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Abstract—This study investigates eight TEFL pre-service teachers’ reflective thinking on their classroom discourse in a middle school in China. The data comes from reflective journals, interviews and classroom observations. Three major themes emerge from the journals: physiological aspect, interpersonal aspect and pedagogical aspect of discourse. Moreover, the features of their reflective thinking on classroom discourse are explained. It is concluded that conceptualization is the most prominent feature. Additionally, the study finds out three influential factors on the focuses and features of pre-service teachers’ reflective thinking: lack of teaching experience, lack of knowledge on students and teachers’ identity dilemma.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the terms of reflection are so popular in TEFL teacher education and development programs (Farrell, 2012). Many compliments are given to reflective teaching: it can improve teaching (Farrell, 2007), can make teachers more confident (Barlette, 1990), increase new comprehension (Laboskey, 1993) and so on. In this case, many programs on reflective thinking proceed worldwide. The objectives the teacher reflects are various. According to Akbari’s (2010) Reflection Questionnaire, there are at least 42 items. However, in language classroom, discourse is an essential topic to research because it embodies two distinct meanings: the aim of teaching and the carrier of teaching. Thus, for a language teacher, the classroom discourse should be an unavoidable content of reflection. This study draws on a case study of 8 TEFL student teachers’ reflection on classroom discourse in a middle school in China. It describes the main focuses they mention and analyzes the features of their reflective thinking and the reasons behind, based on the data collected from their reflective journals, interviews and classroom observations.

II. DEFINING REFLECTIVE THINKING

Reflection was initially proposed in education by Dewey. In his monograph how we think he put forward that “the challenge of learning is learning to think” (Lyons, 2010. p.11). Indeed, in his eyes, the aim of education is to teach students to think critically. In Dewey’s words reflective thinking means “active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends” (Dewey, 1933; as cited in Rodgers, 2002). It is apparent that reflective thinking is an inner dialogue in essence. Further, Dewey (1933) suggests six phrases across reflective thinking: suggesting; intellectualization; the use of hypothesis to initiate operations; the mental elaborations; testing hypothesis; actual action. Echoing Dewey’s understanding, Schon (1987), Gagatsis & Patronis (1990), Lee (2005), Rodgers (2002) and many other scholars propose similar phrases of reflective thinking. Although a great number of differences exist among these phrases, there is the same thread throughout: name a problem; analyze the problem; solve the problem; put the solution into practice. It is necessary to mention the origin of the problem. Some think the problem comes from the experience, such as Dewey, Schon, Lee and Rodgers. They believe the problem emerges naturally when people communicate with the outside world. This phenomenon is called a situation of problem full of doubts. Others think it can be fixed initially, such as Gagatsis & Patronis. This article takes the first viewpoint, namely, the problem comes from experience. No matter how the initial steps are different, the final phrases of the problem are the same, that is, no end. According to Rodgers (2002), the last phrase in Dewey’s view acts as experiment as well as experience (it is also the beginning step of a new reflective thinking). So reflective thinking is cyclical and of no end. The process of reflective thinking can be summarized like this: it begins with a situation of problems, proceeds in a rather equilibrium situation, continually develops in a situation of new problem and cyclically advances. So the functions of reflective thinking is to transform a situation “in which there is experienced obscurity, doubt, conflict, disturbance of some sort, into a situation that is clear, coherent, settled, harmonious” (Dewey,1933.p.100). Another point should be mentioned that the problem is not only troubles, but also puzzles or other interested matters the reflective practitioner encounters in experience. After making clear the definition of reflective thinking, it is necessary to discuss the literature of researches on reflective thinking on TEFL classroom discourse.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are many researches on reflective thinking about TEFL classroom discourse. Some talk about the focuses and the procedures the teacher should mention in reflection, such as Richards & Lockhart’s (1996) monograph Reflective
Teaching in Second Language Classroom. In this book, the authors sketch out various topics the teacher need to reflect and present some guidelines, action researches and other useful points for reflecting the classroom discourse. However, the monograph doesn’t provide one detailed empirical example. Even in practice, the number of systematic researches about reflective thinking on TEFL classroom discourse is rather limited. Among these published researches, a program in Israel is worthy of note. Orland-Barak & Yinon (2007) detailed this program based on a new EFL methods course titled Classroom Discourse: Student teacher examine their practice. In this program, student teachers are encouraged to reflect their classroom discourse and one aim of the program is to enhance their reflections at different phrases of reflective thinking. However, the purpose of this research is designed to understand whether student teachers connect CLT theories with their classroom practice. These kinds of researches mostly regard classroom discourse as an integrated performance of good teaching and ignore the details. Some researches pay attention to details, but merely focus on one point of classroom discourse, such as the use of L1 in the classroom (Orland-Barak & Yinon, 2005); codeswitching in the classroom (Macaro, 2001).

