Feedback on teachers' journal entries: a blessing or a curse?

Ruth Otienoh

Feedback on teachers' journal entries: a blessing or a curse?

Ruth Otienoh*

Aga Khan University-Institute for Educational Development Eastern Africa, Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania

Giving feedback on journal entries in the context of teacher education programmes is a contested issue. While some educationists argue that it is necessary if Course Participants (CPs) have to conceptualise the complex process of reflective journaling, others argue that this has ethical implications that may curtail CPs from achieving critical analysis level of events, issues and situations leading to deeper reflections – one of the goals of feedback. This study sought to find out why, despite feedback being given on teachers' journal entries during the Certificate of Education Programmes, they fail to move from the descriptive to analytical stage of deeper reflections. This was done by exploring teachers' perceptions and experiences of feedback on their journal entries. This study established that teachers did not appreciate, and resented the feedback given on their journal entries. They expressed that the feedback and the way it was given not only discouraged them from journaling, but also made them feel de-motivated, thus, incompetent in the activity of reflective journaling. Hence feedback failed to achieve its goal of enhancing teachers' deeper reflections

Keywords: journal; entries; feedback; descriptive; analytical

Introduction

I work in a teacher education institution that seeks to contribute to the provision of quality education in East Africa. We therefore conduct several teacher development programmes. These include the six-month Certificate in Education Programmes (CEPs). These programmes' ultimate goal is to create a critical mass of teachers in schools who are able to work collaboratively with colleagues to bring about whole school improvement. Therefore, the programmes aim at improving teachers' content knowledge, while introducing them to non-traditional teaching and learning methodologies, reflective practice and relevant current educational issues.

A fundamental tenet of the programmes is to integrate theory with sound classroom practices. Thus, a large component of the programmes is school-based, occurring in the teachers' actual classrooms. This enables them to try out the newly learnt teaching and learning approaches and reflect on their experiences. Hence reflective practice is one aspect of the programmes that is given emphasis. The aim is to empower teachers to have ownership of their professional development and improve their practice.

We encourage the use of journals as tools for learning to ensure that teachers are actively engaged in the reflecting process. To enable teachers to conceptualise the

*Email: ruth.otienoh@aku.edu or ruth.otienoh@akuied.ac.tz

complex process of journaling and to maximise learning, the teachers' journal entries are read and responded to by facilitators during the period of the CEPs. It is envisaged that these experiences may enable teachers to become active reflective practitioners, particularly after the completion of the programmes.

Although feedback has the potential to promote deeper levels of reflections (Samuels & Betts, 2008), it has been realised over the years that this is not the case for most of our target primary school teachers. Very few are able to move from the descriptive to deeper analytical levels of reflections. Questions have been raised as to why this is the case. It has been argued, among others reasons, that perhaps the type of feedback given does not successfully help teachers to critically reflect. However, this study sought to explore teachers' perceptions of feedback on their journal entries. These may ultimately inform us why feedback does not achieve the expected goal.

This study was therefore guided with the question: *What are teachers' experiences and perceptions of feedback on their journal entries?*

Reflective practice in the CEPs

The concept of reflective practice is one among many concepts introduced to teachers during the CEPs. The objective is to enable teachers to have ownership of their professional development, hence to be able to learn and grow from their own practice after the completion of the programmes. Apart from teachers being theoretically introduced to this concept, they have a hands-on experience of reflecting through journals.

To enable teachers to conceptualise the complex process of journal writing, they go through a rigorous experience. They are expected to journal daily. It is expected that when writing, teachers identify a critical incident, describe it and critically analyse its implications in relation to their practice – an indication of deeper analytical reflections. Identification of critical incidents would have an effect on teachers' thinking and action, thus prompting them to critically analyse and examine the incident (Husu, Toom, & Patrikainen, 2008). This is also a way of moving them away from describing events. Their journal entries are read and the facilitators give feedback. This is to help them conceptualise the process of reflective practice and improve the quality of their journaling by having deeper critical analytical reflections, instead of simply describing issues and events.

