

Indonesian EFL Teachers Professional Knowledge Development during Their Participation in TSG: A Case Study

Feni Munifatullah^{1,2}, Bachrudin Musthafa¹ & Wachyu Sundayana¹

¹ English Education Department, Indonesia University of Education

² English Education Department, Education and Teacher Training Faculty, Lampung University

Correspondence: Feni Munifatullah, English Education Department, Indonesia University of Education, Jl. Setiabudhi 229 Bandung, West Java, Canada. Tel: 622-2200-1197 Fax: 622-2200-5090. E-mail: fenimunifa@gmail.com; feni.munifatullah@student.upi.edu

Received: April 20, 2016 Accepted: June 13, 2016 Online Published: June 15, 2016

doi: 10.5539/elt.v9n8p62

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n8p62>

Abstract

The study examines three new EFL teachers professional knowledge development through discussion in a *Teacher Study Group (TSG)* in Indonesian (Asian) context. These three participants have less than five year-teaching experience and teach junior high schools in Bandar Lampung in the time of the study. The data were collected through audio-visual recorded observation of TSG sessions teaching practice. They were converted into written transcription. The analysis signifies that group discussion recalls participants' case knowledge from distant experience while group reflection explores participants' practical knowledge from their own immediate practice. Some of the knowledge is still fragmented and some has been integrated into pedagogical content knowledge (PCK). Both TSG group theme-based discussion and collaborative reflection manage to explore participants' professional knowledge.

Keywords: EFL teachers' professional knowledge, case knowledge, theme-based discussion, collaborative reflection

1. Introduction

Both teachers' knowledge and action are matters of importance. This view regards teachers as the central aspect to understand how they *interpret* their worlds. Teachers' perspectives and voices are the most encouraged to gain validity of understanding the profession because they all that matter (Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Alwasilah, 2013). More interest on teacher development based on this perspective means more interest to teaching process and classroom practice; putting classroom teachers' actions and ideas as the central focus (Bailey & Nunan, 1996). This study employs this view, assuming that as teachers store many categories of knowledge, teachers are considered as professionals who know what they do before, while and after they execute actions. Therefore, there is an urgent need to explore their practice and their perception towards their practice as they provide professional knowledge of EFL teachers.

The examination of teachers' practice should pay more attention to teachers' professional knowledge, how to isolate it from teachers' routines, but still represent teachers' perspective(s). To examine professional knowledge of EFL teachers, this study employed the endeavor to observe professional knowledge English teachers who have less than five year-professional teaching experience by gathering them in Teacher Study Group (TSG) to reflect on their practice. It is assumed that if teachers deliberately bring their experience into discussion, they will develop professional knowledge by making accounts of their own practice. The study examines whether teacher participants have professional knowledge and what forms of professional knowledge they exhibit during TSG dialogues.

1.1 Review of Related Literature

There are two areas of literature related to this study. The first is professional knowledge; its definition and types. The second area is reflection concepts. Then, this section is completed with review of previous studies. Each principles is elaborated below.

1.1.1 Professional Knowledge

Professional knowledge is non propositional knowledge acquired through interaction with experience (Loughran, 2010). Professional knowledge, consists of experiential knowledge (Wallace, 1991) or practical knowledge (Tsui, 2003) and professional craft knowledge gained in teachers' everyday actions in classroom. Similar terms under knowledge from teachers' everyday actions are prototypical or case knowledge, situated knowledge, personal practical knowledge (Borg, 2006; Clandinin & Connelly, 1996) and pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 2004).

Case knowledge is knowledge of specific, well-documented, and richly described events. There are three types of case knowledge. Prototypes exemplify theoretical principles, precedents capture and communicate principles of practice or maxims, and parables convey norms and values (Shulman, 2004, p. 207). Strategic knowledge comes into play as the teacher confronts particular situations or problems, whether theoretical, practical, or moral, where principles collide and no simple solution is possible. *Pedagogical content knowledge* is the ways of representing and formulating the subject that make it comprehensible to others. This includes the most regularly taught topics in one's subject area, the most useful forms of representation of those ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations originated both from research and wisdom of practice. Many experts admit that pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) is a form of professional knowledge which is complex in nature and it comprise of so many aspects (Van Driel & Berry, 2012). Thus, it is difficult to portray (Park & Steve, 2008).

