

Teacher Reflection in Practice: Reflection-in-Action and Reflection-on-Action in Pronunciation Teaching in a Multilingual Cambridge Curriculum Classroom

Yolinda Pramudanti¹, Sri Wahyuni²

^{1,2}English Language Education, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Semarang, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: Yolinda Pramudanti

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20260905>

ABSTRACT

Teacher reflection is widely recognized as a critical component of professional growth, there exists a knowledge gap regarding its mechanism of action in pronunciation instruction in multilingual and curricular-specified settings. This study aimed to explore how an English teacher in a Cambridge Curriculum secondary school in Semarang, Indonesia, reflected on her pronunciation instruction while working with students with diverse linguistic backgrounds. A qualitative case study design was utilized, and the data were collected through a teacher reflection sheet completed after two observed lessons and a semi-structured interview. The data were analyzed using Braun and Clarke's (2006) thematic analysis method, guided by Farrell's (2018) framework of reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action. Four themes were uncovered, with two corresponding to each side of the reflective cycle. In particular, the teacher constantly evaluated the students' responses during instruction and modified her explanations, pace, and error correction in accordance with them. After the lesson, she reassessed her performance and formulated actionable items for future classes. Thus, the two stages of reflection appeared to merge into a single instructional cycle, with reflection-

on-action informing reflection-in-action for the next lesson. The analysis revealed that the teacher's reflection-in-action was largely informed by the limitations of the lesson time rather than the students' language backgrounds. The study showed that reflective practice could be instrumental in instructional improvement by formalizing the reflective cycle into discrete steps, which may be beneficial in contexts where reflective practice is not institutionalized.

Keywords: teacher reflection, reflection-in-action, reflection-on-action, pronunciation teaching, multilingual classroom, Cambridge Curriculum

INTRODUCTION

Although pronunciation is regarded as one of the most critical areas for acquiring communicative competence in the English as a Foreign Language (EFL) context, it has not been prioritized in teaching practice to the same extent as grammar or lexis. Classroom-based studies indicate that, despite teachers' general understanding of the importance of pronunciation instruction for learners' communicative competence, in practice, due to syllabus and examination constraints, they often address it in a decontextualized and routinized manner (Miller & Claire, 2018; Tiwari, 2024). There is a wealth of pedagogical literature

documenting the chasm between teachers' professed beliefs about the significance of pronunciation and their actual classroom practice. Empirical investigations also reveal that explicit instruction in pronunciation is significantly more beneficial for enhancing learners' intelligibility than repetitive pronunciation drilling (Derwing & Munro, 2015).

Teacher reflection, a cyclical process that involves making sense of one's teaching experiences and questioning past practices, has been shown to be critical to fostering professional competence (Farrell, 2018). It can be manifested in two forms: reflection-in-action, which occurs while teaching is happening, and reflection-on-action, which occurs after teaching has taken place.

The present study was conducted in one of the secondary schools in Indonesia that utilizes the Cambridge Curriculum as its educational framework. The Cambridge Curriculum, developed by Cambridge Assessment International Education and adopted by a number of educational institutions around the globe, including Indonesia, explicitly requires that learners demonstrate proficiency in oral communication, intelligibility, and interaction skills (Education, 2024). Thus, the quality of pronunciation is not only embedded as an integral component of language teaching but also assessed as part of the curriculum requirements. Accordingly, the teacher is expected to interpret these general instructional recommendations in relation to the particular needs of her students who speak various languages as their L1.

In this respect, the present study was designed to examine how one English teacher reflected on her pronunciation instruction for linguistically diverse students. Thus, the overarching research question guiding this study was: How did the teacher reflect on her pronunciation instruction in a multilingual Cambridge Curriculum classroom? Specifically, this study aimed to answer the following question: How did the teacher reflect on her

pronunciation teaching-in-action? How did the teacher's reflections-on-action relate to her subsequent teaching-in-action? By investigating how the teacher engaged in reflective practices in teaching pronunciation, this study intended to contribute to a nuanced understanding of how such practices can be cultivated in similar professional contexts.

