Joanna Szymczak   https://doi.org/10.26881/pwe.2023.56.08
ORCID: 0000-0002-5755-5790
Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego w Bydgoszczy
jszym@ukw.edu.pl

Adam Mroczkowski
ORCID: 0000-0002-4011-6134
Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego w Bydgoszczy
adamrm@ukw.edu.pl

The specificity of teacher reflectivity in early education teachers – a study report

Summary

This article presents selected results of a preliminary research of teacher reflectivity. The empirical material was collected through the original Early Education Teacher Reflectivity Questionnaire on (pre)School Daily Life. It was answered by early education teachers and graduate students of early childhood pedagogy. The article also describes the understanding of reflectivity adopted here, along with its importance for building awareness of what it means to be a teacher with regard to reflection. Furthermore, careful consideration was given to the presented results followed by reflections on the results of the study. The analysis indicated that teachers in the study group did have a problem with identifying criteria for selecting situations to which they assigned a critical dimension. They seemed to lack insight into themselves. In their analyses, they evaluated individual aspects of a given event, but did not pose questions that might motivate in-depth reflection. Moreover, they equated anticipating the position of other persons about a given incident with experiencing a variety of perspectives. They avoided involving other people in the process of analyzing a situation, thus depriving themselves of an opportunity to develop transformative learning abilities. At their current stage of professional education, they showed a need for support, which may aided by the assumptions of the humanistic concept of teacher education and the emancipatory rationality.

Keywords: reflectivity, reflection, reflective practice, early childhood education teacher, (pre)school daily life, study report

Słowa kluczowe: refleksyjność, refleksja, refleksyjna praktyka, nauczyciel wczesnej edukacji, codzienność (przed)szkolna, doniesienie z badań

Introduction

Such terms as reflectivity, reflection, self-reflection, the reflective teacher, reflective practice are categories that appear in academic literature, particularly in papers on the boundaries of education and pedeutology. The creator of the concept of reflective practice is Donald A. Schön (1987). The researchers who take up and develop the concept of the reflective practitioner and reflective practice, distinguish between various types of reflection, features of a reflective practitioner, and aspects conducive to becoming a reflective teacher and student (see Szymczak 2017). The characterization of the concept of reflective practice, as presented by Bogusława Dorota Gołębniak, provides us with further motivation to consider it critically. The author indicates not only the basic assumptions of this approach, but also those aspects of it that can be considered its advantages, as well as those that raise certain doubts (Gołębniak 2021: 137–142). Geoff Petty (2010) understands reflection as the ability to learn teaching from experience, a **tool** that helps teachers evaluate their own teaching. He proposes a cycle of learning from experience. Other researchers point to specific strategies that encourage student reflection, such as keeping a portfolio, using self-assessment methods, keeping journals, making self-presentations, writing letters, or holding student-teacher and peer-to-peer consultations. In addition, they characterize a reflective teacher, emphasize the consequences of being a reflective practitioner, stress the importance of reflection for and in the teacher's work, consider reflection as a method supporting learning based on self-regulation and understanding the process-like nature and variability of learning, teaching and assessment (Paris, Ayres 1997). Henryk Mizerek (2021) analyzes such categories as reflectivity, reflection, critical reflection, and reflectivity. Iwona Kopaczyńska (2011) analyzes the peculiarities of reflectivity (also in relation to early childhood education), while Wanda Dróżka (2006) shows her various understandings and analytical categories in pedeutological research, relating them to the reflective assumptions of trends within cognitivism. Małgorzata Lewartowska-Zychowicz (2009) treats the category of a reflective practitioner as one of the contemporary models of a teacher (next to the adaptive-technician, the diagnosing teacher, and the transformative intellectual). For Ewa Filipiak (2012, 2015), reflective practice is one of the roles of the teacher (next to being the organizer of the student's learning environment, an active and engaged participant in episodes of joint engagement, a diagnostician, facilitator, mediator, tutor, expert, responsible professional, and a researcher of their own teaching) in the sociocultural perspective. Rosemary Perry (2000) treats reflection on teaching as a method that allows the use of experiences from teaching practice, explains aspects necessary for reflection, pointing to its advantages. There are authors for whom reflective practice constitutes the teacher's new identity (Rylke 1997). Maria Ledzińska and Ewa Czerniawska (2011) perceive conscious reflection as an important determinant of teaching effectiveness, while Kenneth J. Gergen (2009; cf. Szymczak 2015) takes up the problem of self-reflection as a significant category for the construction of identity in the postmodern

era. Considerations on teacher reflection may lead to the conclusion that it is an aspect significant for building the awareness of being a teacher.