1.1.2 Reflection Process in TSG

Before, it is stated that professional knowledge is acquired through interaction with practice. This process is defined as *reflection-in-action* (Munby & Russell, 1990; Munby, 1989). Basically, reflection is a process of inner dialogue and 'conversation with self' (Prawat in (Mann, 2005) to develop awareness of practice. Besides, reflection is a way of monitoring, examining, and enhancing professional judgment (Newel, 1992). It is an in-depth consideration of events or situations: the people involved, what they experienced, and how they felt about it. This involves projecting, improvising, reviewing or reliving the experience to bring it into focus, and replaying or reframing from diverse points of view (Ghaye, 2011; Bolton, 2010). The processes enable people to think about past experiences or parts of experiences that might be related to the real or imagined situation to help people make good decisions (Jackson, 2015).

Reflection has three key features. The first technical moment is delivering prospective questions and/or following the concepts from *knowledge for practice* (Cochran & Lytle, 1999) to produce the guide. The second feature is, the moment in which *knowledge in practice* develops (Cochran & Lytle, 1999), when teachers do the teaching and improvise. The third one is theoretical moment when teacher does retrospective action to the experience. The re-view and re-frame of their experience produce *knowledge of practice* (Edge, 2011; Bolton, 2010; Cochran & Lytle, 1999).

Reflection-for-action involves planning for action (Van Manen, 1991), taking positive steps to do the tasks, and thinking of alternative ways of doing the actions. It can be the desired outcome of two types of reflections; in-action and on-action, to guide future action (Killion & Todnem, 1991). *Reflection-in-action* is reflection within the very performance (Hustler, 1991) to improvise (Ghaye, 2011), on phenomena, and on one's spontaneous ways of thinking and acting in the midst of action (Killion & Todnem, 1991). In this process, *situated possibilities* are transformed into alternative actions by synchronizing them with their dialectical relations between knowledge and specific contexts of work. Therefore, it allows the modification of the performance plan to make it more efficacious (Hustler, 1991). *Reflection-in-action* is the process of transforming procedural knowledge into principle-based knowledge so that it is established as professional knowledge in practice ((Russell, 1993; Loughran, 2010). This process is vital to guide teachers not to make this knowledge becomes ritual and to be aware of the ways of principled understanding of the practice inform and support the profession (Russell, 1993).

Reflection-on-action is reflecting after the event (a day or two later) is completed, that involves looking back, going over things again focusing on something significant, and to be selective on what to reflect (Ghaye, 2011; Killion & Todnem, 1991) and thinking back over what has been done. TSG stands for Teacher Study Group, an alternative professional development program that is used to encourage participants to create dialogues among its members that develop participants' reflection process by exploring their experience and teaching practice regarding important aspects in each feature of reflection.

1.1.3 Research on EFL Teacher Professional Knowledge

Only several studies of EFL/ESL Teacher professional knowledge were conducted recently. In fact, this topic is

still understudied and gets less attention. The studies were mostly concentrated on portraying the professional knowledge in various frameworks.

The portrait of professional knowledge was examined by comparing what student teachers obtained in initial teacher education and the experience they implemented during their study in post graduate certificate of education course (Brindley & Riga, 2009), conducting reflection in action in the form of learners' feedback and teacher's response to it (Wette, 2010). Also, professional knowledge was regarded in terms of pedagogical reasoning skills as part of Pedagogical Content Knowledge from novice and experienced ESL teachers in Canada (Richards, Li, & Tang, 1998) and in China's mainland (Li & Wilhelm, 2008). These two studies found that experienced teachers in Canada are more flexible, have more and wider repertoire and able to see more options from the materials they prepare to present than the novice ones (Richards, Li, & Tang, 1998). In contrast, the experienced ESL teachers in China Mainland are more concerned with testing outcomes and appeared more comfortable with a teacher-directed approach while the less-experienced teacher was more aware of integrating theory into actual practice and taking a more learner-centered approach (Li & Wilhelm, 2008).

The description of professional knowledge in ESL/EFL was examined by identifying the sources of professional knowledge. First, it was found that language learning experience is a resource of teacher professional knowledge from their prior experience (Ellis, 2004). A comparison of novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge (Gatbonton, 2008) and longitudinal study of foreign language pedagogical knowledge of beginning teachers (Watzke, 2007; Inceçay, 2011) indicated that participants' teaching were greatly affected by their foreign language learning beliefs. Then, Ohi (2007) identifies several sources of teachers' professional knowledge in teaching reading, i.e. their own professional experience, interaction with other teachers, and networking with other professionals in the field.

2. Method

This section provides information on how participants of the study were selected, how the information was pulled out from participants, and the research design of the study.

2.1 Participants' Selection

Participants were EFL teachers who hold bachelor degree in English Education and had less than five years teaching experience at the year of the study (2014). These teachers were teaching in Junior High School in Bandar Lampung, the capital of Lampung Province, located in Southern part of Sumatra Island, Indonesia. Participants were pen-named as Hutri, Elfa, and Erika.

