EXPLORING EFL TEACHERS' NEW PEDAGOGICAL CONTENT KNOWLEDGE OF GENRE-BASED APPROACH

Suharyadi
Department of English, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang
E-mail: suharyadi.fs@um.ac.id

Utami Widiati
Department of English, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang
E-mail: utami.widiati.fs@um.ac.id

Yazid Basthomi
Department of English, Faculty of Letters, Universitas Negeri Malang
E-mail: ybasthomi@um.ac.id

Abstract: This study aimed at exploring the EFL teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of GBA and English instruction in the Indonesian context. The data were collected from 42 senior high school English teachers by making use of a set of questionnaires, interviews, and observations. The first type of data was analyzed through a response counting to calculate the scores and percentages, with which the categories of teachers' knowledge were engineered. Meanwhile, the second type of data was analyzed by describing all indicators in the observation checklists (in the forms of spoken cycle and written cycle and four stages of teaching: building knowledge of the field, modeling of the text, joint construction of the text, and independent construction of the text). The data analysis reveals that the English teachers' pedagogical content knowledge of GBA can be classified into two major groups: 38.1% English teachers had deep knowledge and 61.9% English teachers had shallow knowledge. In connection to the classroom teaching, teachers with these different levels of knowledge are identical in implementing the guidelines of spoken and written cycles. One of the essential implications is that both categories of EFL teachers need to understand theories of GBA and concepts of GBA used in the curriculum more in-depth as the reference and signpost to perform a better classroom teaching.
Keywords: *EFL teachers; pedagogical content knowledge; teaching practices; GBA.*

INTRODUCTION
In English language teaching, teachers' knowledge, as an important part of teacher cognition, has been a burgeoning area of research in the last four decades as one of the indicators of successful teaching (Shulman, 1987). As a crucial foundation, knowledge is needed by teachers not only to accomplish the teaching and learning process (Stark, Eadie, Snow, & Goldfeld, 2020; Carter and Gonzalez, 1993), but also to fulfill learners' needs (Hao, 2016), and to improve the teaching efficacy and students' learning achievements (Walshaw, 2012). Even in the 21st century, teachers' knowledge is consistently required to advocate learners' learning (Kereluik, Mishra, Fahnoe, & Terry, 2013). With knowledge, teachers are able to think, know, believe, and do (Borg, 2003) to make their teaching better.

Among the types of knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) has been an interesting topic investigated in the literature. Theoretically, PCK emphasizes not only what to teach (content) but also how to teach (pedagogy) (Shulman, 1987). The combination of these two entities has been empirically effective to be applied in the classroom instruction (Schmidt, Baran, Thompson, Mishra, 2009), particularly to help students learn better (Kleickmann, Richter, Kunter, Elsner, Besser, Krauss, & Baumert, 2013; Baumert, Kunter, Blum, Brunner, Voss, Jordan, Klusmann, Krauss, Neubrand, & Tsai, 2010). As PCK plays an imperative role in reaching the instructional goals, Cesur and Ertaş (2018) suggested that teachers

should have good PCK in order to be able to teach students the contents with more appropriate teaching method. To do so, PCK should be viewed and assessed within three components: curriculum-related knowledge, students-related knowledge, and teaching strategies-related knowledge (Bukova-Güzel, 2010). These components become a guideline for teachers to make teaching scenarios successfully (Irvine-Niakaris and Kiely, 2015).

So far, PCK has been studied both in a single variable and integrated with other types of knowledge in different settings with various purposes. For example, König, Tachtsoglou, Lammerding, Strauß, Nold, & Rohde (2017) investigated the relationship between the learning opportunities in the EFL teachers' preparation program and their PCK. The result shows that learning activities in the program can aid teachers to increase the level and development of their knowledge. Liu (2013) also conducts a study focusing patterns and development of lecturers' PCK. She finds that policy and culture become important aspects in shaping teachers' PCK. Similarly, Al-Jaro, Asmawi, and Hasim (2017) also study PCK in the curriculum of English teacher education program (ETEP) at a Faculty of Education in a Yemeni University. The results indicate that teachers possess different facets of PCK and pedagogy-related courses provided are inadequate to increase teachers' PCK including their teaching skills. PCK is also studied together with TPACK. For example, Lux, Bangert, and Whittier (2011) include PCK in order to develop an instrument for pre-service teachers' TPACK. Mishra and Koehler (2006) assess teachers TPACK and find out that teachers should possess sufficient knowledge in terms of content knowledge (CK), pedagogical knowledge (PK), and technological knowledge (TK). Similarly, Wu and Wang (2015) combine PCK with TPACK in order to investigate teachers' knowledge and teaching performance. They claim that teachers require more knowledge on technology in order to develop their PCK and TPACK.

Those aforementioned studies apparently adumbrate the importance of teachers' knowledge pertaining to subject matter, pedagogy, and technology which is required to conduct an effective teaching. However, none of them gives adequate attention to the exploration of EFL teachers' knowledge on specific approach of teaching, namely Genre-Based Approach (GBA) and their teaching practices. Previous research has shown that a study on what teachers know and how they teach it is essential to be undertaken (Usak, Ozden, and Eilks, 2011). It is also believed that the harmony of these two parts (knowing and doing) can be a portrait of ideal classroom teaching (Neumann, Kind, and Harms, 2019). Further, none of the existing studies has explored the specific levels of teachers' knowledge which refer to deep knowledge and shallow knowledge as proposed by Bennet and Bennet (2008). Deep knowledge reflects teachers' strong comprehension and abstraction as it is processed, structured and stored in memory so that it is useful for application and task performance (Jong and Ferguson-Hessler, 1996). Meanwhile, shallow knowledge shows teachers' weak comprehension and abstraction and therefore it can insufficiently describe complex situations (Badiru and Cheung, 2002). Knowing teachers' levels of knowledge is surely pivotal for us to identify parts of knowledge teachers know and do not know so that we can develop an effective instruction.

