

MICROTEACHING

Copyright © SIMETRI, 2014

Hak cipta dilindungi undang-undang

All rights reserved

Cetakan I, April 2014

Penulis: Sofendi

Penyunting: Akhmad Aminuddin Bama

Desain sampul & tata letak: Akhmad Aminuddin Bama

Diterbitkan oleh: SIMETRI, Percetakan dan Penerbitan

Jl. Srijaya Negara Lrg. Jaya Sempurna 2015, Bukit Besar, Palembang

Telp./Fax. 0711-315321; HP. 081328740911

Email: simetri_penerbit@yahoo.com; akhmadbama@yahoo.com

xii + 52 hlm.; 23,5 × 15,5 cm

ISBN 978-602-1160-01-5

Buku ini diketik dan didesain dengan menggunakan program L^AT_EX 2_ε

Isi di luar tanggung jawab penerbit

Preface

Microteaching is very popular in teacher training programs. Microteaching consists of several stages, that is plan, teach, observe, re-plan, re-teach, and re-observe. These stages are designed to help the student teachers learn how to teach in the small scale classes before they teach the students in real-size classes. The weaknesses and strengths of the student teachers can be evaluated and discussed in the relevant stages. Then the weakness of the student teachers can be minimized or reduced and their strengths can maximized.

This book is concerned with the microteaching run at the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University. It describes the common practice of microteaching at this institution as well as its theoretical analysis and research-based analysis in line with finding the better way(s) of running the microteaching at this study program.

This book is hopefully beneficial not only for the student teachers for enriching their knowledge preparing themselves to be future professional teachers but also for the lecturers who handle the microteaching in line with helping the students learn how to teach. It may also be useful for anybody who is interested in running teacher training programs as supplementary ideas.

Sofendi

Acknowledgements

In writing this book, some people undoubtedly helped the writer. Therefore the writer would like to appreciate their valuable efforts, particularly to the Head of English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University Palembang and her staff members as well as her students in helping the writer get the data for writing this book. In addition, the writer would also thank the librarians for their help providing some references for the purpose of writing this book. Last but not least, the writer would also to thank everybody who has helped the writer directly or indirectly in writing this book.

Palembang, March 2, 2014
The Writers,
Sofendi

Publishers Forward

T This book entitled Microteaching provides some knowledge in the field of English Teacher Training Program. It can be used as one of references for English teachers wo train their teachers to be professional English teachers as well as for practioners. In addition, it can also be used for student teachers who are interested in teaching English as one of ideas in helping them learn more about English teacher training.

At this valuable opportunity, I would like to thank the writer who trusts the SIMETRI to publish this book.

Palembang, March 14, 2014
SIMETRI, Percetakan dan Penerbitan

Contents

Preface	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Publishers Forward	ix
Contents	xi
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Review of Literatures	3
2.1 Microteaching	3
2.2 Definitions of Microteaching	4
2.3 History of Microteaching	6
2.4 Development of Microteaching	8
2.5 Teaching Skills to be Supervised in Microteaching	11
2.6 Strengths and Weaknesses of Microteaching	12
2.7 Time for Teach and Re-teach Stages	14
2.8 Feedback Stage	15
2.9 The Use of Videotape Recordings in the Feedback Stage	15
2.10 Re-teach Stage	16
2.11 The Use of Peers and Real Students for Micro-lessons	16
2.12 Supervision	17
2.13 Roles of Supervisors	18

Chapter 3 English Education Study Program 21

3.1 English Education Study Program Curriculum 22

3.2 Field Experience One Subject 22

3.3 Simulation Period 23

3.4 Peer-teaching Period 24

3.5 Microteaching Period 24

3.6 Supervision and Roles of Supervisors in the Microteaching Period 27

Chapter 4 Research Methodology 29

4.1 Data 29

4.2 Questionnaire 29

4.2.1 Aim of the Questionnaire 30

4.2.2 Distribution of the Questionnaire 31

4.2.3 Problems arising in the study 31

4.3 Presentation of the Findings 31

4.4 Analysis and Interpretations of the Findings 34

Chapter 5 Conclusions and Suggestions 43

5.1 Conclusions 43

5.2 Suggestions 45

References 47

Index 51

Chapter 1

Introduction

At present, in Indonesia, the demand for teachers in primary schools, junior and senior high schools is very high. This situation has led the Indonesian Government and private parties to opening many teacher training schools, institutes and universities in order to fulfill this demand. With respect to teachers of English, where English is taught in junior and senior high schools as a school subject and its status in Indonesia is as a foreign language, the training is carried out in public institutes and universities as well as private ones.

One of the public universities which runs the teacher training program is Sriwijaya University in Palembang. This University has ten faculties and one of them is the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. This faculty consists of fifteen study Programs and English Education Study Program is one of them. This program is designed for training candidates of teachers of English for junior and senior high schools.

In this study program, the student teachers are taught both theoretical and practical subjects which basically cover (1) general knowledge subjects, (2) basic educational subjects, (3) teaching and learning process subjects, (4) English skills subjects, and field service (FKIP, 2013:39). One of the practical subjects that can be found in its curriculum is Field Experience One. This subject consists of simulation, peer teaching and microteaching periods, and is offered to the students teachers in the sixth semester or at the end of the third academic year.

This book, therefore, attempts to evaluate the microteaching pe-

riod in the English Education Study Program as well as the roles of supervisors. The following chapters describe some issues in the microteaching and roles of supervisors. Having described these two points, the strengths and weaknesses of the microteaching period in this study program are then analysed, and finally the ways of improving, if any, the microteaching period as well as the roles of supervisors in this study program can be found.

Chapter 2

Review of Literatures

2.1 Microteaching

Pre-service and in-service teacher training Programs have a very important role in producing teachers in relation to coping with the demand for teachers in primary schools, junior and senior high schools, and even for institute and university levels. The Programs might be different in some ways from one another because of the time available, the target situation for which teachers are being trained, the educational standard and emotional maturity of trainees, and the staff and facilities available might vary (Strevens, 1974:26). However, they might also have some similarities, for example, both Programs may have theoretical and practical components.

Particularly in pre-service teacher training Programs, they should include both theory and practice, in order to avoid a careless and chaotic accumulation of practical teaching experience and an equally useless amount of theoretical study with little or no reference to the actual classroom situation (Mariani, 1979:74). Since they should include both theory and practice, therefore, teacher trainers should find an appropriate integration of theory and practice, and it is seen as one of the most crucial issues in teacher training (Mariani, 1979:3). This problem was seen as very serious problem by some educationalists at Stanford University in Califaronia, U.S.A. who tried hard to find a method of bridging the gap between instruction in education and classroom practice. The method should provide the beginner with real practice in teaching and with training-specific teaching skills

supervisor aims the camera of a portable videotape recorder at the group, and occasionally jots down some notes. The lesson lasts for only five minutes, but during this brief time, two things happen: the students discover that the butterflies are camouflaged so that they look like leaves, and that this disguise protects the butterflies from their natural enemies. The teacher has a chance to practice the teaching skill of asking probing questions. As soon as the lesson is over, the supervisor has the students fill out a form. They do this quickly and leave the room. In the minutes that follow, the supervisor and the teacher discuss the lesson, reviewing the supervisor's notes and the forms filled out by the students, and viewing parts of the video lesson. Then after a short break, the entire process is repeated. However, the second time around, the teacher teaches different group of four students. The teacher, the supervisor, and the students have been involved in the process of microteaching.

If we look at the above quotation carefully, we can find some very important stages that exist in microteaching, that is (1) the teacher teaches the lesson (one teaching skill) to a small group of students for a very short period a time (five minutes), (2) the teacher and supervisor discuss the students forms and the supervisor's notes, and this is popularly called a feedback, critique, or observe stage, and (3) the teacher re-teaches that material again to a different small group of students and the same cycle happens again. In order words, after the teacher and his supervisor have had a brief discussion, the entire process is repeated. Apart from the above three important stages, there are actually three other stages which are not explicitly described in that quotation, that is, logically, before the teacher teaches and re-teaches, he should plan and re-plan what he is going to teach, and then after he has re-taught, the re-observe stage is held again. The supervisor should, of course, help the teacher plan and re-plan what he is going to teach and re-teach. In short, we can say that in microteaching the following stages exist: PLAN TEACH OBSERVE RE-PLAN -RE-TEACH -RE-OBSERVE, and this is the first model used by the teacher trainers in Educational Department, Stanford University in California, U.S.A. in running their microteaching program.

and strategies. From their research, they arrived at an idea which could fulfill all these functions, that is microteaching for which had five essential characteristics, they are (1) Microteaching is real teaching, (2) microteaching lessens the complexities of normal classroom teaching; class size, scope of content, and time are all reduced, (3) microteaching focuses on training for the accomplishment of specific tasks, (4) microteaching allows for the increased control of practice, and (5) microteaching expands the normal knowledge-of-results or feedback dimension in teaching (Allen and Ryan, 1969:2).