Reflection can support the teacher's *praxis*. Stephen Kemmis, a representative of a critical rather than classical version of reflective practice (see Gołębniak 2021: 141–142), explains that *praxis* is therefore a thoughtful activity, and consciously theorized on, but also one that can reflectively shape and transform its own theory. Moreover, *praxis* is always a risky endeavor, as it requires the practitioner to make wise and prudent judgments on how to act in **this** specific situation (Kemmis 2010: 50). The author emphasizes the role of the practitioner in constructing the *praxis* – the understanding and beliefs that are expressed in the *praxis* are after all available only to the practitioner, which is why only they have the opportunity to study it (Kemmis 2010). The ability to analyze one's own practice requires professionalism from the teacher, or rather acting professionally (see Gołębniak, Zamorska 2014: 18), the results of which will be visible in the area of organizing the learning conditions.

Gołębniak and Zamorska take up the problem of professionalism, understood to be based on interpretative science (not scientism), partnership relations and open communication. They argue that in the redefined professionalism the constitutive aspect becomes: "(…) such a redefinition of one's existence in the constantly changing world of education, that the exploration of **what** and **how it occurs**, enriches understanding and brings solutions adequate to the conditions, even if only temporarily" (Gołębniak, Zamorska 2014: 30–31).

The teacher's professionalism requires representatives of this profession to be able to independently test their own actions and create personal knowledge that complements their academic knowledge. It is expected that the activities they undertake will be "professional", which is to say excellent (Kwiatkowska 2008: 168).

Lawrence Stenhouse argues that the essence of extended professionalism (see Gołębniak, Zamorska 2014) is subjective self-development, which takes place thanks to analyzing one's own practical activities together with other teachers. The fact that the teacher undertakes this type of cooperation with other colleagues fosters the development of such skills as the use of constructed knowledge, understanding the context of educational activities and understanding one's own practice (Kwiatkowska 2008).

Reflectiveness about the (pre)school day-to-day life is an important aspect of teacher professionalism. The ability to analyze how and what is going on in the daily life of the (pre)school and coming to understand the essence of the changes that occur can be significantly supported by reflection. It is difficult (impossible?) to analyze, alone or with other persons, the phenomena and processes occurring in the daily life of the (pre)school without the ability to observe them and without being open to the need to understand what constantly **happens**. Very important **in** and **for** the teacher's professionalism is the ability and readiness to analyze their own activities not only in relation to the classroom, but also in the socio-cultural context in which the activities of both the teacher and the students are **immersed**.

There is often talk of the need for teachers to become and be reflective practitioners, but relatively little is said about what can be done to create the requisite **cultural space**[1] for them to develop reflection in relation to (pre)school daily life and support them in finding their own place in the contemporary professional reality (where changes occur very dynamically, necessitating independent, responsible decision-making). Offering teachers conditions conducive to developing their own reflectivity (thanks to their own involvement) requires that they be diagnosed as to the level of this characteristic they currently exhibit. This, in turn, requires a research tool which may reveal **the current status of teacher reflection in the daily life of the (pre)school**.

The studies on reflectivity and reflection we managed to identify in the literature focused primarily on finding answers to questions about the circumstances in which the participants of these studies showed reflectivity (or lack thereof) as well as questions about the external conditions that favored the transition from an absence of reflectivity to reflectivity (see Szymczak 2017). Additionally, we examined studies on students' reflexivity (Perkowska-Klejman 2014, 2016, 2019). We also took note of a project in which reflexivity (along with self-criticism) was one of the elements of the author's Questionnaire of Self-Assessment of Critical Dispositions (Czaja-Chudyba 2013). These studies involved students of preschool and early school education as well as teachers, and their aim was to "determine the state of readiness of the early school education system for a transformation in critical thinking" (Czaja-Chudyba 2013: 114). The importance of reflectivity and reflection emphasized in the literature **for** and **in** the teacher's work, as well as the desire to create a **cultural space** for teachers for autonomously initiated reflection related to working with children motivated us to construct a tool for studying reflectivity, and use this tool in the study we conducted. A diagnosis of this kind is important for the design of educational situations for (future) teachers.