IV. RESEARCH DESIGN

A. Research Focuses

Situated in an EFL pre-service “reflective practicum” program in Southwest University in China, the current research tries to answer the following questions: (1) what are the focuses and the features of pre-service English teachers’ reflective thinking on their classroom discourse? (2) what influences pre-service English teachers’ reflective thinking on classroom discourse?

B. Research Subjects

There are 8 pre-service English teachers engaging in the study. The following presents their brief introductions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Xin</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zh</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Junior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of them took teaching practice in the same middle school from September to December in 2012. Xin is the only male in the participants. Among 8 pre-service teachers, Zh and Xin took lessons in Senior classes while the others in Junior classes. All of them are very interested in this study and volunteer to engage in it.

C. Instrumentation

All the data examined in this paper were collected from three sources: reflective diary, semi-interview, classroom observation. Pre-service teachers’ diary is the main data source. Semi-interview and classroom observation are ancillary data. According to the content of their diaries, we will invite them to clarify the ambiguous points. In the classroom observation, we make field notes or rapid transcriptions on the discourse episode in details, which is helpful to understand their diaries and their interviews. In some sense, interviews with the student teacher are helpful to promote reflection deeply and broadly.

D. Procedure

All the participants are required to write down at least three diaries on their classroom discourses during the practicum. Diary is an important and useful approach for teachers’ reflective thinking and self-development (Richards & Farrell, 2005, p.68; Bailey et al.2009, p.48). Bailey et al. (2009, p.59) lists four advantages of reflective diaries: articulating puzzles and problems, venting frustration, stretching ourselves professionally and clarifying and realizing. Further, Liou (2001) suggests that EFL student teachers’ reflection should be given some guidelines, so we provide one reflective diary template on classroom discourse with an appendix which illustrates why we reflect in this way. Aligning with the abovementioned definition of reflective thinking, the template is designed on five principles:

1. Name a problem clearly and try best to analyze or explain.
2. Try best to find out a clear solution and predict what you will do if facing the similar context in the future.
3. Before setting the problem, try best to describe the phenomenon in details.
4. When explaining the problem, try best to think why you explain it in this way.
5. Welcome to deliberate the same focus constantly.

The first two principles is only a whole-phrase circle of reflective thinking, and the last principle reminds student teachers of thinking the problem over constantly and cyclically. The third and the forth are based on Dewey’s views and
Rodgers’ reframing. The phrase of naming the problem “demands that the individual continually ground his or her thinking in evidence and not overlook the important data that may not fit his or her evolving ideas (Rodgers, 2002)”. These evidence and important data begin with discreet observation and description in details. When explaining the problem, the teacher might make a spontaneous reasoning. This simple-minded analysis needs “active, persistent, and careful consideration (Dewey, 1933, p.9)”, so he or she need to reflect the belief behind their explanation.

Based on the five principles and the diary template, we get 36 reflective diaries from the student teacher in the end in total. Four of them volunteer to write down another 12 diaries. Besides, we, as mentors, attend every teacher’s lecture and make some field notes, but these field notes are merely ancillary to understand teachers’ diaries and interviews. We believe the problem should be noticed by the teachers themselves at first. After receiving and reading their reflective diaries, we mark the ambiguous points and make an semi-interview concerned the points. Additionally, the data of diaries and interviews are in Chinese. We translate all of them into English after collecting all the data. The number of all the data collected is shown below.