2.2 Research Procedure

During the study, participants and researcher gathered once a week for three months to share ideas on classroom practice in a group initiated by the researcher. The sessions were audio and visually recorded. But the main recording was the audio ones. Each session consisted of opening session, main session, and evaluation session. Each session was opened by reviewing previous knowledge or reading vignettes of professional development and teaching practice. The main sessions' theme of discussion were arranged in the following order as suggested both by participants and facilitator.

Session	themes
1	exploring teachers' experience and understanding of professional development program, and discussing the purpose of TSG
2	TSG mechanism modification; TSG purpose, the length of TSG program, TSG ground rules, members' roles.
3	discussion of Bartlett's article <i>Teacher Development through Reflective Teaching</i>
4	presentation of chapter 2, 5 and 6 from Richards & Lockhart (1996) <i>Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms</i>
5	discussing and writing the guideline for teaching practice evaluation
6	discussion on Hutri's video teaching practice
7	discussion on Elfa's video teaching practice
8	discussion on Erika's video teaching practice

The closing part of TSG was evaluations of the meeting in which participants summarized the dialogue and planned for the next week's meeting, and also completed questionnaire (see full-time schedule in appendix). *Session Six, Seven, and Eight* had special video recording data from participants' classes. These videos were used as resource of discussion.

The data were collected during TSG observation while researcher was involved as facilitator in there. The researcher observed the occurring dialogue and recorded 90 minute-conversation of each TSG session. After that, the data were organized into word-per-word extract of the dialogue; the detailed line-by-line written record of the meeting. It was followed by generating initial categories such as the forms and categories of professional knowledge (with their properties and dimensions) from relevant fragments of the conversation and suggesting relationships among categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) The data were interpreted and led researcher to specific pattern of information based on recurring regularities in the data (Patton, 2002; Yin, 2003). Both commonness and uniqueness are analyzed by comparing them to the theoretical framework (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003); assuming that teachers deliberate interaction with and discussion about their experience develops professional knowledge by making accounts of their own practice. Thus the professional knowledge can be identified in this study.

2.3 Research Design

The design of the study is qualitative multiple case study (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 2003). The relevant instrument for this study is observation (Yin, 2003) by participating as facilitator in TSG sessions. Video and audio recordings were also used as instrumentation to support data organization and to provide relevant source of discussion for *Session Six, Seven, and Eight*. To The result is presented for each individual participants while discussion elaborates both individual and comparison between individuals.

3. Results

The results in this section is divided into two sections, results of theme-based group discussion in session One to Five and results from collaborative reflection in Session Six to Eight.

3.1 Professional Knowledge from Theme-Based Group Discussion

Group discussions are TSG sessions in which participants discuss their teaching experience. The teaching experience was related to particular weekly topic that had been selected together such as *reflection, teachers' beliefs, teachers' role, and structure of English lesson*. During five sessions, both Elfa and Erika showed as if they really had constraints with their knowledge base. On the contrary, Hutri did quite well.

Hutri

There are two themes emerged during TSG discussions; case knowledge of integration many different knowledge categories from Hutri's conceptual knowledge base and case knowledge from each separated category of knowledge. Hutri reported in *Session One* that his regular participation in professional development programs provided by the school every semester allowed him to obtain enactment of curriculum, lesson planning, and psychological considerations for learners. The programs guided him to integrate relevant aspects from different categories of knowledge and represent them in the form of strategies for his classes and to understand what he gained theoretically in university. From the programs, Hutri was capable of doing some implementation of his available knowledge wherein he adjusted it into his students' learning context. On the contrary, he stated that he had never done reflection as part of his practice or thought about what he had done in the class after the lesson over.

In *Session Two*, there was no evidence of relevant information found because the session was prepared to set TSG mechanism. Moreover, in *Session Three* there was not any relevant professional knowledge exposed, either. This was because in this meeting, more conceptual foci on reflection were discussed and Hutri was absent for the meeting. *Session Four* provided separated accounts for each knowledge category, such as his practical knowledge about classroom management and his considerations on students' conception learning strategy. These examples were articulated after the discussion of chapter 6; Structure of Language Lesson.

In *Session Five*, it was found that Hutri also admitted his lack of knowledge on *opening lesson* strategy when he commented on the frameworks for reflection that would be conducted in the following sessions. Initially, he stated that he was familiar with *opening* concept and declared that he regularly performed *opening activities* written in the source. Shortly after that, he happened to be astonished by the fact that one of the opening strategies was not familiar to him.