The phenomenon of reflection has been extensively investigated in language education research. A number of researchers have demonstrated that reflective practices help teachers develop professional competence by supporting them in maintaining continuous awareness of areas for improvement (Widyaningrum et al., 2022). Despite the accumulating body of literature on reflection, there is a dearth of research on how reflection operates in pronunciation teaching, particularly in multilingual and Cambridge Curriculum classrooms (Xiaojing et al., 2022). In fact, the majority of studies that explored the role of reflection for language teaching professionals offer only broad, theoretical insights into the phenomenon, without specifying the minute instructional decisions that teachers need to make when reflecting on their pronunciation teaching. Thus, the aforementioned limitations in the existing scholarship constitute a significant impetus for the current investigation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Teacher Reflection: Models and Stages

Reflective teaching is a process in which teachers critically review their actions, thoughts, and ideas to improve their practice and outcomes through in-depth analyses of classroom events (Cirocki, A., & Widodo, 2019). At the same time, reflective teachers are not the ones who simply follow a lesson plan given to them in advance but rather engage in the continuous cycle of learning and decision-making that underpins the improvement of teaching (Farrell & Macapinlac, 2026). For instance, TESOL teachers are expected to evolve their understanding of language learning and

their ideas about the particular method they have selected during their professional development.

Furthermore, one of the models of reflection classifies it according to levels, starting from surface reflection, referring to questions of technical effectiveness, pedagogical reflection focused on whether a choice matches a teacher's perspective of language learning, and critical reflection, which questions social and personal commitments related to a decision made by a teacher. In other words, critical reflection makes teachers reconsider the impact of their choices on actual students and their backgrounds. For instance, reflective questions related to pronunciation would require further investigations if there is a concern that choosing one accent over others would not benefit students from diverse backgrounds.

On the other hand, another model classifies reflections by when they occur during the lesson. According to this model, reflection-before-lesson prepares a teacher for potential challenges they are bound to encounter and focuses on decisions made to address them; reflection-during-lesson is a continuous process that helps a teacher engage in a dialogue with themselves and rethink emerging issues. Next, reflection-after-lesson evaluates the lesson's effectiveness while it is still fresh in the teacher's mind. Finally, reflection-beyond-lesson allows for connecting specific lessons into a broader context of a teacher's professional life and reflecting on their overall effectiveness. It is reported that reflective journals are useful tools for this type of reflective practice, as they help a teacher engage in an extended conversation with themselves, in which they investigate research literature, collect relevant evidence, analyze it, and finally apply it to a teaching situation (Raza, 2020).

Reflection-in-Action and Reflection-on-Action

Within these broad reflections, reflective teaching most often takes the form of two

interacting notions: reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action (Farrell, 2018). Reflection-in-action is thinking while teaching, enabling the teacher to notice unexpected incidents, misunderstandings, sound confusion, and distractions, and to make timely corrections to keep the lesson on track. In terms of pronunciation teaching, such on-the-spot reflections could include revising the explanation, providing an example of the target pronunciation, slowing down, or responding immediately to a student's problem. Reflection-on-action is thinking about the teaching that has already occurred, reviewing what went well and what did not, and aligning practical teaching with theoretical underpinnings.

Farrell (2018) emphasizes the continuous reflective cycle, in which the teacher uses reflection-on-action to inform reflection-in-action and subsequent teaching sessions. Thus, reflective teachers are more likely to recognize areas for improvement to become better educators (Widyaningrum et al., 2022). However, such continuous reflection, which transforms and improves the teacher's practice, seems rare in Indonesian schools, where reflective practices remain informal and often go unnoticed (Lubis, 2018).

Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC) is another concept similar to reflection-in-action, but viewed from the teacher's interactions with the learners. It is defined as how teachers and learners can exploit interaction to foster learning (Walsh, 2006, 2012), or, in other words, how teachers can shape questions and answers, give feedback, and use other interactive formats to get the most out of each session. CIC is especially relevant to pronunciation, as it determines how the teacher will use their capacity for reflection-in-action to get the most out of the lesson. Specifically, each decision made while teaching pronunciation, including making corrections, scaffolding the learners' utterances, or giving examples of target pronunciation, has interactional consequences and determines the effectiveness of pronunciation learning.

Reflective Practice in Teaching Pronunciation Essay

Reflective practice is especially vital for pronunciation instructors. The teacher's convictions, thoughts, and assumptions have the most significant influence on decisions about which material to cover and which strategies to use, whether explicit or otherwise (Babaeian, 2021). Moreover, reflective practice offers opportunities to evaluate how each teacher's actions align with their beliefs and to identify areas for improvement.