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Diary</th>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Classroom Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Xin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Zh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>W2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Su</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

A. The Focuses of Pre-service Teachers’ Reflective Thinking on Discourse

The contents of reflective thinking on discourse can be divided into two categories: the first is the knowledge of discourse. Johnson (1990, p.279) makes a detailed aspect: physiological aspect; interpersonal aspect; pedagogical aspect. The second is the sociocultural knowledge related to discourse such as discourse identity, cultural characteristic, and discourse control and so on. In the study, the main focuses of pre-service teachers’ reflective thinking on discourse are shown as below.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge of discourse (the physical features of teacher talk)</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Frequencies in Diaries</th>
<th>In Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>physiological aspect</td>
<td>low voice</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronunciation mistakes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not fluent expression</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grammatical mistakes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unnatural English expression</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal aspect (this aspect is conducive to build, develop and maintain the relations among teachers and students)</td>
<td>less prompts</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedagogical aspect (it is the most important aspect, the knowledge of language are transferred through it)</td>
<td>dull assessments on students’ words</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>too much repetition</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use Chinese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inefficient feedback</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inefficient words</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unclear instruction</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table, the first four high-frequency problems include low voice, too much repetition, grammatical mistakes and unclear instruction. The last three includes unnatural expression, the use of Chinese, and inefficient words. The total 11 points on discourse covers physiological aspect, interpersonal aspect and pedagogical aspect. On the interpersonal aspect, the student teachers don’t care about it. What’s more, they do not present any ideas about the sociocultural aspect.

The focuses are mostly paid on physiological aspect and pedagogical aspect in student teachers’ reflective diaries. For example, they write “low voice is not good for students”, “unclear instructions lead to lesson hindrance”. Further, one point should be pointed out that the problem of the use of Chinese appears in two teachers’ diaries and their ideas on it are different. The teacher A thinks that the use of Chinese is unsuitable and concludes that “in the future, I will try my best to use English totally” in the interview. Teacher W2 also mentions this problem, but does not regard it as a bad
thing because “for Junior students, they are too young and lack of English vocabulary, so if teaching in English totally is unsuitable, the teacher’s words might be difficult to understand”. She insists teaching both in English and Chinese. On her last lesson in practicum, she wrote that “the experienced teacher spoke English all the time in English class last time. Some students reflected that they could not understand her, so could not follow her, but they didn’t dare to tell her. In my class, whenever I think students can not understand, I would use Chinese. Several students say that they are more confident than before because they know all my words. I fell happy”. It is apparent that W2 does not agree with A. The other thing worthy of note is that all the problems are about the troubles in teaching. The following only presents the two problems pre-service teachers focus intensively: repetition and unclear instruction. Further, the features of their reflection will be elucidated as well as the influential factors on their reflection.

B. Findings

(1) conceptualization

cancel the problem means that the pre-service teachers prefer to define, explain or solve the problem according to authority (Wang Rong, 2012). They take authority’s idea as a self evident truth, such as the mentor’s words, the contents of the course book or the education policies. The following is two examples of conceptualization around the problem of “too much repetition” and “unclear instruction”.

Repetition

Repetition has been regarded as an useful strategy for modifying the classroom discourse (Richards & Lockhart, 1996, p.183). However, most of the student teachers think they should reduce repetition. Two teachers’ reflection data will be explained one by one.