**Theoretical foundations for the adopted understanding
of reflectivity and reflection in the daily life of the (pre)school**

The key issue seems to be the presentation of the adopted understanding of the categories of reflectivity and reflection on the daily life of the (pre)school (as a result of our studies on the definition and theoretical approaches). The understanding of these concepts we espouse is a consequence of a reconstruction of their meaning carried out as part of

---

[1] Thanks to a comment which Professor Teresa Hejnicka-Bezwińska gave Joanna Szymczak in her review of the dissertation *Refleksja nauczycieli wczesnej edukacji dotycząca pracy z uczniami (w perspektywie badań rekonstrukcyjnych)* (Reflection on Working with Children in Early Education Teachers) (supervisor: Professor Ewa Filipiak, the Institute of Pedagogy, Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz) the author **supplemented** the category of **space** in her analysis by adding the **cultural aspect** (based on the review of March 4, 2016).

an earlier project[2] (see Szymczak 2017). The theoretical framework for thinking and reconstructing these categories was provided by the following theories and concepts: 1) constructivism according to Berner (2006) and Goodman (1997); 2) constructionism (see Zwierżdżyński 2012) according to Gergen (2009); 3) the constructivist model of cognition according to Zybertowicz (1995); 4) non-classical sociology of knowledge according to Zybertowicz (1995); 5) the theory of structuration by Giddens (2003); 6) the sociocultural approach of Bruner (2006); 7) the concept of reflective thinking developed by Dewey (1988); 8) the cognitive concept of a human by Kozielecki (1995), and 9) the concept of reflectivity and unreflectiveness by Ellen J. Langer (1993; Maciuszek 2013); 10) the concept of reflective practice by D.A. Schön (1983; 11) the concept of critical incidents in teaching by David Tripp (1996). In addition, the definitions found in the literature for such categories as reflectivity, reflection, types of reflection, the qualities of a reflective teacher and their significance **in** and **for** the teacher's work were also important (see Szymczak 2017). The considerations of Szyller (2018) were helpful in understanding the daily life of the (pre)school.

The selection of the literature and approaches related to reflectivity and reflection was not accidental. These texts, as we understand them, corresponded with the constructivist and constructionist approaches, which is essential for the theoretical framework for thinking about reflectivity that we are developing. Further, the texts emphasized the importance of the cultural context for the activities and considerations we undertook. The intellectual **proximity** of these works to our own thinking about these categories was also important. In view of our research interests, we presented our understanding of the categories of reflectivity and reflection in relation to the teacher. We reached the realization that these concepts are not the same.

We defined reflectivity as the ability to observe everyday (pre)school life, analyze it, take into account the various contexts and points of view, searching for and creating solutions, and giving them a practical dimension (understanding how to introduce them in one's own activities). The teacher is motivated to reflectivity by the events, situations that take place in the environment and by people who co-create this environment with the teacher. Reflectivity creates a **cultural space** in which reflection can take place (cf. Szymczak 2017).

Reflection is not only a result of consideration, but can also be understood as a process whose essence is the ability to come to understand a specific aspect. We adopted a processual understanding of it (see Szymczak 2017), and we defined it as autonomous intellectual effort, consciously undertaken by the teachers, that allows them to reach an understanding of the processes taking place in their (pre)school daily life and take a specific position toward them. This effort is made by the teachers when they feel the need to

---

[2] The research project entitled *Refleksja nauczycieli wczesnej edukacji dotycząca pracy z uczniami (w perspektywie badań rekonstrukcyjnych)* (Reflection on Working with Children in Early Education Teachers) was written under the supervision of Professor Ewa Filipiak at the Institute of Pedagogy of Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz.

understand their own actions in a given situation or in a given sequence of events. It is a *way* of thinking, thanks to which the teachers **who follow it** have a chance to discover interesting and important issues related to their own actions (cf. Szymczak 2017).

Our understanding of the teachers' (pre)school daily life includes all their experiences characterized by the following, "(…) life with others, repetition of events, ritual forms, engaging the body, locations in space, time frames, automatism and spontaneity" (Szyller 2018: 51), in a kindergarten or school. The author who listed all of these components of teachers' daily life is Piotr Sztompka (2008 after Szyller 2018).

The research project of studying reflection in early education teachers carried out by Szymczak led to the conclusion that reflection cannot be decreed or imposed from the top – teachers cannot be **told** to be reflective, as far as we understand it (see Szymczak 2017, 2020). Reflectivity is a property for which teachers can create favorable conditions. Its progress may be **influenced** by a person cooperating with the teacher. To achieve this, knowledge about reflectivity is essential, and for this reason, we have made an attempt to construct a Reflectivity Questionnaire for Early Education Teachers on (Pre)School Daily Life. Thanks to developing teacher reflectivity, a **cultural space** may be created for teachers, in which reflection can **take place**. To phrase the problem differently, reflectivity is a **cultural space** for teacher reflection on the daily life of the (pre)school.