The intended knowledge in this study is different from knowledge commonly investigated in literature. It refers to knowledge in a specific context, that is the understanding of GBA. As one of the teaching approaches, GBA is strongly influenced by Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics principles on texts, contexts, and meanings (Halliday and Webster, 2007). Since its first prominence in 1980s, it has been formally embedded in the English curricula in several countries such as in Australia (Rose and Martin, 2012; Burns and Joyce, 2007; Marshall, 1991; Hammond, 1987); New Zealand (Locke, Whitehead, Dix, & Cawkwell, 2011); the UK (Paltridge, 2004), the US K-12 schools (Brisk, 2014; Oliveira and Lan, 2014; Gebhard, Chen, and Britton, 2014; Moore and Schleppegrell, 2014, Harman, 2013); Singapore (Lin, 2006); Hong Kong (Graves and Garton, 2017; Maxwell-Reid, 2014); and five European countries: Sweden, Denmark, Scotland, Portugal, and Spain (Whittaker and García Parejo, 2018), including Indonesia (Mbau and Sugeng, 2019; Graves and Garton, 2017; Emilia and Hamied, 2015; Widodo, 2006). With deep knowledge of GBA, teachers are able to achieve the expected aims of teaching and learning of English with GBA which emphasize the understanding and production of various texts.

Knowledge of GBA in this study is called PCK as it comprises knowledge of basic concepts of GBA, knowledge of curriculum of GBA, and knowledge of teaching strategies of GBA. As relatively new in the pursuit of knowledge, these elements of GBA (presented in Table 1) are needed by teachers to facilitate students' learning (Triastuti, 2020; Kissau and Algozzine, 2017; Stran and Curtner-Smith, 2010). This study is, therefore, inevitable to be undergone as it will enrich the body of knowledge in relation to genre pedagogy and types of knowledge and broaden teachers or practitioners' perspectives about the importance of knowledge and its benefits for teaching practices. Finally, this study is believed to enable teachers to positively transform the ways they teach in the future and bring about better students' learning outcomes.

METHOD
This study involved 42 senior high school English teachers of twelve senior high schools. They were selected based on the set-up criteria as follows: they should graduate from an English department; they should at least have had an undergraduate diploma as a minimum requirement of the teachers' qualifications; they taught English in state senior high schools, not in private senior high schools and/or vocational schools; they should be tenured and certified English teachers; and they should have an experience of joining workshops, conferences, seminars, or training on English language teaching.

The instruments (questionnaires, interviews and observations) aiming at collecting data related to teachers' knowledge and teaching practice were developed based on the theory of GBA (Halliday and Webster, 2007) and aspects of GBA in the curriculum used in high schools in Indonesia (Kemendikbud 2013; Emilia, 2011) and validated by the experts in the field and tried out to other

English teachers. The questionnaires contained 63 GBA-related items which were grouped under three major categories of GBA (Parts B, C, and D) as presented in Table 1. The questions used for the interviews were also developed following the same procedures as employed in the questionnaires. The reason was that the interviews were utilized to confirm the teachers' responses obtained through the questionnaires. In relation to observations, the checklists were developed as the guideline, containing two cycles (spoken cycle and written cycle) by which teachers conducted the teaching and learning process. Each cycle was then followed by four stages of teaching, namely building knowledge of the field (BKoF), modeling of the text (MoT), joint construction of the text (JCoT), and independent construction of the text (ICoT). In each stage, specific descriptors were elaborated concerning what and how teachers taught students based on GBA.

Mainly formulated with open-ended questions, the questionnaires were distributed to 42 English of twelve state senior high schools. Appointments to have face to face meetings were made so that teachers could spend time completing the questionnaires in the schools. Having finished answering the questionnaires, they were also requested to be interviewed and observed. However, only 15 English teachers were available and willing to be involved in these stages. The interviews were conducted once for about 30-60 minutes for each teacher within their convinience. The interviews were carried out in a confortable place or room in the school so that noise or any other disturbance could be eliminated. Indonesian language was used to avoid misleading questions and answers and misinterpretation. Dealing with teaching practices, teachers were observed and recorded with the help of observation checklists from the beginning to the end of meetings.

Table 1. *Items in the questionnaire*
(adapted from Kemendikbud, 2013; Emilia, 2011; Halliday and Webster, 2007)

Variables			
Part A: Teachers' background (10 items)	Part B: Basic concepts of GBA (11 items)	Part C: Principles and models of GBA teaching (33 items)	Part D: GBA concepts in the curriculum (19 items)
- teaching experience - training - formal education	- text - context - types of contexts - field - tenor	- 3 principles of GBA teaching - concept of the curriculum cycle - spoken and written	- types of conversations - short functional texts - monolog texts - types of texts (recount, narration, news item,

- mode - text types - genre	cycles - stages of teaching with GBA	procedure, spoof, report, description, explanation, discussions, exposition, and review) - types of competences - levels of literacy

The data revealed from questionnaires and interviews were analyzed by comparing the teachers' answers with the predetermined expected answers taken from the existing theory (Scharfenberg and Bogner, 2016; Kellner, Gullberg, Attorps, Thorén, & Tärneberg, 2011). Here, the correct and incorrect answers were then calculated to obtain the scores and percentages. The scores were utilized to categorize the teachers' knowledge based on two levels of knowledge proposed by (Bennet and Bennet, 2008) as presented in Table 2. It is important to describe whether teachers have shallow knowledge or deep knowledge on GBA. To get details of how teachers with different knowledge teach, the results of observations were analyzed by describing all indicators in the checklists (in the forms of spoken cycle and written cycle and four stages of teaching: BKoF, MoT, JCoT and ICoT.