Teacher Su

Teacher Su writes down repetition problem like:

“I shouldn’t repeat my sentences many times. Last time my mentor told me that. However, I can not help doing it because I am afraid my English is not good enough. Next time I would try my best to avoid it.” (source: Su 20120920D)

In this statement, Su expresses her guilty of not obeying the mentor’s words and regards too much repetition as her problem of discourse. She does not describe the immediate context and makes this judgment directly. However, according to the classroom observation, her repetitions occur frequently when the students are too noisy. In a sense, her repetition is necessary, which can confirm all the students can hear her words and keep the lesson going. After all, it is the right for every student to hear the teacher’s words clearly. Her wrong judgment on the problem comes from her dependence on authority. This phenomenon can be proved in the interview again. The interview on her repetition shows below.

Extract 1

Interviewer: Why do you think your repetition is bad to students?
Su: When I took the micro-teaching last semester, my mentor gave me a suggestion that repetition is not good. Unfortunately, I made this mistake again.
Interviewer: Did your mentor give you the same advice on this lesson?
Su: No, she just advised me to be more confident and to manage the class more efficiently. I think my repetition can be avoided if I am more confident.
(source: Su 20120921I)

In Su’s words, she cites the mentor’s old suggestion to set the current problem. Even if the mentor’s suggestion is not discussed about repetition, she still associates it with her difficulty in teaching. Apparently, she defines the mentor’s words as a rigorous criterion for her problem on discourse. Her behavior is compatible with one of Locke’s Wrong Belief “the first is of those who seldom reason at all, but do and think according to the example of others, whether parents, neighbors, ministers, or who else they are pleased to make choice of to have an implicit faith in, for the saving of themselves the pains and troubles of thinking and examining for themselves.” (cited from Dewey, 1910, p.23)” No doubt this dependence on authority influences the teachers’ judgment seriously. Dewey values judgment on the problem very much. His idea can be read clearly in this paragraph:

“a man of good judgment in a given set of affairs is a man in so far educated, trained, whatever may be his literacy. And if our schools turn out their pupils in that attitude of mind which is conducive to good judgment in any department of affairs in which the pupils are placed, they have done more than if they sent out their pupils merely possessed of vast stores of information, or high degrees of skill in specialized branches.” (Dewey, 1910, p.101)

In Dewey’s ideas, the ability of judging a problem is more important than that of literacy. It is regarded as a basic phrase of reflective thinking. He wrote “a question well put is half answered”(Dewey, 1933, p.108). Further, only if the problem is decided will the teacher take the next step. The quality of the problem is the key for reflective thinking. However, Su does not name it considerately. She proposes the problem intuitively and did not mention the context. Her criterion for deciding the problem is the authority’s view. The following only presents the two problems pre-service teachers focus intensively: repetition and unclear instruction. Further, the features of their reflection will be elucidated as well as the influential factors on their reflection.

Teacher Xin

Extract 2

1 T: Now let’s have a practice. Finish, finish the sentence. (on the PPT, there are two blank-filling sentences: His parents don’t allow him_____[go] with us; We don’t allow ____ here. However, “go” in the first sentence and
“here” in the second sentence do not appear on the screen, so the teacher read and write the two words again in the following.)

2 Ss: Silent.

3 T: GO, GO, HERE. (point at PPT)

4 Ss: To go, to go. (several students answer)

5 T: The first one?

6 Ss: To go.

7 T: Yes. To go. Allow somebody to do something. Number two?

8 Ss: Smoking.

9 T: Yes, smoking. Allow somebody smoking something. And the last one, ... (the teacher continues.)

(source: Xin 20121129T)

This is an excerpt from Xin’s class. The teaching aim is that all the students can grasp the word “allow”. After class, Xin reflected the classroom discourse. According to his reflective diary, many problems appear. One prominent problem is many repetitions filled in his talk. The teacher writes like this “When some student gives me correct answer, I always repeat their words. Sometimes I think it is too verbose. I hope next time I can overcome this fault”. Here, “sometimes” means not all the repetitions are problems in his opinion, but he does not make an further illustration on it. Moreover, it is obvious that Xin decided to reduce inefficient words and avoid too much repetition. His reflective thinking begins with defining the problem, then evaluate this problem, finally make a solution. In the three short sentences, he just finished two phrases of reflective thinking: name the problem and solve it. It is apparent this thinking is lack of analysis phrase. Analysis means “clarifying the seemingly incoherent and disconnected facts after clearing up the problem” (Dewey, 1910, p.111). It is a core phrase of reflective thinking. His incoherent reflection just falls on the second phrase of spontaneous interpretation of the experience, Dewey described this step like this: “[a person] may jump without weighing the grounds on which it rests; he may forgo or unduly shorten the act of hunting, inquiring; he may take the first ‘answer’, or solution.” (Dewey, 1933, p.10).