Methodological assumptions of the project

The research project focused on the reflexivity of early education teachers regarding everyday (pre)school life. We understood reflexivity as the ability to observe everyday (pre)school life, analyze it, search for and create solutions, and critically consider their implementation into one' sown practice. The object of knowledge (see Niżnik 1979) consisted of the participants' declared strategies of observing everyday (pre)school life, analyzing it, searching for and creating solutions, and critically considering their implementation. We understood strategies as cognitive actions and processes that influence the effectiveness of the learning process (Arends 1994: 488).

The theoretical information presented above became an inspiration to seek an answer to the following question: What are the reflective properties of students – novice teachers? The study was of a preliminary nature, and its goals were threefold: 1) understanding the characteristics of reflexivity among teachers participating in the project; 2) draw attention to the importance of the issue of teachers' reflection, and 3) extend our knowledge in the area being the object of reflection.

The main research problem was formulated as follows: What are the characteristics of reflexivity among early education teachers regarding everyday (pre)school life? In the study, we consciously refrained from formulating hypotheses. They had an exploratory rather than a confirmatory nature (see Rubacha 2008).

The global variable in the project was the characteristics of reflexivity among early education teachers regarding everyday (pre)school life, which we presented earlier in our understanding. Its operationalization involved formulating indicators related to strategies of observation, analysis, search and creation of solutions, and critically considering their implementation. This methodological approach allowed us to construct a tool, namely the Reflectivity Questionnaire for Early Education Teachers on (Pre)School Daily Life.

The partial variables and their sample indicators were as follows: 1) characteristics of observation strategies (selecting and describing significant situations, observing oneself while implementing new solutions in working with children, observing children's reactions to the actions taken); 2) characteristics of analysis strategies (asking questions about educational situations, seeking the "pluses" and "minuses" of the analyzed educational event, involving another educational subject in the process of analyzing the situation); 3) characteristics of search and creation of solutions strategies and critically considering their implementation (anticipating the consequences of planned changes in working with children, discussing planned changes in working with children with other educational subjects, adjusting implemented solutions to the needs of children).

The data collection method was a survey (Rubacha 2008), using the author's Questionnaire of Reflexivity in Early Education Teachers regarding Everyday (Pre)school Life, which was provided to respondents in electronic form (participants invited to take part in the project received a website address where the survey questionnaire was posted). The sampling method used was purposive non-random sampling (see Rubacha 2008: 124–126). As a result, the findings and conclusions from the study can only be generalized to the participants. Participation in the project was voluntary.

The study included 48 female students completing their second degree in early childhood education, certified to work with children in preschool and elementary school grades I–III. 26 of them were actively working in the teaching profession (24 in preschool and 2 in primary school), with nine as contract teachers and twelve as teacher trainees. The collected empirical data was analyzed using the version 13.1 of Statistica by StatSoft Polska Sp. z o.o.

Selected results of the study and an attempt at their interpretation

Due to the specific framework of the article, we are merely able to signal certain highlight some of its results preliminary research.

It is better (safer?) to evaluate than ask questions about everyday (pre)school life

24 of the teachers (50%) said that in the process of reflecting on an event taking place in their work with children, they asked questions about the event (12 respondents agreed strongly and 12 agreed moderately). 17 respondents (35.4%) marked the answer "I don't

know", 5 (10.4%) chose the answer "rather not" and 2 (4.2%) – the answer "definitely not". We may assume that half of the respondents did not use the strategy of asking questions in the process of analyzing educational situations. Most of the participants – i.e. 34 people (70.8%), analyzed a given situation in (pre)school daily life, identifying its "pluses" and/or "minuses" (18 teachers selected the answer "definitely yes", and 16 – the answer "rather yes"). Our attention was drawn to the choice of analysis strategy. We sought support in our attempt to explain the results in Robert Kwaśnica's (2007) concepts "Two rationalities", as well as school organizational cultures (Wiśniewska 2015). Pointing out the "pluses" and "minuses" is related to the assessment made by teachers reflecting on a given situation. The teachers do so using only their own perspective, and this ensures that they **do not expose** themselves to the experience of diversity. Questions motivate the search for answers. Searching for them is linked, for example, to conversations with another person and it creates a **cultural space** for experiencing a perspective different from one's own. A consequence of openness to diversity can be cognitive dissonance, which is a difficult experience. Perhaps teachers tend to avoid using strategies of analysis that create opportunities for them to experience diversity, that is, in experiencing the world they draw less on the assumptions of emancipatory rationality. Perhaps the dominant organizational cultures of the institutions do not create a sense of security and the teacher is afraid to talk about a particular educational situation with other teachers and invite them to analyze it together. Perhaps the teacher perceives the other teachers as potential threats to their own position and/or sense of competence, that is, they think of them through the lens of the assumptions of adaptive rationality.

