

2019 Icracos-Munir2

by -- --

Submission date: 07-Mar-2021 12:36PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1526188580

File name: Levels_of_theorising_icracos2019.pdf (341.46K)

Word count: 4414

Character count: 24269

Levels of Theorising Teaching Experiences by Alumni of an MA in English Education in an Indonesian State University

Ahmad Munir
English Education
Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Surabaya, Indonesia
ahmadmunir@unesa.ac.id or 0000-0003-0606-3590

Slamet Setiawan
English Letters
Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Surabaya, Indonesia
slametsetiawan@unesa.ac.id or ORCID

Ali Mustofa
English Education
Universitas Negeri Surabaya
Surabaya, Indonesia
alimustofa@unesa.ac.id or ORCID

Abstract— This study aims to illustrate how English teachers who are alumni of an MA in English Education in a State University in Indonesia use the theory of English education obtained during their study in their teaching experience, how they develop personal practical theory, categorize their theorizing levels. This qualitative research involved 10 alumni of an MA in English Education in a State University in Indonesia who are well known for their achievement in their teaching career. They were interviewed to uncover personal practical theory from the objective theories obtained during their study. The results of the qualitative analysis show that these alumni made use of the objective theories from their study, achieved Gestalt and schema levels, aimed at Theory. Most of them were unable to articulate how their experiences using theory in their prior education. Some suggestions to make these teachers progress to the next theorising level are made at the end of this article.

Keywords— *teacher cognition, theorizing practice, teacher education*

I. INTRODUCTION

The field of English language learning methodology at the beginning of this century was marked by the development of post-method pedagogy [1]. This pedagogy is the culmination of the development of various methods of learning English from the beginning of the teaching of foreign languages in this world, from the grammar and translation methods to communicative approaches [2]. The essence of post-method pedagogy is that in fact we have talked enough about developing methods, what is needed now is besides methods, which are principles that can accommodate all of all methods that exist eclectically [3]. Eclectic means the teacher uses which learning method best suits the real situation, the experience the teacher has and the potential of students. These are the three principles of post-method pedagogy [2, 3].

Post-method pedagogy also marks the invalidation of the dichotomy of theory and practice, or the dysfunction of theories and practices [1]. According to the first and second principles of post-method pedagogy, namely particularity and practicality, the context determines the right method, and the teacher is no longer the person who implements the theory from the expert, but the teacher as a separate expert who masters the context of learning. Thus, teachers in their teaching experience can create their own theories and

simultaneously carry out theories they develop in their daily teaching [2][3]. To become a teacher who can develop his own theory, teachers must rely on their logic, or thinking [4, 5].

There are a number of teachers who jealous their cognition, in other words, teachers who think (thinking), namely undergoing teacher education and then reflecting on teaching [5]. Teacher education has been designed so that prospective teachers are introduced to the basic theories of language learning and education in general [6]. Most teacher education also provides field experience by teaching in partner schools. That's when prospective teachers learn to become teachers through field practice [7, 8]. In this practice they are expected to do reflection for action, reflection in action and reflection on action. With the help of mentors in a guided way prospective teachers can discover certain theories of their teaching experience [7]. Thus the teacher education institution has an important role in creating the thinking teacher, in addition to the hard work of prospective teachers to become the thinking teacher [4].

Korthagen and Kessels [4] have observed the process of developing knowledge about teaching, theorizing, by teachers into three levels: Gestalt (theory with small t), Schema, and Theory, which depart from field experience. This gesture is a dynamic and comprehensive unity of the needs, feelings, observations and real experiences of teachers so that they can describe and explain their teaching experiences [4]. It is in Gestalt that a theory with a small t arises. The accumulation of real experiences that are encountered everyday form a unity of knowledge, or theories, at the Gestalt level, which in turn will group and interrelate according to certain schematic categories. This is level 2, called Schema. As teaching experience increases, these schemes will sort themselves logically. If this logical sequence is formed, and the teacher can draw if-then relationships then the teacher has reached the level of the Theory with capital T. These three levels take place intensively and through a dynamic and sometimes reductive process [4].

What about the efforts of teachers who are already in the field or teachers in positions to become the thinking teacher? One of the many efforts that have been made is to return to teacher education institutions with further studies to take a master's degree in Language Education (English) mainly through collaboration with local government education agencies. The master program curriculum emphasizes critical

thinking on various theories in the field of language education presented in courses in the Master programs [9]. In addition, all of the master programs requires students both the teacher and non-teacher to write a scientific work in a form of a thesis [10]. Through the teacher's thesis, further studies will challenge and see the appropriateness of theory and the field. The thinking teacher will be produced by the alumni of an MA in English Education.