The above talks about the feature of student teachers’ reflection in reflection-on-action. The following will present an example in reflection-in-action.

**unclear instructions**

“unclear instructions” are proposed 13 times in total. Here is teacher A’s example below.

**Teacher A**

In the classroom observation, the researcher wrote down the field note like this:

“when the teacher said ‘Now, discuss the topic ‘my friend’ with your partner.’, students begins to discuss with their partner. After a while, the teacher asked ‘you know PARTNER’?. Some students near the teacher stopped to listen to the teacher, but others did not. Then the teacher continued to say ‘I’ll give you about five minutes’ in a louder voice. At this moment, more students mentioned the teacher’s words.” (source: A 20121107F)

**Extract 3**

Interviewer: In your diary, you talked about the problem about unclear instruction. Could you talk more about it?

A: yeah, I feel my instruction is not clear. Some students don’t follow my instruction after I make instructions. I must use simpler instructions next time.

Interviewer: What do you mean “simpler instruction”?  
A: This Monday, In my class, I used an inefficient instruction, you know, I taught English in Class Two.

Interviewer: Yes.

A: When I asked students to talk the topic “my friends”, my instruction was complicated and not concise. A few students began to discuss after I instructed. When I added some more instructions, many students did not mention my words. Next time I will make a simpler one.

Interviewer: How do you make it simpler?

A: Maybe I can use shorter words or sentences.

(source: A 20121108F)

According to the field note, the problem teacher A has met is that her instructions are not mentioned by students. In teacher A’ words, her problem is unclear instruction and the solution focuses on the modification of the words and sentences. The careful analysis on the field note shows that her instruction did not occur at the moment the students are quiet and ready to listen enough. Her problem is partly to complicated sentences and partly to the noisy environment when giving instruction. It is easy to comb down her reflection thread: the problem is complicated instruction upon which students cannot catch, so a few students discuss with partner. The teacher made a spontaneous analysis by observing the students’ behavior in the action and took a solution of asking if they know the meaning of “partner”. It seems this reflection-in-action is perfect, but her judgment and analysis deviates, which leads to inappropriate solution. Compared with A’s solution, the other two pre-service teachers’ answers are much more abstract on “unclear instruction”. Su wrote down “I will do my best to present a clear instruction”, Xin wrote down “Next time I will attention the efficiency of my instruction”. Those solutions are hard to be tested in practice although it sounds reasonable. It is possible that they cannot solve the similar problem because they have not found out a specific measure.

To sum, conceptualization is one typical feature of student teachers’ reflection. Some characteristics of
conceptualization emerge during the phrases of these student teacher’s reflective thinking. 1. The ideas from the authority become criteria for deciding and solving the problem. These criteria are be used in any situations and in any time in student teachers’ reflection. 2. The student teachers often stop at spontaneous interpretation of the experience. This is similar to “reflect instinctively” proposed by Schon (1987). Although the conceptualization thinking influences the quality of reflection, the student teachers’ attitude should be praised. For the teacher Su, she strives to connect her cognition with the practice and be aware of the importance of confidence as a teacher.

(2) Three reasons why student teachers’ reflection is conceptualized

The abovementioned has discussed the focuses and feature of pre-service teachers’ reflective thinking on classroom discourse. This section summarizes three main influential factors on it. The first one is the lack of teaching practice. The second is the lack of knowledge about the students. The third is their identity.