In conclusion, the findings from the first to fifth sessions' observation indicate that Hutri was sure that his

professional learning introduced him more on contextual and practical aspects on his work based on his conceptual knowledge base from his teacher education in university. During practice exploration in TSG, he was able to narrate how he employed his teaching ability to integrate many different aspects as well as how he executed separated use of each knowledge category for his teaching. He also softly admitted that he did not know all concepts about each type of knowledge. Altogether, the observation shows that Hutri's professional knowledge narrated in TSG's first to fifth sessions is originated from his stories of his experience. These accounts, whether they are integration of many types of knowledge or separated description of single knowledge category, are considered as case knowledge.

Elfa

Elfa revealed a single theme, case knowledge on how she experienced limitation to process integrated understanding on knowledge base. She admitted that there are many weak spots in her knowledge base, including primary concepts that every language teachers must know. Besides, she was lack of confidence in teaching because of what she thought of herself. Fortunately, she hinted professional knowledge on her awareness of different functions between conceptual knowledge and professional knowledge while practicing dialogues in TSG. She also expressed that sometimes she also thought about students' difficulties in performing their tasks. In *Session Three* and *Four* it was noticed that Elfa was assisted to improve essential knowledge about reflection, teaching, and reading skills. Her involvement in the discussion also implied her weakness. *Session Five* did not provide any information about Elfa's professional knowledge.

Observation on group discussion did not work out to explore Elfa's professional knowledge. The conceptual atmosphere was not suitable for Elfa as she was less confident to her conceptual knowledge base and she indicated less study skills. Therefore, Elfa experienced difficulties to demonstrate what she knew when a particular topic was being introduced and discussed.

Erika

Erika also narrated single theme, case knowledge on how she evaluated her professional self. Instead of demonstrating knowledge integration or her inadequacy in representing her knowledge base during her teaching, she stated both positive and negative evaluation on her performance. In *Session One* she told members of TSG that she had a half-conscious habit to rethink about what she had done in the class. While she walked out of the room, she thought that she missed something in the class. Erika also did not utilize group discussion to demonstrate her knowledge development. In *Session Three*, Erika showed her fine comprehension to article that was being discussed, however, she never quoted any examples of related case knowledge from her own practice. In *Session Four*, she mentioned how she felt that her confidence in teaching was reduced slowly only within eight months of working experience. *Session Five* did not supply relevant finding because Erika was sick and absent for TSG meeting.

Observation on them-based discussion in TSG showed that Erika did not demonstrate sufficient professional knowledge.

3.2 Professional Knowledge from TSG Collaborative Reflection

TSG collaborative reflection was the last three sessions of TSG in which participants played the videos of their classroom practice of the week. Each participants video-taped one of their classes and presented to the floor. Everyone in the group including the performing teacher gave their maximum effort to look back at the lesson and presented their best judgments for them. In classroom evaluations, Elfa and Erika had a contrasted (but positive) development while Hutri's enthusiasm decreased when he evaluated his class.

Hutri

Collaborative reflection showed two emerging themes for Hutri, reasoning for his own practice and feedback for partners as case knowledge. When he narrated his lesson in *Session Six*, and he was asked to show his lesson plan, he said that he did not have a formatted lesson plan. Instead, he represented the lesson plan into students' worksheets. He stated that he used the process of recording the lesson, to set the video recording equipment, as a chance for reviewing previous lesson; "Asking for Help". When he opened his lesson, he tried to relate the lesson to students daily life as boarding school students. He asked students how they expressed themselves if they wanted to give help to others. In the end of the opening session for his lesson, he suddenly jumped into the main activity without checking students' readiness. When Elfa asked to explain the situation and to consider that inconducive atmosphere, he said that he had been running out of time and blamed the time limit as the cause of his decision. Furthermore, there is no response indicating Hutri's acceptance and willingness to refine his class nor to respond to the feedback.

The second theme was (more of) his experience in teaching. In *Session Seven*, when giving feedback to Elfa, he demonstrated some of his content knowledge. He elaborated what he understands about grammar and was able to locate some elements on content (English Grammar and language skill). Later when Hutri gave another supportive feedback, he suggested to refine the lesson on the next class. This is some point that he made for others but not for him. Later still in giving Elfa his feedback for the practice, he perceived classroom management, student behavior management, and the content of the lesson as separated elements and insisted on not to link them when reflecting a teacher's lesson.