That said, it is common to find that teachers' beliefs about pronunciation instruction rarely influence their day-to-day classroom practices. Although the majority of instructors understand the need to explicitly teach pronunciation, few consistently and systematically incorporate such strategies in their classes (Huensch, 2019; Mahmood, 2024). It seems that when faced with decisions about how to handle learner pronunciation, most teachers tend to default to instinct rather than carefully consider each option and its likely outcomes (Burri, 2023). This could explain why many teachers report believing that implicit corrective feedback is generally more appropriate, but still tend to use explicit corrections most often, probably because they feel it is more effective when the circumstances call for it.

MATERIALS & METHODS

Research Design

This study adopted a qualitative case study design to explore how one English teacher reflected on her pronunciation teaching practices in a multilingual Cambridge Curriculum classroom. A qualitative study was deemed suitable since this research focused on participants' interpretations, experiences, and interactions rather than attempting to quantify variables of interest. Qualitative studies were seeking to understand how phenomena generate meaning in participants' realities (Creswell, 2023). Specifically, this study adopted a case study design to investigate phenomena

within a specific context by understanding their occurrence rather than attempting to separate them from that context (Yin, 2009). This design was suitable for this study because the objective was to understand how the teacher reflected on her practices in a given context rather than pursue generalizability. A case study design was also appropriate because it entailed conducting an intensive analysis of a bounded system such as a teacher's practice (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Specifically, this study aimed to gain a deep understanding of how one teacher practiced reflective skills in English in a secondary school, an endeavor that would not be possible with multiple teachers.

Research Site and Participants

This study was conducted at a private secondary school in Semarang, Indonesia, that implements the Cambridge Curriculum. The school was selected because English is taught in a multilingual classroom environment involving both Indonesian and international students, and because the Cambridge Curriculum places explicit emphasis on pronunciation, intelligibility, and effective oral communication as part of its learning objectives and assessment criteria, making the site directly relevant to the focus of this study. The teacher who participated in this study was purposively selected as the primary participant. She served as Head of the English Department and was responsible for teaching English to a multilingual class comprising students from Ethiopia, China, South Sudan, and South Korea, among other countries and regions. She was selected because she regularly integrated pronunciation instruction into her classroom practice, had extensive experience teaching multilingual learners, and was actively involved in applying Cambridge speaking assessment criteria when evaluating students' oral performance. These characteristics made her instructional practices and reflective experiences a rich source of data for understanding how reflection operates

around pronunciation teaching in this specific curricular and linguistic context.

Instruments

Two primary instruments were used to capture the teacher's reflective practice, supported by a classroom observation sheet that provided contextual and behavioral data. The teacher reflection sheet was used to capture the teacher's written reflections immediately after each observed classroom session. Completed on the same day as each lesson, the sheet prompted her to evaluate the pronunciation activities delivered, the corrective feedback strategies she used and her reasoning for them, the in-the-moment adaptations she made in response to students' phonological difficulties, and any aspects of the lesson she would approach differently in future sessions. This instrument was designed primarily to capture reflection-on-action, the evaluative thinking that occurs once a lesson has ended while the immediacy of completing it on the same day helped preserve details that might otherwise fade from memory.

A semi-structured interview guide was also used to explore the teacher's reflective cognition, pedagogical reasoning, and decision-making processes in greater depth. The guide covered her instructional strategies for pronunciation, the challenges of teaching learners with diverse first-language backgrounds, the real-time adaptations she made during lessons, the rationale behind her corrective feedback decisions, and her own evaluations of teaching effectiveness. The interview was conducted after both lessons had been observed, allowing the teacher to reflect on her practice across the full observation period rather than on a single isolated session.

Finally, a structured classroom observation sheet was used during both observed lessons to document classroom conditions, teaching techniques, teacher–student interactions, and student responses to pronunciation activities. Although this instrument did not directly elicit reflective data, it provided a

behavioral record of classroom events against which the teacher's reflective statements from the reflection sheet and interview could be interpreted and contextualized.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection proceeded in a systematic sequence across two classroom sessions. First, the researcher conducted classroom observations of two pronunciation lessons, using the observation sheet to document teaching practices, corrective feedback, and student responses as they occurred. Second, immediately following each observed lesson, the teacher completed the reflection sheet on the same day, ensuring that her reflective account remained close to the actual teaching experience. Third, after both lessons had been observed and both reflection sheets completed, the researcher conducted the semi-structured interview with the teacher, using the interview guide to probe more deeply into the reasoning behind decisions already documented in the reflection sheets and observed in the classroom. This sequencing allowed the reflection sheet to capture the teacher's reflection-on-action close to each lesson, while the interview offered a more retrospective, integrative account once the full observation period had concluded.

