



Pedagogical Contexts 2021, No. 2(17)
www.kontekstypedagogiczne.pl
ISSN 2300-6471, e-ISSN 2720-0000
pp. 159–189
<https://doi.org/10.19265/kp.2021.2.17.326>



ORIGINAL PAPER

Received: 14.06.2021
Accepted: 21.09.2021



Eva Bolfiková

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4668-3436>
University of Prešov, Slovakia
eva.bolfikova@unipo.sk

Ivana Pirohová

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0784-1473>
University of Prešov, Slovakia
ivana.pirohova@unipo.sk

INTRODUCING A STUDY OF SECOND CHANCE SCHOOL TEACHERS FROM THE SELF-REFLECTION PERSPECTIVE OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND ETHNOMETHODOLOGY

WSTĘP DO KSZTAŁCENIA NAUCZYCIELI W RAMACH EDUKACJI DRUGIEJ SZANSY Z AUTOREFLEKSYJNEJ PERSPEKTYWY ANALIZY DYSKURSYWNEJ I ETNOMETODOLOGII

Keywords:


second chance
education, teacher
in second chance
education, reflectiv-
ity, self-reflective
methods, discourse,
discourse analysis,
ethnomethodology

Summary: The importance of studying the specific features of the educational environment at second chance schools is supported by the effort to create more effective tools used to introduce marginalised groups into the labour market and, in this way, make sure their socio-economic situation improves. Teachers involved in second chance education at primary and secondary schools take a role they have not been, in the course of their education or existing teaching experience, trained for and which requires that the framework of their competences is re-evaluated. The paper is aimed at suggesting a possible

theoretical-methodological perspective in the studies of the teachers involved in second chance education, towards an understanding of their work in the current environment, from their viewpoint, by means of self-reflective tools, especially diaries that mirror their everyday life in educational practice. The present discourse analysis and ethnomethodology is a highly effective approach to sharing a way of constructing identification frameworks and practices in self-cognition and managing the process of education with regard to the specifics of its participants and the delicate nature of the unique and exceptional nature of individual potentials and the continuity of complex dynamics, development, and changes. The presented model of the role of a second chance teacher consists of five levels: 1) self-identification, 2) self-determination, 3) self-interpretation, 4) self-correction, and 5) self-inspiration. Individual dimensions work as discrete fields with their own life and dynamics but, at the same time, do not exclude inter-connectivity.

Słowa kluczowe:
edukacja drugiej szansy, nauczyciel w edukacji drugiej szansy, refleksyjność, metody autorefleksyjne, dyskurs, analizy dyskursywne, etnometodologia

Streszczenie: Badania nad właściwościami środowiska edukacyjnego w szkołach drugiej szansy znajdują zastosowanie jako element wypracowania efektywniejszych narzędzi pozwalających na włączenie grup zmarginalizowanych do udziału w rynku pracy i zapewnienie im lepszych warunków socjalno-ekonomicznych. W edukacji drugiej szansy nauczycielom w szkołach podstawowych i średnich przydzielano rolę, do której w ramach swojego kształcenia zawodowego i dotychczasowej praktyki pedagogicznej nie byli przygotowywani, a która wymaga od nich przewartościowania zakresu kompetencji. Celem artykułu jest nakreślenie jednej z możliwych perspektyw teoretyczno-metodologicznych kształcenia nauczycieli w ramach edukacji drugiej szansy, uwzględniającej ich funkcjonowanie w aktualnych warunkach, z ich pozycji, z wykorzystaniem narzędzi autorefleksji, zwłaszcza dzienników lekcyjnych, jako obrazu ich codziennej praktyki edukacyjnej. Zastosowanie analizy dyskursywnej i etnometodologii stanowi bardzo efektywny sposób przekazywania wiedzy o konstruowaniu ram tożsamościowych i praktyk samopoznania oraz zarządzania procesami kształcenia, biorąc pod uwagę cechy odrębne ich uczestników, wrażliwość na odmiennosć i wyjątkowość potencjału jednostek, w toku nieustannego dynamicznego rozwoju i zmian. Zaproponowano model obrazujący pozycję nauczyciela w ramach edukacji drugiej szansy w pięciu wymiarach: 1) autoidentyfikacja,



2) autodeterminacja, 3) autointerpretacja, 4) samodoskonalenie, 5) autoinspiracja. Poszczególne wymiary funkcjonują jako pola dyskretne, z własnym życiem i dynamiką, nie wykluczają jednak wzajemnych powiązań.

Introduction

Criteria for the evaluation of teachers pose a significant mirror of the situation in pedagogical practice and provide space for many efforts in the determination of variations of teachers' competence models. Requirements, expectations, and schemes for the evaluation of teachers are not only a professional tool but also part of educational policies in national as well as transnational frameworks which, as such, present a high level of obligation anchored in the programme documents and, subsequently, the organisation of educational activities of various types in the everyday life of teachers.

In the EU countries, the main trends for second chance education are determined by the Lisbon Strategy (2000), the EUROPE 2020 Strategy (2010), which defined the direction of national educational policies and the concepts of educational society prioritising the development of competitiveness in the market. For second chance education, those differentiating moments of lifelong education are supportive which point to the prevention of social problems, social exclusion, marginalised and other disadvantaged groups, groups with incomplete primary education and without further completed education, supporting the importance of the content of lifelong education in formal and informal education, as well as informal learning at all levels that is to be available for everybody regardless their socio-economic situation (Lukáčová, 2013).

Second chance education at primary and secondary schools can be defined as "an opportunity to, in adult age and a continued and continuous cycle of education, acquire such a type and level of education which is normally acquired in one's childhood or youth in the initial cycle of education" (Švec, 2008, p. 225). It is connected to the opportunity to make use of so-called 'second chance' to acquire education and qualification when, for various subjective or objective reasons, participation in education was interrupted. It is part of a subsystem of schooling which, at this level, plays a substitutive role (Lukáč, 2013).

Second chance education is a *type of formal education of adults*. In terms of the cycles of education, the participants of second chance education have always been understood as adults, provided they completed the initial cycle of their education prior to acquiring a vocational qualification, or this was interrupted for various reasons, and such participants later return to the process (either on the completion of compulsory schooling, or abandoning general secondary or vocational education). Education of adults is an important component of lifelong education and includes a whole scale of activities within general as well as technical formal and informal teaching that adults participate in after the completion of primary education and professional training (Council Resolution on a renewed European agenda for adult learning 2011).

The present paper focuses on teachers involved in second chance education who design educational reality and the possibility of using discourse analysis and ethnomethodology in self-reflective practices when portraying the ways in which factors differentiating the education of children and youths (their dominant direction) from educating adults, usually from marginalised, socially excluded, groups are managed.

Teacher in second chance education and its adult participants

Specific features of a *second chance teacher* are determined by the position which is not only connected to pedagogical, but also andragogical competences, since education and vocational training take place in an environment aimed at children and youths. However, *adult age* can be defined and characterised from various viewpoints. With regard to formal education within the school system, the lower limit of adulthood is given by the age when compulsory schooling is to be completed. In the Slovak Republic, “compulsory schooling takes ten years and finishes, at the latest, at the end of the school year in which the student reaches 16 years of age, if not defined otherwise by law ((2), § 19 Law No. 245/2008 Coll. *on Upbringing and Education [the School Act]*). The age at which compulsory schooling is completed and the average limit of the productive/retirement age broadly defines the age group of adults, i.e. from 16 to 65 years of age (cf. The Survey of Adult Skills [PIAAC]). The school legislation of the Slovak Republic (Law No. 245/2008 Coll. *on Upbringing and Education [the School Act]*) allows for second chance education in an external (part-time) form of study in the system of primary and secondary schools as early as the age of 16.

Educational environments “differ in the types of participating subjects and the content, forms, and intensity of educational processes” (Průcha, 1997, p. 66). Second chance education takes place in a school environment following the national curriculum identical to the one applied in the initial cycle of educating children and youths. Educational environments differ in their organisation and, in the case of adult participants of second chance education, also in the taught subjects. Second chance education takes place in a part-time form and an emphasis is placed on the students’ individual learning. Law No. 245/2008 Coll. *on Upbringing and Education (the School Act)*, § 54 *Forms of organisation of upbringing and education, Point 3*, states that part-time education is carried out in an evening, remote, or distance form.