Feedback is in the form of comments, questions and remarks written, in most cases, within the text of the entries for the teachers to easily relate them to the content of their entries. In addition, general comments are written at the end of each entry, pointing out their strengths and areas to be improved upon (see Appendix 1). At times, teachers are also required to share their reflections with the rest of the class and both facilitators and their colleagues give feedback.

Literature review

In this literature review, I analyse the importance of feedback to teachers' journal entries and discuss certain aspects of feedback that might impede teachers from developing journal-writing skills, which include the writing of deeper analytical reflections.

Feedback on journal entries acts as a support mechanism to get teachers started with reflection and as they deepen reflection (Samuels & Betts, 2008). This is vital because the process of 'reflection is a complex, rigorous, intellectual and emotional

enterprise that takes time to do well' (Dewey, 1933 p. 38). It also requires the use of higher-level metacognitive skills (Calderhead, 1988, cited in Moon & Boullon, 1997) of critical thinking. Therefore, the support system which may be done through prompts, examples, metaphors and direct instruction is to ensure that teachers have the underpinning knowledge and skills (ibid) of deeper analytical reflections. These help teachers, and at the same time give them emotional support (Bean & Stevens, 2002) they need as they grapple with the complex process of reflection.

As a result of the foregoing argument, feedback may ensure success and motivation arising from achievement. It also has the potential to promote deeper levels of reflections (Samuels & Betts, 2008).

However, despite the above argument in favour of feedback on journal entries, some educationists have advanced an argument that feedback may curtail teachers from developing critical analytical skills for deeper reflections. For example, journals are generally perceived as intimate and personal, hence confidential writings. They have 'the potential to contain a plethora of ethical issues' (Ghaye, 2007 p.15). These include 'rights to autonomy, confidentiality, anonymity, privacy and dignity … conflicting loyalties … and encroachment of personal liberty' (p. 15).

Nonetheless, in many teacher education programmes, although the reading and giving feedback on teachers' journal entries is to ensure success and motivation arising from achievement and has the potential to promote deeper reflection levels, Ghaye (2007) and Ghaye and Lilyman (1999) raise ethical issues about sharing journals with tutors who are not intimately known to teachers. Ghaye implies that it is unethical to read teachers' journals and to ask them to be honest and give more details about their intimate feelings. These could impede not only deeper analytical reflections, but also any reflections at all if teachers perceive the information they have to share to be intimate, private and confidential.

Moreover, reading and giving feedback to reflective journal entries implies assessment of the entries, which indicates that there is a preferred way of writing reflective journals. The pressure to perform well therefore discourages honest and uninhibited reflections (Hargreaves, 2004). Furthermore, Hobbs (2007) argues that teachers will naturally feel resentment towards a stipulation that asks them to be open and honest about their beliefs whilst implying that a certain response is preferable. For these reasons Hargreaves, concludes that reflection and assessment are incompatible. Nevertheless, assessment of journals may bear positive results if it 'is designed to be developmental rather than regulatory' (Ryan, 2007, p. 197).

Methodology

Research design

This study sought to explore and understand teachers' perceptions of the facilitators' feedback on their journal entries. This was inferred from their sentiments of their experiences and perceptions about reflective practice and journal writing. Therefore, this research was of a qualitative, interpretative/hermeneutic nature, since it focused on an analysis of the meaning participants (teachers and facilitators) conferred upon their perceptions (Robson, 2002) of teaching and learning about reflective practice and engaging in journal writing and ultimately how they felt about the feedback given to their journal entries. My role was to understand and make sense of participants' sentiments and to construct meaning out of them (Usher, 1996). This involved interpretations of their actions (experiences), while the participants were interpreters

of the same. This was a double hermeneutic process (Usher, 1996), since it involved interpretations of interpretations.

The phenomenological approach was used to try and 'gain entry into the conceptual world of informants in order to understand how and what meaning they constructed around events in their daily lives' (Geortz, 1973, in Bogdan and Biklen, 2007, p. 26). Thus, teachers' conceptual world of reflection, what meaning they constructed around the event of journaling, and feedback given on their journal entries, was explored. In addition, facilitators' experiences of teaching and engaging teachers in the process of reflective practice through journaling, which included giving feedback on teachers' journal entries, was also explored.