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis, coded in accordance with Farrell's (2018) distinction between reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action (Braun, V., & Clarke, 2006). Coding of the reflection sheet yielded nine child codes that grouped naturally into two broader categories: four codes related to the teacher's observations and instructional adjustments during the lesson, and five codes related to her evaluations after the lesson. These categories were subsequently consolidated into four overarching themes, two aligned with reflection-in-action and two aligned with reflection-on-action. Interview excerpts were coded independently using the same

framework and were combined with reflection-sheet evidence only where an excerpt converged on a pattern already identified in the reflection sheet; where the reflection sheet stood alone, only that evidence was reported. In this way, the two instruments were treated as complementary perspectives on a single reflective process rather than as separate, independent responses to the research question. Trustworthiness was supported through the triangulation of reflection sheet, interview, and observational data, consistent with the principle of analytical generalization, in which single-case findings are understood to contribute to and refine existing theoretical understanding rather than to produce statistically generalizable results (Yin, 2018).

RESULT

Coding of the teacher reflection sheet and the semi-structured interview yielded nine

child codes that were combined into two categories per reflective phase and then collapsed into the following four themes: two of reflection-in-action and two of reflection-on-action. Farrell's (2018) categorization of the two-phase reflective practice model was adopted to code the teacher's reflection sheet, yielding four codes related to the teacher's observations and adjustments during the lesson and five codes associated with after-lesson considerations. The interview responses were independently coded, with interview excerpts added to the corresponding reflection sheet items when they exhibited similar patterns. In cases when no pattern could be identified, only the reflection sheet evidence was used for coding. Table 1 below provides an overview of how the four themes relate to the two categories in Farrell's (2018) two-phase framework.

Table 1. Themes of Teacher Reflection Mapped to Farrell's (2018) Reflective Phases

No.	Theme	Reflective Phase
1.	Monitoring and responding to students' real-time needs	Reflection-in-action
2.	Adjusting instruction and delivering corrective feedback in the moment	Reflection-in-action
3.	Evaluating interaction, effectiveness, and instructional challenges	Reflection-on-action
4.	Reflecting on lesson outcomes and planning future improvement	Reflection-on-action

Theme 1: Monitoring and Responding to Students' Real-Time Needs (Reflection-in-Action).

This theme combines two reflection-sheet categories, Monitoring Students' Participation and Response and Attending to Multilingual Classroom Dynamics, along with their child codes of observing active participation, noticing hesitant or reluctant responses, identifying the need for encouragement among international students, modifying speech clarity for diverse learners, and being sensitive to students' emotional readiness. Both categories describe the same underlying activity: the teacher closely observing how each student, particularly the international students, was responding to the lesson and basing her decisions on those observations. The teacher noted on the reflection sheet

that while most students actively engaged in pronunciation exercises, especially when new vocabulary was introduced, some remained hesitant when unsure of their pronunciation, and that international students typically required more encouragement before responding

"Most students actively participated in the pronunciation activities, especially with new vocabulary; some remained hesitant when unsure of their pronunciation, and the international students generally needed more encouragement before answering" (Reflection sheet, Item 1)

She added that having students from many countries meant she had to be mindful of her speaking pace, the clarity of her explanations, and students' emotional readiness (Reflection sheet, Item 7). The interview confirmed this as a continuous

process of reading the classroom rather than a single pre-made decision:

"I look at the students' condition first, whether the situation is conducive or not, and whether my lesson plan is going to work... Usually, I let them speak first while I'm observing them. I think, 'Oh, this student is really good at English,' or 'This one needs more support.' From there, I can adjust my teaching." (Teacher interview)

The interview further showed that this monitoring extended beyond verbal participation to encompass emotional and psychological dimensions, as the teacher noted that international students often had to adjust to unfamiliar surroundings and distance from home, which shaped their participation in class. This suggests that reflection-in-action in this classroom began before any instructional change was made, rooted in the teacher's ongoing interpretation of subtle behavioral and emotional cues from a linguistically diverse group.