Table 1 summarises the differences between the following groups: a) students – children, youths, and b) adult participants of education, based on external and internal criteria. Among external criteria are: a) the way education is financed, b) educational environment (organisation of education, participants of education, specifics of the *teacher – student* relationship), c) socio-economic factors. Internal criteria include: a) cognitive factors, b) emotional factors, c) motivational factors. Here, the internal criteria have been based on publications in the fields of psychology, pedagogy, and andragogy (Beneš, 2014; Vágnerová, 2012; Petlák, 2019; Končecová, 2010; Machalová, 2006).

Table 1

Differences between students and adult participants of education in the system of primary and secondary schools

1. External criteria	Students – children and youths	Adult participants of education
1.1. Forms of financing education	Education free of charge. Financed from state funds and self-governing regions.	Tuition – employed adults. Possibility of education free of charge – the long-term unemployed, members of marginalised groups, incarcerated adults. Financing – state budget, European structural funds.
1.2. Educational environment	Students – children and youths	Students – adults
1.2.1. Organisation of education	Full-time education. Intense contact with the teachers. Teaching of students controlled by the teachers.	Part-time education: evening, remote and distance form. Less intense contact with the teachers. Emphasis on self-study.

1.2.2. Participants of education	Teacher and student – child, teenager, adolescent; parent – the child's legal representative, student – the child's social status and his/her social roles – son/daughter, sibling.	Teacher and adult student, the status of an adult person, starting their own family (social roles – husband/wife, parent), starting a career (employed/unemployed).
1.2.3. <i>Teacher – student</i> relationship	<i>Adult – child/youth</i> relationship, teaching controlled by the teacher who educates the students in the school environment and takes over responsibility for them.	<i>Adult – adult</i> relationship, in the legal context, mature students are responsible for their behaviour.
1.3. Socioeconomic factors	Students from various social classes with various level of family income.	A majority of participants of education are members of lower social classes with a low family income.
2. Internal criteria	Students – children and youths	Adult participants of education
2.1. Cognitive factors	Perception, attention, memory, way of thinking during development, active attention, less stable and consistent attention and focus, mechanical memory increases between the ages of 7 and 15 (on average); in adolescence, logical memory prevails over mechanical, imagination in childhood influences perception, puberty and adolescence is typical of daydreaming, concrete thought being at its best in adolescence.	In adulthood, perception develops, good attention and focus, the level of mechanical memory decreases while the level of verbal-logical memory increases, better organisation of memorised material, capability of more complex thought. Involution changes in cognitive processes take place (on average) after a person reaches 45 years of age. Involution changes are compensated by knowledge and experience.
2.2. Emotional factors	Emotional instability, mainly during puberty, fades away as late as adolescence.	Emotional life harmonises, emotional instability changes into emotional stability.
2.3. Motivational factors	Motivation determined by innate predispositions and conditions given by the environment (family, school, peer groups, media, social networks). Motives change and are of temporary nature, the experience of school success (or a lack of it) is key. Motivation – grades, avoiding punishment, getting praise or reward, interest in specific school subject(s), topic(s).	Motivation determined by the status of the adult, influenced by the work area, family and community life Motivation – find, retain or change job, start a business, support by the family.

Source: Own study.

However, the *participants* of this education are adults of a very specific personal background. Due to this fact, an intersection between pedagogical and andragogical aspects is typical for this educational environment as: 1) it is formal education (at a school) for the purposes of acquiring a level of education (which is only possible in a school, following the legislation in force);

2) it is carried out in accordance with pedagogical laws and documents applied in the education of children and youths; 3) its target group is adults rather than children or youths who, according to Beneš (2008), cannot be reduced to students (since adult people are not isolated from their social roles in their work, family and personal spheres of life); 4) the subject of education cannot be a lecturer or an educator of adults (as is the case in andragogy) but rather a primary or secondary school teacher (Lukáčová, 2017).

From this position of a second chance teacher, it is obvious that the training for specifics of the educational process and working with adult participants of education who are usually members of marginalised groups, requires taking the specific and unique nature of this education environment into consideration. The common environment of primary and secondary schools also requires a focus on creative and innovative methods and tools, including individual approach. Nevertheless, working with marginalised groups calls for an understanding of their social, economic, social, cultural, family as well as individual specifics, alongside a great number of active determinants and developmental characteristics, differing in many aspects. Starting with the motives for education, reasons for interrupting the continuous process of education, potentials for education, through understanding the actual role of the participant of education, possibility to find one's place in the labour market, to great numbers of obstacles, barriers, or risks, these educational processes possess attributes of exceptionality and extraordinariness. Since teachers enter education without special training aimed at the specifics of this job, they are inevitably reliant on improvisation and 'trial and error' methods, the need to deal with discomfort in many regards, as well as a different way of evaluation of their work and its effectiveness.

There are various target groups within second chance education and local, or regional, peculiarities can be observed. Among frequent participants are Roma, people coming from a marginal socio-economic environment who, in the past, did not appreciate the importance of further education and acquiring formal qualification, prisoners serving their sentence, as well as people who are interested in starting their own business but lack the necessary qualification that can be acquired within the system of formal education. A unifying point for all the target groups is the status of participants as adult learners and the identification of the educational environment in the spectre of adult education. Since the teachers are in the position of educators of adults, their dominant position is that of a primary or secondary school teacher, placed in

the context of features differentiating a teacher of children and youths from a teacher of adults. Thus, examining the role of a second chance teacher is inevitably connected to the specifics of two varied educational environments with significantly different target groups.

The construct 'teacher's quality' is closely connected to cross-sectional schemes of professional competences and is determined by rather general aspects, based on the parameters of educated society and its attributes. Among such attributes are, for instance, strong individualisation, an emphasis of creative and critical thinking, quality methodological tools, etc., however, these differ significantly from one target group to another. Requirements assigned externally are known and anchored in relevant documents and programmes, with the reality of a common educational environment being part of research studies and evaluative processes; however, the issue of second chance education and its peculiarities with regard to its institutionalisation, organisation, participants, tools and methods, as well as its effectivity is significantly underdeveloped. Questions especially arise where this educational environment is closely connected to the situation in the labour market, possibilities to make full use of available potential, contrast between the offer and demand and the general effectivity of investment in second chance education (finances, human resources, potentials, etc.), as well as where there is a need to provide quality education and teachers.

The teacher of second chance education in self-reflection

An assessment of teacher's work is part of evaluative processes, techniques, tools and methods in the context of educational effectiveness. The criteria set externally (institutionally, through theoretical and practical lenses, or the creative work of a researcher) make use of the possibility to acquire information following frameworks set in advance, taking regard for the goals set at the level of qualitative or quantitative analysis. Here, the teacher is the subject of research and assessment and serves as a 'source of information'; alternatively, information is acquired from other 'sources' – participants of education, superiors or colleagues, when, for instance, observation methods are marked by the level of subjectivity of the observer, various types of content analysis, only occasionally exceeding the descriptive character of working with material. Quantitative tools are only used for what can be measured and in what way while common reports and evaluation sheets in teaching only provide

a rough overview, etc. Each of the available tools has its advantages as well as disadvantages, providing the existing spectrum of knowledge with something new and enriching while being exceptional when uncovering the studied area in its complexity.

With regard to the generally intense trend of emphasising self-reflective tools in the effort to increase the quality of a teachers' work (Minor, 2002, as quoted in Orosová, Ganajová, Rozenfeld & Desiatníková, 2018, p. 2), it is possible to provide a highly varied interpretation spectrum of contents and meanings with consequent implication for the relationship towards teachers themselves on the one hand, and the cognitive, or evaluating, subject on the other. Compared to other tools, the difference primarily lies in preserving the unique nature of the teacher's viewpoint and providing freedom in the way of recording expressions as well as the content, greater space for sincerity and personal depth, especially in the way of utilising self-regulatory mechanisms of individuality aimed at self-change, self-development, self-determination, self-correction, etc. Self-reflection, or the self-reflective competence, can be included in the set of a teacher's professional competences (Bajtoš & Orosová, 2011), alongside professional (related to a specific field), psycho-didactic, communicative, diagnostic, planning and organisational, advisory and consulting competences, with the aim of assessing one's work and improving future activities.