Inability (and/or a lack of opportunities?) to assign meaning to aspects of the daily life of the (pre)school

Regarding the statement "From each day of working with children, I select a situation that is important to me" 3 respondents (6.3%) chose the answer "definitely not", the same number – the statement "rather not", 15 teachers chose (31.3%) – "I don't know", 11 teachers (22.9%) – "rather yes", and 16 (33.3%) – "definitely yes". A similar distribution of responses was given to the item "I pay attention to trivial (insignificant) situations that occur during my work with children". The distribution is as follows: 3 respondents (6.3%) marked the statement "definitely not", 4 (8.3%) – "rather not", 20 teachers (41.7%) – the answer "I don't know", 12 of them (25%) – "rather yes", and 9 (18.8%) – "definitely yes". The statements are related to the criteria for selecting the situations that early childhood education teachers then analyze. It can be assumed that some respondents did not allow themselves to discover what mattered to them. They did not identify the motives behind their own choices, nor did they establish any "criteria" for selecting situations for analysis. A consequence of this may be the selection of a **random** educational event. It seems that the answers marked by the participants with regard to this item corresponded with the statements "I don't think about what makes / made me decide to analyze a particular

situation". These responses were as follows: the answer "definitely not" was selected by 8 teachers (16.7%), the statement "rather not" – by 9 (18.8%), "I don't know" – by 16 (33.3%), "rather yes" – by 4 (8.3%), and "definitely yes" – by 11 (22.9%).

It is likely that the participants had difficulties in observing themselves (their own actions and their own activities – cf. Engeström, Sannino 2012) in their (pre)school daily life. Or rather, they lacked (the ability to make (?)) insights into themselves. The consequence of this was that the teachers may have lacked familiarity with themselves (their own needs, beliefs, and educational philosophy), and an awareness of their own adopted understanding of what learning is. This, in turn, made it difficult for them to notice their own "significant" as well as "trivial" activities in daily life, as they didn't know which of them **were** trivial or significant **in/for** their activities. The humanistic concept would induce us to draw the conclusion that they may have not assigned meaning to what surrounded them, including the activities they undertook. Arthur W. Combs underscored the assertion that perception and understanding does not merely consist in external reception of objects or manifestations of human behavior. They both involve the reception of those meanings that humans assign to objects, or persons, or actions (Kwiatkowska 2008). Perhaps the respondents observed their (pre)school daily life and themselves in it, but they were unable to assign meaning to it – unable to relate what they perceived to their own activity.

A **confirmation** of this lack of insight into themselves – into their own needs, beliefs and activities related to them – can be found in the respondents' answers to the statement "In my own activity, I notice some actions that I'm surprised by when working with children". 4 participants (8.4%) declared that they did not notice any such actions. 14 (29.2%) marked the statement: "I don't know", and 15 (31.3%) selected the answer: "rather yes". These results motivated us to pose a question about the criteria guiding the teachers in deciding to which educational situation from their (pre)school daily life they would assign a critical dimension. In explaining these results, we may be aided by noting the teachers' lack of research competence and their "entanglement" in their own practice, which may not allow them "to maintain the distance from their own actions that would be necessary to do research". This, in turn, leads "to limiting the designed change to teaching methodology" and to focusing on gathering evidence of their effectiveness (Gołębniak 2021: 141).

A peculiar understanding of experiencing diverse perspectives

Some of the respondents seemed to deprive themselves of the chance to learn about diverse points of view in relation to a particular educational situation. This may be evidenced by their declarations regarding the statement "I do not include other people (e.g. a teacher, child, parent, spouse, headmaster, expert in a given field) in reflecting on a given situation that took place in a kindergarten/school". 13 respondents (27.1%) indicated that they agreed with this statement and the same number selected the option "I don't know". Similar results were revealed in terms of the teachers' opinions on the item "When I think about a specific situation that took place while working with children, I look for information in

various sources (e.g. in the literature, on the Internet)". 11 respondents (23%) disagreed with this statement, and 10 (20.8%) marked the option "I don't know". By way of **complementing** the attempted explanation of the results, we may note that responses regarding three more statements. Concerning the first, "When I think about a given situation that arose while working with children, I think about what a teacher I know would say about it" (23 teachers agreed, and 15 marked the option: "I don't know"); for the second, "I look at the situation that happened while working with children from various perspectives, e.g. that of a child, a parent, another teacher, the director of the institution" (29 respondents agreed with it, and 13 selected the answer "I don't know"). As for the statement "I look at my own action during activities with children from a variety of perspectives, e.g., a child, parent, another teacher, director of the institution" (29 respondents agreed with it, and 14 responded "I don't know").