Sample and sampling procedure

The study involved 12 participants: eight CEP graduate teachers of both public (government) and private primary schools, and four certificate course facilitators. I was therefore able to access the views of both the teachers who were the consumers of feedback and those who facilitated teachers' engagement with journal writing and gave them feedback.

I considered eight teachers to be appropriate for rich and reliable data that could lead to generalised findings. I had an equal number of male and female teachers from both private and public schools who attended the CEPs at different times: in 2004, 2005 and 2006 for diverse experiences and perceptions about facilitators' feedback on their journal entries.

I deliberately sought to include four experienced facilitators, those who had facilitated at least three programmes for diverse details about their experiences of the process of engaging teachers in reflective practice, and to have an insight of the type of feedback they give to teachers, and their perceptions about it. Moreover, facilitators would perhaps be able to tell why feedback does not serve the purpose of enabling teachers to have deeper analytical reflections.

The facilitators were Masters in Education (MEd) – Teacher Education graduates, known as Professional Development Teachers (PDTs). Two of them were male and two were female. One was a lead teacher (a title for a PDT in charge of professional development programmes) in a private school. While two were teacher educators with my institution, the fourth one was with the Ministry of Education, teacher in-service unit, Tanzania. Apart from facilitating CEPs, their jobs involved working with teachers. Therefore, from these very experienced positions they were able to give rich information that deepened my insight into teachers' up-take of and their perceptions about feedback on teachers' journal entries. During their MEd course, PDTs are introduced to the concept of reflective practice and journal writing.

In this paper, I used codes to identify the study's participants: T1–T8 and F1–F4 for teachers and facilitators respectively. I also used letters F (Female) and M (Male) to distinguish them by gender. For example, MT and FT symbolise male and female teachers while MF and FF represent male and female facilitators respectively

Methods of data collection

From the foregoing design, semi-structured interviews were the sole method of data collection. Semi-structured interviews enabled me to find out what was on the participants' minds and what they thought and felt about reflective practice (Wallen

& Fraenkel, 2001). This involved discussions and interpretations of participants' world (of reflection), and their expressions of how they regarded situations (journal-writing and feedback on their entries) from their point of view (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2006).

A phenomenological approach of using semi-structured interviews allowed me to access the past events and situations at which I was not able to be present (Scott, 1996). Thus, I was able to access and explore teachers' knowledge, values and preferences, attitudes and beliefs, which revealed their experiences and perceptions of journal writing and the feedback on their journal entries – situations that, would otherwise be difficult to access (Tuckman, 1972, cited in Cohen et al., 2006).

Analysis and interpretation of data

For data analysis, I used the Huberman and Miles approach (Punch, 2005; Robson, 2002) of analysing qualitative data. The essential activities of data reduction, data display and conclusion drawing/verification (Robson, 2000; Walliman, 2006) were utilised. Data reduction was done using coding and writing of memos (see Appendix 1) after data collection (Robson, 2002) through interviews. For data display purposes, I used 'session summary sheets' (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007 p. 162). These summarised what had been obtained from each interview. The summaries focused on issues such as: the teachers interviewed, the topics covered, their relevance to the research question, and implications for subsequent data collection (ibid and see Appendix 2). These displays organised my data and showed what stage the analysis had reached and, therefore, was a basis for further analysis (Punch, 2005).

I developed coding categories at two levels (Glesne, 2006). At the first level, descriptive codes were used (Punch, 2005); to separate materials bearing on a given topic from other data. This was done by searching through data for regularities and patterns, as well as for topics the data covered. I therefore stayed close to the data and let it speak for them (Wolcott, 1994, in Glesne, 2006). Phrases and words as indicated by the different quotations, representing topics and patterns, were written (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007).

At the second level, being a hermeneutic phenomenological study, the initial codes were broken down further into interpretative codes. I went beyond the factual data and probed what meaning was to be made of them ((Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). This is indicated by my interpretations of the descriptive data, which were then placed in a meaningful sequence (Glesne, 2006) to find a story that addressed my research questions.