Theme 2: Adjusting Instruction and Delivering Corrective Feedback in the Moment (Reflection-in-Action).

This theme combines the categories Adapting Instruction in the Moment and Delivering Immediate Corrective Feedback, with child codes including modifying speech rate, simplifying explanations, giving more examples, verifying comprehension before moving forward, permitting online dictionaries or translation tools, modeling correct pronunciation before repetition, and softening correction through humor and peer involvement. These are the concrete instructional and corrective actions the teacher took once a need identified under Theme 1 had been recognized.

"The teacher adjusted her explanations by slowing down her speech, simplifying difficult explanations, giving additional examples, and checking students' understanding before continuing, and allowed the use of online dictionaries or translation tools when necessary" (Reflection sheet, Item 5).

"Usually, I ask them to repeat the word again. Sometimes I also ask the student sitting next to them to check whether the pronunciation is correct or not... I'll open a thesaurus or another online pronunciation website, and then we'll listen to it together and say the word together. Sometimes I also make it funny because I don't want it to feel too serious. I even intentionally pronounce it incorrectly first." (Teacher interview)

The interview also illustrated how adaptation and monitoring worked together in practice: mid-lesson, the teacher allowed a Chinese student who had nearly stopped participating to use Google Translate on her Chromebook, an accommodation not extended to other students at the time. This shows that the adjustments in this theme were applied individually, driven by the continuous reading of each student described in Theme 1, rather than through a single uniform technique. Together, Themes 1 and 2 depict reflection-in-action as a tight loop of observation followed immediately by targeted instructional response, repeated throughout the lesson.

Theme 3: Evaluating Interaction Effectiveness and Instructional Challenges (Reflection-on-Action).

This theme combines three reflection-sheet categories, Evaluating the Effectiveness of Interaction, Identifying Challenges in Multilingual Teaching, and Assessing Support for Multilingual Learners, with child codes such as appreciating peer support, managing different proficiency levels in one class, balancing pronunciation practice with available lesson time, and realizing the need for more speaking opportunities. Unlike Themes 1 and 2, these categories emerged only after the teacher stepped back and assessed the completed lesson.

"The most effective interaction was modeling the correct pronunciation and immediately asking students to repeat it; peer support was also helpful because students felt more comfortable practicing

with classmates than individually in front of the class." (Reflection sheet, Item 8)

"The biggest challenge was accommodating students with very different English proficiency levels and language backgrounds, and balancing pronunciation practice with the need to complete the lesson within the available time." (Reflection sheet, Item 9)

The interview extended this evaluative stance to the teacher's assessment of her own ability, and confirmed that she addressed students individually rather than applying one strategy to the whole class:

"Well, first I need to be consistent. I'm still learning pronunciation myself... I usually tell students, 'It's up to you which model you want to follow, but be consistent.'" (Teacher interview)

"We deal with them case by case, and we can't generalize our teaching." (Teacher interview)

Theme 4: Reflecting on Lesson Outcomes and Planning Future Improvement (Reflection-on-Action).

This theme combines the categories Reflecting on Lesson Outcomes and Planning Future Instructional Improvement, with child codes confirming the achievement of learning objectives, acknowledging time constraints, increasing pair and small-group speaking activities, and preparing additional pronunciation resources for independent practice. It represents the closing point of the reflective cycle documented in this study.

"The lesson objectives were achieved, and students responded positively to corrective feedback, though pronunciation practice could have been extended with more available time." (Reflection sheet, Item 11)

"The teacher would provide more pair-work and small-group speaking activities and prepare additional pronunciation resources, such as online audio models, for students needing extra practice." (Reflection sheet, Item 12)

In the interview, the teacher connected this lesson-level evaluation to a longer-term professional goal:

"I always feel that I'm not really good at teaching pronunciation. My reflection is always, 'Okay, I'll try to do better next time and make it more fun,' maybe through simple games or speaking activities. But then I also remember that I have a syllabus to finish." (Teacher interview)

"So I think it's also a challenge for me to keep learning by listening more, watching movies, and paying closer attention to pronunciation... that's my challenge and also my target for the future." (Teacher interview)

The four themes reveal a reflective cycle that consistently moves through Farrell's (2018) two stages: reflection-in-action began with the teacher's close, ongoing observation of individual students and moved directly into specific instructional adjustments; reflection-on-action then returned to those same events with more analytical distance, evaluating what had genuinely worked, identifying limited time and the range of student proficiency as the primary constraints, and translating that evaluation into concrete plans for subsequent lessons. As shown in Figure 1, the two phases did not function as separate activities; what the teacher observed and modified in the moment informed what she evaluated afterward, and what she evaluated afterward shaped what she would watch for and adjust in the next lesson.