Perhaps early childhood education teachers use the strategy of **avoidance** when it comes to **experiencing diversity**, or **a perspective different from their own**. Experiencing diversity is **cognitively uncomfortable** and it **demands that something be done about it**. To be able to analyze a problem using selected sources of information is to remain within one's own perspective (in terms of one's own understanding of what these sources can offer). Perhaps it is a concern (care) for one's own comfort. It may be significant that the study involved 'young' teachers in terms of the number of years on the job. They were all in the pre-conventional stage (see Kwiatkowska 2008: 204–228), i.e. in the incipient, preliminary stage of building their own careers, and were focused rather on adapting, and displaying conformist attitudes (see Przygońska 2014: 28–46). They lacked a sense of competence and willingness to be open to diverse points of view. We are motivated to seek further support in explaining the results we obtained in this **area** by looking at studies on the professional development of teachers, including teachers at the threshold of their careers (Kędzierska 2015; Rodgers 2002 after Mizerek 2021: 36–37). The studies show that "novice" teachers tend to focus primarily on the content of the curriculum while ignoring the conditions of learning, the students and their learning process. As Henryk Mizerek argues, this is because a teacher who is overly focused on the content of the curriculum does not have the opportunity to observe what happens to the students (and in the students) during the lesson. According to Carol Rodgers (2002 after Mizerek 2021: 37), the ability to observe students is directly proportional to the degree to which the teachers are able to free themselves from fixation on curriculum content.

Thinking about what another teacher would say about an educational situation still occurs within the mind of the teacher who undertakes such reflection. After all, he or she cannot really look at it from the perspective of another colleague. If they do not include the other teacher in the analysis of the situation, there is no opportunity to open up to the other person's perspective and learn what it is. Some respondents anticipate what another teacher would say, but do not talk to them about a particular incident. Perhaps they are afraid of experiencing a perspective different from their own. Anticipating another teacher's point of view is done through the prism of one's own conception of experiencing

the world (cf. Kwaśnica 2007). Thus, it can be assumed that a significant portion of the respondents are denying themselves the opportunity to develop transformative learning abilities (see Pleskot-Makulska 2007). Perhaps some participants equate **thinking about what another person** (a child, a parent, another teacher, a facility director) **would see, how they would understand something** in relation to the incident being analyzed, with being open to a diversity of viewpoints. However, what they do not take into account is the fact that without including this other person in the considerations, they still remain within the **confines** of their own perspective.

Our attention here was drawn in particular to the instances where the respondents selected the answer "I don't know". These probably indicated that the respondents did not know themselves well enough, and had not (yet?) gained a sufficiently in-depth insight into their own needs, capabilities, abilities, and beliefs. Perhaps this was a consequence of their being at the beginning of career building, as we mentioned above. Perhaps at the stage of their college studies, no **cultural space** was created for them that might be conducive to building their awareness of being a teacher (or it was created too rarely).

Concluding remarks

The selected characteristics of reflexivity presented in the article indicate that the predominant strategy of analysis among the surveyed teachers regarding everyday (pre)school situations involves evaluation, that is, seeking their "positives and negatives". Additionally, the respondents tend to avoid experiencing diverse perspectives, meaning they do not analyze events together with other educational subjects. In terms of the ability to observe everyday (pre)school life, the randomness of selecting situations for subsequent analysis and a lack of self-observation skills have been revealed.

Thanks to the study and the analysis of its results, we have reflected on how to organize the learning conditions of early education teachers to give them the opportunity for developing reflexivity regarding everyday (pre)school life.

Teacher education could create a **cultural space** so that teachers may develop their ability to modify their existing ways of perceiving educational reality, as well as deepen their understanding of the concepts they are already familiar with. Understood in this way, it can serve them as a **source** of problems, resources, information and opportunities for self-examination, which is fundamental in the process of becoming a teacher. It allows the teacher to feel the need to integrate the knowledge they built with their developing self-esteem in relation to designing their educational situations within the daily life of the (pre)school. And it enables the teacher to carry out this integration. Reflectiveness makes an important **point** of the educational offer for the teacher and his or her needs. Learning, understood as changes in behavior, requires finding the personal meaning of knowledge and skills as a prerequisite for their effective use in action (Kwiatkowska 2008). For this reason, when creating educational programs addressed to teachers, it may be worthwhile

to draw upon the assumptions of the humanistic concept and the rationality of emancipation and motivate them to make systematic insights into their own needs, abilities, beliefs. It seems no less important to create, in cooperation with (future) teachers, educational situations that are conducive to the development of their research competence (cf. Gołębniak 2021: 141).