The MA in English Education of a state university in Surabaya has a role as well in making the teacher thinking through the vision and mission and profile of graduates [10]. With a vision of "strong in linguistics and literature as well as great in language learning and literature", this Study Program is ready to produce graduates who will become the thinking teachers. Graduate profile of the Master Program also aims to produce lecturers at diploma levels who are competent, have robust knowledge of language and literature as well as knowledge and skills in language and literature education. This will make these graduates the thinking teachers [11]. Thus, the graduates who have returned to their work places in teaching experience can create homemade theory and simultaneously implement the theory he developed in daily teaching [2][3].

However, the realization of the vision, mission, and the graduate profile of The MA has not been tracked through studies which explore how these alumni theorize their experience of teaching, particularly in the teaching and learning of English. Theorizing is the process of understanding what the teacher does in his teaching experience. That is, theorising is practical knowledge that teachers use to build a framework for guiding action [9]. For this reason, the research has been conducted. This research addressed the following questions: How do the English teachers, alumni of the MA in English Education of a state university in Surabaya use theory gained during their master program in their teaching experiences? How do they develop of their personal practical theory? And What are their theorizing levels?

II. METHODS

This research is qualitative in nature. This is in line with the research objectives to get a detailed picture of what the theorising practical theories and how they articulate the theories they develop from teaching experience. Subjects were 10 alumni of the MA in English Education who had confirmed that they made incredible career achievements out of their teaching experiences. They were interviewed so that their meaning making of their experience could be explored. Interview has been widely used in studies that revealed theorizing practice of English teacher [5].

The results of the interview were analyzed qualitatively by bringing up the theme of data interpretation. This began by transcribing interviews, then coded and analyzed for their contents (content analysis) to search for words/phrases based on keywords cognition teacher, theorising experience, theory on campus, and forms of personal theory. This is commonly done in research on teacher cognition and the field of teacher professional development.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The A. Descriptions of how English teachers graduated from the MA in English Education use the theories obtained during their MA study in their experience teaching at school

The alumni felt that their experience of studying at the MA in English Education provided not only knowledge of basic theory (objective theory) about learning English and Literature, but also gave them concrete examples of English educators who became role models in in the English teacher education profession. More than that, the subjects also took their experiences wrestling with the theories and assignments of lectures during the MA in English Education as a concrete example of the success of learning English to be transmitted to their students. The courses given also give them very broad insights that learning a foreign language (English) is related to other sciences.

In the following statements the subjects revealed the three things above as an illustration of how they used the theory of English education acquired during their education at the MA in English Education in their experience teaching at school.

Four subjects, WIN, KUS, ICH, and NAS said how their knowledge of basic theory (objective theory) about learning English and English Literature they used in their learning. WIN said, "Language and brain courses inspire the need for child and social language psychology." What WIN is referring to is the Second Language Acquisition (SLA) course. In addition to SLA courses, WIN added literary courses such as General Outlook of Literature, as another side of the coin, as follows, "Literature gives another form of language". So theories in SLA and Literature provide WIN, giving WIN the basis for learning innovation in the form of habituation which will be explained in the next section. In line with WIN, KUS also revealed the theory of behaviorism important in learning English, "Theory of behaviorism means teaching listening first". For ICH, linguistic theories are the basis for him being able to teach in teacher training. He said, "The basics of linguistics are used to teach friends in AKTA 4 and teacher training". NAS specifically mentions the theory of error analysis as his provision in implementing his writing learning innovations. He said, "Including the theory of error analysis is very important to me".

In addition to using learning theories such as behaviorism, linguistics, SLA, all subjects reveal indirectly that what they are doing in their profession is a broad application of the theory they learned during the the MA in English Education. Win, for example "Making my successful experience in graduate school as an example for my students". KUS said, the knowledge he got at the the MA in English Education, "I used it to develop the national exam test items". In fact, for ICH, "the joyful learning experience at the MA in English Education inspired and became the favourite teacher of the province". AN also felt "to be confident while serving as teachers' association secretary". This is in line with FIT which says, "learning behaviorism theory inspired my innovation". For EV, "The MA in English Education degree made me a confident as the 2013 Curriculum resource and applied C4". NAS also said "The books studied at S2 inspired for innovation so as to become the winner of the innovation competition". In line with NAS, USW said "Learning theories learned at the MA in English Education inspire innovation." H agrees with the statement

of ICH, in H's words, "The learning experience in the MA in English Education, especially with education lecturers, provides inspiration for learning innovation".