DISCUSSION

The findings suggest that reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action should not be understood as two completely separate forms of reflection. Rather, they appeared to function as connected stages within the teacher's ongoing decision-making process. During the lesson, the teacher paid close attention to students' responses and adjusted her teaching according to their immediate needs. After the lesson, she revisited those experiences and considered what could be improved. In this sense, reflection-in-action

was mainly concerned with responding to the question, “What does this student need at this moment?”, whereas reflection-on-action allowed the teacher to consider, “What should be changed in the next lesson?” Although the two forms of reflection occurred at different points in time, they were closely related because both contributed to the same process of making instructional decisions (Farrell, 2018).

The findings also provide a clearer picture of why reflection-on-action can become more analytical. Once the lesson had ended, the teacher had more opportunity to look beyond individual classroom events and consider the factors influencing her pronunciation teaching more broadly. Through this process, she identified limited instructional time as the main challenge in teaching pronunciation. Interestingly, she did not view students’ linguistic diversity as a major obstacle. Instead, she considered the presence of learners from different linguistic backgrounds manageable and, in some respects, beneficial to classroom learning. This understanding was less apparent during the lesson itself and became more evident when she had the opportunity to review the lesson afterwards. Thus, reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action served different but complementary functions. The former enabled the teacher to notice students’ needs and respond to them immediately, while the latter helped her make sense of those experiences and identify issues that required attention in subsequent teaching.

Another interesting finding concerns the relationship between teachers’ stated beliefs about corrective feedback and the strategies they actually use in the classroom. Previous research has shown that teachers may express a preference for implicit feedback, such as recasts, but rely more frequently on explicit correction when responding to students during classroom interaction. This discrepancy has been interpreted as an indication that the immediate demands of classroom teaching can influence teachers’ reflection-in-action more strongly than their stated beliefs (Burri, 2023). A different

pattern emerged in the present case. The teacher consistently identified clear pronunciation modelling followed by student repetition as an appropriate way of addressing pronunciation difficulties, both during and after the lesson. She did not describe this approach as a temporary solution adopted because of classroom pressure. Instead, she viewed it as a useful strategy for helping students develop more accurate pronunciation. This practice is also compatible with findings that explicit feedback and prompts can be more effective than recasts in developing segmental pronunciation (Saito & Lyster, 2010). The teacher’s preference for explicit correction may therefore represent a deliberate pedagogical choice rather than simply an adjustment made in response to classroom constraints. Since the present study involved only one teacher, this interpretation cannot be generalized to other contexts. However, it can be understood through the concept of analytical generalization, whereby findings from a case study can help refine or reconsider existing theoretical explanations rather than yield statistical generalizations (Zhang & Yin, 2009).

The findings can also be understood in relation to Classroom Interactional Competence (CIC), which highlights teachers’ ability to make appropriate instructional decisions in response to classroom interaction. The teacher in this study regularly monitored students’ participation and responses during pronunciation activities. Her observations helped her determine which students appeared confident, which students needed further assistance, and when additional encouragement was necessary. These decisions were sometimes based on relatively small interactional cues, including hesitation, limited participation, or nonverbal responses. Rather than treating these cues as insignificant, the teacher appeared to use them to guide her subsequent actions. This provides a more concrete understanding of how reflection-in-action may operate in pronunciation

teaching. From this perspective, CIC can be seen as one of the mechanisms through which reflective thinking becomes visible in classroom practice. The teacher's reflection was not only an internal process but was expressed through her moment-by-moment responses to students and their pronunciation needs (Walsh, 2006, 2012).