As a pre-service teacher, the most significant annoying thing is the lack of teaching practice. Because of the limited practice experience, they feel out of control when facing the incidents unexpected. Based on their reflection, incidents unexpected often leads to much repetitions, unclear instruction and other bad points in classroom discourse. As Rodgers (2002) said “the explanations that arise will come from a synthesis of the meaning derived from the current experience with that drawn from previous experience”. Student teachers, lack of experience, means they lost one important teaching cognition resources for recourse compared with experienced teachers. In Wallace (1991, p.19)’s TEFL Teachers’ Reflective Professional Development Model, it also proposes received knowledge are necessary for reflection. Tsui (2003) made a comparative study on the teaching cognition schemata between experienced teachers and novice teachers. The result shows that experienced teachers’ cognition schemata is much more complicated. When they face the difficulty in class, they can draw a solution from their cognition and make an informed decision rapidly. Comparatively, pre-service teachers are nervous at the face of difficulties and are easy to make unsuitable reactions in the class.

As a new comer in a middle school, pre-service teachers’ understanding on their students is rather limited. They don’t know what language knowledge the students have grasped, and which teaching method the students prefer best. Their reflection is full of these puzzles. For example, W2’s diary wrote, “when I ask students to answer my question, no one responds, so I think maybe they don’t know my words, but I don’t know which words they don’t understand, and finally I translate all of my words into Chinese”. From her reflection, the problem of “too much use of Chinese” comes from her lack of knowledge about the students.

Pre-service teachers’ identity is in an embarrassed situation in that teacher identity and student identity converge together during the period of practicum. The two identities are in conflict, which require them to adjust flexibly and carefully. Although they are teachers in the class, they regard themselves as students on most occasions. During teaching, they will pay much attention to the mentor’s facial expression on the last row in the classroom. After the class, they will ask for their mentors’ suggestions in time. Of course, learning from more able teachers is necessary and beneficial. However, it influences their teaching if overloaded. Hu complained that her class was always being monitored by her mentors, which gave her uncomfortable feeling. The reason is that she thinks she is an independent teacher in the class and her teaching shouldn’t be monitored every time. Her uncomfortable feeling influenced the classroom discourse deeply while being monitored. In her reflection on the problem of “inefficient feedback”, she wrote, “I thought I must make some mistakes because the monitor looks very serious. I felt very nervous and hoped to end this class as soon as possible”. Apart from her, some other pre-service teachers have similar feeling. Further, they perform in a lack of self esteem, which leads to lose the ability to control the lesson if they take the authority as the criterion of defining the problem. In some sense, these discourses are symbols of pre-service teachers’ periphery identity in language teaching because they don’t establish a stable status in the class and often feel guilty at the first sight if meeting troubles in the classroom. Wang Chenguang (2007) thinks that the pre-service teacher wants legitimate position in a new environment, which stimulate them to struggle to win mentors’ or supervisors’ positive appraisal. This intention directs them to mention themselves too much and handicaps their quality of reflective thinking.

VI. Conclusions

A. Some Important Points

(1) As the abovementioned, the focuses of pre-service teachers’ reflective thinking emerge with 11 points on the classroom discourse. Their reflective diaries and interviews are all full of self-blame. They are so eager to improve teaching and acquire a legitimate position in the community of English teaching that they put too much focuses on their own behavior. This anxiety promotes the teachers to reflect actively on one hand, but shades their eyes to pursue other evidences to analyze the problems.

(2) The features of pre-service teachers’ reflective thinking on discourse are as following: in judging the problem, their reflection tends to be dependent on authorities; in analyzing the problem, their reflection is lack of collecting various evidences; in solving the problem, their reflection tends to be absolute or abstract. In fact, they often conclude the solution spontaneously. These features reflect that pre-service teachers’ reflective thinking on discourse are full of conceptualization. The sources of conceptualized theories are various, such as the textbooks or the mentor.