Table 2. *Indicators of teachers' knowledge (adapted from Bennet and Bennet (2008)*

Teachers have deep knowledge if they…	**Teachers have shallow knowledge if they…**
have information about GBA and full understanding of the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum.	have information about GBA and some understanding of the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum.
know the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum and can use them in the classroom teaching.	know the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum but cannot use them in the classroom teaching.
can make relationship between the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum.	cannot make relationship between the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum.
can easily remember the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum (they are not easy to forget).	cannot easily remember the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum (they are easy to forget).
develop/ construct the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum for understanding.	memorize the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum for understanding.
have more than 5 years of experience in using the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum in the classroom teaching.	have less than 5 years of experience in using the basic concepts of GBA, principles and models of GBA teaching, and GBA concepts in the curriculum in the classroom teaching.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Results
Teachers' PCK of GBA

The data analysis shows that the English teachers' PCK of GBA can be summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. *Categories of teachers' PCK of GBA*

Categories	Teachers	Scores	Percentage
Deep	16	71.23-95.89	38.1
Shallow	26	17.80-69.86	61.9

Table 3 highlights that the teachers' PCK can be classified into two major groups: deep and shallow. Sixteen teachers (38.1%) belong to having "Deep" knowledge while 26 teachers (61.9%) fall within the category of possessing shallow knowledge. In details, teachers with deep knowledge mean that they are strong in two or three assessed parts of GBA covering Parts B, C, and D. From the responses, teachers with deep knowledge are strong in Parts C and D as they are consistently able to explicate those parts as expected by the relevant theory, but weak in Part B as they cannot theoretically elaborate the concepts such as "text, context, context of culture, context or situation, three elements of context of situation (field, tenor, and mode), and genre". Different from teachers with deep knowledge, teachers with shallow knowledge are weak in two or three measured parts. Based on the data, they are weak in Parts B and D. They cannot define the concepts of text, context, context of culture, context of situation, genre, levels of literacy, and types of competences, etc. However, they are strong in Part C, which is related to the principles and models of GBA teaching.

Teachers' teaching practices of GBA
Teachers with deep knowledge and shallow knowledge are also described based on the teaching practices. As reflected from the analysis, none of the teachers adheres the expected cycle of teaching in the form of spoken and written cycles as the guidelines which state that the listening and speaking skills are incorporated into the spoken cycle and the reading and writing skills are amalgamated in the written cycle. In this regard, teachers are also expected to integrate the language skills and components appropriately in the teaching practice.

As revealed from the analysis, teachers with deep knowledge utilize the cycles to integrate the language skills and/or language components in the following patterns. For instance, in particular meetings with BKoF-MoT-JCoT stages, teachers integrate reading- speaking; grammar-writing; speaking-reading; speaking-reading-speaking; reading-grammar-writing; speaking-writing-speaking; listening-reading-writing; listening-writing-speaking; and grammar. In some other meetings with BKoF-MoT stages, teachers have the following styles of integration: speaking-reading-speaking-vocabulary; and speaking-grammar-

writing. In BKoF-JCoT, teachers integrate the language skills and language components as follows: writing-reading-vocabulary; reading-speaking; reading-grammar; reading; speaking-writing-speaking; and speaking. In BKoF-ICoT, teachers emphasize the teaching on one language skill only: writing.

Teachers with shallow knowledge on GBA also deploy different styles of interpreting the spoken cycle and written cycle. For example, In BKoF-MoT-JCoT, teachers teach the language skills and components in this hierarchy: speaking-writing-speaking; listening-reading-writing; speaking-writing-speaking; grammar; listening-reading-writing; speaking-reading-speaking-reading; and listening-speaking-listening. In BKoF-MoT, teachers employ ten styles of integration: speaking-grammar-writing; writing-speaking-listening; listening; reading; speaking-reading-listening; listening-reading; speaking-reading; listening-speaking; grammar; and reading-grammar. In BKoF-JCoT, teachers incorporate the language skills and components under these styles: speaking-listening-writing-speaking; speaking, writing-speaking; speaking-listening-writing; speaking-reading-writing; reading; reading-speaking-reading-writing-speaking; writing-speaking-reading; reading-speaking-grammar; writing-reading; speaking-listening; and speaking. In BKoF-MoT-ICoT, teachers possess two styles: reading-writing; and speaking-listening-vocabulary.

Discussion
The main findings in this study are teachers' PCK related to GBA and their teaching practices in the classroom. As portrayed from the results, sixteen (38.1%) teachers' PCK fall within "deep" and 26 teachers (61.9%) are found to be in the category of "shallow". These categories indicate that the majority of teachers' PCK is low (61.9%). This finding can also similarly be portrayed in several previous studies. For instance, Sumarsono (2015) finds out that the English teachers' competence (combination of abilities, knowledge and skills) in Indonesia is low as indicated by their national average score reaching 56.02 out of 100, which is below the minimal national passing grade, 75. In terms of English teachers' professional competence, their average score is 32 and their pedagogical competence is 17. In another setting of study, Kömür (2010) measures preservice EFL teachers'

knowledge of teaching and the result shows that their knowledge was not applied in their teaching. Chen and Goh's study (2014) focusing on teachers' knowledge about spoken English teaching shows that that teachers do not have adequate pedagogical content knowledge. A similar study done by DeBoer (2007) reflects that a number of teachers possess insufficient knowledge on how to teach listening and speaking. With regard to grammatical knowledge, some other studies indicate that both pre-service English teachers and in-service English teachers are weak in their grammatical knowledge (Borg, 2001; Andrews, 1999; Williamson and Hardman, 1995). These studies inform that English teachers in different settings have shallow knowledge not only in terms of the language skills and components but also in teaching method. Therefore, it is important for teachers to involve themselves in more focused and intensive professional development programs in the form of joining seminars, conferences and workshops, pursuing their studies, doing research and writing articles to be published in the proceedings or journals. The discussion on possible factors attributing to the teachers' deep and shallow knowledge is presented in the following.

Teachers' deep PCK versus teachers' shallow PCK
Teachers with deep knowledge do not mean that they know all aspects of GBA. They have different areas of mastery and non-mastery in their PCK. For instance, they are strong in the principles and models of GBA teaching (Part C) and the GBA concepts in the curriculum (Part D), yet they are weak in dealing with the basic concepts of GBA (Part B). Teachers with shallow knowledge also possess areas of mastery and non-mastery in their PCK. In general, they are strong only in part C, which is related to the principles and models of GBA teaching, but weak in the GBA concepts in the curriculum (Part D) and the basic concepts of GBA (Part B).

In this context, teachers with deep knowledge can be described as the ones who have information and full understanding about the principles and models of GBA teaching (Part C) and the GBA concepts in the curriculum (Part D). They have deep knowledge of GBA as they develop or construct, not memorize it. Therefore, they can easily remember them in all occasions. With this knowledge, they are able to apply and undertake a better classroom teaching. In line with these characteristics, Badiru and Cheung (2002); Jong and Ferguson-Hessler (1996) state that deep knowledge refers to the internal and causal structure of a system and involves the interactions between the system's components. It is embedded in the person's knowledge and deals with comprehension and abstraction. It is processed, structured and stored in memory so that it is useful for application and task performance.