In *Session Eight*, Hutri responded to Erika's teaching reasoning by sharing his experience on how to deal with discipline matters and how to design story as *donkey-bridge* to particular lesson. Hutri also commented for vignette of the eighth session, describing a real preparation and execution of a lesson performed by a teacher from *Kelas Inspirasi (Inspirational Class)* in Bandung. Hutri stated that visualization of his practice is necessary. He admitted that the act of visualizing the flow of scenarios that a teacher has been planned to execute was included in preparation for teaching. He also said that preparation was intense, serious, and needed a lot of great effort rooted in great ideas. Yet, he believed that the teacher preparation in the vignette was complex because she had taught different type of students and using different psychological approach for learning.

Contrasted with the previous statement, Hutri justified his opinion to make less intense preparation by stating that it is less possible to prepare that deep by addressing other activities he needed to perform as the excuse. He thought it was tolerable to simplify the making of *realia* because he did not have special abilities to create such puppets used by the teacher in the vignette. Thus, the limited spare time and the lack of ability to make puppets are two reasons why Hutri did not agree to make detailed lesson preparation.

In sum, the observation showed that while doing reflection, Hutri preferred knowledge sharing and suggestion for others to his exploration to his teaching.

Elfa

The change of TSG dialogue mechanism had influenced Elfa to be more confident and to get more space to express her thoughts. Two themes emerged; her reasoning and her case knowledge. In the sixth session, she began to show how she understood the knowledge she employed for her teaching. She showed and admitted that she did not prepare comprehensive planning. When other participants explored deeper and challenged her choice, she was able to give more arguments to describe her points. When facilitator asked the reason for choosing group work as opening strategy, she said that she had gathered information about her students before she made decision and she put contextual aspect to consider what to do for her class. However, she was unaware of the misconception happened in her students' learning such as; "One student reacted by mentioning her own name, RU-LY, as her conception to *Adverb*. Elfa admitted the misunderstanding by exposing students' misconception for past-form verbs grammatical aspect.

Other member of TSG commented that she seemed overwhelmed with the group work she initiated because she did not prepare enough for matching the work with the classroom size, the strategy to control the activity of her students, and how the result of her games would become. However, she could not see the practical application of the advice given by her peers nor her facilitator. She replied the comments by proposing argument that she had no more option and decided to group them as individual work may not work for many students.

Further, her partners suggested her to use different ways of forming group by (1) selecting group members carefully to make the groups learning more effective, (2) offering alternatives in forming the group to arrange the movement of the students, and (3) setting the students in more flexible seat arrangements, but she insisted on her limitation related to the time. Her answers seemed to accept the recommendations but essentially she refused all possibilities and summarized her answer by pointing at time as her biggest constraint but finally admitted how she was least prepared for the lesson. She expressed that regarding to one-period she had for the lesson, she wanted to go directly to the lesson because she did not prepare, and instead, she used everything she could reach. Finally, in the end of the session while she reflected on her action, she managed to organize ideas to review the lesson later. The second theme emerged in the same session when she suggested her experience to modify the teaching action whenever possible. She suggested to motivate herself to maintain her mood when she confronted difficult situation in the classrooms, as well. However, she also cited some uneasy feelings and statements of being offended by her students' attitude and used them as her excuses not to perform her teaching optimally.

In *Session Eight* Elfa's reasoning also showed proper understanding when she contributed significant feedback for Erika. She conveyed crucial interpretation points of conceptual knowledge such as the translation of strategy that her colleague used for opening the lesson. Elfa also requested reason for her colleague's decision to use a story as a transitional tool for students to move to the next activity.

To conclude, by observing collaborative reflection, Elfa finally encouraged herself to demonstrate her experience especially her immediate experience. She was successful in recognizing few key ideas as her advice for Erika. Elfa proved that she had ability in explaining her knowledge and picked some important aspects that she employed in her teaching.

Erika

Erika revealed a single theme; complete reason for her lesson. Actually, Erika had responded to Hutri's and Elfa's lessons, but her feedback did not represent her professional knowledge. She reconfirmed the same comment that Elfa had mentioned for Hutri in the *Session Six*. In *Session Seven*, she mentioned technical aspect of video shooting in her feedback and regarded Elfa's work as perfect execution. In *Session Eight*, Erika narrated her reflection for action in the eighth session of TSG. Firstly she told the group that she had prepared strategies to focus students to attend their lesson. She designed two strategies; special claps and Hugo's story because she was fully aware that her students had limit of concentration.

Erika also changed some part, started when she involved her students as parts of her lesson explanation, some students were instructed to do several things, expecting they would say "thank you" after that. When it did not work, she discussed it with her senior colleague who accompanied her teaching the class, skipped that sequence, and continued to explain concepts and skills on thanking. Erika also coped with situation deliberately when she could not find ideal video as media to help her explained the lesson, when she sensed that time would not cover her plan for assessment, she decided to change the assessment procedure.