In addition to the theory and learning experience in the MA in English Education, the subjects also revealed modelling by their lecturers. For some subjects, it was the MA in English Education lecturers who inspired them. WIN, KUS and IR say this. WIN said, "The lecturer competency is his role model". In line with WIN, Kus said, "The inspirational competence of lecturers". And for IRs, "Assessment lecturer inspires".

This finding signifies a strong reference to objective theory within the framework of English teacher education as revealed by Maghubhai et al. [9] or Li's [12] espoused theory. WIN, KUS, ICH, and NAS refer to the need for learning theory, linguistic theory and literary theory. Within the framework of English teacher competencies, they refer to Pedagogical knowledge and Subject knowledge [13]. This shows that the MA in English Education performs its role to provide objective knowledge to S-2 PBS students [9, 14].

Further findings that subjects use their learning experiences as capital to develop their profession show that subjects carry out their duties as learners in English teacher education to develop in-use theory [12] and subjective theory [4]. They can connect theory and practice so that the confidence in carrying out learning. This is actually the resemblance to the applied science model of teacher education [15].

However, so there are a few subjects who glorify their lecturers as models. This is similar to the craft model [15], although they do not fully design their lecturers. The lecturers are limited as role models as all English teachers as role models for their students [1]. The successful experiences of the subjects themselves are also used as role models in their learning. This is in line with the spirit that non-native teacher teachers have an advantage over native speaker teachers in terms of a successful learner model [16].

B. How do they develop their personal experience theory (personal practical theory)

The alumni expressed their diversity of teaching experiences in a variety of ways. They honestly tell what they are doing to innovate, improvise so that learning English in their schools is successful. Most of what they do is included in the instructional category, meaning that it is included in the core learning activities. A small portion is included before learning, but none is included in the post-instructional category.

Efforts to develop theories by the subjects in the core activities of learning various kinds of activities. For example, WIN uses habituation to use English. KUS learns little by little and uses Audiolingual method and Language game. ICH provides Joyful learning and assigns the use of language directly in the field. AN strives to maximize the use of student gadgets and approach individual and collaborative students. In addition, IR provides Inquiry learning and uses Language directly to the field. FIT teaches English according to students' initial knowledge and daily lives by bringing real objects. EV provides Joyful learning and C4 implementation. NAS creates DRP (Drafting, Rehearsal and presentation) procedures for learning to write. Finally, H gave a story writing project for middle school students.

The theory of teaching experience of the subjects before learning usually occurs in preparing lesson plans, teaching materials, choosing methods and preparing assessment instruments. WIN for example claims to focus on practical objectives in the lesson plan, not theoretical. IR places more emphasis on following the 2013 Curriculum rules especially for the RPP format and learning models. USW pays more attention to the students' initial ability to determine the learning strategies written in the lesson plan.

From the recognition of the theory during the core learning activities there are four categories of teaching experiences of the subjects: habituation of the use of the target language (WIN, KUS, ICH, and IR), certain learning models such as inquiry (IR), project (H), and the creation of procedures such as DRP (NAS), while pre-learning theory is very normative, following the rules. This finding, if related to the definition of authority at the beginning of this report, is the process of understanding what teachers do in their teaching experience, it can be said that the subjects did understand what they did in their teaching experience. That is, what is presented above is practical knowledge that teachers use to build a framework for guiding action [9]. However, pre-learning activities show that subjects also adhere to the norms or administrative rules of learning planning.

This description shows that the subjects can develop it through various efforts, among others, based on the objective theory described in the previous section and some are adapting the theory to their classroom context into something that has never existed. WIN, KUS, and ICH are examples that normatively use objective theory in the MA in English Education and in their teaching experience emphasizes the habit of using the target language. This is based on the theory of learning behaviorism. On the other hand, the subjects still adhere to the normative rules of learning planning.

C. The category of their level of achievement

Based on the research subject's acknowledgment during the interview, efforts to develop their knowledge about learning or their aneurizing efforts can be categorized into the Gestalt level (AN, FIT, EV, USW, H), meaning they have done reflection on action; Schema level (WIN, KUS, IR, NAS), meaning that they have developed a conceptual framework and relationships but cannot explain why and for what; and theory level (ICH), meaning that a can formulate definitions, draw logical propositions that apply to various situations.