Findings

In this section I analyse and interpret data from both the teachers of the facilitators, and examine their views about feedback on teachers' journal entries.

Participants views about feedback on journal entries

Most facilitators expressed satisfaction with the aspect of giving feedback to teachers' journal entries. They perceived this as a way of guiding them to 'refine' and 'reshape' the process of journaling (MF1); giving them a lead (FF2); and a way of gauging whether 'they can actually move up to the level of analysis' (MF4).

Two of the teachers (MT7, MT5) were positive about facilitators' comments on their journal entries. They argued that these helped them to conceptualise better the process of reflecting through journal writing. MT7 stated:

> By submitting our journals, I would get a clue of what exactly I should do … when I got the comments from facilitators and went through it (sic), I think this really helped to 'turn over' the practice of reflection.

To him this experience gave teachers a hands-on practice that helped to develop the skill of journaling: '… just teaching and leaving it at theoretical level won't help anybody to develop the skills'.

MT5 said the feedback was useful. Facilitators pointed out their weaknesses, which was a way of correcting or advising teachers, thus, enabling them to improve on their journal entries. He cited some of the comments that were written for him: 'why don't you reflect on that?' He went on: 'even if you didn't write well, it was, why didn't you write like this?' To him, there was no indication of ridicule in the feedback: 'It was also a good way of correcting or advising CPs [teachers] rather than saying this is very bad'. He argued, this exercise established a mentor-mentee relationship between the teachers and facilitators. However, it is difficult to establish the certainty of the above sentiments because MT5 laughed before he responded to the question on feedback. It is also difficult to ascertain whether this was a genuine response or whether this is what he thought I wanted to hear.

Nevertheless, many of the teachers pointedly argued that they found facilitators' feedback very discouraging. Even MT7, who sounded positive about this aspect of journaling, had the same feelings. He said: 'When I presented my first journal [entry] and it was read, I was told that it was not a good reflection'. However, in the same breath he retracted this sentiment when he said: 'those words were not the exact words. … the words were to encourage me and motivate me', the message had been passed. This might have occurred because he did not want to sound as if he was accusing the facilitating team of which I was a member. FT2 seemed to reiterate MT7 sentiments when she said: 'The first day I reflected, I was told it was not reflection. So I was discouraged completely'.

FT1 seemed to complain so much about facilitators' feedback:

> In the beginning, I thought that it was some kind of (sic) discouraging, because you were commenting there, that may be you haven't flashed back, not yet. So I was thinking, how should I write it down?

She also graphically explained how other teachers felt and their sentiments about facilitators' feedback:

> What have they [facilitators] written now? Ahhh (with a hissing sound) they [comments] are so bad this time. I really can't write any more. Some [teachers] say there are so many comments now. How can I improve? I am not going to write it next time.

These are sentiments of teachers who seemed to be very frustrated as a result of the type of feedback given about their journal entries. Similarly, the hissing sound might have indicated how fed-up and discouraged teachers felt, that some contemplated stopping journaling.

According to FT2 this made the whole activity very boring. She raised the issue of having so many comments written in their journals and the many questions asked:

> The second day I wrote, [with a complaining tone-dragging words] [there was] a whole paragraph of comments, and questions [claps], why, what, who. It was very boring …boring … and I felt discouraged.

The complaining tone, dragging of words, and the clap could have been an indication of how fed-up and frustrated she felt about the many comments made and questions asked on her journal entries.

MF1 and FF2 confirmed this when they explained how comments (feedback) are written in the journals – that comments are not written at the end of the journal entry text but rather, as MF1 explained:

> You comment all through [within the text], all along: If you see something is not clear you ask a question there … [For example], that is a good comment, but can you elaborate on this? This is a good one, will it be beneficial to your school? Can it be implemented?

Although facilitators perceived the comments as a way of guiding teachers to conceptualise the process of journal writing, these many 'little comments' (see Appendix1), as MF1 terms them, seemed to irk most teachers. Perhaps teachers interpreted them to mean that they were incapable of reflecting competently (FF2). However, FM4 argues that because teachers lacked critical thinking skills, they did not have the capacity to interact meaningfully with feedback, to enable them improve on their journal entries.