Erika delivered explanation on how she collaborated during her teaching performance, how she executed her plan and why she dealt with changes in the middle of the class session. She considered many aspects to select, prepare, represent, and evaluate; including the media, content, strategies, and tasks. For both preparation and execution, she had strong arguments and consideration, including when she changed some strategies or maintained others. More importantly, she also positively responded to her partners' evaluation. She also accepted her less attention in students' discipline. Unfortunately, there is no case knowledge demonstrated from Erika.

4. Discussion

This part discusses comparison among three participants, consist of the regularities and distinctiveness among them. The patterns are connected to the previous theories and findings to set the position of this study in within them.

4.1 Participants' Regularities

All participants are able to demonstrate professional knowledge. This proves Loughran (2010), Wallace (1991) Tsui (2003), Borg (2006) and Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1999). Teacher participants make their professional knowledge public and they further enhance growth and development in their professional lives through dialogue among practitioners to establish a basis for understanding. This is relevant to Osterman (1998). Case knowledge is the most frequent appeared data because the knowledge is presented by each participant in the form of teaching experience, lesson plan, and review on their own teaching performance. Case knowledge in the form of PCK appeared in the form of pedagogical reasoning skills as Shulman (2004) suggested. They demonstrate different articulation of PCK and content knowledge from their experience. The development of professional knowledge from experience supports Clandinin and Connelly (1996) and Ohi (2007). However, some of knowledge validations were still fragmented when participants reflected them. Some comments and interpretations separated one types of knowledge with other.

The professional knowledge was still in the form of tacit knowledge from their experience. In order to gain this knowledge, teachers have to own their experience of teaching. But experiencing teaching will not make this PCK consciously become teachers' professional property. *Reflection-for, in, and on,-action* should be realized to discuss teaching experience so that teachers will practicing theory and theorizing practice action. In collaborative reflection, participants managed for the first time in making the knowledge explicit because they consciously and constantly interacted with practice to explore it. This finding supports Ghaye (2011) Jackson (2015), Van Manen (1991), Bolton (2010) Hustler (1991) and Killion and Todnem (1991). From TSG collaborative reflection, all participants were able to articulate their thoughts that represent reflection of their work. Overall, the knowledge from practice that had been resided tacitly in participants' memories can be withdrawn in TSG interactions. This is relevant to Loughran (2010). This opportunity allows TSG participants to establish efforts on how to convert their routine into informed practice. This is in line with Russell (1993).

The difference between conceptual knowledge and experience from practice confirms Brindley and Riga (2009); Erika's reflection-in-action supports Wette (2010), and their reasoning for the action support novice teachers'

characteristics in Richards, Li, and Tang (1998) but challenges Li and Wilhelm (2008). The source of professional knowledge in this study is relevant to Ohi (2007). During collaborative reflection, participants evaluated their immediate practice and gave account on it. They came up with self-judgment and reaction after watching the video of the practice. In other words, participants were able to articulate their thoughts both in discussion and reflection action. In addition, collaborative reflection also shown how participants projected and improvised their practice and extracted them as new understanding (or not). This finding is parallel to Ghaye (2011), Jackson (2015), Van Manen (1991), Bolton (2010), Hustler, (1991) and Killion and Todnem (1991).

To date, all participants indicated that they shared similar types of knowledge but signified distinctive development, too. During TSG group discussion, they all were able to evaluate their conceptual knowledge and had agreed that their knowledge base had different functions from professional knowledge. Teaching knowledge from their professional practice helped them understand deeper how to integrate concept into specific context. When they identified the functions of knowledge base and professional knowledge, they realized that their knowledge base was not sufficient as a sole source of teaching knowledge. Their evaluation led them to increasing awareness about their existence as teachers and the urgent need to learn more to add more source for improving their practice. However, their evaluation and awareness were from random distant experience recalled cognitively as their perceptions. This is indicating that metacognitive skills and strategies emerged during the study when participants learn how to reflect upon their practice. Professional knowledge can be explored both through re-opening/memorizing the distant experience and reframing the immediate practice by conducting reflection-on-action. Thus, prior experience is one of participants' sources of their professional knowledge.