① In China, the mentor usually sits on the back row to observe the student teachers’ teaching.
The hidden reasons for conceptualization is lack of experiences, knowledge of students and the dilemma identity. Because of lack of experiences, student teachers’ schemata are not enough to think broadly and deeply and deal with unexpected problems in teaching instantly. Owing to lack of knowledge of students, they don’t know what instructions can be understood easily by the students. The dilemma identity leads to a tension between dependent growth and independent growth during the period of practicum.

B. Suggestions

As mentioned earlier, the student teachers concerned about physiological aspect and pedagogical aspects a lot in their reflection. Moreover, their reflections are conceptualized: depending on authorities and lack of the phrase of careful analysis. The hidden reasons include their small teaching schemata, their dilemma identity and a little knowledge about their students. However, it is hard to deny the functions of the authorities totally. After all, at the beginning of teaching, the teachers need a strong dependence, which can support them when they fall into troubles and resist the failure feeling. However, they should learn to face many troubles independently in the future. Some suggestions are shown with respect to the teacher educators and pre-service teachers in reflective practice.

(1) What the teacher educator does during practicum is to scaffold pre-teachers, not to provide suggestions directly. The teacher educator should assist pre-service teachers to be a thoughtful and critical thinker, not directly propose the measures. Since reflective thinking in practicum is the basis of teachers’ professional development (Han Gang, 2011, p.40), the teacher educator should pay much attention on how to improve pre-service teachers’ thinking. When they point out student teachers’ fault, they need to direct them to think logically. Furthermore, they should be much more reflective on their instruction. It is no doubt that unreflective teacher educator is hard to cultivate reflective teachers. The teacher educator must be clear about their role in practicum period.

(2) Pre-service teachers should try best to know their students and enhance teaching schemata. Two points are necessary to mention. First, there is a wrong viewpoint that the knowledge of students and teaching can merely be grasped in practice as the public theories and experiences are enriched. Actually, the pedagogical lessons can provide them enough psychological and educational knowledge about students when they study in their University. These public knowledge should be digested and reflected in-depth before they enter into practicum. Second, they should fulfill any chance to know their students and teaching in practicum, such as chatting with students, getting students’ information from their headmaster, asking help from experienced teachers etc.. To some extent, “face” is the most obstacles to hinder Chinese teachers to accumulate teachers’ knowledge. In this study, most of pre-service teachers admit that asking for help is to present their weakness and lose their face. For them, the only way to know their students is limited to classroom teaching.

C. Recommendation for Further Research

There are some limitations in the study. On the research method, the further researches can combine quantitative investigation and qualitative methods. Moreover, pre-service teachers’ reflective thinking ability can be traced along with teaching experience increasing. Teachers’ professional development begins with the pre-service period and develops in in-service period, so a longitudinal research is quite meaningful. On research perspective, the further study can explore the students’ viewpoints on teachers’ reflection on classroom discourse systematically. After all, an ecological classroom is created by both of teachers and students.

APPENDIX 1

Basic principles for the semi-structured interviews

(1) only ask the question with the interrogatives like “why”, “how”, “what”.

(2) Discuss around the reflective diaries.

APPENDIX 2

One example of teacher Su’s reflective diary (original edition)

针对本节课的retell环节,从我本身的话语里可以看出存在以下问题:
(1) 太多重复句了。就是在下指令或者让学生注意的时候，不停地在重复同一句子。例如：ok, now 这些词。
分析原因：首先肯定最重要的原因还是我本身的问题。当时很紧张，所以就不停的重复句型来缓解紧张的情绪。
其次，因为是初一的学生，没有很好的学习习惯，上课很吵闹，所以很多学生就没有听到我的指令，所以就需要进一步的来重复刚才的指令，这样才能让学生听懂。
具体改进：对于重复的问题，以后我会尽可能多避免，在平时的说话当中就要尽力避免，这样才能形成良好的习惯。
我可以等班上学生安静以后在进行下一步的指示，这样就可以避免类似情况的发生，或者一个眼神，一个动作来示意给吵闹的学生，让学生明白自己已经影响到了上课秩序。
------Su 2012 年 11 月 11 日
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