Moreover, according to MF4, because teachers did not believe that reflective journaling could make them better teachers, there is a possibility that teachers perceive feedback on their journals as not meaningful. Perhaps this justifies the sentiments by FF3 that when she gave descriptive feedback the teachers would simply regurgitate it in their subsequent entry instead of using it to improve on the entries.

The foregoing sentiments indicate that although facilitators were of the opinion that feedback on teachers' journal entries would result in positive journal writing skills of deeper analytical reflections, this was not the case. Rather, teachers felt discouraged, de-motivated and hence incapable of reflecting competently. They developed very negative attitude and feelings towards it, hence impeding them from developing the appropriate skills of the process of reflective practice and journal writing.

Discussions and recommendations

Discussion

Dewey (1933) argues that 'reflection is a complex, rigorous, intellectual and emotional enterprise that takes time to do well' (p. 38). It also requires the use of higher-level metacognitive skills (Calderhead, 1988, cited in Moon & Boullon, 1997) of critical thinking. These take time, and need appropriate opportunities to be developed. Moreover, both emotional and cognitive support (Samuels & Betts, 2008) is essential if teachers have to develop appropriate skills for reflections. It is therefore important that feedback is given to teachers that have been introduced to journal writing for the first time. Feedback is essential for emotional support and for helping them to develop critical thinking skills for deeper analytical reflections.

From this study, the facilitators seemed satisfied with the type of feedback and how it was given on the teachers' journal entries. It was to guide them in refining and re-shaping their entries, hence enable them write deeper analytical reflections. The feedback as Samuels and Betts (2008) state, was to ensure success and motivation arising from achievement for the teachers, and to promote deeper levels of reflection.

However, in this study feedback on teachers' journal entries had the opposite effect – it discouraged, de-motivated and made teachers feel incompetent at journaling. It also created a threatening atmosphere that affected their confidence (Hobbs, 2007); hence, deeper levels of reflection in the majority of teachers were curtailed.

Moreover, giving feedback and critiquing teachers' journal entries indicates that there is a preferred way of writing reflective journals. Hobbs (2007) argues that teachers will naturally feel resentment towards a stipulation that asks them to be open and honest about their beliefs whilst implying that a certain response is preferable. He therefore suggests that given the personal nature of reflective practice, teachers should be involved in choosing the format of their reflections, but I would add that some guidance from facilitators is needed.

Writing reflective journals is viewed as a personal, private and intimate affair. Ghaye (2007). Ghaye and Lilyman, (1999) raise ethical issues about the privacy and confidentiality of journal entries, and sharing these with tutors who are not intimately known to teachers. Ghaye implies that it is unethical to read teachers' journals and ask them to be honest and give more details about their intimate feelings. Therefore, there is a possibility that the above-argument impacted on teachers' ability to open-up, divulge and analyse their intimate feelings while reflecting. Thus, they remained at the descriptive level, despite getting feedback that was supposed to help them to the analytical level.

Recommendations

Although reading and giving feedback has ethical implications (Ghaye, 2007), I realise that it may be difficult to avoid reading and giving feedback on teachers' journals if they have to conceptualise the process of journaling. However, we have to ensure that we give feedback in such a way that serves its purpose of ensuring success and motivation arising from achievement, and having the potential to promote deeper levels of reflection (Samuels & Betts, 2008). Perhaps friendly and encouraging feedback would serve this purpose. This can be given in terms of developmental rather than regulatory feedback (Ryan, 2007).

Conclusion

From the study, although facilitators' perceived that feedback would enable teachers to have deeper analytical reflections, this was not the case. Due to an interplay of diverse factors, it seems apparent that teachers resented the type of feedback that was given about their journal entries. Moreover, feedback facilitated feelings of discouragement, de-motivation and incompetence at journaling among the teachers. As a result, many of them did not view it as meaningful; hence it did not serve its purpose of helping teachers to have deeper analytical reflections.

Furthermore, it was asserted that most teachers did not seem to perceive reflective journaling to be of any value to their profession. This could be the reason why they do not utilise feedback as expected.