4.2 Participants' Distinctiveness

Participants' differences were spotted during discussion and collaborative reflection. In TSG discussion, only Hutri was able to narrate his case knowledge while Elfa and Erika were not able to. Hutri's dominant roles during theme-based discussion inhibited other teachers' courage to share. On the contrary, during collaborative reflections when they evaluated their immediate practice and gave account on it Hutri indicated the simplest account while Elfa and Erika had more complete ones. Dissimilar to group discussions, their evaluation in collaborative reflection was more equal in portion and revealed different judgments or reactions. While they came up with self-judgment and reaction after watching the video of the practice, their statement about how they integrated various knowledge and adjusted them in specific context were not the same.

From two out of three participants, they indicated irrelevant articulation of professional knowledge in collaborative reflection sessions. They stated that they need integration of various knowledge forms when teaching but they did not properly execute it. For instance, they did not integrate careful planning to anticipate improvisation during teaching. Their statement about the enactment of curriculum that was integrated for Islamic School network curriculum and national curriculum and specific consideration based on their students' characteristics was not relevant with their plan, execution, and evaluation of their lesson. In addition, Hutri and Elfa had performed their plan but reluctantly accepted the evaluation. To be specific, the recorded practice reflections showed that Hutri and Elfa calculated some contextual aspects such as students' learning styles and previous lesson but forgot to anticipate the concordance of classroom management and the content of opening session. In the end, they hardly accepted suggestion from others. On the other hand, Erika managed to create *situated possibilities* because of her continuous interaction between her knowledge and specific contexts of work. She was able to make modification of the performance plan that was adjusted to students' current condition. Erika's progress is relevant with Hustler (1991).

Both different and synchronized statement and action can be absorbed as new professional knowledge for all participants, especially for Hutri and Elfa. Because through collaboration in reflection their colleagues offered different perspectives, alternatives, and practical suggestions so that in the future they will not face the same problems again. Also, they realized that they can improve their practice by conscious preparation and more anticipation. However, the knowledge will become Hutri's and Elfa's property if they have pro- active judgment toward themselves and their colleagues'.

Thus far, participants' differences are not found in any relevant studies. One dominant participant preferred pure sharing and narrating the experience he selected himself, while two less confident participants are more excited when their practice is employed as the trigger to recall their knowledge. Therefore, this part is regarded as new finding that needs further examination and observation with more emphasis on individual and personal development. This new finding is made because the design of the study emphasizes individual observation for each participant. This finding suggests that to make professional knowledge explicit, single strategy cannot work for all teachers. Pure discussion using referred concept and collaboration in preparing, executing, or reviewing teachers'

lesson are two out of many strategies that can be implemented to explore professional knowledge of teachers.

5. Conclusion

This study shows that teacher participants in this research have professional knowledge. Although they have small amount of teaching experience, they succeed to publicly discuss it and produce it as their professional knowledge. The research signifies that group reflective discussion and collaborative reflection in TSG develop different forms of professional knowledge. TSG theme-based discussion facilitates participants to recall their individual experience in which they integrated many forms of knowledge. TSG collaborative reflection provides participants opportunity to evaluate the real practice and to check whether their opinion about professional knowledge were in line with their practice. Collaborative reflection to participants' immediate practice also makes possible for participants to articulate their reasoning for every decision they made in teaching. This is helpful to elicit teachers' tacit knowledge inside their actions.

It is important to note that the researcher considers that this study proposes another type of knowledge base, the first one will be the one that teachers obtained from pre-service university education. We can name it as conceptual knowledge base, consists of knowledge for practice that originated from proposition, results of academic research, or experience of other teachers. Another type of knowledge base is the professional knowledge base, coming from teacher's interaction with his/her practice or knowledge in practice and his assumptions after performing evaluation or reflection to his/her work (knowledge of practice). This second knowledge base will support teachers to retrieve knowledge from their practice constructively, actively, and critically.

References

- Alwasilah, A. C. (2013, June Saturday, 29). Down to Earth with Indonesian Teachers' Knowledge. *The Jakarta Post*, 7.
- Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative Data: An Introduction to Coding and Analysis*. New York: New York University Press.
- Bailey, K. M., & Nunan, D. (1996). *Voices from the Language Classroom: Qualitative Research in Second Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bolton, G. (2010). *Reflective Practice: Writing and Professional Development Third Edition*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Borg, S. (2006). *Teacher Cognition and Language Education*. London: Biddles, Ltd.
- Brindley, S., & Riga, F. (2009). Professional Knowledge learned and Professional Knowledge Applied: A Case Study of Two Trainee English Teachers. *English in Education*, 43(1), 68-85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-8845.2009.01030.x>
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1996). Teachers' Professional Knowledge Landscapes: Teacher Stories-Stories of Teachers-School Stories-Stories of School. *Educational Researcher*, 25(3), 24-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X025003024>
- Cochran Smith, M., & Lytle, S. L. (1999). Chapter 8: Relationships of Knowledge and Practice: Teacher Learning in Communities. *Review of Research in Education*, 24, 249-305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0091732X024001249>
- Edge, J. (2011). *The Reflexive Teacher Educator in TESOL: Roots and Wings*. New York: Routledge.
- Ellis, E. M. (2004). The Invisible Multilingual Teacher: The Contribution of Language Background to Australian ESL Teachers' Professional Knowledge and Beliefs. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, 2, 90-108. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14790710408668181>
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the Knowledge-Base of Language Teacher Education. *TESOL QUARTERLY*, 32(3), 397-417. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3588114>
- Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking Beyond Teachers' Classroom Behaviour: Novice and Experienced ESL Teachers' Pedagogical Knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 161-182. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1362168807086286>
- Ghaye, T. (2011). *Teaching and Learning through Reflective Practice: a Practical Guide for Positive Action*.
- Hustler, D. (1991). Introduction: The Reflective Practitioner, Initial Teacher Training and Teachers' Professional Development. *British Educational Research Journal*, 17(4). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0141192910170401>

- Inceçay, G. (2011). Pre-service Teachers' Language Learning Beliefs and Effects of these Beliefs on their Practice Teaching. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 128-133. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.03.061>
- Jackson, N. (2015, March). *Lifewide Magazine Issues Thirteen*, pp. 29-40.
- Killion, J. P., & Todnem, G. R. (1991). A Process for Personal Theory Building. *Educational Leadership*, 48(6), 14-16.
- Li, H., & Wilhelm, K. H. (2008). Exploring Pedagogical Reasoning: Reading Strategy Instruction from Two Teachers' Perspective. *The Reading Matrix*, 8(1), 96-110.
- Loughran, J. (2010). *What Expert Teachers Do: Enhancing Professional Knowledge for Classroom Practice*. Crows Nest: Allen&Unwin.
- Mann, S. (2005). The Language Teacher's Development. *Language Teaching*, 38(03), 103-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0261444805002867>
- Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case Study in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Munby, H. (1989). Reflection-in-Action and Reflection-on-Action. *Education and Culture*, 09(1), 31-41.
- Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1990). Metaphor in the Study of Teachers' Professional Knowledge. *Theory into Practice*, 29(2), 116-121. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00405849009543441>
- Newel, R. (1992). Anxiety, Accuracy and Reflection: the Limits of Professional Development. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 17, 1326-1333. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.1992.tb01855.x>
- Ohi, S. (2007). Teachers Professional Knowledge and the Teaching of Reading in the Early Years . *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(2), 57-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2007v32n2.5>
- Osterman, K. F. (1998, 04 00). *ED 425 518*. Retrieved from EDRS: <http://www.eric.ed.gov>
- Park, S., & Steve, O. J. (2008). Revisiting the Conceptualization of Pedagogical Content Knowledge (PCK): PCK as a Conceptual Tool to Understand Teachers as Professionals. *Research in Science Education*, 38(3). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11165-007-9049-6>
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Method*. Thousan Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Richards, J. C., Li, B., & Tang, A. (1998). Exploring Pedagogical Reasoning Skills. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Beyond Training* (pp. 86-102). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell, T. (1993). Teachers; Professional Knowledge and the Future of Teacher Education. *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 205-215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0260747930190418>
- Shulman, L. S. (2004). Knowledge and Teaching: Foundations of the New Reform. In L. S. Shulman (Ed.), *The Wisdom of Practice: Essays on Teaching, Learning, and Learning to Teach* (pp. 219-248). San Fransisco: Wiley Imprint.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Reserach: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Tsui, A. B. (2003). *Understanding Expertise in Teaching; Case Study of Second Language Teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524698>
- Van Driel, J. H., & Berry, A. (2012). Teacher Professional Development Focusing on Pedagogical Content Knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 41(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X11431010>
- Van Manen, M. (1991). Reflectivity and the pedagogical moment: the normativity of pedagogical thinking and acting. *JOURNAL OF CURRICULUM STUDIES*, 23(6), 507-536. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0022027910230602>
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training Foreign Language Teachers; A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watzke, J. L. (2007). Foreign Language Pedagogical Knowledge:Toward A Developmental Theory of Begining Teacher Practices. *The Modern Language Journal*, 91, 63-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00510.x>

Wette, R. (2010). Professional KNowledge in Action: How Experienced ESOL Teachers Respond to Feedback from Learners within Syllabus and Contextual Constraints. *System*, 38, 569-579. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2010.09.017>

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case Study Research Design and Methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publication, Inc.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).