The subjects who conveyed their teaching experience and articulated what they felt, did and planned but were still in the form of fragments of activities that did not arrive at an explanation of the relationships could be categorized as still at the Gestalt level. AN for example, states that in his teaching experience he utilizes student gadgets as a medium for learning. He saw this opportunity because almost all students carried Android phones. Encouraged by this fact AN uses gadgets. In addition, AN emphasizes individualized learning and collaboration between students. However, in his explanation there are not many real examples of the use of gadgets and individualized learning that he did. Similar to AN, FIT provides a general understanding that it teaches English according to students' initial knowledge and their daily lives by carrying real objects. What real objects and how to use them in learning cannot be described in detail.

In general, the development of knowledge about teaching at the Gestalt level is often revealed because it is provoked by the interviewer's question, not naturally arising from the explanations of the subjects. EV for example states using Joyful learning and C4 implementation. But no concrete examples have been revealed. EV also states students must be happy that English first and then use English, cannot be explained theoretically. Likewise, USW's explanation that he made adjustments to the strategy according to the child's context and abilities, which changes every year there is no real example. There are subjects who provide concrete examples of their teaching experience, for example H, which shows the work of students he teaches through story writing projects for students. But when asked to explain the basis of the theory he used he could not articulate it.

Some subjects reached the schema level in developing their knowledge of learning. Schema level means they have developed a conceptual framework and relationships but cannot explain why and for what. For example, WIN, which claims to be accustomed to using English and focus on practical goals is not theoretical, cannot mention the underlying theory, even if the theory it says is inaccurate. This means that he has tried to explain his theory but did not arrive at a coherent and systematic explanation. Likewise KUS which states teaching little by little through habituation also mentioned the Audiolingual method theory to base it. Language games and the use of language directly in the field are also mentioned based on the theory of behaviorism. The underlying theory should be the theory of language acquisition.

The lack of explanation of this theory also occurs in the explanation of teaching experience by IR and NAS. IR conveys a real relationship between statements following the 2013 curriculum, all models suggested K13 and using Inquiry learning. However, he cannot explain the theory underlying his inquiry learning. The subject named NAS, in explaining the theories developed in the learning experience including being creative because it created DRP (Drafting Rehearsal and Presentation) for learning to write. However, the underlying theory cannot be explained by NAS.

One of the subjects, ICH, in his teaching experience stated that he prefers to try (methods), review the trial and error efforts, and improve (the methods that were tried earlier). These are the characteristics of the teacher who always develops his professionalism. He also explained his efforts with Joyful learning using authentic tasks, learning English directly in the field, from direct English speakers. In the school environment and the surrounding area there are various tourist attractions visited by foreign tourists. When asked what was the basis of it, he replied, "If I ... children learn ... um ... um ... what is contextually" (ICH).

This finding is certainly not surprising because penorian is a process, meaning that anyone who tries to develop theories about learning based on their teaching experience will reach the highest level (Theory). This finding is in line with the results of Glenn [17] research and Hardy and Edwards-Groves [18] research that teacher retrieval does indeed require time and serious effort to become a teacher who can draw theory from daily teaching experience.

If this finding is connected This is also in line with the cycle of the teacher profession by Huberman [19], the

subjects are indeed included in the middle career category with varied tenure. It is clear from the level of illumination of subjects at the level of gestalt and schema, they undergo a process of stabilization and testing. But not all made it to the stage of drawing conclusions. This might be explained by the stages of teacher professional development according to Steffy and Wolfe [20]. The subjects can be categorized in stages 3 (professional teacher) and 4 (expert teacher). But most are still in stage 3, not stage 4. This shows the findings support the stages of the teaching profession according to Steffy and Wolfe [20]. Indeed Korthagen and Kessel [4] also pointed out that teachers who reached Theory level were professors in certain fields of education.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The conclusion is that the educational process at the MA in English Education Unesa is recognized as contributing to the efforts to provide for the teaching experience of the alumni who participated in this study. However, most of the efforts to mark the teaching experience delivered by them are still at the Gestalt level, theory with small t, and Schema, conceptual frameworks and relationships, and some are trying to achieve the formation of (T)heory. This is still in the reasonable category because this theory is individual and requires serious individual efforts to arrive at the level of the theory. There is recognition that language education courses are important for the program but not courses related to literacy and linguistics are felt to be less related to the formation of the assessment of their teaching experience. This can be input for revitalizing the curriculum of the MA in English Education.