Notes on contributor

Ruth Otienoh is a teacher educator at the Aga-Khan University-Institute for Educational Development, Eastern Africa, which is based in Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania. Her work involves

teaching and conducting research in teacher educational issues. The study here emanates from this experience. She is also currently pursuing a Doctoral in Education (EdD) degree at the Institute of Education, University of London.

References

Bean, T., & Stevens, L. (2002). Scaffolding reflection for pre-service and in-service teachers. *Reflective Practice, 3*(2), 205–218.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Quality research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2006). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think.* Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Ghaye, A. (2007). Is reflective practice ethical? (The case of reflective portfolio). *Journal of Reflective Practice, 8*(2), 151–152.

Ghaye, A., & Lillyman, S. (1999). *Learning Journals and critical incidents: Reflective practice for health care professionals, key management skills in nursing.* Salisbury: Mark Allen.

Glesne, C. (2006). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction* (3rd ed). Boston: Pearson.

Hargreaves, J. (2004). So how do you feel about this? Assessing reflective practice. *Nurse Education Today, 24*(3), 196–201.

Hobbs, V. (2007). Faking it of hating it: Can reflective practice be forced? *Journal of Reflective Practice, 8*(3), pp. 405–417.

Husu, J., Toom, A., & Patrikainen, S. (2008). Guided reflection as a means to demonstrate and develop student teachers reflective competencies. *Journal of Reflective Practice, 9*(1), 37–51.

Moon, J., & Boullon, R.L. (1997). Reluctance to reflect: Issues in professional development. In *English Language teaching review in-service teacher development: International perspectives,* ed. Hayes, D. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Punch, K. (2005). *Introduction to social research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research.* Victoria: Blackwell.

Ryan, J. (2007). Exploring 'lifewide learning' as a vehicle for shifting pre-service teachers' concepts of teaching and learning. In T. Townsend & R. Bates (Eds.), *Handbook of teacher education: globalisation, standards and professionalism in times of change* (pp. 193–204). The Netherlands: Springer.

Samuels, M., & Betts, J. (2008). Crossing the threshold from descriptive to deconstructive and reconstruction: Using self-assessment to deepen reflection. *Journal of Reflective Practice, 78*(2), 269–283.

Scott, D. (1996). Methods and data in educational research. In D. Scott & R. Usher (Eds.), *Understanding educational research* (pp. 52–73). London: Routledge.

Usher, R. (1996). A critique of the neglected epistemological assumptions of educational research. In D. Scott & R. Usher (Eds.). *Understanding educational research* (pp. 9–32). London, Routledge.

Wallen, N.E., & Fraenkel, J.R. (2001). *Educational research: A guide to the process* (2nd ed.). New Jersey and London: Erlbaum Associates.

Walliman, N. (2006). *Social research methods.* London: Sage.

Appendix 1

27th June 2005.

At the end of the day I learned how to enrich the curriculum. Enriching curriculum means adding to the exeisting curriculum knowledge to be more relevant and up-dated.

As a teacher I am supposed to use all kinds of resources to make my pupil understand the lesson. In so doing I am suppose to teach by using teaching aids such as Action, Songs, news paper charts, flash cards, cuttings, puzzles and debates. *why* As a teacher I should be selective to what I teach are according to age, class place and ability. *Why* All material should focus the topic I am teaching. All the resources which will support learning must be big enough for the class to see, well drawn, drawn in a correct correct colour, it should be not poisonous, not flammable. From now own I will use as many resources as I can to make my pupils understand well.

Which resources will be available and appropriate in your context

1/07/05

30th June 2005

~~Today I learnt~~

Today was a micro-teaching day. This day I learnt different teaches approaches where by different teaches used to teach in class, different stages following their lesson plan.

It is really a day of to remember as different ~~teacher~~ used different method.

This day I learnt a lot about how a teacher should be prepaired before the lesson and the teacher has to be comfortable in presenting his objectives so that it can be understood to the pupils. In my opinion I have gained and ~~expet~~ ~~to~~ changed according to my previous teaching and I shall use the new technique learn in the course.