Teachers with shallow knowledge can be also described in the following points. They have information and some understanding about the basic concepts of GBA (Part B) and the GBA concepts in the curriculum (Part D). They get their shallow knowledge of GBA by means of memorizing, not by developing / constructing ideas. Consequently, they cannot make connections among the concepts and application. Since they have difficulties retrieving their knowledge, they cannot apply and undertake a better classroom teaching. In line with these, Badiru and Cheung (2002) state that shallow knowledge deals with reproduction and trial and error. This knowledge basically represents the input/output relationship of a system. It is stored in memory more or less as a copy of external information. Shallow representation is limited. It may have little to do with the manner in which experts view the domain and solve problems. This may limit the capability of the system to provide appropriate explanations to the user. Shallow knowledge may also be insufficient in describing complex situations. Therefore, a deeper presentation is often required.

Regardless of these categories, there are interesting sides to explore pertaining to why they have different areas of mastery and non-mastery in the context of GBA. Here, we can say that teachers who are strong in a particular part or all parts may be sufficiently exposed to the concepts in the school context and therefore there is likelihood for them to read and understand the concepts correctly. In contrast, teachers who are weak in one part or all parts may also have no or less exposure to the concepts, and therefore it is difficult for them to figure them out. Teachers' exposures to the concepts seem to play an important role in making them have different levels of knowledge. In fact, teachers with deep knowledge have a better understanding about Parts C and D compared to teachers with shallow knowledge who are good

only in Part C although both types of teachers are similar in that they know Part C.

Teachers know the concepts as they are frequently exposed to in the school setting through various activities. For example, they join a teacher forum to share and discuss the issues or topics related to English teaching. When teachers read the curriculum and syllabus, they are supposed to know the goal of English instruction, competences students need to achieve, types of texts, etc. Another example is when teachers are preparing lesson plans. Commonly, they are required to determine the objectives of the teaching, the texts to be taught, methods of teaching (i.e. using spoken and written cycles and stages of teaching), media of teaching, activities to be done, and assessment tasks and procedures. In this regard, Tagle, Díaz, Etchegaray, Alarcón, Quintana, & Ramos (2020) stated that teachers activate six types of knowledge when designing lesson plans: content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, curricular knowledge, knowledge of learners, and knowledge of educational contexts. In the semesterly workshop provided by schools, teachers are usually also requested to analyze the relevant documents before conducting the classroom teaching in the following semester. These regular activities are the exposures teachers always deal with regardless of their different ages and teaching experiences. Thus, these exposures are believed to help teachers be familiar with and understand the concepts. Although there is no specific research on the issue, the exposures have been claimed to be influential, particularly in English language teaching and learning. For example, the provision of sufficient exposures in the forms of media (movies, books, magazines, and TV programs) can increase students' vocabulary knowledge (Peters, 2018). A study done by Unsworth, Persson, Prins, & De Bot (2014) also showed that giving early EFL students exposures of grammar weekly can improve their grammar scores. These two studies indirectly indicate that exposures contribute to teachers' familiarity and understanding of the concepts.

Besides those mastery areas, teachers also have non-mastery areas of knowledge. For example, as reflected in Part B, teachers with deep knowledge get difficulties in defining the fundamental concepts of GBA which include "text, context, context of culture, context or situation, three elements of context of situation (field, tenor, and mode), and genre". They cannot elaborate the concepts based on the theory probably because they are not obviously operationalized in the curriculum, syllabus, and textbooks, so they have no idea to deal with and therefore they possess less exposures. To the best of our observation, the curriculum, syllabus, and textbooks provide limited information, for instance, about types of texts, types of competences, language skills and components. In other words, the ideas of "text, context, context of culture, context or situation, three elements of context of situation (field, tenor, and mode), and genre" should also be sufficiently provided in the curriculum or in a supplementary book which specifically elaborates the concepts and is accessible to teachers.

Surprisingly, what happens to teachers with shallow knowledge is quite unique in the sense that they do not understand the aspects of GBA in the curriculum though they have been exposed to them in the schools. Different from teachers with deep knowledge, the exposure to the concepts seems to have less influence to teachers with shallow knowledge and it is in contrast with the studies stating that exposures will increase teachers' knowledge (Peters, 2018; Unsworth et al., 2014). For example, they are weak in explaining types of conversations, short functional texts, monolog texts, social functions, generic structures, and linguistic features of the texts instructed in schools, including types of competences. In addition, their teaching experience seems to not go hand in hand with their development of knowledge. Even though they belong to experienced teachers with more than five years of teaching, their knowledge on GBA is not developed. For example, two teachers involved in the study have been teaching English for about 30 years, yet they have shallow knowledge on GBA. Another teacher with eight-year teaching experience also has poor knowledge on GBA.

These examples of teachers show that the length of teaching does not guarantee that they have deep knowledge. This fact contradicts with the existing research results. For instance, And, Tomer, and Tamir (1990) prove that there is no connection between the length of teaching experience and knowledge of subject matter. More specifically, teachers with short and long years of teaching are similar in the sense that they possess partial knowledge of pedagogy. Another study by Chen

and Goh (2014) focusing on teachers' knowledge about spoken English teaching also shows that there is no considerable difference in terms of knowledge among teachers with various teaching experiences and involvements in training. A more surprising research finding also reveals that teachers with more years of teaching tend to have less PCK (Asl, Asl, and Asl, 2014). It means that teachers' knowledge is complex, as it is determined not only by years of teaching, but also beliefs and positive attitudes towards the concepts in particular or GBA in general.

Beliefs and positive attitudes can impact the levels of teachers' knowledge and quality of teaching. In line with this, Hu and Tian (2012) state that beliefs and positive attitudes are key factors in determining the levels of teachers' knowledge and quality of teaching. Similarly, Bernat and Gvozdenko (2005) also assert that beliefs and attitudes become important determiners to the success of the classroom instruction including scaffolding instructors in preparing the syllabus and implementing teaching. Some other research has also suggested that teachers with positive attitudes tend to have better knowledge and quality of teaching (Al Harthy, Jamaluddin, and Abedalaziz, 2013; Nadeem, Rana, Lone, Maqbool, Naz, & Ali, 2011; Duatepe and Akkus-Cikla, 2004). Therefore, teachers need to be open and have willingness (Wong, 2011) to learn any changes in curriculum or development of teaching methods/media so that they have adequate knowledge. To do so, any teacher preparation programs should be effectively designed by focusing on how to develop PCK (Mayne, 2019; Kaplan and Owings, 2002).