The case also provides an opportunity to reconsider the argument that reflective practice in Indonesian schools is often informal and receives limited institutional support, which may reduce its contribution to teachers' professional development. The present study does not provide sufficient evidence to either confirm or challenge this claim generally because it examined only one teacher in one school. Nevertheless, the teacher demonstrated a relatively clear reflective process in which reviewing a lesson resulted in specific considerations for subsequent instruction. Reflection therefore appeared to function as a practical part of instructional improvement rather than simply as a description of what had happened in the classroom (Lubis, 2018). At the same time, the findings do not establish whether this reflective practice was influenced by the school's implementation of the Cambridge Curriculum or primarily resulted from the teacher's own professional habits and beliefs. The data also provide evidence mainly of short-term instructional planning and cannot show whether the teacher's reflection influenced broader curriculum decisions, professional autonomy, or institutional practices. This limitation is important because it suggests that a structured reflection sheet may support lesson-level improvement, but its capacity to promote wider professional development may depend on additional forms of institutional support.

The teacher's reflections were also consistent with previous research showing that regular reflective engagement can help teachers identify concrete areas for professional development. Rather than limiting her evaluation to broad statements about whether a lesson was successful, the

teacher identified particular changes that could be made in future instruction. These included providing more opportunities for collaborative speaking practice and preparing additional pronunciation resources for students who required further support. Such reflections indicate that the process moved beyond evaluating past teaching and became connected to planning future instructional actions. In other words, reflection provided a basis for identifying practical steps to incorporate into subsequent lessons (Widyaningrum et al., 2022).

This practical function is also consistent with research on reflective teaching journals. Systematic reflection can help teachers document classroom experiences, examine their teaching practices, and use what they learn to inform future instruction. Although the present study used a structured reflection sheet rather than a teaching journal, the two tools served a similar purpose. The reflection sheet provided the teacher with a space to revisit classroom experiences and translate them into possible instructional adjustments. This suggests that reflective practice does not necessarily require an extensive or highly formal system to be useful. Even a relatively simple structured instrument may provide teachers with an opportunity to examine their teaching and consider changes for subsequent lessons, particularly in contexts where more comprehensive reflective support is not readily available (Raza, 2020).

Finally, the teacher's reflection in this study was mainly situated at the practical and pedagogical levels. Her attention was largely directed toward instructional techniques, including selecting corrective feedback strategies, adjusting learning activities, and creating a supportive environment for multilingual learners. There was comparatively little evidence of critical reflection concerning the wider ethical, social, or ideological implications of her instructional decisions. However, this absence should not necessarily be

interpreted as evidence that the teacher lacked the capacity for critical reflection. It may instead be related to the nature of the instrument used in the study. Because the reflection sheet was primarily designed to capture lesson-level experiences and instructional decisions, it naturally directed the teacher's attention toward immediate pedagogical concerns. Therefore, the level of reflection identified in this study may have been shaped not only by the teacher's reflective disposition but also by the questions and scope provided by the reflection instrument itself (Cirocki, A., & Widodo, 2019).

CONCLUSION

This study explored how one English teacher reflected on her pronunciation teaching in a multilingual Cambridge Curriculum classroom. The findings show that reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action functioned as interconnected parts of a single continuous process. During instruction, the teacher monitored students' responses and adjusted her pacing, explanations, and feedback to meet their needs. After the lessons, she reviewed her teaching and identified limited instructional time as the main challenge, rather than students' different linguistic backgrounds. This reflection led to practical plans for future lessons, including more pair and small-group speaking activities and additional pronunciation resources.

The findings also show that the teacher's reflection was closely connected to classroom interaction. She used students' participation, hesitation, and nonverbal responses to guide her immediate decisions. Her consistent use of pronunciation modeling followed by repetition also appeared to be a deliberate teaching choice rather than simply a response to classroom pressure. The study suggests that a simple reflection sheet can help teachers examine their teaching and identify practical ways to improve future instruction.

For teachers, structured reflection can help identify classroom challenges and guide

future instructional adjustments. Schools can support this process by providing opportunities for collaborative planning and reflective discussion. Future research could involve more teachers and schools and use video-based or stimulated-recall methods to capture reflection-in-action more directly.

This study is limited to one teacher, one school, and two observed lessons. Therefore, the findings are context-specific. In addition, because the reflection sheet was completed after the lessons, the study relied partly on the teacher's recollection of her in-the-moment thinking. Future studies could use real-time methods to examine this process more directly.