7th December 2005

Today was presentation day of the workshop presentation. It was very busy day everybody was busy for writing their workshop plan. I have presented my workshop plan for my school. I learnt that before all this ~~pass~~ process I had to contact my headteacher the accademic teachers for the go ahead.

I also learnt the cooperation is needed in any society. As the Cp were so helpfull to give their suggestions, opinion to the ones presented. This will help me to correct myself where I have made a mistake.

What is it that made you learn the need for cooperation? you need to be more analytical in the issues that you identify.

Appendix 2: interview reflective memos

Interview with MF4

Making an interview appointment with MF4 was not a problem. We agreed that when he gets some time he would inform me and then agree on the appropriate time for interview since he was conducting a CEP in Nairobi. He eventually found some time and informed me about it.

MF4 and I have facilitated CEPs. Professionally we are very much familiar in how we work and relate. However, this familiarity did not seem to interfere with the interview at all. MF4 seemed to be very honest in his responses. I guess it is because he knows the value of research and the implications of participants being superficial in their responses.

Interviewing MF4 was very intriguing. He was very honest in his responses to questions and did not seem to feel that I was testing him on certain issues like one facilitator seemed to feel when I was interviewing him. He used examples, metaphors and illustrations to explain certain issues he raised. He had particular insights into the CEPs and specifically into teachers' perceptions and their experiences of the programmes.

MF4 seemed to be very passionate about what he was talking about. For example, when he mentioned that teachers do not seem to value reflective practice because they do not think that it will make them better teachers, and all they are interested in is to be introduced to methodology, he gave an example of his recent experience of the programme he was facilitating. He narrated how he wanted to get teachers to understand the goal of teaching mathematics, but they perceived this as a waste of time. He went further and said how the teachers at break time, in the absence of facilitators, wrote the word METHODOLOGY on the blackboard. This seemed to irk MF4. Due to this, his perception was that teachers wanted ready recipes that would enable them to ease their teaching of mathematics.

So far MF4 is the only facilitator who has recognised that the reason teachers are unable to utilise feedback and have deeper analytical reflections is because they lack the capacity of critical thinking that is needed for reflections. He put so much emphasis on this as a challenge for teachers, hence continuing to teach this concept to teachers would not make a difference.

To illustrate what critical thinking entails, he illustrated it with a story of a villager who knew exactly how snakes inhabit their underground residence and how if you kill one in a hole you have to look for the partner in the different direction of the same hole.

Appendix 3

Table A1.   Session summary sheet 2 (teachers).

Teachers interviewed	Topics covered	Relevance to research question	Implication to subsequent data collection
Teacher MT7	His background information – his experience of teaching in years, experience, why he chose to attend the CEP and what he gained or learnt from the CEP. Issues related to reflective practice and journal writing. How the facilitators introduced the two. His understanding of reflective practice and journal writing. His perception of journaling. Other teachers' perception and experience of journaling. His perception of feedback given by facilitators on journal entries.	The topics explored and the responses were very much related to the research questions. Aspects of how the concept was introduced, how teachers understood and their knowledge of reflective practice and journal writing were explored and responses from the participant were related to the questions. Issues revealed of how reflective journaling was received by teachers indicated how teachers perceived the whole activity and the challenges they encountered.	Due to my insider position, MT7 seemed to hold back information. Perhaps I have to emphasise the objective of this study to teachers and assure them once more that the information given will be treated with utmost confidence.

Table A2.   Session summary sheet 1 (facilitators).

Facilitators interviewed	Topics covered	Relevance to research question	Implication to subsequent data collection
Facilitator MF 4	Background information about the number of CEPs facilitated and his experiences of facilitating the CEPs. This was in terms of how the concept of reflective practice was introduced, how journal writing was introduced. How teachers experienced perceived both reflective practice and journal writing, what challenges teachers encountered with reflective practice and journal writing during the CEP.	Teachers' uptake of reflective practice and their experiences of the concept and journal writing are relevant for the research question. These revealed how teachers grapple with reflective writing which is as result of, according to MF, lack of teachers' capacity in critical thinking skills.	The issue of what can be done to ensure teachers are able to conceptualise enable them to sustain has to be explored in the subsequent interviews.