In addition to lack of exposure, beliefs and positive attitudes, teachers' shallow knowledge is also related to their not being accustomed to reading concepts which sound too theoretical. In the EFL context, not all teachers are interested in associating with something conceptual, which is full of abstractions and difficult to understand. In a response to it, Author, (2001) state that teachers need to be equipped with more theoretical underpinning in the training so that they understand what underlies the practical matters. It is quite challenging also for them to spend adequate time enjoying reading, particularly articles and books that contain many theories, which include the notions of, for example, text, context, context of culture, context or situation, three elements of context of situation (field, tenor, and mode), and genre. To them, enjoying reading for comprehension and pleasure is not their habit and interest. Research done by Khan and Madden (2018) has proven that psychological factors such as interest, anxiety, and motivation affect the reading activities. Therefore, teachers need to psychologically be ready to start reading. It can be true also that having a reading habit is fundamental for teachers as it reflects their attitude and increases their understanding or knowledge. Studies carried out by Whitten, Labby, and Sullivan (2016); Cullinan (2000) have empirically shown that enjoying reading can significantly enhance students or even teachers skills of reading comprehension, fluency, and general knowledge. A correlational study has also evidenced that the attitude towards reading directly has a positive correlation with reading habit and indirectly with critical thinking (Ulu, 2019). Here, reading habits become the key factors for teachers to be able to enrich their knowledge not only related to the subject matters but also pedagogical aspects to improve the quality of teaching. Therefore, there should be a policy on promoting a reading habit for school teachers including the provision of a free online and anchor reading sources.

Another factor is related to teachers' routine activities in the schools. During their teaching career for years, they have dealt with repeated activities such as preparing lesson plans and instructional materials and media, choosing teaching strategies, assessing students, and correcting students' work. They have also been busy with administrative matters (Ertmer and Ottenbreit-Leftwich, 2010) such as managing school finance, making proposals for school funding, attending meetings, etc. (Dewi, Hendrawani, Kurniasih, Suryati, & Khery, 2018). These activities have, to some extent, changed their perception about how to develop their profession as teachers. In several formal meetings, teachers deem that that their job is teaching, not researching nor writing. Teaching seems to be the only way to enrich their competence. Consequently, not many teachers have interests to conduct research, write articles to be published in journals or proceedings, and take part in a seminar, conference, workshop, or training, particularly on GBA as to develop their professional and intellectual competences as shown in our previous work (Author, 2001) which reveals

that 45.2% English teachers are not interested in writing articles for publication. A similar study done by Kartowagiran (2015) also shows that 82.5%-90% teachers, in general, have not done research and published articles. It means that the existing regulation stating that activities teachers can do for a promotion through research, dissemination, and publication is not optimally manifested. Thus, the government should periodically evaluate and control the implementation of this regulation so that teachers' research, dissemination, and publication can be increased.

Teachers' knowledge and teaching practices
This study is not correctional, yet it is interesting to see the teachers' knowledge and their teaching practices. Viewed from the levels, teachers with deep knowledge are supposed to perform a better teaching than those of teachers with shallow knowledge. A better teaching in this context is defined as a full implementation of the curriculum cycle to integrate the language skills and components in the real instruction. As shown in the data, however, both categories of teachers, in the spoken cycle, integrate listening not only with speaking but also with other skills and components. In the written cycle, teachers integrate reading not only with writing but also with other skills and components. For instance, teachers with deep knowledge mix listening with reading, writing and grammar. They also mix speaking with reading and vocabulary; and with grammar and writing. In the written cycle, teachers integrate reading with speaking, with grammar and writing, with listening, and with vocabulary. A similar phenomenon is also found out in teachers with shallow knowledge. They combine listening with reading and writing; speaking with writing; speaking with grammar and writing, speaking with reading; speaking with listening and writing. In the written cycle, they blend writing with speaking and listening, reading with grammar, reading with speaking and speaking, writing with speaking and reading, etc.

These findings apparently evidence that there is no striking difference among those teachers in terms of utilizing the cycles of teaching as well as integrating the language skills and components. Both types of teachers apply similar procedures in teaching although they have different levels of knowledge. Obviously seen in this context,

teachers' knowledge is not always parallel with their teaching practice in the classroom. Several studies have reported regarding this phenomenon. For example, Al-Husban and Alkhawaldeh (2016) try to investigate a relationship between English teachers' knowledge and the teaching practice. They find out that there is no connection between English teachers' knowledge with the teaching practice. Another study by Cesur and Ertaş (2018) on 127 English teachers' perceptions in relation to their PCK levels and the use of their PCK in teaching also proves that their belief (being able to do) is not considerably reflected in their actual teaching, particularly in terms of lesson planning, leaners, and evaluation. A recent study is also conducted by Triastuti (2020) assessing pre-service teachers' knowledge base and their reflection on the real teaching in Indonesia. The results reveal that their good knowledge is not adequately implemented in their teaching practicum.

These findings show us that the quality of teaching of both categories is not yet reflected in the real classroom and is far from the expectation. They seem not to know what to do and how to do in the classroom. Particularly, they do not have a clear lesson planning on what to teach and how teach English with GBA. Consequently, what can be seen in the classroom is just a set of teaching routines which may not make significant differences on students' learning. In other words, the quality of teaching is not entirely related with the knowledge teachers possess. Other factors such as beliefs and positive attitudes can be strong predictors. As mentioned earlier that both beliefs and positive attitudes influence the quality of teaching (Al Harthy, Jamaluddin, and Abedalaziz, 2013; Hu and Tian 2012; Nadeem et al., 2011; Bernat and Gvozdenko, 2005; Duatepe and Akkus-Cikla, 2004). Being able to reflect is also paramount for teachers to help enhance their teaching performance (Wong, 2011). Triastuti (2020) finds out that reflections are also needed by pre-service teachers so that they can identify what works and what does not work in teaching. In other words, why teachers with deep knowledge and teachers with shallow knowledge do similar patterns in applying the spoken and written cycles is not merely because of the levels of their knowledge, yet their beliefs, positive attitudes, and reflections.

Another interesting thing to probe is that it can be a new piece of evidence that teachers'

knowledge and teaching practice are of two different entities. They are not in nature connected, but they need to be purposively connected. Knowledge is something teachers obtain from much reading and discussing, but quality of teaching is something teachers attain from real teaching practices and watching or observing teaching practices in the classroom. According to Graham, White, Cologon, & Pianta (2020), the quality of teaching is not always related with whether teachers are beginning teachers or experienced teachers. Knowledge is built from teaching, not the opposite. In line with this, Watzke (2007) states that the development of teachers' knowledge particularly on a teaching method occurs through the processes which include classroom teaching, conflict, reflection, and resolution. Nilsson (2008); Hashweh (2005) add that having more teaching experiences is an effective way to develop teachers' knowledge and teaching quality. Therefore, to get a better teaching, teachers need to do more teaching tryouts than knowledge mining.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions, some conclusions are generated. First, the levels of the English teachers' pedagogical content knowledge on GBA are grouped into categories. From these categories, however, 38.1% teachers have deep knowledge and 61.9% teachers have shallow knowledge. Second, both types of teachers have various areas of mastery and non-mastery regarding their PCK of GBA. These areas of mastery and non-mastery are not comparable with teachers' length of teaching and teaching practices. Third, both teachers with deep knowledge and teachers with shallow knowledge have similar patterns in utilizing the spoken cycle and written cycle in teaching resulting in similar integrations of language skills and components. Fourth, teachers need to do more teaching practices to remember and apply what they have learned and understood from scholarly activities such as reading, discussing, and joining conferences, seminars, etc.

REFERENCES

Al Harthy, S. S. H., Jamaluddin, S., & Abedalaziz, N. A. (2013). Teachers' attitudes and performance: An analysis of effects due to teaching experience. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education*, *2*(9), 889–894. https://doi.org/10.12816/0002957

Al-Husban, N. A., & Alkhawaldeh, A. M. (2016). Exploring female EFL teachers' knowledge of Marzano's researchbased instructional strategies and its relationship with their level of performance in teaching reading comprehension. *Dirasat, Educational Sciences*, *43*(5), 2195–2207.

Al-Jaro, M., Asmawi, A., & Hasim, Z. (2017). Content analysis of the pedagogical content knowledge in the curriculum of Yemeni EFL teacher education programme. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2945906

And, R. H., Tomer, Y., & Tamir, P. (1990). The relations between disciplinary and pedagogical knowledge and the length of teaching experience of biology and geography teachers. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *27*(10), 973–985. https://doi.org/10.1002/tea.3660271006

Andrews, S. (1999). "All these like little name things": A comparative study of language teachers' explicit knowledge of grammar and grammatical terminology. *Language Awareness*, *8*(3–4), 143–159. https://doi.org/10.1080/09658419908667125

Asl, E. S., Asl, N. S., & Asl, A. S. (2014). The erosion of EFL teachers' content and pedagogical-content knowledge throughout the years of teaching experience. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *98*, 1599–1605. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.583

Badiru, A. B., & Cheung, J. Y. (2002). *Fuzzy engineering expert systems with neural network applications*. J. Wiley. http://www.123library.org/book_details/?id=9935

Baumert, J., Kunter, M., Blum, W., Brunner, M., Voss, T., Jordan, A., Klusmann, U., Krauss, S., Neubrand, M., & Tsai, Y.-M. (2010). Teachers' Mathematical knowledge, cognitive activation in the classroom, and student progress. *American Educational Research Journal*, *47*(1), 133–180. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831209345157

Bennet, D., & Bennet, A. (2008). The depth of knowledge: Surface, shallow or deep? *VINE*, *38*(4), 405–420. https://doi.org/10.1108/03055720810917679

Bernat, E., & Gvozdenko, I. (2005). Beliefs about language learning: Current knowledge, pedagogical implications, and new research directions. *TESL-EJ*, *9*(1), 1–21. http://tesl-ej.org/ej33/a1.pdf

Borg, S. (2001). Self-perception and practice in teaching grammar. *ELT Journal*, *55*(1), 21–29. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.1.21

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers

think, know, believe, and do. *Language Teaching*, *36*(2), 81–109. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444803001903

Brisk, M. E. (2014). *Engaging students in academic literacies: Genre-based pedagogy for K-5 classrooms* (1st ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781317816164

Bukova-Güzel, E. (2010). An investigation of pre-service mathematics teachers' pedagogical content knowledge, using solid objects. *Scientific Research and Essays*, *5*(14), 1872–1880. http://www.academicjournals.org/SRE

Burns, A., & Joyce, H. D. S. (2007). Adult ESl programs in Australia. *Prospect*, *22*(3), 5–17. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/revista?codigo=9310

Carter, K., & Gonzalez, L. (1993). Beginning teachers' knowledge of classroom events. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *44*(3), 223–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/002248719304400309

Cesur, K., & Ertaş, A. (2018). Examining the prospective English teachers' pedagogical content knowledge: Canakkale case. *International Journal of Progressive Education*, *14*(3), 128–139. https://doi.org/10.29329/ijpe.2018.146.9

Chen, Z., & Goh, C. (2014). Teacher knowledge about oral English instruction and teacher profiles: An EFL perspective. *Teacher Development*, *18*(1), 81–99. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2013.854270

Cullinan, B. E. (2000). Independent reading and school achievement. *School Library Research*, *3*, 1–24. http://www.ala.org/aasl/pubs/slr

DeBoer, B. B. (2007). *Effective oral language instruction: A survey of Utah K–2 teacher self-reported knowledge* [Unpublished Thesis]. Utah State University.

Dewi, C. A., Hendrawani, Kurniasih, Y., Suryati, & Khery, Y. (2018). Optimalisasi peningkatan profesionalisme guru-guru melalui pelatihan penulisan karya ilmiah. *Lumbung Inovasi: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat IKIP Mataram*, *3*, 20–26. http://ojs.ikipmataram.ac.id/index.php/lumbunginovasi

Duatepe, A., & Akkus-Cikla, O. (2004). The attitudes towards teaching professions of in-service and pre-service primary school teachers. *Pedagogika*, *71*, 61–65.

Emilia, E. (2011). *Pendekatan genre-based dalam pengajaran bahasa Inggris: Petunjuk untuk guru*. Rizqi Press.

Emilia, E., & Hamied, F. A. (2015). Systemic functional linguistic genre pedagogy (SFLGP) in a tertiary EFL writing context in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal - A Publication on the Teaching and Learning of English*, *26*(2), 155. https://doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v26i2/155-182

Ertmer, P. A., & Ottenbreit-Leftwich, A. T. (2010). Teacher technology change: How knowledge, confidence, beliefs, and culture intersect. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *42*(3), 255–284. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2010.10782551

Gebhard, M., Chen, I.-A., & Britton, L. (2014). "Miss, nominalization is a nominalization:" English language learners' use of SFL metalanguage and their literacy practices. *Linguistics and Education*, *26*, 106–125. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.01.003

Graham, L. J., White, S. L. J., Cologon, K., & Pianta, R. C. (2020). Do teachers' years of experience make a difference in the quality of teaching? *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *96*, 103190. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103190

Graves, K., & Garton, S. (2017). An analysis of three curriculum approaches to teaching English in public-sector schools. *Language Teaching*, *50*(4), 441–482. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444817000155

Halliday, M. A. K., & Webster, J. J. (2007). *Language and education, 9*. Continuum International Pub. Group.

Hammond, J. (1987). An overview of the genre-based approach to the teaching of writing in Australia. *Australian Review of Applied Linguistics*, *10*(2), 163–181. https://doi.org/10.1075/aral.10.2.10ham

Hao, Y. (2016). The development of pre-service teachers' knowledge: A contemplative approach. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *60*, 155–164. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.02.054

Harman, R. (2013). Literary intertextuality in genre-based pedagogies: Building lexical cohesion in fifth-grade L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *22*(2), 125–140. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2013.03.006

Hashweh, M. Z. (2005). Teacher pedagogical constructions: A reconfiguration of pedagogical content knowledge. *Teachers and Teaching*, *11*(3), 273–292. https://doi.org/10.1080/13450600500105502

Hu, B., & Tian, L. (2012). Do teachers and students share similar beliefs about teaching and learning strategies? *System*, *40*(2), 237–254. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2012.04.001

Irvine-Niakaris, C., & Kiely, R. (2015). Reading romprehension in test preparation classes: An analysis of teachers' pedagogical content Knowledge in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly*, *49*(2), 369–392. https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.189

Jong, T. de, & Ferguson-Hessler, M. G. M. (1996). Types and qualities of knowledge. *Educational Psychologist*, *31*(2), 105–113. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3102_2

Kaplan, L. S., & Owings, W. A. (2002). *Teacher quality, teaching quality, and school improvement*. Phi Delta Kappa International Press.

Kartowagiran, B. (2015). Kinerja guru profesional (guru pasca sertifikasi). *Jurnal Cakrawala Pendidikan*, *3*(3). https://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v3i3.4208

Kellner, E., Gullberg, A., Attorps, I., Thorén, I., & Tärneberg, R. (2011). Prospective teachers' initial conceptions about pupils' difficulties in Science and Mathematics: A potential resource in teacher education. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, *9*(4), 843–866. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-010-9232-5

Kemendikbud. (2013). *Pedoman pelatihan implementasi kurikulum 2013*. Kemendikbud.

Kereluik, K., Mishra, P., Fahnoe, C., & Terry, L. (2013). What knowledge is of most worth: Teacher knowledge for 21 st century learning. *Journal of Digital Learning in Teacher Education*, *29*(4), 127–140. https://doi.org/10.1080/21532974.2013.10784716

Khan, A., & Madden, J. (2018). Active learning: A new assessment model that boost confidence and learning while reducing test anxiety. *International Journal of Modern Education and Computer Science*, *10*(12), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.5815/ijmecs.2018.12.01

Kissau, S., & Algozzine, B. (2017). Effective foreign language teaching: Broadening the concept of content knowledge. *Foreign Language Annals*, *50*(1), 114–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/flan.12250

Kleickmann, T., Richter, D., Kunter, M., Elsner, J., Besser, M., Krauss, S., & Baumert, J. (2013). Teachers' content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge: The role of structural differences in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *64*(1), 90–106. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487112460398

Kömür, Ş. (2010). Teaching knowledge and teacher competencies: A case study of Turkish preservice English teachers. *Teaching Education*, *21*(3), 279–296. https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2010.498579

König, J., Tachtsoglou, S., Lammerding, S., Strauß, S., Nold, G., & Rohde, A. (2017). The Role of opportunities to learn in teacher preparation for EFL teachers' pedagogical content knowledge. *The Modern Language Journal*, *101*(1), 109–127. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12383

Lin, B. (2006). Genre-based teaching and Vygotskian principles in EFL: The case of a university writing course. *Asian EFL Journal*, *8*(3), 226–248. http://www.asian-efl-journal.com

Liu, S. (2013). Pedagogical content knowledge: A case study of ESL teacher educator. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(7), p128. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n7p128

Locke, T., Whitehead, D., Dix, S., & Cawkwell, G. (2011). New Zealand teachers respond to the 'national writing project' experience. *Teacher Development*, *15*(3), 273–291. https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2011.608509

Lux, N. J., Bangert, A. W., & Whittier, D. B. (2011). The Development of an Instrument to assess preservice teacher's technological pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *45*(4), 415–431. https://doi.org/10.2190/EC.45.4.c

Marshall, S. (1991). A genre-based approach to the teaching of report-writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, *10*(1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(91)90012-L

Maxwell-Reid, C. (2014). Genre in the teaching of English in Hong Kong: A perspective from Systemic Functional Linguistics. In D. Coniam (Ed.), *English Language Education and Assessment* (pp. 87–102). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-071-1_6

Mayne, H. (2019). Pedagogical content knowledge and social justice pedagogical knowledge: Re-envisioning a model for teacher practice. *Research in Educational Administration & Leadership*, *4*(3), 701–718. https://doi.org/10.30828/real/2019.3.9

Mbau, A. T., & Sugeng, B. (2019). Critical Literacy for ELT in Indonesia: What EFL teachers should be aware of. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, *4*(2), 143. https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v4i2.255

Mishra, P., & Koehler, M. J. (2006). Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. *Teachers College Record*, *108*(6), 1017–1054. https://www.learntechlib.org/p/99246/.

Moore, J., & Schleppegrell, M. (2014). Using a functional linguistics metalanguage to support academic language development in the English Language Arts. *Linguistics and Education*, *26*, 92–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2014.01.002

Nadeem, M., Rana, M. S., Lone, A. H., Maqbool, S., Naz, K., & Ali, A. (2011). Teacher's competencies and factors affecting the performance of female teachers in Bahawalpur (Southern Punjab) Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *2*(19), 217–222. http://www.ijbssnet.com/

Neumann, K., Kind, V., & Harms, U. (2019). Probing the amalgam: The relationship between science teachers' content, pedagogical and pedagogical content knowledge. *International Journal of Science Education*, *41*(7), 847–861. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500693.2018.1497217

Nilsson, P. (2008). Teaching for understanding: The complex nature of pedagogical content knowledge in pre-service education. *International Journal of Science Education*, *30*(10), 1281–1299. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500690802186993

Oliveira, L. C. de, & Lan, S.-W. (2014). Writing science in an upper elementary classroom: A genre-based approach to teaching English language learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, *25*, 23–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2014.05.001

Paltridge, B. (2004). Academic writing. *Language Teaching*, *37*(2), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444804002216

Peters, E. (2018). The effect of out-of-class exposure to English language media on learners' vocabulary knowledge. *ITL - International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *169*(1), 142–168. https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.00010.pet

Rose, D., & Martin, J. R. (2012). *Learning to write, reading to learn: Genre, knowledge and pedagogy in the Sydney school*. Equinox Pub.

Scharfenberg, F.-J., & Bogner, F. X. (2016). A New role change approach in pre-service teacher education for developing pedagogical content knowledge in the context of a student outreach lab. *Research in Science Education*, *46*(5), 743–766. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-015-9478-6

Schmidt, D. A., Baran, E., Thompson, A. D., Mishra, P., Koehler, M. J., & Shin, T. S. (2009). Technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK): The development and validation of an assessment instrument for preservice teachers. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education*, *42*(2), 123–149. https://doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2009.10782544

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, *57*(1), 1–23. https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.57.1.j463w79r56455411

Stark, H. L., Eadie, P. A., Snow, P. C., & Goldfeld, S. R. (2020). The impact of a sustained oral language professional learning program on Australian early years' teachers' knowledge, practice and beliefs: A mixed-methods exploration. *Professional Development in Education*, *46*(2), 178–194. https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2019.1603170

Stran, M., & Curtner-Smith, M. (2010). Impact of different types of knowledge on two preservice teachers' ability to learn and deliver the Sport Education model. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, *15*(3), 243–256. https://doi.org/10.1080/17408980903273147

Sumarsono, P. (2015). Model pengembangan sumber daya manusia guru bahasa Inggris di Indonesia dari hulu hingga hilir. *Journal of Educational Innovation*, *3*(1), 10–23. https://erudio.ub.ac.id/index.php/erudio/article/view/198

Tagle, T., Díaz, C., Etchegaray, P., Alarcón, P., Quintana, M., & Ramos, L. (2020). Lesson planning: What types of professional knowledge are activated by Chilean pre-service EFL teachers? *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *17*(1), 258–271. https://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/

Triastuti, A. (2020). Assessing English pre-service teachers' knowledge base of teaching: Linking knowledge and self-portrayal. *TEFLIN Journal*, *31*(1), 108–138. http://dx.doi.org/10.15639/teflinjournal.v31i1/108-138

Ulu, H. (2019). Examining the relationships between the attitudes towards reading and reading habits, Metacognitive awarenesses of reading strategies and critical thinking tendencies of pre-service teachers. *International Journal of Contemporary Educational Research*. https://doi.org/10.33200/ijcer.549319

Unsworth, S., Persson, L., Prins, T., & De Bot, K. (2014). An investigation of factors affecting early foreign language learning in the Netherlands. *Applied Linguistics*, amt052. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amt052

Usak, M., Ozden, M., & Eilks, I. (2011). A case study of beginning science teachers' subject matter (SMK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) of teaching chemical reaction in Turkey. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, *34*(4), 407–429. https://doi.org/10.1080/02619768.2011.592977

Walshaw, M. (2012). Teacher knowledge as fundamental to effective teaching practice. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education*, *15*(3), 181–185. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10857-012-9217-0

Watzke, J. L. (2007). Foreign language pedagogical knowledge: Toward a developmental theory of beginning teacher practices. *The Modern Language Journal*, *91*(1), 63–82. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2007.00510.x

Whittaker, R., & García Parejo, I. (2018). Teacher Learning for European Literacy Education (TeL4ELE): Genre-based pedagogy in five

European countries. *European Journal of Applied Linguistics*, *6*(1), 31–57. https://doi.org/10.1515/eujal-2017-0021

Whitten, C., Labby, S., & Sullivan, S. L. (2016). The impact of pleasure reading on academic success. *The Journal of Multidisciplinary Graduate Research*, *2*(4), 48–64. https://jmgr-ojs-shsu.tdl.org/jmgr/index.php/jmgr

Widodo, H. P. (2006). Designing a genre-based lesson plan for an academic writing course. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique*, *5*(3), 173–199. http://education.waikato.ac.nz/research/files/etpc/2006v5n3nar2.pdf

Williamson, J., & Hardman, F. (1995). Time for refilling the bath?: A study of primary student-teachers' grammatical knowledge. *Language and Education*, *9*(2), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500789509541407

Wong, R. M. H. (2011). Developing teacher awareness of language use and language knowledge in English classrooms: Four longitudinal cases. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *8*(1), 19–38. https://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v8n12011/wong.pdf

Wu, Y.-T., & Wang, A. Y. (2015). Technological, pedagogical, and content knowledge in teaching English as a foreign language: Representation of primary teachers of English in Taiwan. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, *24*(3), 525–533. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-015-0240-7