Self-reflection can be understood as part of general reflectivity in the experiential sharing of not only professional but also personal and other values, be it in a progressive or a regressive (constructive or destructive) mode, always respecting the specifics of purposes and goals as the initiation as well as consequences of the processes of continuous creation of the internal as well as external world of the subjects. It is a journey of constant search for explanations, interpretations, attitudes, and evaluations with regard to situations, events, and circumstances in the variability of the constructed (in our case educational) environment, including (self) identification aspects.

Reflection, or reflective practice, has a long tradition and stems from philosophy, particularly the work of Dewey (1933) on reflective thinking for personal and intellectual growth (psychological approach) where the main steps of reflection are defined as follows: 1) doubting and feeling perplexity in relation to a given situation; 2) tentatively interpreting the possible meanings of the situation or factors involved in it and their consequences; 3) examining/exploring/analysing all considerations that might help clarify the problem;

4) elaborating the preliminary hypotheses; and 5) deciding a plan of action (Dewey, 1933, p. 2). A more critical and transformative approach is rooted in critical social theory (Freire, 1972; Habermas, 1974). Schon's (1983) work on the 'reflective practitioner' has also influenced many scholars interested in the work of professionals and how 'reflection-in-action' and 'reflection-on-action' can influence their professional education. Reflection has been variously defined from different perspectives, but at the broad level includes two key elements: 1) making sense of experience; 2) reimagining future experience (Ryan, 2012). Grossman (2008) suggests that there are at least four different levels of reflection along a depth continuum – from descriptive accounts, to different levels of mental processing, to transformative or intensive reflection. Ryan (2012) offers more specific conceptualisations and applications to practice of reflection modes: written, oral, visual, embodied, and multimodal forms.

Reflective processes can be understood as a common denominator for highly variable strategies in permanent changes of behaviour. Logren, Ruusuvoori and Laitinen (2017) propose four key methods – diaries, journals, and applications to conversational practices such as cue questions and stimulated recall (Coulson & Harvey, 2013; York, Yamagata-Lynch & Smaldino, 2016). These methods have been developed within adult education (Boud, Keogh & Walker, 1996; Mezirow, 1990, 1998; Samuels & Betts, 2007; Waring, 2014), the reflective practice of health professions (Mann, Gordon & MacLeod, 2009) and medical education (Sandars, 2009), and others. The development of methods has drawn upon interview, observational and textual data, together with theoretical knowledge about the cognitive factors that benefit individual change (Logren, Ruusuvoori & Laitinen, 2017).

Reflectivity can provide information not only about what the world is like but also about what it could, or should, be (Hu & Little, 2015). Reflection is as complex as the subject of reflection (regardless of the issues of authenticity or veracity), when reflectivity stands for an individual, or group, ability and potential to realise one's own image of the surrounding world (educational environment) and their position, role, in it. The methodological basis in the theory of complexity allows for work across interdisciplinary differences, in the inter-disciplinarity of aspects of pedagogy (the nature and character of educational processes), andragogy (environment of adult education), psychology (mental processes and aspects), sociology (social situation, structures, processes, organising, positions), cultural studies (rules, values, creation of a specifically human environment), anthropology (types of human contact,

unions and societies, formation of social patterns), as well as political studies (power structures and positions), economy (creation and distribution of products of human activity), etc. The importance of reflection in education, and across disciplinary fields, is widely recognised (Ryan, 2012).

In this perspective that is least limiting, the *reflected educational environment* can be understood as a specifically human environment with activities, socially interactive individuals (other subjects), products, institutions, and instrumental dispositions (including methods), in constant motion, aimed at educational intentions and goals (Kuhn, 2008). Characteristics included in the terminology of theory of complexity – multi-dimensionality, non-linearity, interconnectivity, (long-term) non-predictability, continuous change, sensitivity to initial conditions, etc., are part of this perspective. A complex view is that

in human beings, as in other living creatures, the whole is present within the parts, every cell of a multicellular organism contains the totality of its genetic patrimony, and society inasmuch as a whole is present within every individual in his language, knowledge, obligations and standards (Morin, 2001, p. 31).

Semetsky (2005) points to the difference between what ‘should be’ and what ‘is’, or, a confusion between what should be perceived as complex in its essence and nature (as that is what it is) and what is understood in education when tools of arranging, structuring, organising, and managing the educational environment function, in many aspects, in contradiction to characteristics of complexity (e.g. the effort for maximum control blocks natural potential; quality indicators suppress qualitatively significant effects; requirements and expectations block creative production; externally determined directions of communication block mutually interactive processes, etc.).

Self-reflection turns attention, direction, content, values, and interpretations towards the creation of subjective space and is, thus, reflection of oneself in the active course of events, in accordance with the formation of self-image in self-observation. It takes place as a process of a conscious search for one’s own conception of one’s uniqueness in the continuity of past, present, and future. It serves as a tool for self-cognition, self-understanding, as well as self-presentation which, in essence, happens constantly, as any interaction with the surrounding world can only take place by means of individualised structures of personality, their features, characteristics, and potentials, and everybody creates their relationship towards anything and anybody exclusively from their own

position. It is, therefore, possible to understand self-reflection as systematic processing of feedback (Orosová et al., 2018), as a process of self-awareness (Hupková, 2006), self-evaluation (Průcha, Walterová & Mareš, 1995, p. 196), as an “internal process that helps teachers to assess and analyse their pedagogical activities, views, attitudes which teachers, consequently, utilise for their professional improvement and development” (Feranská, 2017, p. 83). In the conditions of educational reality, self-reflective processes focus on the character of processes determined by education; however, in the overall scheme of things, they also overlap with other relevant areas.

Among *methods of self-reflection* in the teaching practice are observations (inspection), self-reflective interviews and debates (mainly aimed at feedback), self-reflective questionnaires (specifically structured query schemes aimed at research objectives and goals), polls, discussions, preparation of self-reflective teaching plans, and self-reflective taxonomy. Among the most intense with regard to their content and weight are self-reflective observation, including introspection and self-reflective diaries (in order to record one’s own experience, views, perception, feelings and emotions, opinions, evaluations, standpoints, and activities within internal retrospective). It is self-reflective diaries that are a source of a great amount of significant information regarding teachers’ work in their educational environment, with the possibility of observing one’s own developmental steps, changes, and great variability of internal views, understanding and assessment through the lens of everyday life.

It is *self-reflective diaries* that are a source of a great amount of significant information regarding teachers’ work in their educational environment, with the possibility of observing one’s own developmental steps, changes, and great variability of internal views, understanding and assessment through the lens of everyday life. For teachers, diaries are an important journey to one’s own intimacy and in-depth personality; their keeping induces the feeling of quiet privacy, an opportunity to stop and deal with ‘nothing but oneself and one’s world’ and, in this way, acquire information that is highly valuable and useful for interpretation. It is, thus, interesting that they are among the least frequently used tools and, at the same time, most commonly labelled as a method that is never used by teachers (Orosová et al., 2018). As Wiegerová and Lampertová (2012) state, it is diaries whose greatest disadvantage is the difficulty to convince teachers to cooperate in research while it is something that is most valuable for self-reflection – recording one’s own internal thought processes, their description, interpretation, contemplations, confrontations, etc., that teachers do not

find an attractive enough world. The data and information acquired in this way can be analysed by means of appropriate qualitative and quantitative tools, each technique offering a specific image and cognitive output.

Discourse analysis and ethnomethodology in the educational environment

Data collected in qualitative research are most frequently processed by content analysis in the effort to produce key descriptions, categorised structures, schemes, and relational frameworks. Self-reflective tools and their products can provide highly intense and classic content analysis that, by far, exceed constructed products of work with statements of varied character that then become part of coproduction (of the author and the researcher) of the analysed meanings, with regard to the specifics of educational reality. Educational environment in second chance education is among those that are rather poorly documented. The criteria of evaluation usually maintain a viewpoint adequate for primary and, especially, secondary schools and are determined institutionally – externally. Working with self-reflective materials (primarily self-reflective diaries) makes it possible to examine the work of teachers in second chance education from the inside – from their own viewpoint – and observe the specifics of their work with minimum regulation and interference by the researcher. For analysis, a text that is an authentic account (be it structured or not) is available that provides significant space for cognition.

Making use of discourse analysis and ethnomethodology leads to highly complex interpretations and, in their focus and tools, the limitations of various branches and sets of methodological tools become more relaxed. As early as 1963, the sociologist Harvey Sacks published one of the earliest ethnomethodological writings, within which he suggested that the ways in which people self-characterise are central to the social world (Sacks, 1963). Educational reality can be accepted as a specifically constructed and organised social world, in which teachers are among the main agents. Self-reflection in diaries, even though not created through direct interaction, bears signs of reflective interactivity in the given environment and provides unique evidence, together with other contextual images, about everyday personal life and who/what a teacher in second chance education is in educational practice.

Discourse analysis is a complex analysis of any content, meaning, and practice in the framework of context. Context is defined as a mentally represented structure of features that characterise social situations and events which significantly

relate to the production and construction of discourse (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). Discourse as a dynamic sign system of constructions is not only a text that, through a subjective lens of anecdotal experience and its interpretation, combines the aspects of social, cultural, historical, psychological, moral-ethical, and other levels but, at the same time, a space for grasping the specific aspects of individually shared acts and themes.

The *concept of discourse* is a vast spectrum of topics in various disciplines. It refers to a great number of approaches to analysing written or oral accounts, done alongside the study of language in the effort to identify individual and group specifics in broader social contexts, taking regard for set topics. “Discourse is a field of speech in which meanings of events and objects of social reality are conceptually created or shaped” (Klapko, 2016, p. 388). In the centre of the researcher’s attention is the use of language and ways in which various semantic plains of shaping the reflected reality are created. In more recent papers, language is viewed, in all its forms, as constitutive rather than representative or reflective of social reality or the inner mind (Lester, 2011). Schiffrin, Tannen and Hamilton (2001), in their introduction to *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (p. 1), note that definitions of ‘discourse analysis’ can be grouped into three general categories: 1) the study of language use; 2) the study of linguistic structure ‘beyond the sentence’; and 3) the study of social practices and ideological assumptions that are associated with language and/or communication. In the educational environment, there are studies that point out the importance of conscious reflection – “like discourse analysis utilised by teachers themselves – as an important element of development within mediated action” (Wertsch, 1991, p. 68), while pointing to the importance of language and its analysis for the understanding and possibility to adopt effective practices of teaching in class (Burbules & Bruce, 2001). Theoreticians dealing with discourse analysis emphasise that discourse can never be ‘neutral’ or value free, as it always reflects ideologies, systems of values, faith, and social practices (Gee & Green, 1998).

Klapko (2016) presents a possible classification of methods for the hierarchy in discourse analysis. Here, most authors use as a criterion the level of autonomy of the agents, where conversation analysis (Sacks, 1995) is in the position of an intense focus of the agent and the analysis provides constructions related to the statements and actions of those involved taking their statuses into account. Significant conceptual initiatives for discourse analysis can be found in Foucault’s *Archaeology of Knowledge* (2002), where discourse is understood as practices

subjected to certain rules. With regard to the essence of archaeology as a set of rules for discourse, this refers to dealing with what the agents report on in relationship to the institutionalisation of power practices and their construction, rather than the active participants as autonomous subjects. In many respects, discourse psychology (Harré & Gillett, 2001) is close to conversation analysis, especially in terms of the focus on interactivity and the content schemes; its specifics can be found in the relationship towards the interpretation of “human action as the dynamic interplay between ‘mind’ and ‘world’, that is, between a mental world of thoughts, beliefs, and emotions ‘within’ and the social, normative, and ideological world ‘out there’” (Korobov, 2010, p. 263). These are, thus, concepts that deal with active, dynamic, and constructive processes of human interaction on the one hand while, on the other hand, also observing what originates in these interactions, what people bring in them (mind) and how the schemes of norms, rules, and ideologies (world) function in this context. Critical discourse analysis (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997) focuses on the investigation of the political and social contexts constituting discourse; it includes, among other things, the issue of identity, awareness/self-awareness, and systematically reproduced differences in the relationships of power and authority, their dynamics, institutions, and cognition. Another criterion for the classification of discourse analysis (Klapko, 2016) is their imbedding in a specific set of tools – linguistic, historical, sociological, sociolinguistic, biographical, ethnographic, etc. In present-day educational research, discourse analysis, as part of social structures, is required and extensively used to explain the teaching process. With regard to the character, focus, and tools of discourse analysis, an alternative theoretical viewpoint can be suggested (Gee & Green, 1998).

In the context of possible needs of pedagogical analysis, Sedláková (2018) provides the following overview of discourse theories: 1) critical approach to commonly available knowledge, when the teacher as a knowledge mediator is to approach a self-reflective view on forming his/her own thoughts and ideas and motivate students to do the same; 2) the relationship between discourse and power focused on the formation of unequal conditions for the participants of events; 3) interconnection between knowledge and social actions in studying the journey from certain knowledge towards generating social response; 4) discourse as a linguistic form within a specific group or environment, such as observing the language codes of marginal, or socio-culturally defined, groups; 5) analysis of media discourse as a dominant voice forming opinion cohorts in

society; 6) discourse analysis of the forms of social representation, shared by the members of a different group; 7) analysis of discourse with the intention of understanding its effects, for instance, what language does to its recipients, how speakers achieve their goals, etc.; 8) dialogic nature of discourse at the level of interaction and observing communication rules. The above areas can be understood as mutually interconnected and intersecting, rather than mutually exclusive. Adger (2001) lists some topics of discourse analysis in school settings: 1) classroom interaction as a cultural practice (ethnographic research); 2) classroom discourse and literacy development; 3) discourse study of second language development; 4) classroom discourse as learning; 5) school as a venue for talk; 6) application of discourse studies to education.

In the identification of social processes of cognition (including self-reflective practices), the implementation of tools used in studying the dynamics of discourses in time as part of creative interpretation of a great number of semantic plains of reflection and their variability is fundamental. Compared to individual events or themes, this approach is enriched by such aspects that concern the level of stability of semantic, identification, interaction, and other schemes, including those determinants that enter the space and free the accounts in the complexity of their potential in the given environment. With regard to the complex and continuing nature of the educational environment, research is often a combination of discourse analysis and an ethnographic approach, directed at such questions as what counts as learning in the specifics of various environments, local and group peculiarities, socio-cultural factors and subjects (Gee & Green, 1998). With regard to self-reflective diaries, grasping the records in a text form as a constantly continuous process, considerably dynamic in its transformations (sensitivity to the initial conditions), as it is not discourse related to a single event, situation, or theme. It is possible to observe how educational processes and practices shape in time, whether and how active viewpoints and perspectives of arrangement, organisation, and rules develop, including the variants of the identifying attributes of the participants.

It is in the approach taken in ethnographic papers where the essence of the tools applied in ethnomethodology can be found, aimed at analytical attention “to the ordinary and mundane ways that people in their everyday lives jointly produce, account for, and manage local, practical, and taken-for-granted scenes to produce social order” (de Montigny, 2007, p. 95).

Ethnomethodology works with participants (agents) as the products of interactions in various environments where “settings are self-organizing, and that

organization includes the identities of the 'actors' within them" (Garfinkel & Sacks, 1970, p. 342). Internal conditions of the agents, their self-evaluation, self-cognition, motives, tools, self-image and others, are always the final creation of the interactions in progress. For a teacher in a second chance educational environment, it is a priority interaction with adult learners, which is why shaping the teacher's identity is a constant process as well as a product of interactive schemes in various extents of stability/variability. Self-reflective tools allow for the discovery of ways (methods) in which teachers, in their role, form and shape themselves through interaction with their students, taking the objectives of educational processes into consideration, as well as other relevant contexts, directly related to education or exceeding the educational environment (as broader social contexts).

Ethnomethodology originated in the 1960s as a sociological theory (Garfinkel, 1967; Sacks, 1995) embedded in a broader context of problematisation in social theory. This approach can be understood as an empirical study of practices, procedures, methods, and the common-sense knowledge that social actors use every day to make sense of and, at the same time, to produce social scenarios in which they participate (Heritage, 1984). Ethnomethodologists focus on the observable actions of individuals in concrete contexts, taking into account the discourses that agents produce as part of their actions (Ritzer, 1993). In this context, the object of the study is a set of strategies, procedures, and methods that the agent in a specific environment finds as an appropriate way to coordinate and manage expected activities in current circumstances. The focus is mainly on diverse variations in practical methods that the agents, in their everyday life, produce in order to recognise and explain social scenarios and, based on these, shape the meanings of social (educational) reality. Language and its use are the key elements of these methods and procedures, while competent members, indexicality, reflexivity, and accountability act as auxiliary concepts. Ethnomethodology understands individual agents as competent and active members within their social reality, with necessary knowledge and work experience, able to participate in the production of various social environments (Coulon, 1995). Indexicality refers to the contextual character of ordinary language: words (and actions) acquire their full meaning in concrete contexts of interaction (Coulter, 1991). Reflexivity points to a bi-directional movement that operates at all times, when the social order is perceived and described by the agents and is, at the same time, created through interactions in social situations. Accountability points to the fact that all social actions are

describable, intelligible, relatable, or analysable by the competent members who participate in it. “Accounts are achievements of competent members and are indexical as they should be considered external to the context where they occur” (Guzmán, Stecher & Rueda, 2016, p. 515).

The use of ethnomethodology in the discourse of self-reflective diaries is directed at studying what ways teachers in second chance education prepare and use as their individual practices, methods, procedures, in unique events and situations in an environment of interaction with specific groups of participants of education and with regard to their views, perceptions, and shaping the educational environment.

The *use of self-reflective tools* for the study of processes and products of self-constructing can be highly effective, especially wherever there is a need to open deep levels of semantic schemes, mainly with regard to the construction of self-identity and the use of competence practices in ongoing processes. Empirical analyses in specific conditions and with specific aims point to not only significant findings and new, enriching, knowledge but especially to a large spectrum of possible implementation of discourse analysis and ethnomethodology to answer the questions asked. Pertinent to Pereira’s (2014) research is an example of discourse analysis in critical and interpretative perspectives of body representation, focused on self-reflective practices and self-representation while coupling heterogeneity and multiplicity of self (not only fragmentation) and on the awareness of one’s own identity, accompanied by certain representations. The discourse analysis of student athletes in relationship to the possibilities of integrating the role and identity of the student and athlete (Cosh & Tully, 2014) has a similar focus. The research dealing with discourse analysis in ethnography (Cheng & Pan, 2019) points to diverse understanding of the roles and identities of English teachers in English-speaking countries and China, in typically recurring events. Self-reflective diaries as material for critical discourse analysis (Jalilifar, Khayaie & Kasgari, 2014) are understood as part of reflective practice and an oncoming dominant aspect of teacher education programmes worldwide. A paper dedicated to self-reflective tools of effective teaching by discourse analysis (Piliouras, Plakitsi & Nasis, 2015) pointed to significant differences in which methods teachers use in various environments with various participants of education and with varied intentions of their works, including differing frameworks of reference. Discourse interaction in working with read and written text by young and adult education students (Gomes, Fonseca, Dias & Vargas, 2010) pointed to differences in the developmental characteristics

of the participants of educational processes regarding cognitive processes and possibilities of critical reflection of interactions in one's personal experience. Research into student teachers who, in a field of discourse, work with repeated reading of children's literature (Tal, 2012) also deals with reflective competences. In the context of the present topic, research from variously defined educational environments is especially relevant, as well as research aimed at self-reflection and its means, the *teacher – student* relationship, the processes of elaborating real practices and patterns with regard to self-identification, managing certain tasks, flexibility, etc.

The roles of teachers in second chance education in self-reflection – levels of analysis

The objective of the present paper is to research (present) those means and methodology of studying specific conditions for second chance teachers which, based on an in-depth analysis, allow for the construction of educational reality by teachers and their position (identification) in such a reality through self-reflective discourse which enables the formation of competence frameworks and, consequently, assessment of the teacher's quality, resulting not in a set of empty external criteria (in many aspects removed from reality) but, rather, recognising and taking into consideration the specific viewpoint of the active participants in the interactive environment of educational practice. Moreover, opening a discourse field within the concept of 'a teacher in second chance education' (cf. the objectives of the research project that the paper is part of) in self-reflection of directly experienced and constructed reality means providing a vital space for shared meanings which, in the logic of discourse analysis and ethnomethodology, can provide (from the methodological as well as practical viewpoint) valuable constructions, schemes, patterns, and tools useful to answer the following *questions*:

- who is a second chance teacher and what are they like; what is the level of their identification with their role;
- which means are available for the teacher to manage the dynamics of education, what patterns might be extracted and used for solving common as well as specific situations, events, and challenges;
- how is the borderline perceived between the standard and the expected on the one hand and the unique, exceptional, and specific on the other hand;
- what is the level, form, and methods of the individual contribution when constructing educational reality;

- which factors determine the reflection, understanding, and the acceptance of the teacher's role and what are the outcomes;
- and many others.

Getting answers to the above (and further) questions might be aided by the model structure of the roles of second chance teachers as a suggested technique for an empirical research analysis in the studied area. With regard to the above theoretical-methodological basis, it is possible to form, on the anticipatory level, a rough theoretical model, which could (and for the present empirical analysis also will) serve as a guide and a compass in the analysis of self-reflective empirical material with the idea of operationalising the key components of competence schemes and models by means of terminology within discourse analysis and ethnomethodology, which is unique and exceptional by its naturalness in everyday life. The model can serve as a bridge between the theoretical-methodological background for empirical research and work with actual self-reflective material, produced directly by teachers during their teaching practice. It fully respects the tools of discourse analysis and ethnomethodology and is not presented as an unalterable scheme, but rather a reflection of the intentions and goals of the subsequent empirical analysis, which, in teachers' non-regulated self-reflections, should not be lost. The model is supported and inspired by authors in the field of theory and methodology (such as de Montigny, 2007; Guzmán, Stecher & Rueda, 2016; Lester, 2011; Adger, 2001; Fairclough, 2003; Maynard & Clayman, 1991; Klapko, 2016; Sacks, 1963; Harré & Gillett, 2001; Bajtoš & Orosová, 2011), as well as empirical analysis (for instance, Pilouras, Plakitsi & Nasis, 2015; Cosh & Tully, 2014; Jalilifar, Khazaie & Kasgari, 2014 and others).

Discourse analysis can be supported by an approach of discourse analysis, determining what questions will be asked, as well as the logic, construction, and reconstruction of the meanings, their structure and the final image. Ethnomethodology makes it possible to use various types of discourse analysis and available tools in a free choice of the perspective in leading the subjects and their accounts, with the use of any available methodology. With regard to what the logic of this analysis and the focus of the questions asked can provide, the fundamental levels (dimensions) of the analysis can be formed and defined in a generalised framework as a theoretical model of a second chance teacher:

1. Self-construction (I AM).
2. Self-determination (EXTERNAL and INTERNAL).
3. Self-interpretation (INDIVIDUALISATION).

4. Self-correction (I CREATE).
5. Self-inspiration (PRACTICES).

Self-construction, I AM. Whenever a person presents (writes/says) something, it is always done in self-perspective, regardless whether an externally adopted arrangement and organisation of social order follows, or 'one's own' opinion is internalised, provided one does not exclude the other – any presentation is a presentation of, about, and from oneself and always has a relational character and is a product of interaction with the surrounding world, active conditions, and their reflection from the viewpoint of the structure of one's personality. In this way, a complex of individual identities is created (Harré & Gillett, 2001; Pilouras, Plakitsi & Nasis, 2015) or a complex of schemes and structures of self-identification (Cheng & Pan, 2019; Pereira, 2014; Korobov, 2010) that is in constant dynamics (what was true yesterday might not apply today, what was valid for one event might not be applicable to a different one). This level is connected to questions about who one is, what they are like and why they are like that; including self-assessment following adopted rules (be it voluntary or enforced), self-image and imagination framework on a positive or negative spectrum (I am a good teacher – I am a bad teacher). It includes motives, intentions, aims, feelings and emotions, as well as competence frameworks, positions of power and authority, self-diagnostics, frameworks of values, etc. The level of identity/identification determines the status of focus and its direction – I am more of a carer than an educator; I am a good leader but a bad subordinate; I like to teach but I find it exhausting; I do it because I have to; etc. Interpretations of meanings of such statements always become meaningful when the social context of what was (or was not – hypertext) said/written is taken into consideration. The final product of the analysis is always a construct of the identity of a teacher in second chance education, the knowledge of what sub-identities are involved, including the determination of one's position against the other participants.

Self-determination: EXTERNAL and INTERNAL. Context is one of the key attributes of all that a person thinks about, says/writes, or does. The semantic levels of the expressed (as well as unexpressed) can be extracted within available knowledge to various levels of authenticity. Defining and labelling fields of discourse inevitably requires entering relevant contexts, their identification, and respect. Everybody who participates in a field of discourse also takes the following three-fold position: *'bow – arrow – target'*. Questions arise regarding how and by what teachers define themselves as actors/participants/

agents in the context of external and internal factors (Albert & Ruiter, 2018; Mascolo, 2009; Korobov, 2010). Among external factors are influences starting with the upbringing of the child by the family, to existing experience, education, professional competence, organisation, interpersonal interaction, to culturally defined patterns. Internally, it mainly concerns the level of interiorisation of the factors and their incorporation in the personality framework of the multi-world of individual identities, while distinguishing between one's role perceived as a game and one's role as an internalised status – identity. In this three-fold position, the teacher plays the role of an agent.

- *Bow*: initiator – creator of conditions, starter of action;
- *Arrow*: executive – administrator, mediator;
- *Target*: processor – recipient who 'only reacts' and chooses from the offer, evaluates the positive and negative influences.

These positions might, or might not, be conscious or consciously identified; they can be active to various extents in the unique nature of events and actions. Another label that can be used is the logic of *designer – producer, distributor – consumer*. External factors cannot be left out of shaping one's self-image and their reflection is a permanently proceeding process of actions and reactions, the actor responds to interventions and, at the same time, reinitiates the formation and effect of others.

Self-interpretation, INDIVIDUALISATION. According to interpretative approaches, there is no world, event, phenomenon, or a thing 'as such' as an objective reality. All there is are subjective constructions of meanings in an active field of interaction between participants – interpretations always produced with regard to the unique nature of everyday moments (Mead, 1912). Language, vocabulary, or terminology, are tools for expressing, and consequently, understanding (or misunderstanding) by the recipients and the way in which language in a field of discourse is used creates space for searching for and getting to know how variants of representations are embedded in the form of language games and what the representations stand for within reflections. In other words, if something does not exist 'as such', then there is multi-variability of this 'something' in the realia of representations and their bearer is the agent in his or her uniqueness (Raffel, 2007). A necessary level of consensus for corresponding interactions is a common denominator (on some level, even as a condition for effective interaction) for a great number of representations. It is not only in everyday practice of the educational environment that this logic is of great importance. It is not the production and

distribution of something identical or 'unisonous' (everybody understanding everybody) that is the aim of shaping any environment for interaction. The goal is the support of variability and the knowledge there is something 'common' as well as its constant cognition. For a teacher, the field of discourse is entered by adult learners in their variability, in many respects different from the variability of the environment where children and youths are educated. Here, in a rough resolution, the distinction of educational environments for a teacher is compensated for by being organised, to various extents, in three patterns (everybody creating a complex of their own schemes) based on self-interpretation and a various level of activity in different everyday situations:

- *Conservationist*: preserves the status of 'the same teacher for all', regardless the environment, participants, or influences (without identification);
- *Explorer-adapter*: is open to the existence of differences and reacts to them if necessary (partially identified);
- *Demolisher-creator*: realises the differences, separates them from existing experience, abolishes them and is active in the creation of the environment (completely identified).

Self-correction, I CREATE. The will and initiation of the identification frameworks manifests in the sequences of action character and the organisation of relevant activities. These are part of practical frameworks and give evidence about those potentials which, in interaction with the environment (expectation, responsibility, opportunity, etc.), find their purpose. They portray the reflection of logic in ideological frameworks in thought maps and navigation while using active patterns of social order (Guzmán, Stecher & Rueda, 2016), as well as the extent of adopting one's position in the educational environment, including the consequences and effects. The frameworks of self-correction usually manifest in a delimited spectrum, on the one hand, made stereotypical and ritualised by the statuses and processes and, on the other hand, innovative-creative, unconventional practices (Washington, 1982). It is a spectrum between artificial external regulation and self-regulation in internal freedom, or between linearly understood techniques within a simple system and non-linear, complex, trajectories in the continuity of permanent decision-making. It is, at the same time, a differentiation between 'the learnt' and 'the learner'. Here, the following can be observed:

- Which activities are subjected to the stereotypes of the environment where children and youths are educated and what solutions are available with different effects;

- Which activities are typical of flexibility, adaptability, and dynamics;
- Whether a reaction is present to changed conditions and how it manifests in the preparation of activities;
- What is the extent of correctness in self-reflection in an interactive environment, etc.

Self-inspiration, PRACTICES. Semantic constructions of the shared accounts always make possible to not only observe what is happening but also in what way. The tools for portraying subjective reflected reality bear a label of individual focus in the complexity of all that is happening and point to the fact that all agents always have their unique potentials available for relevant self-expressions, including the idea of the effect and the consequences of what they do. In this way, specific sequences and successions are created in the logic of practices as methods of constructing the space of discourse, be it a single event or episode (Bonková, 2004), or a chain of events bound by a shared theme. Sets of such practices create a unique and unrepeatable individual methodology (Guzmán, Stecher & Rueda, 2016), part of which are constant changes and the development of particular practices, including their perception. With regard to the previous levels, questions can be asked about which patterns of practices can be identified and what parameters there are to the discovered patterns of shared, or unifying, schemes (Raffel, 2007) of individual methodologies used by teachers, with regard to the specifics of the educational environment and the challenges of continuous confrontation among the initial factors, such as:

- If we find out the structures of identity and sub-identity of the teacher, the question is in what way they came into existence, or how they were formed, what lead the teacher to ‘be in this way’, what practices are stabilising, which are dynamicising, how the potentials are used, etc.;
- If we find out which internal and external determinants enter the discourse and what schemes they form, the question is what the tools are of internalising the external factors, how the reactions to the external interventions are structured, what the techniques of updating the internal factors are, etc.;
- If we find out what the schemes of self-individualisation are, the question is by what techniques they were created, how they are updated, whether deconstruction and reconstruction are part of their updating, etc.

All levels should be understood as mutually conditioned, within their own field mutually discrete but interacting when creating the global image, with

available modifications in the course of the analysis. The model functions as idealisation while its experiential activation is also part of constructing the image of individual practices of the researcher, with the following step being processing self-reflective materials of second chance teachers, identifying semantic schemes and their structuring, taking the levels of the anticipated model into regard.

Conclusion

The study of the internal space of second chance teachers, focused on the specifics of individual viewpoint in an active reality of educational environment, is directed at searching for the most effective means to start the process of getting to know this rich world in its unique complexity. The objective of the paper is to present the second chance teacher in the spectrum of methodology of discourse analysis and ethnomethodology, making use of self-reflective techniques (especially diary records), while taking the following into consideration: 1) the position of the second chance teacher, 2) specific characteristics of the participants of education (adults), 3) specific conditions in which second chance education takes place, and 4) significant aspects of the teacher's work in second chance education. The starting point here is the understanding of the teacher in a role of active participant in and creator of educational reality in the dynamics of interactive processes, with the aim of discovering and naming typical structures of semantic schemes in the teachers' self-reflective materials, focused on self-identification techniques, methods (ethno-methods) of self-determination in the environment of active participants, initiation of self-correction, active creative efforts, and self-assessing versions of personal dynamics, including the expectations of previously undefined levels of introspective production.

Creating a theoretical-methodological framework in the logic of discourse analysis and ethnomethodology following some relevant empirical studies (their objectives, techniques, and outcomes) for inspiration, with regard to research questions stated in the present paper, functioned as the basis for gradually defining the positions of the second chance teacher in the terminology of ethnomethodologically understandable 'labels' and constructing a five-level anticipatory model of the second chance teacher: 1) self-construction (I AM), 2) self-determination (EXTERNAL and INTERNAL), 3) self-interpretation (INDIVIDUALISATION), 4) self-correction (I CREATE), and

5) self-inspiration (PRACTICES). The above model is part of the methodological preparation for the analysis of self-reflective materials by teachers at the empirical level and is a direct reflection of research objectives and questions, when the final schemes, following an empirical analysis, reflect the mutual interaction of two roles – the ‘studying’ and the ‘studied’ – in the joint construction of a unique educational reality of the second chance teacher. Consequently, the identified schemes and ethno-methods will be compared and contrasted with selected competence models in order to depict the image of the second chance teacher, both from the ‘outside’ and ‘inside’.

The available resources provide a great contribution to the debate on using self-reflective tools, discourse analysis and ethnomethodology in educational practice and, in this way, promote the development of new projects. The paper presents some key concepts and tools for the study of a specific educational environment in second chance education with regard to the position and role of the teacher in the theoretical-methodological discourse in anticipation of their empirical pursuit in a relevant school environment in Slovakia.

The paper is an outcome of the APVV-18-0018 project: *Teaching at second chance schools from the perspective of a teacher and adult learner*.

References

- Adger, C.T. (2001). Discourse in Educational Setting. In: D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H.E. Hamilton (eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (pp. 503–516). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Albert, S. & de Ruiter, J.P. (2018). Repair: The Interface between Interaction and Cognition. *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 10(2), 279–313. DOI: 10.1111/tops.12339.
- Bajtoš, J. & Orosová, R. (2011). *Mikrovyučovanie v pregraduálnej príprave učiteľov* [Microeducation in pre-gradual preparation of teachers]. Košice: FF UPJŠ.
- Beneš, M. (2008). *Andragogika* [Andragogy]. Praha: Grada.
- Beneš, M. (2014). *Andragogika* [Andragogy]. 2. vyd. Praha: Grada Publishing.
- Bonková, J. (2004). Ethnomethodological Approach: The Case of Degradation Practises. *Sociológia*, 36(4), 361–376.
- Boud, D., Keogh, R. & Walker, D. (1996). Promoting Reflection in Learning: A Model. In: R. Edwards, A. Hanson & P. Raggatt (eds.), *Boundaries of Adult Learning* (pp. 32–56). New York: Routledge.
- Burbules, N. & Bruce, B. (2001). Theory and Research on Teaching as Dialogue. In: V. Richardson (ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 1102–1121). Washington: American Educational Research Association.

- Cheng, X. & Pan, X. (2019). English Language Teacher Learning in Professional Learning Communities: A Case Study of Chinese Secondary School. *Professional Development in Education*, 45(4), 698–712. DOI: 10.1080/19415257.2019.1579109.
- Cosh, S. & Tully, P.J. (2014). „All I Have to Do Is Pass”: A Discursive Analysis of Student Athletes’ Talk about Prioritising Sport to the Detriment of Education to Overcome Stressors Encountered in Combining Elite Sport and Tertiary Education. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15(1), 180–189. DOI: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.10.015.
- Coulson, A. (1995). *Ethnomethodology*. Thousand Oak: Sage Publications.
- Coulson, D. & Harvey, M. (2013). ‘Scaffolding Student Reflection for Experience-based Learning: A Framework’. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 18(4), 401–413. DOI: 10.1080/13562517.2012.752726.
- Coulter, J. (1991). Logic: Ethnomethodology and the Logic of Language. In: G. Button (ed.), *Ethnomethodology and the Human Scenes* (pp. 20–50). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1933). *How We Think*. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Duranti, A. & Goodwin, C. (1992). *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Europe 2020: A Strategy for smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth (2010). Brusel: European commission, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52010DC2020&from=en> [accessed: 20.05.2021].
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In: T.A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction* (pp. 258–284). London: Sage.
- Feranská, M. (2017). Sebareflexia ako jeden z determinantov profesijného rozvoja učiteľa [Self-reflection as One of Professional Development of Teacher Determinant]. In: J. Králík (ed.), *Evropské pedagogické fórum 2017. Koncepcie vzdelávání a psychologie, ročník VII. [European Forum of Paedagogy 2017. The Conception of Education and Psychology, Vol. VII]* (pp. 82–87). Hradec Králové: MAGNANIMITAS.
- Foucault, M. (2002). *Archeologie věděni [Archaeology of Knowledge]*. Praha: Herman a synové.
- Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Garfinkel, H. & Sacks, H. (1970). On the Formal Structures of Practical Actions. In: J. McKinney & E. Tiryakian (eds.), *Theoretical Sociology: Perspectives and Developments* (pp. 337–366). New York: Apleton-Century-Crofts.
- Gee, P. & Green, J. (1998). Discourse Analysis, Learning, and Social Practice: A Methodological Study. *Review of Research in Education*, 23, 119–169.
- Gomes, M.C., Fonseca, M.F.R., Dias, M.T. & Vargas, P.G. (2010). Culture, Cognition and Language in the Constitution of Reading and Writing Practices in an Adult

- Literacy Classroom. *Psicologia: Reflexão e Crítica*, 24(3), 561–569. DOI: 10.1590/S0102-79722011000300017.
- Green, J.L., Baker, W.D., Chian, M.M., Vanderhoff, C., Hoope, L., Kelly, G., Sku-kauskaite, A. & Kalainoff, M.Z. (2020). Studying the Over-Time Construction of Knowledge in Educational Settings: A Microethnographic Discourse Analysis Approach. *Review of Research in Education*, 44, 161–194.
- Grossman, R. (2008). Structures for Facilitating Student Reflection. *College Teaching*, 57(1), 15–22. DOI: 10.3200/CTCH.57.1.15-22.
- Guzmán, A.M., Stecher, A. & Rueda, L.Í. (2016). Discursive Psychology Contribution to Qualitative Research in Social Psychology: An Analysis of Its Ethnomethodological Heritage. *Psicologia USP*, 27(3), 510–520.
- Habermas, J. (1974). *Theory and Practice*. London: Heinemann.
- Harré, R. & Gillett, G.R. (2001). *Diskurz a myseľ: Úvod do diskurzívnej psychológie [Discourse and Mind: An Introduction to Discursive Psychology]*. Bratislava: IRIS.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnometodology*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hu, W. & Little, M. (2015). So What's the Problem? Reflection and Reflexivity as Agents of Change. *Medical Education*, 49, 1174–1186. DOI: 10.1111/medu.12890.
- Hupková, M. (2006). *Profesijná sebareflexia učiteľa [Professional Self-reflection of Teacher]*. Nitra: PF UKF.
- Jalilifar, A., Khazaie, S. & Kasgari, Z.A. (2014). Critical Discourse Analysis of Teachers' Written Diaries Genre: The Critical Thinkong Impact on Cognition in Focus. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 735–741.
- Klapko, D. (2016). Diskurzívni analýza a její využití ve výzkumu edukačních jevů [Discursive Analysis and Using of It in Educational Phenomena Research]. *Pedagogická orientace*, 26(3), 379–414.
- Končeková, L. (2010). *Vývinová psychológia [Developmental Psychology]*. Prešov: Vydavateľstvo Michala Vaška.
- Korobov, N. (2010). A Discursive Psychological Approach to Positioning. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 7, 263–277. DOI: 10.1080/14780880902822321.
- Kuhn, L. (2008). Complexity and Educational Research: A Critical Reflection. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 40(1), 177–189. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-5812.2007.00398.x.
- Lester, J.N. (2011). Exploring the Borders of Cognitive and Discursive Psychology: A Methodological Reconceptualization of Cognition and Discourse. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*, 10(3), 280–293. DOI: 10.1891/1945-8959.
- Lisabonská stratégia [Lisbon Strategy]* (2000). Bratislava: Ministerstvo investícií, regionálneho rozvoja a informatizácie Slovenskej republiky, <https://www.mirri.gov.sk/sekcie/ccko/strategia-europa-2020/lisabonska-strategia/index.html> [accessed: 15.05.2021].
- Logren, A., Ruusuvoori, J. & Laitinen, J. (2017). Self-reflective Talk in Group Counseling. *Discourse Studies*, 19(4), 422–440. DOI: 10.1177/1461445617706771.

- Lukáč, M. (2013). Dospelí a školská edukácia – od historických aspektov k aktuálnym výzvam [Adults and School Education – from Historical Aspects to Current Challenges]. In: E. Lukáč (ed.), *Metamorfózy edukácie I. Zborník [Metamorphoses of Education I. Proceedings]* (pp. 35–48). Prešov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, <https://www.pulib.sk/web/kniznica/elpub/dokument/Lukac2/subor/Lukac.pdf> [accessed: 15.05.2021].
- Lukáčová, S. (2013). Druhošancové vzdelávanie v nadnárodných a národných dokumentoch [Second-chance Education in Transnational and National Documents]. In: E. Lukáč (ed.), *Edukácia človeka – problémy a výzvy pre 21. storočie [Human Education – Problems and Challenges for the 21st Century]* (pp. 358–362). Prešov: Prešovská univerzita v Prešove, <https://www.pulib.sk/web/pdf/web/viewer.html?file=/web/kniznica/elpub/dokument/Lukac1/subor/9788055508252.pdf> [accessed: 15.05.2021].
- Lukáčová, S. (2017). Učiteľ ako vzdelávateľ dospelých v druhošancovom vzdelávaní odsúdených [A Teacher as an Adult Educator in the Secondary Education of Convicts]. In: I. Pavlov (ed.), *Kontexty podpory profesijného rozvoja učiteľstva [Contexts to Support the Professional Development of Teachers]* (pp. 129–144). Banská Bystrica: Belianum.
- Machalová, M. (2006). *Psychológia vo vzdelávaní dospelých [Psychology in Adult Education]*. 1. ed. Bratislava: Gerlach Print.
- Mann, K., Gordon, J. & MacLeod, A. (2009). Reflection and Reflective Practice in Health Professions Education: A Systematic Review. *Advances in Health Sciences Education, 14*, 595–621.
- Mascolo, M.F. (2009). Beyond Student-Centered and Teacher-Centered Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning as Guided Participation. *Pedagogy and the Human Sciences, 1*(1), 3–27.
- Maynard, D.W. & Clayman, S.E. (1991). The Diversity of Ethnomethodology. *Annual Review of Sociology, 17*, 385–418.
- Mead, G.H. (1912). The Mechanism of Social Consciousness. *Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods, 9*, 401–406.
- Mezirow, J. (1990). How Critical Reflection Triggers Transformative Learning. In: J. Mezirow et al. (eds.), *Fostering Critical Reflection in Adulthood* (pp. 1–20). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Mezirow, J. (1998). On Critical Reflection. *Adult Education Quarterly, 48*(3), 185–198. DOI: 10.1177/074171369804800305.
- Minor, L.C. (2002). Preservice Teachers' Educational Beliefs and Their Perceptions of Characteristics of Effective Teachers. *Journal of Educational Research, 96*(2), 116–127. DOI: 10.1080/00220670209598798.
- de Montigny, G. (2007). Ethnomethodology for Social Work. *Qualitative Social Work, 6*(1), 95–120. DOI: 10.1177/1468017318795925.

- Morin, E. (2001). *Seven Complex Lessons in Education for the Future*. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.
- Orosová, R., Ganajová, M., Rozenfeld, J. & Desiatniková, L. (2018). Metódy sebareflexie v praktickej profesijnej príprave učiteľov [Methods of Self-reflection in Practical Professional Training of Teachers]. *Journal of Global Science*, 3(1), http://www.jogsc.com/pdf/2018/1/metody_sebareflexie.pdf [accessed: 5.05.2021].
- Pereira, A. (2014). The Discursive Analysis of Body Representation: A Critical, Realistic and Embodied Overview. *Portuguese Journal of Social Science*, 13(1), 75–92. DOI: 10.1386/pjss.13.1.75_1.
- Petlák, E. (2019). *Motivácia v edukačnom procese [Motivation in the Educational Process]*. Bratislava: Wolters Kluwer.
- Pilouras, P., Plakitsi, K. & Nasis, G. (2015). Discourse Analysis of Science Teachers Talk as Self-reflective Tool for Promoting Effective NOS Teaching. *World Journal of Education*, 5(6), 96–107.
- Průcha, J. (1997). *Moderní pedagogika [Modern Pedagogy]*. Praha: Portal.
- Průcha, J., Walterová, E. & Mareš, J. (1995). *Pedagogický slovník [Pedagogical Dictionary]*. Praha: Praha Portál.
- Raffel, S. (2007). Self-Reflective Rule-Following. *Culture and Organization*, 13(4), 327–335.
- Ritzer, G. (1993). *The McDonaldization of Society*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.
- Ryan, M. (2012). Conceptualising and Teaching Discursive and Performative Reflection in Higher Education. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 34(2), 207–223. DOI: 10.1080/0158037X.2011.611799.
- Sacks, H. (1963). On Sociological Description. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 8, 1–16.
- Sacks, H. (1995). *Lectures on Conversation*, Vol. 1–2. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Samuels, M. & Betts, J. (2007). Crossing the Threshold from Description to Deconstruction: Using Self-assessment to Deepen Reflection. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 8(2), 269–283. DOI: 10.1080/14623940701289410.
- Sandars, J. (2009). The Use of Reflection in Medical Education: AMEE Guide No. 44. *Medical Teacher*, 31, 685–695. DOI: 10.1080/01421590903050374.
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Hamilton, H. (eds.) (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schon, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sedláková, M. (2018). Potenciál diskurzivní analýzy a vizuální metodologie v postmoderním paradigmatu vědy [The Potential of Discursive Analysis and Visual Methodology in the Postmodern Paradigm of Science]. *Pedagogická orientace*, 28(1), 163–180. DOI: 10.5817/PedOr2018-1-163.
- Semetsky, I. (2005). Not by Breadth Alone: Imaging a Self-organised Classroom. *Complexity: An International Journal of Complexity and Education*, 2(1), 19–36.

- Švec, Š. (2008). *Anglicko-slovenský lexikón pedagogiky a andragogiky [English-Slovak Lexicon of Pedagogy and Andragogy]*. Bratislava: Iris.
- Tal, C. (2012). Discourse and Reflection Competencies Developed by Student Teachers through Repeated Children's Book Read Alouds: A Multiple Case Study. *ISRIN Education*, 2012, 1–10, <http://downloads.hindawi.com/archive/2012/308198.pdf> [accessed: 23.05.2021].
- Vágnerová, M. (2012). *Vývojová psychologie [Developmental Psychology]*. 2. ed. Praha: Karolinum.
- Waring, H.Z. (2014). Mentor Invitations for Reflection in Post-observation Conferences: Some Preliminary Considerations. *Applied Linguistics Review*, 5(1), 99–123.
- Washington, R.O. (1982). Social Development: A Focus for Practice and Education. *Social Work*, 27(1), 104–109. DOI: 10.1093/sw/27.1.104.
- Wertsch, J. (1991). *Voices of the Mind: A Sociokultural Approach to Mediated Action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wiegerová, A. & Lampertová, A. (2012). Denník učiteľa ako výskumný nástroj [Teacher's Diary as a Research Tool]. *Kvalita ve vzdělávání, Sborník konference České asociace pedagogického výzkumu*, <http://www.capv.cz/index.php/cz/2012/39-sborniky-capv/archiv-sborniku/2012/200-dennik-ucitele-ako-vy-skumny-nastroj> [accessed: 30.04.2021].
- York, C.S., Yamagata-Lynch, L.C. & Smaldino, S.E. (2016). Adult Reflection in a Graduate-level Online Distance Education Course. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 17(1), 40–58. DOI: 10.1080/14623943.2015.1123686.