Declaration by Authors

Acknowledgement: None

Source of Funding: None

Conflict of Interest: No conflicts of interest declared.

Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

This is an open-access article published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

REFERENCES

1. Babaeian, A. (2021). Approaches to pronunciation instruction in communicative language teaching classrooms. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 11(4), 68–89. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jse.v11i4.18977>
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
3. Burri, M. (2023). Comparing L2 teachers' practices with learners' perceptions of English pronunciation teaching. *Profile: Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 25(1), 129–145. <https://doi.org/10.15446/profile.v25n1.101156>
4. Cirocki, A., & Widodo, H. P. (2019). Reflective practice in English language teaching in Indonesia: Shared practices from two teacher educators. *Language Teaching Research*, 7(3), 15–35.

5. Creswell, J. W. (2023). Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches. In SAGE Publications, Inc.: Vol. Sixth Edit (Issue 1). <https://medium.com/@arifwicaksanaa/pengetahuan-use-case-a7e576e1b6bf>
6. Derwing, T. M., & Munro, M. J. (2015). Pronunciation fundamentals: Evidence-based perspectives for L2 teaching and research. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
7. Education, C. A. I. (2024). Cambridge Lower Secondary English Curriculum Outline (Issue 0993). <https://www.cambridgeinternational.org/>
8. Farrell, T. S. C. (2018). Reflective Practice for Language Teachers. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0873>
9. Farrell, T. S. C., & Macapinlac, M. (2026). Professional Development Through Reflective Practice: A Framework for TESOL Teachers.
10. Huensch, A. (2019). Pronunciation in foreign language classrooms: Instructors' training, classroom practices, and beliefs. *Language Teaching Research*, 23(6), 745–764. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168818767182>
11. Lubis, A. H. (2018). Reflective teaching toward EFL teachers' professional autonomy: Revisiting its development in Indonesia. *International Journal of Education*, 11(1), 35–49. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.17509/ije.v11i1.9400>
12. Mahmood, R. Q. (2024). Teaching Pronunciation in EFL Classes!" An Investigative Study. *MEX*, 48(4), 1–12. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61871/mj.v48n4-3>
13. Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
14. Miller, J. S., & Claire, U. (2018). Bridging the gap between pronunciation research and proficiency-based teaching. In *Research Agenda in Second Language Speech Learning: In Honor of Janusz W. Arabski* (pp. 111–119).
15. Raza, B. K. (2020). Differentiated instruction in English language teaching: Insights into the implementation of Raza's teaching adaptation model in Canadian ESL. *Journal of Language and Education*, 6(3), 41–50.
16. Saito, K., & Lyster, R. (2010). Effects of form-focused instruction and corrective feedback on L2 pronunciation development of /r/ by Japanese learners of English. September, 1–33.
17. Tiwari, H. P. (2024). Challenges in teaching pronunciation: Secondary level English teachers' perspectives. *Journal of NELTA Gandaki*, 10(1), 1–16.
18. Walsh, S. (2006). Talking the talk of the TESOL classroom. *ELT Journal*, 60(2), 133–141. <https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccil00>
19. Walsh, S. (2012). Conceptualising classroom interactional competence. *Novitas-ROYAL (Research on Youth and Language)*, 6(1), 1–14.
20. Widyaningrum, L., Mujiyanto, Y., Yuliasri, I., & Astuti, P. (2022). In-service EFL teachers' critical reflective practice: An appraisal analysis. In Universitas Negeri Semarang (Ed.), *Proceedings of International Conference on Science, Education, and Technology* (pp. 349–354). <https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/ISET/article/view/1775>
21. Xiaojing, X., Badakhshan, E., & Fathi, J. (2022). Exploring teacher reflection in the English as a foreign language context: Testing factor structure and measurement invariance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.828901>
22. Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
23. Zhang, F., & Yin, P. (2009). A study of pronunciation problems of English learners in China. *Asian Social Science*, 5(6), 141–146. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v5n6p141>

How to cite this article: Yolinda Pramudanti, Sri Wahyuni. Teacher reflection in practice: reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action in pronunciation teaching in a multilingual Cambridge curriculum classroom. *International Journal of Research and Review*. 2026; 13(9): 35-46. DOI: [10.52403/ijrr.20260905](https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20260905)