In accordance with the conclusions above there are plans for further activities, the suggestions for this research are:

1. Need to collect additional data in the form of evidence of the teacher's statement in the interview because the assessment is sometimes not explicit
2. The data collect with more alumni with various educational contexts and achievements in their careers
3. The subject of this research teacher needs to get new insights about post methods that promote teachers as theorists of teaching and the life cycle of teachers in their profession in general.
4. For future researchers, the following research focus can be the focus: the third synergy in the content of language education, language and literacy courses in continuing teacher education through the MA in English Education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the alumni of State University of Surabaya Postgraduate who participated in this study, and to the Director of Postgraduate and the Head of master program in language and literature education for the permission to conduct this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Brown, H.D., and Lee, H.: 'Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy' (Pearson Education, 2015)
- [2] Kumaravadivelu, B.: 'Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod' (Routledge, 2006. 2006)
- [3] Kumaravadivelu, B.: 'TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends', *Tesol Quarterly*, 40, (1), pp. 59-8, 2006
- [4] Korthagen, F.A.J., and Kessels, J.P.A.M.: 'Linking theory and practice: Changing the pedagogy of teacher education', *Educational Researcher*, 28, (4), pp. 4-17, 1999.
- [5] Burns, A., Freeman, D., and Edwards, E.: 'Theorizing and studying the language - teaching mind: Mapping research on language teacher cognition', *The Modern Language Journal*, 99, (3), pp. 585-601, 2015.
- [6] Tognini, R.: 'A survey of preservice education for language teachers', *ACER*, 40, (3), pp. 31-38, 2006.
- [7] Arnold, J., Edwards, T., Hooley, N., and Williams, J.: 'Theorising on-site teacher education: Philosophical Project Knowledge (PPK)', *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 40, (1), pp. 67-78, 2012
- [8] Edwards, G.: 'Pre-service teachers' growth as practitioners of developmentally appropriate practice: A Vygotskian analysis of constraints and affordances in the English context', *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 2014, 37, (1), pp. 4-17
- [9] Mangubhai, F., Marland, P., Dashwood, A., and Son, J.-B.: 'Teaching a foreign language: One teacher's practical theory', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, (3), pp. 291-311, 2004
- [10] Pascasarjana Unesa: 'Buku Pedoman Pascasarjana Unesa', in Editor (Ed.) (Eds.): 'Book Buku Pedoman Pascasarjana Unesa' (Pascasarjana Unesa) 2017.
- [11] Bullough, R.V.: 'Chapter 2 Practicing Theory and Theorizing Practice in Teacher Education', in Loughran, J.J., and Russel, T. (Eds.): 'Teaching about teaching' (The Falmer Press), pp. 13-31. 1977
- [12] Li, L.: 'The complexity of language teachers' beliefs and practice: One EFL teacher's theories', *The Language Learning Journal*, 41, (2), pp. 175-191. 2013
- [13] Shulman, L.S.: 'Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of new reforms', *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, (1), pp. 1-22, 1987.
- [14] Richards, J.C.: 'Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education' Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [15] Wallace, M.J.: 'Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach' Cambridge University Press, 1991
- 16 Medgyes, P.: 'Native or non-native: Who's worth more?', *ELT Journal*, 46, (4), pp. 340-349. 1992.
- 17 Glenn, M.: 'Developing holistic practice through reflection, action and theorising', *Educational Action Research*, 19, (4), pp. 489-502, 2011.
- [18] Hardy, I., and Edwards-Groves, C.: 'Historicising teachers' learning: a case study of productive professional practice', *Teachers and Teaching*, 22, (5), pp. 538-552, 2016.
- [19] Huberman, M.: 'The lives of teachers', London, 1993)
- [20] Steffy, B.E., and Wolfe, M.P.: 'A Life-Cycle Model for Career Teachers', *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 38, (1), pp. 16-19, 2001.

2019 Icracos-Munir2

ORIGINALITY REPORT

3%

SIMILARITY INDEX

2%

INTERNET SOURCES

2%

PUBLICATIONS

1%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	ft.unesa.ac.id Internet Source	1%
2	epdf.pub Internet Source	<1%
3	"Successful Teacher Education", Springer Nature, 2014 Publication	<1%
4	rpltl.eap.gr Internet Source	<1%
5	Andriyani, I K Budayasa, D Juniati. "The blind student's interpretation of two-dimensional shapes in geometry", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2018 Publication	<1%
6	Xinyu Mo. "Teaching Reading and Teacher Beliefs", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2020 Publication	<1%
7	www.mitrariset.com Internet Source	<1%

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On