Microteaching has been used by all disciplines, in TEFL situations, for example, it has been used widely all over the world as part of pre-service and/or in-service teacher training Programs, because most teacher trainers believe that microteaching is one of the most flexible and useful tools that they available to bridge the gap between the theory and practice of TEFL methodology (Wallace, 1979:58). Furthermore, we should always bear in mind that microteaching is not teaching but it is an exercise in the development of teaching skills necessary in the classroom (Brumfit and Rossnes, 1982:28)

This chapter describes the definitions, history, development, teaching skills to be supervised in the microteaching, and some views on microteaching in details.

2.2 Definitions of Microteaching

There are many definitions of microteaching and , therefore, it is felt necessary to provide the most useful description of basic microteaching procedures by quoting Allen and Ryans description of microteaching, because there is no clearer description of microteaching than that of Allen and Ryan (Stones and Morris, 1972:79). They say:

A teacher holds up before four children a picture what appears to be a branch that has five brownish leaves. However, when the students inspect the picture closely, they realize that two of the five leaves are actually butterflies. The teacher then questions the four students, trying to see whether they can come up with an explanation of this phenomenon. Fifteen feet away a

Many definitions of microteaching have developed since 1963. This is caused by the difficulty of adequately defining microteaching itself (Geddes, 1978:3) and also fundamentally, microteaching is an idea and therefore it is potentially subject to misapplication and distortion (Allen and Ryan, 1969:8). Furthermore, Allen and Ryan say that although the term microteaching was first coined in 1963, the concept has never been a static one, it continues to grow and change and develop both in focus and format. So that is why we can now find various definitions of microteaching. For example, it has been described as a scaled down teaching encounter in terms of class size, lesson length, and teaching complexity (McAleese and Unwin, 1971 in Trott, 1979:56; Philips, 1975:120; Wallace, 1979:56; Carver and Wallace, 1975:184; and Broughton, 1979:48); it has been described as a system of controlled practice that make it possible to concentrate on specific teaching behavior (Allen And Eve, 1968 in Trott, 1977:9); it is the teaching (by the trainee) of specific items of techniques, possibly with the use of closed-circuit television and videotape recording (Strevens, 1974:26). Finally Britton and Sow (1981:22) define microteaching as follow: (1) a skills approach: limited and coherent bundles of desirable teacher behavior are defined as far as possible in easily observable terms, one such bundle or skill is practiced at a time, (2) scaled-down practice situations: trainees practice the skill in short micro-lesson (preferably five to ten minutes) taught to very small classes (about five students), (3) maximum relevant feedback to help each trainee evaluate his or her performance in the skill, (4) perceptual modeling of the skill before trainees practice it, maximum positive reinforcement of trainee success and a supportive practice and feedback environment, and (6) a non-directive or counseling approach by the trainer.

Among those definitions, there are two essential features of the technique which exist in each of them, that is a simplification of the teaching and the provision of feedback (Geddes, 1978:3).

2.3 History of Microteaching

Before the term microteaching was known, it was common in any teacher training Programs, either in pre-service or in-service used a

traditional method for training their student teachers. The method which was based on a sitting with Nellie approach, where the student teachers were sent out to schools to observe teachers teaching in the classroom, with the implication being that the student teachers should model the master teacher (Stones and Morris, 1972 in Hargie and Maidment, 1979:1). But this approach is beset by numerous problems and is far from satisfactory. One major problem is that it assumes that the teachers encountered by student teachers will be highly competent and worthy of note. However, since many teachers are not highly competent, we are presented with the situation where the student teachers may either imitate teachers who leave a lot to be desired, or may end up having learned nothing from their period of observation (Hargie and Maidment, 1979:1). Furthermore, the difficulties are increased, because the student teachers are quite often given no training in methods of observation prior to being sent into the classroom (McAleese, 1973 in Hargie and Maidment, 1979:1).

The technique of modeling a master teacher would possibly be acceptable if all teachers always displayed ideal teaching behaviours and were widely experienced and highly competent teachers (McKnight, 1971), but widely experienced and highly competent teachers were not available in sufficient numbers to cope with the demands of institutions of teacher training. Thus, the technique of modeling the master teacher as a method of training student teachers is again far from satisfactory (Hargie and Maidment, 1979:1).

The above problem impressed some educationalists at Stanford University in California, U.S.A. and apart from those they also had their own problems in their institution where the liberal arts graduates who had entered the Stanford teacher training program were reluctant to undertake serious study of the teaching-learning process (Allen and Ryan, 1969:iii). Most of these students had come for one reason, that is state laws required a teaching credential for school practice. This situation led those educationalists to make a genuine attempt to overcome these difficulties from Stanford University, designed a demonstration teaching lesson, and it was supported by behavior modification theory (Barley, 1971 in Geddes, 1978:19).

The first attempt that they made was to simulate teaching situations by having student teachers teach groups of their peers, but

they found that these student teachers tended to react negatively to this. Then, they arranged for these student teachers to teach short lessons to small groups of school students, the goal being to provide them experience of real teaching but in simplified conditions. Since then, a further innovation found in the microteaching, that is, for example, the use of videotape recordings so that student teachers can directly observe their own teaching instead of having to depend on the reports of the supervisor and students (McIntyre et al. 1977:10). This innovation is considered very helpful by most teacher trainers, because there are so many advantages of using the videotape recorders.

2.4 Development of Microteaching

This sub-section discusses two aspects of microteaching: its flexibility and the use of videotape recordings. Microteaching has been adapted by various teacher trainers to suit their different needs and consequently the variations occur in almost every aspect of the microteaching process (Wallace, 1979:58). For example, in some Programs, the re-teach may take place very soon after the teach; in others it may be a day or a week later, this because the evidence shows that both shorter and longer intervals have satisfactory results (Britton and Sow, 1981:31). And even in some Programs, the re-teach is dropped altogether, so that more ground can be covered in limited time. In these Programs, the supervisor perhaps feel that once the student teacher has got the idea, there is no need to continue drilling the skill by making him re-teach the lesson. This kind of situation happens at the New University of Ulster where they use only Plan Teach observe for their own model in running the microteaching (Brown, 1975:5). In another program, a complete thirty-minute foreign language lesson is divided into two units, and each unit is taught by a different student teacher (Beattie and Teather, 1971 in Wallace, 1979:58).

Particularly in EFL situation, we can find some other variations of microteaching which are caused by its flexibility. One of them is described by Carver and Wallace in Geddes, 1978:7-10), where they identify five models in their use of microteaching, that is (1) classical

skills-analysis microteaching: the behaviour required of the micro teacher is specified beforehand, an area of subject-oriented teaching behavior is broken down into skills and these skills are discussed with the micro teacher, then practice of the skills is given by asking the micro teacher to perform prescribed tasks, and finally teaching is done with peers and re-teach sessions are used; (2) problem-centered microteaching: this model is the same as the previous one, except the skills are analyzed in the feedback session and the feedback focuses on how the problem was dealt with and may advise on alternative procedures; (3) exploratory microteaching: this model is more loosely structured than the preceding ones, the micro lesson is longer and the discussion that follows may cover a wide variety of pedagogic problems; (4) demonstration microteaching: this model is the same as model 1, except that before the skills are practiced, the demonstration of these skills are shown (usually on films or videotape); and (5) non-participant microteaching: this model envisages the viewing and discussion on videotape or other teachers doing micro lessons, or samples from all lessons. No practice or imitation of the skill (s) is involved.

Another development in microteaching that can be found now is caused by the availability of videotape recordings. The use of videotape recordings is considered necessary in running the microteaching Programs, because here are many advantages to it. Some of these advantages as described by Wallace, 1981; Stones and Morris, 1972; McAleese, 1973; Britton and Sow, 1981; and Allen and Ryan, 1969 are:

1. it enhances the effectiveness and flexibility of microteaching,
2. The single most effective variable in an experiment on the acquisition of a teaching skill for the student is self-viewing of video a recording with prompting by a supervisor.
3. It provides a common frame of reference for student teacher and his supervisor,
4. It allows the student teachers to observe their own teaching,
5. It is excellent for both the development and display of models of various teaching skills,

6. It is powerful source feedback in the microteaching process and also it helps the students teacher understand his own performance and serves as teaching tool for the supervisor.
7. It can be used by supervisors to support and reinforce their supervisory instruction.
8. It allows the micro-lesson to be replayed and stopped at any point for discussion, and
9. The disagreement over categorization (as to whether, for example, a certain question was a literal question or not) can be settled, or at least more fully explored by a replay of the tape.

Apart from the above aspect of microteaching that can be found in the development of microteaching, there is still another aspect which may cause the development of microteaching itself, that is many teacher trainers see many advantages in using microteaching to bridge the gap between the theory and practice. Some of these advantages as described by Cohen and Manion, 1977; Allen and Ryan, 1969; Hargie and Maidment, 1979; Wallace, 1979; Carver and Wallace, 1975; and Geddes, 1978 are:

 1. It has a much shorter lesson and fewer students, so specific techniques can be studied closely, most of the variables can be controlled, and more knowledge of results can be obtained.
 2. The students teacher can concentrate on one teaching skill at a time,
 3. by emphasizing the analysis of teaching into its component skills, microteaching lays the basis for a truly scientific approach to teaching training,
 4. it focuses the attention of both student teacher and supervisor on a specific skill, thus making evaluation and discussion much more manageable,
 5. By scaling down the size of the class, the amount of time, the scope of the lesson, etc., the complexities of the classroom are drastically reduced, and all of these allow the student teacher to

 6. it is able to offer immediate feedback following performance, thus the student teacher has several sources of feedback at his disposal with the help of which he can maximize his insight into his teaching behaviour,
 7. it provides a context in which the student teacher's primary responsibility is to learn, not that of coping with the various needs and demands of his students,
 8. it allows for repeated practice until a skill is mastered in one context before it is necessary to transfer the use of that skill to other contexts,
 9. the systematic definition and practice of teaching skills allows close links to be established between student teachers' theoretical studies and their practice teaching,
 10. the 'micro approach encourages both the supervisor and student teachers to examine in great detail exactly what happens in a particular area of teaching,
 11. It is 'low risk' situation in which student teachers can find success before teaching in a real classroom. This decreases their anxiety towards teaching practice, and
 12. By enabling the student teacher to focus on specific skills, providing immediate feedback from several resources, and then allowing him to continue practice, microteaching leads to great strides in the acquisition of teaching skills in a short time.

2.5 Teaching Skills to be Supervised in Microteaching

The original teaching skills firstly developed for supervision in microteaching session at Stanford University are (1) stimulus varia-

6. It is powerful source feedback in the microteaching process and also it helps the students teacher understand his own performance and serves as teaching tool for the supervisor.
7. It can be used by supervisors to support and reinforce their supervisory instruction.
8. It allows the micro-lesson to be replayed and stopped at any point for discussion, and
9. The disagreement over categorization (as to whether, for example, a certain question was a literal question or not) can be settled, or at least more fully explored by a replay of the tape.

Apart from the above aspect of microteaching that can be found in the development of microteaching, there is still another aspect which may cause the development of microteaching itself, that is many teacher trainers see many advantages in using microteaching to bridge the gap between the theory and practice. Some of these advantages as described by Cohen and Manion, 1977; Allen and Ryan, 1969; Hargie and Maidment, 1979; Wallace, 1979; Carver and Wallace, 1975; and Geddes, 1978 are:

 1. It has a much shorter lesson and fewer students, so specific techniques can be studied closely, most of the variables can be controlled, and more knowledge of results can be obtained.
 2. The students teacher can concentrate on one teaching skill at a time,
 3. by emphasizing the analysis of teaching into its component skills, microteaching lays the basis for a truly scientific approach to teaching training,
 4. it focuses the attention of both student teacher and supervisor on a specific skill, thus making evaluation and discussion much more manageable,
 5. By scaling down the size of the class, the amount of time, the scope of the lesson, etc., the complexities of the classroom are drastically reduced, and all of these allow the student teacher to

tion, (2) set induction, (3) closure, (4) nonverbal behaviour, (5) reinforcement, (6) fluency in asking questions, (7) probing questions, (8) higher-order questions, (9) divergent questions, (10) recognizing attending behaviour, (11) illustration and use of examples, (12) lecturing, (13) planned repetition, and (14) completeness of communication (Allen and Ryan, 1969:3-4). Because of the flexibility of microteaching and some other possible factors, all these allow teacher trainers to use all skills mentioned above in their Programs or to choose some of them to suit the objectives of their Programs, and they can include all these skills as well as other teaching skills in their Programs.

In EFL situations, for example, there have been many teaching skills used by teacher trainers in training their student teachers. These skills may or may not be the same as the Stanford's teaching skills to some extent, because of their different needs in running their teacher training Programs. Particularly in Cyprus, for example, the teacher trainers use fifteen teaching skills in training their Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot teachers of English. These teaching skills are (1) how to begin a lesson using greetings, fixed expressions related to the weather, class attendances, etc., and informal dialogues, (2) how to revise given lexical items and structures, (3) the presentation of new lexical items, (4) the presentation of new structures, (5) the use of the blackboard matchstick figures to practice given items, (6) the use of the flannel board for oral composition, (7) the use of the wall pictures associated with the recommended textbook to stimulate oral practice, (8) using games linked specifically with certain revision topics, (9) songs for revision and variety, (10) the use of the taperecorder with specially prepared supplementary taped minidiologues, (11) dramatization developed from the supplementary mini dialogues, (12) the use of models, (13) the use of puppets, (14) group work using picture cards and realia, and (15) use of flash cards (Philips, 1975:124-125).

2.6 Strengths and Weaknesses of Microteaching

Most teacher trainers include both theoretical and practical components in their teacher training Programs, because they believe that their student teachers should have a thorough knowledge of the

language they are supposed to teach, they should know how the language works in order to be able to handle it, they should possess the teaching skills to put their knowledge into practice and they should also master a series of techniques which they can draw on for their teaching (Williams, 1975:108-109). They also believe that the integration of the theory and practice is one of the most crucial issues in teacher training. Therefore, they try to achieve a sound balance between the theory and practice, because they know that knowledge alone will not do the 'job'; adopting a handful of skills will not either, but the integration of these will certainly do so.

All the above problems lead the teacher trainers to use microteaching in their Programs, because they see microteaching as a useful technique to help bridge the gap between theory and practice. In microteaching, the relationship between the theory and practice can be made more apparent, and attention can be focused on particular skills and strategies before the student teachers practice putting them together in a real classroom (Geddes, 1978:4). But it does not mean that microteaching is intended to replace school teaching practice. Furthermore, they also believe why they have to include practice in their Programs, because the student teachers should not be asked to teach in schools until they have proven competence in basic teaching skills. Without these skills, they can never conquer the two problems of controlling and motivating learners (Brown, 1975:4). Therefore, the best way for these student teachers to practice all these teaching skills is in microteaching.

Apart from the above positive views of microteaching and many advantages to it, they also consider criticisms from some teacher trainers. They consider that microteaching is an artificial procedure. This is admitted by the supporters of microteaching, but they go on to make the point that all training procedures to some extent artificiality is the price one has to pay for control over the training process, and also microteaching is usually seen as complementary to more realistic procedures rather than as an alternative. Some research, moreover, seems to show that it is a more efficient alternative to normal teaching practice (Wallace, 1979:57; Carver and Wallace, 1979:158; and Brown, 1977:62).

The second possible criticism is the psychological strain under-

gone by a student teacher who has to perform in front of fellow students, more especially if the teaching is being videotaped. Again the supporters of microteaching argue that in practice, it is not a major problem because most student teachers adjust very quickly to the situation, and indeed the microteaching sessions are often the most popular elements in the training Programs (Wallace, 1979:57).

The third possible criticism is whether it is desirable, or even possible, to analyse the teaching process into component skills in the way that is proposed. In this case, most supervisors adopt a 'common sense' approach and allow that there are at least some teaching skills that can profitably be isolated and practiced (Wallace, 1979:57).

The fourth problem with all microteaching exercises is that they depend largely on the supervisor's view of what constitutes good teaching (Crippwell and Geddes, 1978:233), while if we try to find out what we mean by 'good' language teaching, it is difficult to reach a consensus. The fifth criticism of microteaching is that it is threatening. Again, those who support microteaching say that it is true that microteaching is threatening but most challenging activities are.

The sixth criticism of microteaching is that it is behaviouristic. In this case, the supporters of microteaching say that it is true that microteaching is behaviouristic, but there is little point in producing a training program which does not change behaviour.

The last problem with the microteaching is from the administrative point of view, that is they consider that it is timeconsuming and, if videotape recording is used, expensive (Stones and Morris, 1972:81).

2.7 Time for Teach and Re-teach Stages

Normally, the time given for the teach or re-teach stage is five minutes for each teaching skill (e.g. asking probing question) to be practiced and it is quite sufficient, but if we ask the student teacher to practice the skills of 'set induction' and 'closure' at one time, five minutes seems to be not sufficient, because the student teacher should have a chance to present a topic at more length. Therefore, the time for a teach or re-teach stage should be lengthened a bit longer, and most

teacher trainers tend to use 15 minutes for each of these sessions. As Hargie (1979:7) says, 'how can you close a lesson which you have not taught, or open a lesson which you do not intend to teach'. Furthermore, he also finds that the notion of increasing lesson length gradually to be very helpful from the point of view of both student teacher and supervisor perceptions, making the whole exercise much more realistic for those involved.

2.8 Feedback Stage

The provision of feedback stage is seen as a vitally important element in microteaching (McAleese in Griffiths, 1977:18), because in this stage, the student teachers can get feedback from several sources, e.g. supervisors, learners and/or peers and even from self-viewing from the television (if videotape recording is available). All these can help the student teachers improve their teaching performance.

Particularly in foreign language microteaching, the favourite feedback procedure is group discussion which is led by the supervisor, because it seems to be the most efficient way of using student teacher time. It may enable the whole group to benefit from the critique arising from any one example of microteaching, it takes a lot of the tension out of the situation, in that remarks need not be directed specifically at the micro teacher, and the presence of the supervisor makes it possible to direct the discussion and to relate it to methodology tutorial classes (Geddes, 1978:16). And, of course, all these feedbacks can be translated into practice when the student teacher re-teaches shortly after the critique stage is over.

2.9 The Use of Videotape Recordings in the Feedback Stage

The use of videotape recordings is considered very important in enhancing the effectiveness of discussion during the feedback stage. But, if simply replaying the entire lesson during this stage, it is seen to be the most insufficient use of video. Therefore, it is suggested that is more effective if it is selective. In other words, the super-

visor and/or student teacher should decide which part or parts of the recording to play back (Geddes, 1978:16; and Britton and Sow, 1981:25). However, the video replay can only be regarded as feedback when the viewers (student teachers and supervisor) know what behaviours are expected of him and accept these behaviours as desirable, otherwise, it will be meaningless (Solomon and McDonald, 1969 in Griffiths, 1977:19).

2.10 Re-teach Stage

There are many advantages for the student teachers if they are given an opportunity to re-teach their previous lessons. One of them, for example, especially if they re-teach to a different group of learners, is that it allows them to capitalize upon the strengths and to overcome the weaknesses which they have observed in their first teaching of the lessons (McIntyre and Duthie, 1977:29). Furthermore, theoretically, the student teachers should go on giving micro-lessons and having critiques until each skill has been perfected (Carver and Wallace, 1975:185).

If lack of time is a problem to let the student teachers re-teach their previous micro lessons, it can be solved by, for example, determining which student teachers need more or less practice after observing their first teaching performance, because not all student teachers need the same practice or the same amount of practice (Geddes, 1978:23). Therefore, the time problem can be solved and the student teachers can, of course, get advantages from the re-teach stage.

2.11 The Use of Peers and Real Students for Micro-lessons

Users of microteaching often worry about the relative advantages and disadvantages of using peers and real students for micro-lessons. Nutthall (1972) in Geddes, 1978:14 used mini course 1 to test his hypothesis about the advantages and disadvantages of using peers and real students for microlessons. The results showed that there was no difference in the development of teaching skills between stu-

dent teachers who practiced in microteaching situation using real students, and student teachers who practiced using peers acting as students. In fact, the majority of foreign language teacher trainers use peers, not because of research findings but for pragmatic reasons. Although, ideally the student teachers should teach their micro-lessons to real students, it does not mean that teaching their micro-lessons to their peers does not make any sense at all, because we find some advantages either for supervisors or students teachers if these student teachers teach their peers, such as:

1. microteaching is easier to organize,
2. student teachers learn from the simulation as well as from the teaching,
3. highly satisfactory personal relations develop between peers,
4. student teachers are helped gain confidence before being required to teach in a real classroom,
5. by peer teaching in a microsituation, we are able to isolate certain aspects of the teaching situation from the presence of real students; thus certain techniques and abilities can be concentrated on in a comparatively pure form, and
6. we are provided with as live as possible a context for the discussion of teaching problems (Brumfit, 1978; Britton and Sow, 1981; and Geddes, 1978:14).

Apart from these advantages, we cannot deny that, of course, there are also some disadvantages of using peers for micro-lessons. Such disadvantages are (1) the danger of role-playing by peers who may concentrate more on their performance than the 'teacher' (Crippwell, 1979 in Geddes, 1978:15), and (2) peers tend to be overly empathetic in their criticism of fellow students (DeLorenzo, 1975).

2.12 Supervision

Microteaching has been opened to a new approach to supervision (Allen and Ryan, 1969:75), but the supervision itself is a very complex activity (Stones, 1984). This leads most student teachers to see

supervision unpleasantly, because they tend to confuse supervision with evaluation or assessment. The aims of supervision itself are to produce competent teachers and to guide the student teachers how best to optimize student learning (Stones, 1984:39), and to provide the improvement of the instruction for the student teachers (Allen and Ryan, 1969:75).

In relation to microteaching, supervision plays a very important role, especially in a feedback stage, because the supervisor has opportunities to help student teachers improve their performance or teaching skills and techniques. But the effectiveness of supervision itself depends on the way of microteaching program itself organized, the level or skills competence with which the student teachers enter the program or the stage of training at which supervisors are involved, the expectancies that the student teachers have about the ways in which supervisors should behave, and the kind of supervising strategy (Griffiths, 1977; McKnight, 1971; Johnson and Knaupp, 1970; and McIntyre, 1971).

2.13 Roles of Supervisors

Since the supervision is a very complex activity, therefore, the roles of supervisors are logically very complex too. Thus, supervisors need to acquire certain skills before they are involved in supervising the student teachers practicing teaching in microteaching. These skills are the abilities to (1) see what was happening in the micro lesson, (2) understand the significance of what was happening, (3) see what could be happening, (4) see what should have happened and did not, and (5) know how to get what should have happened and did not happen to happen (Stones, 1984). All these skills are very important for the supervisors, because in supervising the student teachers, they should be able to:

1. help student teachers investigate and reflect upon and deliberate about why they are doing, are trying to do, or are failing to do,
2. enable student teachers to reflect upon practice, to draw theory out of practice and to bring relevant formal theory to practice,

3. help student teachers learn from their mistakes as well as successes,
4. view and/or listen, during the replay session with the student teachers,
5. provide advice, give information about the subject matter and how to teach it, and suggest possible alternative methods to try during the reteach session,
6. explain to the student teachers the 'good' and 'bad' points of their performance and the implications of any other forms of feedback,
7. act as someone who can use different forms of evaluation to obtain an objective view of teaching,
8. increase and refine performance of the skills that serve as the objectives of the institution, and
9. aid the student teacher to make professional decisions, such as when and where the skills are used (Stones, 1984; Trott, 1977; and Brown, 1975).

All of the above roles of supervisors are not separate, but they are integrated into one very complex job during the microteaching.

In one microteaching session, for example, the supervisor may be an assignment setter before the teach stage or in the plan stage (it is intended to help the student teachers formulate what they should teach for their microlessons), a participant in the taught classes (where he can observe whether or not the student teachers do what they should really do), a discussion leader after the play-back or in the observe stage (where he can make, for example, some valuable suggestions for improving the student teachers' performance for the re-teach).

As a whole, the supervisor should always help student teachers improve their own teaching during the microteaching program. This means that, for example, at early sessions, he usually needs to be particularly encouraging and supportive. As the student teachers learn to analyse and improve their skills, he gradually withdraws his support - but not his encouragement, and by the end of the

program, hopefully, the student teachers have been able to analyse and suggest improvements without any help from him. Therefore, he should try to work himself out of a job (Brown, 1975:139).

Chapter 3

English Education Study Program

Sriwijaya University nowadays has ten faculties which is located in two campuses, one in Palembang and the other in Indralaya, South Sumatera Province, Indonesia. One of the faculties in this university is the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. This faculty runs pre-service teacher training Programs for primary school, junior high school, and senior high school teachers. The main aim of this faculty is to teach and educate student teachers to become professional teachers and educators in relation to fulfilling the needs for the development of Indonesia and its community (FKIP, 2013), and therefore it has three main tasks. One of these is to carry out teaching and education in relation to producing teachers and educators for senior high schools. At the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, there are four departments and fifteen study Programs. One of these study Programs is English Education Study Program. In this study program, as well as the others, teaching is carried out on the basis of a semester credit system, that is a system where student teachers, teachers and an implementation of the program are defined as semester credits (FKIP, 2013). Each student teacher, in general, has to do between 144 and 160 credits to complete his program in this faculty, and in the English Education Study Program, for example, the student teachers have to do 146 credits to complete theirs. The length of the program is between four and a half and seven years or nine and fourteen semesters. This variation is caused by the exis-

tence of the semester credit system, where each student teacher can do between nine and twenty two credits in each semester depending upon his previous cumulative index, except for semester one. In the English Education Study Program, for example, the student teachers have to do twenty two credits in their semester one.

3.1 English Education Study Program Curriculum

The curriculum for the English Education Study Program can roughly be classified into five main subjects (FKIP, 2013), that is general knowledge subjects, basic educational subjects, teaching and learning process subjects, English skills-related subjects, and field service.

One of the teaching and learning process subjects is Field Experience One. This subject consists of three successive periods: simulation, peer-teaching and microteaching (Sjarkowi, M., 1990:3) and weighs one credit (a forty-five minute meeting per week) which equals to 0.63 percent of the whole subjects or 5.56 percent of the teaching and learning process subjects.

3.2 Field Experience One Subject

Field Experience One subject is offered to the student teachers in the sixth semester or at the end of the third academic year. The length of this semester is six months - January to June, but the lecture activities last for about four months or sixteen weeks, because the rest of them are used for registration (at the beginning of the semester), mid-semester test (in the middle of the semester), and a reading week and semester test (at the end of the semester). This subject is intended to guide the student teachers to practice teaching before they do teaching practice in schools. Before they do this subject, they have to pass some compulsory subjects which are prerequisites those are related to knowledge and skills for helping the students to do the Field Experience One subject.

As mentioned earlier, this subject consists of three successive

periods: simulation, peer-teaching and microteaching. Therefore, it should be noticed here that the simulation and peer-teaching periods only have a minor distinction, that is in terms of the teaching skills that should be practiced by the student teachers. Furthermore, these two periods are popularly called a peer-teaching period among the student teachers and lecturers in the English Education Study Program. These three periods will be discussed in the following sections.

3.3 Simulation Period

Simulation period is the first of three periods under the Field Experience One subject. The length of this period depends entirely on how many student teachers do the Field Experience One subject at one particular time, because each of these student teachers should have some opportunities to practice the required teaching skills which are covered in this simulation period. Generally, between 30 and 40 student teachers do this subject at the same time.

In this period, the student teachers are guided by their lecturer to practice the following teaching skills (Sjarkowi, 1990:3):

1. how to open a lesson,
2. how to present teaching materials,
3. how to ask questions,
4. how to answer questions,
5. how to close a lesson, and
6. how to perform as good teachers in the classroom.

To practice all these teaching skills, the student teachers teach their peers. The ways of organizing the session in this period are as follows:

1. Firstly, the lecturer and student teachers have a brief discussion of, for example, what these student teachers are going to teach, the length of the teaching period for each student teacher (normally between 5 and 10 minutes), etc.

2. Then, each student teacher is instructed to teach his micro lesson in turn to the rest of the student teachers (the lecturer asks all student teachers to act as students). Each of them has to teach from the beginning of his micro lesson (set induction) to the end of it (closure), and therefore he does not practice one particular teaching skill at one time, but all required teaching skills which are mentioned earlier.

3. Finally, after three or four student teachers have taught their micro lessons, the lecturer and all student teachers have a brief discussion again. This discussion is intended to evaluate the teachers' performance and to give some valuable suggestions, if any, to improve their performance.

3.4 Peer-teaching Period

Peer-teaching period is the second period under the Field Experience One subject and the length of this period is the same as the length of the simulation one. In this period, the student teachers are guided by their lecturer to practice the following teaching skills (Sjarkowi, 1990:4):

1. how to devise a unit lesson or a lesson plan,
2. mastering teaching materials,
3. how to use good performance and body movements,
4. how to present teaching materials and communicate, and
5. how to use quantitative-analytic evaluation.

To practice all these skills, the student teachers teach their peers. The ways of organizing the session in this period are the same as the ways of organizing the session in the simulation period.

3.5 Microteaching Period

Unlike the simulation and peer-teaching periods where the teaching practice is done in the normal classrooms, the microteaching period

is done in the Studying Centre of Sriwijaya University where there is a videotape recorder that can be used for recording the student teachers' micro lessons. In this period, the required teaching skills practiced by the student teachers are the skills which have been practiced in the simulation and peer-teaching periods. The aims of this period are to (1) help the student teachers improve their weaknesses in the teaching skills that have been practiced in the simulation and peer-teaching periods, (2) get wider feedback from the student teachers, supervisors, lecturer and the 'teachers' themselves, and (3) confirm the student teachers' strengths in the teaching skills; the skills that have been mentioned in the sub-sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 (Sjarkowi, 1990:6).

The ways of organizing the session in this microteaching period are as follows:

1. First of all, the lecturer, who has guided the student teachers from the beginning of the simulation period, and student teachers have a brief discussion of, for example, what each student teacher should teach for his micro lesson, the length of the teaching period and what level of students he is going to teach. In this discussion, the lecturer normally divides the student teachers into two or three groups, because there is not enough time for these student teachers if they teach their micro lessons on the same day. Therefore, the lecturer determines, for example, which student teachers should teach their micro lessons today and which of them should teach theirs tomorrow.
2. Then, each student teacher, in turn, is instructed to teach his micro lesson to ten or fifteen senior high school students for ten minutes and it is videolized. Whilst he is teaching, in the class, there are also his lecturer and two microteaching team members (supervisors) from the Studying Centre of Sriwijaya University. These three people make some notes to evaluate the 'teacher's' performance.
3. After one group of the student teachers have finished teaching their micro lessons, all students are asked to leave the class and all student teachers in this group are invited to enter the class again. Then, the two supervisors and the lecturer announce the

results of their evaluations for each student teacher's performance, that is by giving marks to each of the student teacher's performance - the marks used between 0 and 100. Having announced these, all supervisors leave the class.

4. The next step, the student teachers and their lecturer watch each student teachers micro lesson on the television. The lecturer replays each student teacher's entire micro lesson, and therefore it takes ten minutes for each micro lesson or each student teacher's performance.

5. Finally, after they have finished watching each micro lesson on the television, they have a brief discussion, to discuss the notes from the lecturer and the supervisors as well as the responses from the student teachers themselves after they have watched each 'teacher's' micro lesson.

In short, the stages that exist in the session of this microteaching period can probably be summarized as follows: PLAN TEACH - EVALUATION - REPLAY THE RECORDING DISCUSSION. The time for each student teacher in the session of this period can also be summarized as follows: ten minutes for teaching, ten minutes for replaying the videotape recording and twenty minutes for a discussion, while the time for the plan and evaluation stages is unidentified (Sjarkowi, 1990:6).

Furthermore, there are two other important things that should be noticed in this period, that is (1) the supervisors, the appointed microteaching team from the Studying Centre of Sriwijaya University, are not from the English Education Study Program but from the other study Programs which exist in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, and (2) each student teacher only has one opportunity to teach his micro lesson during this microteaching period.

Now, if we look back to the evaluation, replay the recording and discussion stages in the session of this microteaching period should not be separated, because what the student teachers, supervisors and lecturer are doing in these three stages can actually be done in one stage, discussion stage. Therefore, these three stages should be integrated into one stage in which all these people can get involved

and the student teachers get more feedback, especially from the supervisors because so far these supervisors do not get involved in the discussion stage. Another important thing that should also be noticed here is that the lecturer replays the entire videotape recording in the replay recording stage, however, this is not necessary, because a part or parts of it which are considered important to discuss will be more efficient in order that more time can be used for discussion.

3.6 Supervision and Roles of Supervisors in the Microteaching Period

During the microteaching period, the student teachers do teaching practice under the guidance of their lecturer and microteaching team members from the Studying Centre of Sriwijaya University (Sjarkowi, 1990:6). Furthermore, he also says that among these people, only the microteaching team members can be called supervisors. Therefore, in this period the supervision is not done by the lecturer by the microteaching members. These team members only take part in the teach and evaluation stages of the session during this microteaching period. Thus, the main roles of these supervisors seem to be as evaluators or assessors, because in the teach stage they make some notes that they can use them as a basis for marking each student teacher's performance, and in the evaluation stage they announce the results of their evaluation or assessment.

If the main aims of supervision in the microteaching are to produce competent teachers, guide the student teachers practicing teaching and provide the improvement of the instruction of the student teachers (Stones, 1984:9; and Allen and Ryan, 1969:75). Therefore, the supervision in the microteaching period in this study program should be done, for example in one session, from the beginning of the session (plan stage) to the end of it (discussion or feedback stage). Thus, the supervisors should attend every stage which exists in this session. Furthermore, if we also look back to previous section, Stones (1984) says that before someone becomes a supervisor, he should acquire certain abilities. These abilities, however, are very important to equip him in doing supervision during the microteaching period, because there many roles that should be done by

him during this period, for example, acting as a mediator between theory and practice. However, in this microteaching period, the microteaching team members are not from the English Education Study Program and also they do not attend every stage of the session in this period. Thus, how can they supervise the student teachers practicing teaching effectively? Therefore, these supervisors should be from the English Education Study Program in order that they have theoretical background in Teaching English as a Foreign language and should attend every stage of the session in this microteaching period. Having completed these two things, hopefully, the aims of supervision and roles of supervisors can be implemented.

Chapter 4

Research Methodology

This chapter describes the research methodology, the questionnaire, which is used for writing this book with reference to the relevant literature in chapters one and two, and also attempts to give conclusions and suggestions in relation to improving the microteaching period in particular and the Field Experience One subject in general in the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University.

4.1 Data

The data were collected from the student teachers in the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, that is by asking them to fill in the questionnaires distributed to them.

4.2 Questionnaire

Table 1 describes what questionnaire items are asking for.

Table 4.1: Questionnaire Description

Questions	Descriptions
1	Asking the respondents when they did the microteaching, in terms of semester, month and year.

- 2 Asking the respondents how many times they had opportunities to practice teaching during the microteaching period.
- 3 Asking the respondents whether or not they had a discussion with their supervisors before they taught their micro lessons.
- 4 Asking the respondents how many supervisors participated in the discussion which was held before they taught their micro lessons.
- 5 Asking the respondents how many supervisors were in the teach stage.
- 6 Asking the respondents whether or not they had a discussion with their supervisors after they had taught their micro lessons.
- 7 Asking the respondents how many supervisors participated in the discussion which was held after they had taught their micro lessons.
- 8 Asking the respondents whether or not they had to re-teach their previous micro lessons.
- 9 Asking the respondents whether they had to re-teach their previous micro lessons to the same students or different students.
- 10 Asking the respondents whether the time for the teach stage is too long, enough or too short, and also Asking for some suggestions from them about the time needed for this stage.
- 11 Asking the respondents whether they perceive the microteaching period as an assessment or a practice.
- 12 Asking the respondents whether they see the supervisors as assessors or helpers.
- 13 Asking the respondents how long they did the peer-teaching period.
- 14 Asking the respondents how many times they had opportunities to practice teaching during the peer-teaching period.

4.2.1 Aim of the Questionnaire

The aim of the questionnaire is to find out whether or not the implementation of the microteaching period in particular and the Field

Experience One subject in general in the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University is being implemented on the basis of the existing curriculum of this study Program.

4.2.2 Distribution of the Questionnaire

The copies of the questionnaire were distributed in June 2012 to 67 student teachers who did the microteaching in May 2011 (30 student teachers), and September 2011 (37 student teachers).

4.2.3 Problems arising in the study

For Question 4 as well as Questions 5 and 7, the writer must admit that he did not define who can be considered as supervisors and a lecturer during the microteaching period in the English Education Study Program in his questionnaire. Consequently, misunderstanding about these people could have occurred. According to Sjarkowi, M. (1990:6), supervisors are microteaching team members from the Studying Centre of Sriwijaya University and a lecturer is a Field Experience One subject lecturer. Therefore, in analyzing and interpreting the data later, he will consider them as follows: if a majority of respondents say that, for example, there are two supervisors in the 'plan' stage, then they will be considered as one supervisor and one lecturer, because in every stage of the session in this microteaching period, the lecturer always gets involved and the respondents tend to consider both of them as supervisors.

4.3 Presentation of the Findings

Question 1: 30 respondents did the microteaching in May 2011 in the semester six and 37 respondents did it in September 2011 in the semester seven.

Question 2: 65 respondents said that they had one opportunity to teach their micro lessons during the microteaching period, and 2 respondents said that they had two opportunities.

Question 3: 55 respondents said that they had a discussion with their supervisors before they taught their micro lessons and 12 of them said that they did not.

Question 4: 46 respondents said that there was one supervisor in the discussion before they taught their micro lessons, and 21 respondents said that there were two supervisors.

Question 5: 62 respondents said that there was one supervisor in the taught class, and 5 respondents said that there was no supervisor.

Question 6: 33 respondents said that they had a discussion after they had taught their micro lessons and 34 of them said that they did not.

Question 7: 60 respondents said that there was one supervisor in the discussion which was held after they had taught their micro lessons, and 7 respondents said that there were two supervisors in this discussion.

Question 8: All respondents said that they did not have to re-teach their previous micro lessons.

Question 9: There was no respondent answered this question, because all of them answered 'no' to question 8. Therefore, this question could not be answered.

Question 10: 28 respondents said that the time for teaching their micro lessons in the session of this microteaching period was enough and 39 of them said that it was too short.

Question 11: 19 respondents saw the microteaching period as an assessment and 48 of them saw it as a practice.

Question 12: 33 respondents saw the supervisors as assessors, and 34 respondents saw them as helpers.

Question 13: 55 respondents said that the length of the peer-teaching period was one month and 12 respondents said that it was two months.

Question 14: 34 respondents said that they had two opportunities to teach during the peer-teaching period, and 33 respondents said that they had three opportunities.

Table 2 shows the summary of the findings which are mentioned above in figures as well as in percentages.

Table 4.2: The Summary of the Findings

No.	Description	Results in	
		Figures	Percentages
A. Microteaching Session			
1	Doing the microteaching:		
	- May 2011 (sem. 6)	30	44.76
	- September 2011 (sem. 7)	37	55.24
2	Opportunities to teach:		
	- Once	65	97.02
	- twice	2	2.98
3	Planning stages:		
	- yes	55	82.09
	- no	12	17.91
4	Supervisors in the planning stage:		
	- One	46	68.66
	- two	21	31.34
5	Supervisors in the teach stage:		
	- one	62	92.54
	- two	5	7.46
	- no supervisor		
6	Discussion stage:		
	- yes	33	49.25
	- no	34	50.75
7	Supervisors in the discussion stage:		
	- One	60	89.55
	- two	7	10.45
8	Re-teaching stage:		
	- yes	67	100
	- no	0	0
9	Re-teaching to:		
	a. the same students		

On the basis of the Field Experience One subject where the microteaching period is one of the periods, we see that it should be given to the student teachers in the semester six, while the findings show that the respondents did it in two different semesters: semesters six and seven. Therefore, the implementation of the Field Experience One subject seems to be inconsistent.

Question 2:

The data show that the respondents have the following opportunities to teach during the microteaching period: once (97.02%) and twice (2.98%). These data show that the majority of student teachers have only one opportunity to practice teaching during this period, therefore, it means that during the microteaching period in this English Education Study Program, the majority of the student teachers have one opportunity to practice teaching their micro lessons.

If we look at the aims of the microteaching period in this English Education Study Program, one opportunity to practice teaching for each student teacher during this microteaching period is not enough for him to achieve the aims, because there are many teaching skills that should be practiced during this period (Sjarkowi, M., 1990).

Furthermore, theoretically, microteaching is intended to provide teaching practice for the student teachers to acquire some basic teaching skills before they do teaching practice in schools and also one of its essential characteristics shows that it focuses on training for the accomplishment of specific tasks. Therefore, theoretically, one opportunity to practice teaching for each student teacher during this microteaching period seems to be less than satisfactory.

Thus, these student teachers in this period, theoretically and in terms of achieving the aims of the microteaching period itself, need more opportunities to practice teaching in order that they can master the acquired basic teaching skills required at this stage. Consequently, the implementation of the microteaching period in this study Program probably needs to be reconsidered. In other words, the student teachers should be given more opportunities to practice teaching in order that the aims of this microteaching period can be achieved satisfactorily.

- yes	-	-
- no	-	-
b. the same students		
- yes	-	-
- no	-	-
10 Time for the teach stage:		
- enough	28	41.79
- too short	39	58.21
11 Time for the teach stage:		
- as assessment	19	28.36
- as practice	48	71.64
12 Supervisors in the teach stage:		
- assessors	33	49.25
- helpers	34	50.75
- no answer		

B. Peer-teaching Session

13 Length of the peer-teaching:		
- one month	55	82.09
- Two month	12	17.91
14 Opportunities to teach:		
- Twice	34	50.75
- three times	33	49.25

4.4 Analysis and Interpretations of the Findings

The analysis and interpretation of the findings for question 1 are based on the descriptive analysis and interpretation, while for question 2 until question 14, analysis and interpretation are based on the percentages. Of those based on the percentages, only the majority of student teachers' views will be considered.

Question 1:

The data show that the respondents did the microteaching in two semesters: semester six (30 respondents) and semester seven (37 respondents).

Question 3:

The data show that 82.09% of the respondents have a discussion before they teach their micro lessons, and 17.91% of them do not. Again, because it shows that the majority of student teachers have a discussion before they teach their micro lessons, therefore, it means that a discussion or plan stage exists in the microteaching period in this English Education Study Program. In other words, the important plan stage is recognized in the Program.

Question 4:

The data show that there are the following supervisors in the plan stage: one supervisor (68.66%) and two supervisors (31.34%). These data show that the majority of student teachers say that there is one supervisor in the plan stage. In other words, the student teachers tend to consider the lecturer as a supervisor. Therefore, it means the data tend to show that there is a supervisor in the plan stage of the session in the microteaching period in this English Education Study Program.

Furthermore, this finding supports the description the roles of the supervisors in the microteaching, that is they should attend every stage in the microteaching session in order that they can supervise the student teachers practicing teaching fully (Stones, E., 1984). It is relevant to the finding in Question 12 shows that the student teachers see the supervisors as helpers. Therefore, the implementation of the microteaching period in this study Program, particularly in terms of the roles of the supervisors, can be considered relevant to what it should be, that this microteaching period can help the student teachers practicing teaching as stated in the aims of this microteaching period and also as stated in the aims of the supervision itself, that is to produce competent teachers and to guide the student teachers how best to optimize student learning (Stones, E., 1984), and to provide the improvement of the instruction for the student teachers (Allen, D. and Ryan, K., 1969).

Question 5:

The respondents say that there are the following supervisors in the teach stage: one supervisor (92.54%) and two supervisors (7.46%). Because it shows that the majority of student teachers say that there are one supervisor in this stage, therefore, it means that there is one supervisor in the teach stage of the session in this microteaching period in this English Education Study Program.

However, there should be two supervisors in this stage. Therefore, the attendance of the supervisors in this stage does not show consistency with the guidelines. Furthermore, if we also look back to Question 4, it is doubtful that this supervisor knows exactly what he is doing in this teach stage, because he probably does not know exactly what the 'teacher' should practice in this stage, because he does not necessarily attend the plan stage; the stage where the student teachers and their lecturer discuss, for example, what the 'teacher' should practice in the teach stage. Another important point that should be noticed here is that this supervisor may not necessarily be from the English Education Study Program. Therefore, it is also doubtful whether, for example, a lecturer from the Mathematics Study Program can supervise the student teachers from the English Education Study Program practicing teaching. Are the teaching skills needed for the student teachers from the English Education Study Program and those from the Mathematics Study Program the same? In this stage, the supervisors should be able to, for example, enable student teachers to reflect upon practice, draw theory out of practice and bring relevant formal theory to practice (Brown, 1975). How can they do these if they are not from the English Education Study Program, because they probably have no theoretical background which they need to give feedback to the student teachers. Consequently, the implementation of the microteaching period in this study Program, particularly in terms of the attendance and roles of the supervisor probably needs to be reconsidered.

Question 6:

The data show that 49% of the respondents have a discussion with their supervisors after they have taught their micro lessons and 50.75

of them do not. These data show that the existence of discussion stage may be inconsistent or questionable. It means that discussion or feedback stage may or may not exist in the session of the microteaching period in this English Education Study Program.

Question 7:

The data show that the respondents have the following supervisors in the discussion or feedback stage: one supervisor (89.55%) and two supervisors (10.45%). Because it shows that the majority of student teachers say that there one supervisor in this discussion, therefore, it means that there is one supervisor in the discussion or feedback stage of the session in the microteaching period in this English Education Study Program.

This finding, furthermore, shows that the attendance of the supervisor in the feedback session is not consistent, because according to Sjarkowi, M. (1990:6) the supervisor does not get involved in this stage, but the lecturer does. The supervisor gets involved only in the teach and evaluation stages. Therefore, the implementation of this microteaching period, particularly in terms of the attendance of the supervisor has not been implemented, although theoretically the supervisor should get involved in all stages during the microteaching session. Consequently, the implementation of the microteaching period in this study Program probably needs to be reconsidered.

Question 8:

The data show that 100% of the respondents do not re-teach their previous micro lessons. This means that the re-teach stage does not exist in the session of the microteaching period in this English Education Study Program.

Furthermore, this finding supports the previous description, that there is no re-teach stage in this microteaching session. But, if this finding is analysed further, it can probably reflect that the session has not been implemented properly in terms of helping the student teachers practice teaching, because if these student teachers are given the opportunities to re-teach, there will be many advantages for them in relation to improving their teaching skills which is one of the aims

of this session. Again, if we look back to Question 2, where each of these student teachers only has one opportunity to teach during this period, therefore, it strengthens the impression that this period can also be considered not well-implemented in terms of helping the student teachers practice teaching. So, it seems that these student teachers need more opportunities to teach or re-teach during this microteaching period, if this period is really meant to help them acquire some basic teaching skills. Consequently, the implementation of this microteaching period probably needs to be reconsidered.

Question 9:

The data in Question 8 show that all respondents answer 'no' to this question. Thus, this question is not necessary to be answered. But, if the re-teach stage is included in the session of this microteaching period, it should be decided at the beginning of this period which student teachers need this stage and which of them probably do not. It is important, because not all of them probably need the same amount of practice (Geddes, 1978).

Furthermore, if the re-teach stage has been included, these student teachers do not necessarily have to teach the real students but they can also teach their peers who can act as students, because either using real students or peers, the results are still the same. This means that the problem of using real students, if any, can be solved.

Question 10:

The data show that a small majority of respondents consider the time for the teach stage too short (58.21%). Therefore, it is possible to say that these student teachers still need more time for this stage. In other words, the time for this stage should be lengthened.

Furthermore, as described earlier, it shows that the time for this stage is five minutes per teaching skill, for example, a probing question, to be practiced at one particular time. Thus, this finding can also be accepted theoretically and practically, because in one session of this microteaching period, each student has to practice not less than ten teaching skills at one time. Therefore, it is doubtful that ten minutes is sufficient for each of the student teachers to practice all

these teaching skills. Consequently, the suggestions described under the Question 10 should be reconsidered, that is the time for this stage should be based on the student teachers' needs, the same as the time for real teaching and lengthened to between 15 and 20 minutes. All of these mean that the time for the teach stage in the session of this period probably needs to be lengthened.

Question 11:

The data show that 28.36% of the respondents consider the microteaching period as an assessment and 71.64% of them consider it as a practice. Because it shows that the majority of student teachers consider this period as a practice, therefore, it means that this period can probably be considered as practice one.

This finding, furthermore, supports the aims of the microteaching period in this study Program, but if we look back to Questions 2 and 8, it is still doubtful that this period is seen as a practice period, because how can one opportunity to practice teaching during this period be seen as practice? with one opportunity, the student teachers are required to master more than ten teaching skills. Thus, the question arises 'is one opportunity to teach for each of these student teachers sufficient to master all required teaching skills which exist in this period?'

Question 12:

The data show that the respondents consider the supervisors as assessors (49.25%) and helpers (50.75%). Because a number of student teachers consider the supervisors as helpers and assessors are more or less the same, therefore, their roles in the session of the microteaching period in this English Education Study Program can probably be considered as helpers as well as assessors. But, if we look back to previous sub-sections, the roles of these supervisors which are considered as helpers are still doubtful, because they do not attend the plan and discussion or feedback stages in the session of this microteaching period, although the finding under the Question 7 shows that there is one supervisor in the discussion stage. But, it is argued by Sjarkowi, M. (1990), he says that in this discussion stage, there

are only the student teachers and their lecturer. In relation to these supervisors, they are not from the English Education Study Program but from the other study Programs which exist in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education. Therefore, how can they be seen as helpers if they do not get involved in those stages and are not from the English Education Study Program? Consequently, the roles of the supervisors in the session of this microteaching period should probably need to be reorganized.

Question 13:

The data show that the respondents do the peer-teaching session for one month (82.09%) and two months (17.91%). As a majority of the data shows how long this period is, therefore, it still needs to be investigated further. This is because it may depend on the number of the student teachers take part in the period.

Question 14:

The data show that the respondents have the following opportunities to practice teaching during the peer-teaching period: twice (50.75%) and three times (49.25%). Because the number of student teachers have two opportunities and three opportunities to practice teaching, therefore, it means that during the peer-teaching period in this English Education Study Program, the student teachers have two and/or opportunities to practice teaching.

Furthermore, if we look back to Question 2, each student teacher has one opportunity to practice teaching during the microteaching period. It means that each of these student teachers has two opportunities to practice teaching during one semester (six months) or we can say that he has two opportunities to practice teaching on the campus during his studies in this study Program. With these two opportunities to practice teaching, it is doubtful that he can be a professional teacher of English as stated in the aims of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University. All of these seem to show that the student teachers in this study Program need more practice in teaching in which they can master all the required teaching skills which exist in the Field Experience One subject. If

more opportunities to practice teaching are given to them, therefore, it means that the credit of this subject should be increased. Consequently, the curriculum of this study Program should be revised in order that the Field Experience One subject be granted more credits.

Chapter 5

Conclusions and Suggestions

5.1 Conclusions

Having analysed and interpreted the findings in the previous chapter and looked back to chapters one, two, and three, the following conclusions can possibly be drawn:

1. The implementation of the Field Experience One Subject in general and the implementation of the microteaching period in particular in this study Program are inconsistent on the basis of the English Education Study Program curriculum and the guidelines for the implementation of the microteaching period. Therefore, the Field Experience One subject should be offered consistently in semester six so that the student teachers can do the compulsory subjects before they do this subject. These compulsory subjects are felt necessary to equip these student teachers with theoretical backgrounds before they do teaching practice under this subject. Furthermore, the microteaching period should also be offered to these student teachers consistently, that is at the end of the semester six in order that they can do teaching practice in the simulation and peer-teaching periods as their preparation before they do teaching practice in the microteaching period.

2. The microteaching period in this study Program is felt too short if the aims of this period and the aims of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education will really be achieved. Therefore, this period should be increased, particularly in terms of the opportunities to practice teaching for each student teacher and the time for the teach stage. These opportunities are needed by these student teachers during this period so that they can have more time and opportunities to practice teaching one or two teaching skills at one time before they are asked to practice all the required teaching skills which exist in this period at one time. whilst the longer time for the teach stage is also needed by the student teachers so that they can practice all the required teaching skills in this period properly. Having given these opportunities to practice teaching and longer time for the teach stage, the aims of this period in particular and the aims of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education can hopefully be achieved. Consequently, if all of these are increased, the credit for the Field Experience One subject needs to be increased too. Thus, the curriculum in this study Program also needs to be revised in order that the Field Experience One subject be granted more credits.

3. The re-teach stage should be included in the microteaching session, because so far this stage has not been included. Therefore, the student teachers have no opportunity to correct their mistakes, if any, in their first performance practically. Whilst this stage is very powerful in improving the student teachers' weaknesses in their first performance. Having given the student teachers an opportunity to re-teach their previous micro lessons, their weaknesses in their first performance can be corrected practically. Consequently, if this stage is included, the discussion stage after the re-teach stage should be included too.

4. The replay of videotape recording is not necessarily shown entirely, but a part of parts of it will be more efficient and useful in order that more time can be used for, for example, a discussion of the micro lesson.

5. The evaluation, replay the videotape recordings and discussion stages should not be separated, because the evaluation and replay the videotape recordings are actually as parts of the activities that can be found in the discussion stage. Therefore, these three stages should be integrated into one stage, a discussion stage. Thus, the existing stages in the session of this microteaching period should be reorganized as follows: Plan - Teach - Discussion - Re-teach - Discussion ...

6. The supervision and roles of the supervisors in the session of this microteaching period still need to be reorganized, because the supervisors' involvement in the session of this period has not shown what the supervisors should really do in the microteaching, particularly in terms of their attendance, and also these supervisors are not from the English Education Study Program. Therefore, these supervisors should attend every stage in the session of this microteaching period in order that they can help the student teachers practicing teaching fully and they should also be from the English Education Study Program so that they have theoretical and practical backgrounds in teaching and learning English, because these backgrounds are very important for them in relation to supervising the student teachers practicing teaching, especially when they are acting as mediators between the theory and practice, for example.

5.2 Suggestions

The suggestions may be offered in this study, that is the implementation of Field Experience One Subject in general and the implementation of the microteaching period in particular in this study Program will be better if they are consistently implemented not only based on the theoretical bases but also on practical ones. It means that, particularly the microteaching, all stages should fully be implemented in order that it really and fully contributes the benefits to the student teachers.

References

- Allen, D.W., and Eve, A.W. 1968. *Microteaching: Theory into Practice*. Massachusetts : Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Allen, D. and Ryan, K. 1969. *Microteaching*. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Bartley, D.E. 1971. *Microteaching: Rationale, Procedures and Application to Foreign Language*. *Audio-Visual Language Journal* 9/3.
- Beattie, N.M. and Teather, D.C.B. 1971. *Microteaching in the Training of Teachers of Modern Languages: Some Preliminary Comments*. *Audio-Visual Language Journal*. 9/3 .
- Britton, D. and Sow, F. 1981. *Designing a Microteaching Programme for the Third World*. ELT Document 110.
- Broughton, G. 1979. *Microteaching in TEFL Teacher Training*. ELT Document 104.
- Brown, G. 1975. *Microteaching: A Programme of Teaching Skills*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
- Brown, G.A. 1977. *Some Myths and Methods of Staff Training and Development* in Trott, A.J. (ed.). *Selected Microteaching Papers*. Rushden: Stanley L. Hunt (Printer) Limited.
- Brumfit, C.J. 1978. *A Seven-Dag Microteaching Programme for EFL Teachers* in Crippwell, K. and Geddes, M. (eds.) *Microteaching and EFL Teacher Training: Report of a Workshop held at the London Institute of Education*. London: London University.

REFERENCES

- Brumfit, C. and Rossner, R. 1982. The 'Decision Pyramid' and Teacher Training for ELT. *ELT Journal* 36/4.
- Carver, D. and Wallace, M.J. 1975. Some Applications of Microteaching to TESL. *ELT Journal* 34/3.
- Cohen, L. and Manion, L. 1977. *A Guide to Teaching Practice*. Suffolk: Richard Clay (The Chaucer Press) Ltd.
- Crippwell, K. 1979. Microteaching in the Training of Teachers of English as a Second or Foreign Language. In *Occasional Papers 1: Microteaching and EFL Teacher Education*. EFL Department, Institute of Education, University of London.
- Crippwell, K. and Geddes, M. 1978. *Microteaching and EFL Teacher Training*. London: University of London Institute of Education.
- DeLorenzo, W.D. 1975. Microteaching as a Transitional Technique to Student Teaching. *Foreign Language Annals* B/3.
- Geddes, M. 1978. *Microteaching and Foreign Language Teacher Training*. In Crippwell, K. and Geddes, M. (eds.) *Microteaching and EFL Teacher Training: Report of A Workshop held at the London Institute of Education*. London: London University.
- Griffiths, R. 1977. The Contribution of Feedback to Microteaching Technique in Trott, A.J. (ed.). *Selected Microteaching Papers*. Rushden: Stanley L. Hunt (K.J. Printer) Limited.
- Hargie, O. 1979. *The Development of Microteaching A Review in Perspective*. Hargie, O. and Mairdment, P. *Microteaching in Perspective*. Newtownabbey: Blackstaff Press Limited.
- Hargie, O. and Mairdment, P. 1979. *Microteaching in Perspective*. Newtownabbey: Blackstaff Press Limited.
- Johnson, W.D. and Knaupp, J.E. 1976. *Trainee Role Expectations of the Microteaching*. J. *Ichr. Educ.* 21.
- FKIP. 2013. *Buku Pedoman*. Palembang: Percetakan Nuriz
- Marlani, A. 1979. Some Guidelines for Teacher Training Programmes in Holden, S. (Ed.). *Teacher Training*. Modern English Publications Limited.
- McAleese, W.R. 1973. *Microteaching: A New Tool in the Training of Teachers*. *Educational Review*. 25/2.
- McAleese, W.R. and Unwin, D. 1971. *A Selective Survey of Microteaching*. Programmed Learning and Educational Technology.
- McIntyre, D. 1971. *Three Approaches to Microteaching: An Experimental Comparison*. Department of Education, University of Stirling.
- McIntyre, D. et al. 1971. *Investigation of Microteaching*. London: Croom Helm Ltd.
- McIntyre, D. and Duthie, J. 1977. *Students' Reactions to Microteaching in McIntyre, D. et al. (Eds.)*. *Investigations of Microteaching*. London: Croom Helm Ltd.
- McKnight, P. 1971. *Microteaching in Teacher Training: A Review of Research in Morrison, A. and McIntyre, D. (eds.)* *The Social Psychology of Teaching*. Penguin
- Nutthall, G. 1972. *A Comparison of the Use of Microteaching with Two Types of Students Ten Year Old Students and Peers Acting as Students*. Paper Presented at the International Microteaching Symposium. Tübingen. W. Germany.
- Phillips, E.T.J. 1975. *Microteaching: A Tool of In-service Training*. *ELT Journal* 34/2. Ramani, E. 1987. *Theorizing from the Classroom*. *ELT Journal* 41/1.
- Sjarkowi, M. 1990. *Peranan Program Pengalaman Lapangan Bagi Mahasiswa Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan, Universitas Sriwijaya*. FKIP Unsri. Palembang.
- Solomon, G. and McDonald, F.J. 1969. *Pre- and Posttest Reactions to Self-viewing One's Teaching Performance on Videotape*. Stanford Centre for Research and Development in Teaching. