reflections to visible performance aspects such as confidence or teaching delivery, a tendency widely reported in novice teachers' reflective writing (Arslan, 2019), participants in this study considered relationships among learning objectives, activities, learner engagement, assessment, and theory. This broader scope may be related to the structured prompts, which directed participants' attention to specific pedagogical dimensions rather than leaving reflection entirely open-ended. This finding supports the view that structured prompts can function as cognitive scaffolds by organizing novice teachers' professional thinking rather than relying solely on unguided introspection. Recent research on scaffolded reflective practice similarly suggests that deliberately designed prompts can help pre-service teachers develop schemas and restructure pedagogical knowledge

more effectively than unstructured reflection (Chaseley & Abercrombie, 2025). Comparable evidence comes from the Indonesian context. A scoping review of Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers' reflective journals found that, without structured guidance, novice teachers tended to reflect "monotonously" and rarely moved beyond surface-level description (Oktama et al., 2023). This finding further supports the value of the structured, video-anchored protocol used in the present study.

An Emerging Shift Toward Learner-Centered Thinking

Although participants repeatedly acknowledged that their teaching remained teacher-centered, they also frequently proposed learner-centered alternatives, including more pair work, reduced teacher talk, and more authentic interaction. They also frequently referred to CLT, student-centered learning, and scaffolding. This gap between stated pedagogical beliefs and enacted classroom practice is consistent with research on early-career teaching, which suggests that novice teachers' professional knowledge may develop ahead of their instructional expertise, while confidence and practical experience develop more gradually (Li, 2025). Reviewing recorded teaching may help make such discrepancies more visible than reflection based on memory alone. This interpretation is consistent with findings from Thai pre-service EFL teacher education, where reflection helped trainees notice inconsistencies between their communicative teaching intentions and more teacher-fronted classroom practices (Swatevacharkul, 2019). Similar findings have been reported among Indonesian in-service English teachers, whose reflections tended to focus on recognizing, rather than fully resolving, tensions between communicative ideals and established classroom practices (Halimi, 2025).

Video-Based Reflection Fostered Professional Self-Awareness

Confidence emerged not as an isolated trait but as a factor connected to movement, eye contact, teaching delivery, and classroom interaction. This suggests that participants increasingly viewed teaching competence as an integrated set of practices rather than a collection of separate skills. This finding is consistent with research on pre-service and novice teachers' classroom management, which links lower confidence with more constrained and teacher-directed behavior and suggests that confidence-related limitations often require sustained practice and mentoring to address (Karasova & Nehyba, 2025). Participants' developing engagement with formative assessment also suggests that video review supported greater awareness of aspects of teaching that may be overlooked during instruction. For example, some participants moved from reporting the use of general praise towards recognizing the need for more specific and individualized feedback (Rothe & Gobel, 2024). A recent Indonesian study of reflective mentoring during teaching practicum reported a similar pattern, with EFL pre-service teachers developing professional identity and self-awareness through repeated, guided reflection. However, the study also cautioned that reflection alone does not guarantee comprehensive change (Ubaidillah et al., 2025). Thus, self-awareness may represent an important step towards improved practice, but it is not sufficient on its own.

Reflection Depth Increased When Theory Met Practice, and Content Did Not Always Predict Depth

Using Kember and colleagues' (1999, 2000) framework, most reflections were classified at the Understanding and Reflection levels, while Critical Reflection was absent. This pattern is understandable given participants' limited teaching experience and developing pedagogical knowledge. However, reflection depth varied across prompts and did not correspond directly to the frequency of particular reflection topics. Frequently mentioned topics such as confidence, explanation, classroom interaction, and time management were typically discussed at the Understanding level. These responses often demonstrated awareness through brief statements such as

"clear explanation" or "confidence" as a weakness, but provided limited further analysis.

By contrast, prompts requiring synthesis and evaluative comparison, particularly Strengths and Weaknesses and Theory into Practice, elicited more analytical responses. In Theory into Practice, participants moved through a discernible sequence of identifying a pedagogical principle, evaluating their actual practice against it, identifying a discrepancy, and proposing an improvement. For example, one participant stated, "Communicative Language Teaching was partly applied, but the lesson was still teacher-centered. More interactive and student-centered activities are needed." A similar pattern appeared in assessment-related reflections, where participants moved from reporting the use of praise to evaluating the adequacy of their feedback and identifying the need for more individualized assessment.

These findings suggest that the cognitive demands built into reflection prompts may influence reflection depth. Video evidence provides the material for reflection, while prompt design may influence how deeply that material is processed. This interpretation is supported by recent research on scaffolded reflective writing, which suggests that prompts requiring explicit comparison, justification, or connections to theory can move pre-service teachers beyond descriptive reflection more effectively than open self-report prompts (Brunker, 2025). This also corresponds with evidence from Indonesian and international contexts. Halimi (2025) found that reflection levels among Indonesian in-service English teachers varied according to the type of teaching issue addressed, with theory-oriented and evaluative topics eliciting deeper reflection than routine procedural issues. Similarly, Cirocki, Indrarathne, and Calderón (2024) found in an Ecuadorian professional development context that reflective depth improved when participants were explicitly required to connect observed practice with pedagogical principles rather than simply describe classroom events. Together, these findings suggest that the relationship between prompt structure and reflection depth may extend beyond the Indonesian EFL context and represent a broader feature of reflective learning among novice and practicing teachers.

Implications for Pre-Service EFL Teacher Education

These findings carry several implications for pre-service EFL teacher education. First, video recording alone is unlikely to produce deep reflection. Without structured guidance, novice teachers may focus primarily on visible performance concerns. This concern is also reflected in Indonesian research on reflective journals, which found that reflective writing skills among Indonesian pre-service teachers often remained below the expected level without deliberate scaffolding (Oktama et al., 2023). Teacher education programs should therefore explicitly support the development of reflective thinking. Frameworks such as Kember et al.'s (1999, 2000) reflection levels can help pre-service teachers understand the progression from descriptive awareness towards deeper evaluation and critical reflection. Recent Indonesian research on collaborative, lesson-study-informed reflective practice among EFL teachers also suggests that involving peers, mentors, or supervisors can support this progression beyond what individual video review may achieve alone (Rozimela, Fatimah, & Fudhla, 2025).

Second, the persistent theory-practice gap identified by participants suggests the value of iterative cycles of planning, teaching, video-based reflection, feedback, and reteaching. Such cycles provide repeated opportunities for pre-service teachers to apply theoretical knowledge, examine their implementation, and refine their teaching. This is consistent with evidence from Ecuador suggesting that reflective competence develops incrementally through repeated and guided practice rather than through a single reflective episode (Cirocki, Indrarathne, & Calderón, 2024). Finally, structured video-based reflection can help bridge coursework and classroom practice by making

differences between intended and enacted pedagogy more visible and open to evaluation, particularly when prompts require participants to justify their evaluations and connect them with pedagogical theory (Balıkçı & Ataş, 2026).

Conclusion

This study examined structured video-based self-reflection among 48 Indonesian EFL pre-service teachers during microteaching, focusing on both the content and depth of their reflections across ten pedagogical domains, using an integrated framework that combined thematic analysis with Kember et al.'s (1999, 2000) reflection-level analysis.

The single most important finding of this study is that breadth of reflective content did not translate into depth of reflective thinking. Participants attended to a wide range of pedagogical domains, including planning, delivery, interaction, assessment, and theory, yet this breadth was not matched by comparable analytical depth: reflection remained concentrated at the Understanding and Reflection levels, and Critical Reflection did not emerge, even in domains that received extensive descriptive attention. Deeper reflection occurred most consistently where prompts explicitly required participants to connect theory with observed practice, such as those addressing strengths and weaknesses and theory into practice. Content and depth therefore appear to be shaped by different factors, and simply broadening what a reflection task asks pre-service teachers to address will not, by itself, deepen their reflective thinking.

This finding carries a direct implication for teacher education: reviewing one's own recorded teaching supplies evidence for reflection, but it does not on its own guarantee depth. Reflective depth appears to depend more on how a reflective task is designed, particularly whether prompts require comparison, justification, and explicit theoretical connection, than on the availability of video evidence alone. Programs seeking to move pre-service teachers toward Critical Reflection may therefore benefit from prompts that make these cognitive demands explicit, supported where possible by mentoring or collaborative discussion.

This study was limited to a single course and institution, and the absence of Critical Reflection may partly reflect the specific prompts and context rather than a limitation in participants' reflective capacity. Future research could examine whether more evaluative prompts, repeated reflective cycles, or structured mentoring can elicit Critical Reflection, and whether reflection depth develops as pre-service teachers gain further classroom experience.

Declaration of the Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The authors declare that ChatGPT and Claude were used during the preparation of this manuscript for language editing, proofreading, assistance in identifying relevant references, and comparison of the authors' data analysis with alternative analytical perspectives. Turnitin was used for similarity checking.

Bibliographic references

Alamri, H.A. & Alfayez, A.A. (2023). Preservice teachers' experiences of observing their teaching competencies via self-recorded videos in a personalized learning environment. Humanities and Social Sciences Communications, 10, Article 745. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-023-02260-2

Amalia, L. L., Widiati, U., Basthomi, Y., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2020). Reflective practice on lesson planning among EFL teacher educators. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 10(1), 153–160. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i1.25025

Arslan, F. Y. (2019). Reflection in pre-service teacher education: Exploring the nature of four EFL pre-service teachers' reflections. Reflective Practice, 20(1), 111–124. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2018.1564652

Balıkçı, G., & Ataş, U. (2026). Video-based reflection in second language teacher education: developing reflective practice through microteaching. Journal of Education for Teaching, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2026.2630282
Biggs, J. (2003). Aligning teaching for constructing learning. The Higher Education Academy. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/255583992
Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Thematic analysis: A practical guide. SAGE Publications Ltd.
Brunker, N. (2025). Developing pre-service teachers' critically reflective practice through a writing scaffold of sequenced vignettes. Teaching Education, 36(4), 389–412. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2025.2536829
Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics, 1(1), 1–47.
Celce-Murcia, M., Dörnyei, Z., & Thurrell, S. (1995). Communicative competence: A pedagogically motivated model with content specifications. Issues in Applied Linguistics, 6(2), 5–35.
Chaseley, T.L. & Abercrombie, S. (2025). Using scaffolds to support preservice teachers' reflective practice. Frontiers in Education. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1621269
Cirocki, A., Indrarathne, B., & Calderón, V. E. A. (2024). Effectiveness of professional development training on reflective practice and action research: a case study from Ecuador. Reflective Practice, 25(5), 676–694. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2024.2384124
Graneheim, U. H., & Lundman, B. (2004). Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. Nurse Education Today, 24(2), 105–112. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2003.10.001
Groenier, M., Khaled, A., Kamphorst, J., et al. (2025). Adaptive expertise development during work-based learning in higher education: A realist review. Vocations and Learning, 18, 11. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-025-09366-5
Guite, T., Savi, V., Seyie, V. (2025). Reflective Practice as a Pedagogical Tool in Teacher Education: A Systematic Conceptual Review. Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research 12(12) DOI:10.56975/jetir.v12i12.573768
Halimi, S.S. (2025). Reflection levels and teaching practices of in-service English teachers in Indonesia. Indonesian Journal of Aplied Linguistics. 15(1). https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v15i1.80324
Harmer, J. (2014). The practice of English language teaching (5th ed.). Pearson Longman.
Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), Sociolinguistics. pp. 269–285. Penguin Books.
Karasova, J. & Nehyba, J. (2025). Novice teachers' classroom behaviour management: Situations, responses and impact on student behaviour. British Educational Research Journal. https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.4166
Karlström, M., & Hamza, K. (2019). Preservice science teachers' opportunities for learning through reflection when planning a microteaching unit. Journal of Science Teacher Education, 30(1), 44–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/1046560X.2018.1531345
Kember, D. (1999). Determining the level of reflective thinking from students' written journals using a coding scheme based on the work of Mezirow. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 18(1), 18–30. https://doi.org/10.1080/026013799293928
Kember, D., Leung, D. Y. P., Jones, A., Loke, A. Y., McKay, J., Sinclair, K., Tse, H., Webb, C., Wong, F. K. Y., Wong, M., & Yeung, E. (2000). Development of a questionnaire to measure the level of reflective thinking. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 25(4), 381–395. https://doi.org/10.1080/713611442
Lewis, K. B. (2024). Shifting images of teaching in student teachers' talk about microteaching. Teaching and Teacher Education, 104438. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104438
Li, H. (2025). Reflective practice for pre-service teachers' professional development. SAGE Open, 15. https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251363136

Marhaban, S., Kasim, U., Syamaun, A., & Sulistyo, T. (2023). Student-teacher conferences and video-recorded microteaching sessions in developing preservice teachers' teaching competences. Studies in English Language and Education, 10(1), 337–349. https://doi.org/10.24815/siele.v10i1.26026
Odo, D.M.. (2022). An action research investigation of the impact of using online feedback videos to promote self-reflection on the microteaching of preservice EFL teachers. Systemic Practice and Action Research.Vol. 35, 327-343. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11213-021-09575-8
Oktama, M. Y., Fauziati, E., & Rochsantiningsih, D. (2023). Reflecting on Reflective Journals of Indonesian EFL Pre-Service Teachers to Examine Their Quality of Reflective Practice. Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan, 15(1), 565–574. DOI: 10.35445/alishlah.v15i1.2601
Palinkas, L. A., Horwitz, S. M., Green, C. A., Wisdom, J. P., Duan, N., & Hoagwood, K. (2015). Purposeful sampling for qualitative data collection and analysis in mixed-methods implementation research. Administration and Policy in Mental Health and Mental Health Services Research, 42(5), 533–544. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10488-013-0528-y
Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
Rothe, L. & Gobel, K. (2024). Preservice teachers' reflection processes when collaboratively reflecting on videotaped classroom teaching. Education Sciences, 14(12), 1357. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci14121357
Rozimela, Y., Fatimah, S. & Fudhla, N. (2025). EFL teachers' practices and perspectives on self- and collaborative contextualized reflective practice. Asian. J. Second. Foreign. Lang. Educ. 10, 35. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40862-025-00338-9
Salo, P., Francisco, S., & Olin Almqvist, A. (2024). Understanding professional learning in and for practice. Professional Development in Education, 50(3), 444–459. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2024.2311108
Schön, D. A. (1983). The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. Basic Books.
Swatevacharkul, R. (2019). Promoting pre-service EFL teacher reflection: An investigation of reflection levels in Thai context. Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics. 9(2). 463-471. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v9i2.20244
Ubaidillah, M. F., et al. (2025). EFL pre-service teachers' professional identity construction through reflective mentoring during teaching practicum. LLT Journal: A Journal on Language and Language Teaching, 28(1), 87–105.
Webster-Wright, A. (2009). Reframing professional development through understanding authentic professional learning. Review of Educational Research, 79(2), 702–739. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308330970

Words: 8966
Characters: 70 196 (39 standard pages)

Dr. Nuri Emmiyati, M.Pd
Department of English and Literature
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin, Makassar, 92113
Indonesia
nuri.emmiyati@uin-alauddin.ac.id
ORCID: 0000-0001-9485-7627

Dr. Muhammad Syukri, M.Pd
Department of English and Literature
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin, Makassar, 92113
Indonesia
muhammad.syukri@uin-alauddin.ac.id
ORCID: 0009-0008-6737-3027

Dr. Jumharia Djamereng, M.Hum.
Department of English and Literature,
Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin, Makassar, 92113
Indonesia
jumharia.djamereng@uin-alauddin.ac.id
ORCID: 0009-0009-3396-4475