It seems that the participation of others in the teacher's reflection can give the teacher an opportunity to develop their own competence and make qualitative changes in their perspective on a particular aspect of reality. A reflective teacher has the opportunity to build a social and educational environment in a way that fosters the development of the students' capacity for reflection in relation to their own pursuit of knowledge. Reflectivity appears as a **cultural space** for teachers to experience the need for deliberation combined with analysis, and consideration. As a consequence, in working with teachers, striving to allow them to experience the need for reflection may create an opportunity for students who engage with these teachers to also become and be continually reflective, genuinely engaged in organizing their own process of learning. Reflective practitioners have the opportunity to support their students in being and becoming reflective (co-)creators of their (pre)school daily life.

References

Arends R.I. (1994), *Uczymy się nauczać*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.

Berner H. (2006), *Współczesne kierunki pedagogiczne*. In: B. Śliwerski (red.), *Pedagogika. Podstawy nauk o wychowaniu*. Vol. 1. Gdańsk, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Pedagogiczne.

Bruner J. (2006), *Kultura edukacji*. Kraków, Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawnictw Prac Naukowych Universitas.

Czaja-Chudyba I. (2013), *Myślenie krytyczne w kontekstach edukacji wczesnoszkolnej – uwarunkowania nieobecności*. Kraków, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Pedagogicznego.

Dewey J. (1988), *Jak myślimy?* Warszawa, Książka i Wiedza.

Dróżka W. (2006), *Kategorie analityczne w badaniach pedeutologicznych – w świetle założeń refleksyjnych nurtów poznawczych*. "Chowanna", 26(1).

Engeström Y., Sannino A. (2012), *Badania nad ekspansywnym uczeniem się: założenia, wnioski i przyszłe wyzwania*. "Forum Oświatowe", 46(1).

Filipiak E. (2012), *Rozwijanie zdolności uczenia się. Z Wygotskim i Brunerem w tle*. Sopot, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Filipiak E. (2015), *Kulturowe kompetencje studentów-beneficjentów projektu ACK. Wprowadzenie*. In: E. Filipiak, E. Lemańska-Lewandowska (red.), *Raport tematyczny z realizacji projektu ACK. Model nauczania rozwijającego we wczesnej edukacji według Lwa S. Wygotskiego. Gotowość studentów i nauczycieli. Możliwości aplikacji*. Bydgoszcz, Agencja Reklamowo-Wydawnicza ArtStudio.

Gergen K.J. (2009), *Nasycone Ja. Dylematy tożsamości w życiu współczesnym*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Giddens A. (2003), *Stanowienie społeczeństwa*. Poznań, Zysk i S-ka.

Gołębniak B.D. (2021), *Ekspansja uczenia się? Co z nauczaniem? W stronę społeczno-kulturowych podstaw edukacji nauczycieli*. Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej.

Gołębniak B.D., Zamorska B. (2014), *Nowy profesjonalizm nauczycieli. Podejścia – praktyka – przestrzeń rozwoju*. Wrocław, Dolnośląska Szkoła Wyższa.

Goodman N. (1997), *Jak tworzymy świat*. Warszawa, Fundacja Aletheia.

Kemmis S. (2010), *Teoria krytyczna i uczestniczące badania w działaniu*. In: H. Červinková, B.D. Gołębniak (red.), *Badania w działaniu. Pedagogika i antropologia zaangażowane*. Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej.

Kędzierska H. (2015), *Novice teachers: The process of "anchoring" in the teaching profession*. "Forum Oświatowe", 27(2).

Kopaczyńska I. (2011), *Osobliwości procesu refleksyjności nowoczesności w rozważaniach nad wczesną edukacją. (Kon)sekwencje obserwowanych zmian*. In: D. Klus-Stańska, D. Bronk, A. Malenda (red.), *Pedagogika wczesnej edukacji. Dyskursy, problemy, otwarcia*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademickie ŻAK.

Kozielecki J. (1995), *Koncepcje psychologiczne człowieka*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo "Żak".

Kwaśnica R. (2007), *Dwie racjonalności. Od filozofii sensu ku pedagogice ogólnej*. Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Naukowe Dolnośląskiej Szkoły Wyższej Edukacji TWP.

Kwiatkowska H. (2008), *Pedeutologia*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

Langer E.J. (1993), *Problemy uświadamiania. Konsekwencje refleksyjności i bezrefleksyjności*. In: T. Maruszewski (red.), *Poznanie. Afekt. Zachowanie*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Ledzińska M., Czerniawska E. (2011), *Psychologia nauczania. Ujęcie poznawcze. Podręcznik akademicki*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Lewartowska-Zychowicz M. (2009), *Nauczyciel (wczesnej edukacji) w relacjach wolności i przymusu*. W: D. Klus-Stańska, M. Szczepska-Pustkowska (red.), *Pedagogika wczesnoszkolna – dyskursy, problemy, rozwiązania*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

Maciuszek J. (2013), *Automatyzmy i bezrefleksyjność w kontekście wpływu społecznego*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Mizerek H. (2021), *Refleksja krytyczna w edukacji i pedagogice. Misja (nie)wykonalna?* Kraków, Oficyna Wydawnicza "Impuls".

Niżnik J. (1979), *Przedmiot poznania w naukach społecznych*. Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Paris S.G., Ayres L.R. (1997), *Stawanie się refleksyjnym uczniem i nauczycielem*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.

Perkowska-Klejman A. (2014), *Cztery poziomy refleksyjności studentów*. "Teraźniejszość – Człowiek – Edukacja", 2.

Perkowska-Klejman A. (2016), *Refleksyjność studentów pedagogiki*, "Studia Edukacyjne", 39.

Perkowska-Klejman A. (2019), *Poszukiwanie refleksyjności w edukacji. Studium teoretyczno--empiryczne*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo Akademii Pedagogiki Specjalnej.

Perry R. (2000), *Teoria i praktyka. Proces stawania się nauczycielem*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.

Petty G. (2010), *Nowoczesne nauczanie. Praktyczne wskazówki i techniki dla nauczycieli, wykładowców i szkoleniowców*. Sopot, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Pleskot-Makulska K. (2007), *Teoria uczenia się transformatywnego autorstwa Jacka Mazirowa*. "Rocznik Andragogiczny".

Przygońska E. (2014), *Etapy rozwoju zawodowego nauczyciela*. In: E. Przygońska (red.), *Nauczyciel. Rozwój zawodowy i kompetencje*. Toruń, Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.

Rubacha K. (2008), *Metodologia badań nad edukacją*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne.

Rylke H. (1997), *Refleksyjny praktyk – nowa tożsamość nauczyciela*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwo CODN.

Schön D.A. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner. How professionals think in action*. New York, Basic Books.

Szyller A. (2018), *Bezrefleksyjna codzienność refleksyjnych uczniów, czyli polska edukacja wczesnoszkolna z podręcznikiem w tle*. "Problemy Wczesnej Edukacji", 40(1).

Szymczak J. (2015), *Model rozwijania refleksyjności u (przyszłych) nauczycieli edukacji wczesnoszkolnej – założenia, istota, motywy konstruowania i nadawania mu wymiaru praktycznego*. "Problemy Wczesnej Edukacji", 28(1).

Szymczak J. (2017), *Refleksja nauczycieli wczesnej edukacji dotycząca pracy z uczniami (w perspektywie badań rekonstrukcyjnych). Studium teoretyczno-badawcze*. Bydgoszcz, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego.

Szymczak J. (2020), *"Dobre?" (nie)przygotowanie do prowadzenia projektu w jakościowej orientacji badawczej – ku autoentografii*. "Forum Oświatowe", 32(1). DOI: 10.34862/fo.2020.1.2.

Tripp D. (1996), *Zdarzenia krytyczne w nauczaniu. Kształtowanie profesjonalnego osądu*. Warszawa, Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.

Wiśniewska M. (2015), *Kultury organizacyjne w szkole. Teoria – Badania – Rekomendacje*. Bydgoszcz, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kazimierza Wielkiego.

Zwierżdżyński M.K. (2012), *Konstruktywizm a konstrukcjonizm*. "Principia", 56.

Zybertowicz A. (1995), *Przemoc i poznanie. Studium z nie-klasycznej socjologii wiedzy*. Toruń, Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika.

Internet sources

Rodgers C. (2002), *Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking*. "Teachers College Record", 104(4). https://www.canr.msu.edu/bsp/uploads/files/Reading_Resources/Defining_Reflection.pdf, 10.07.2022.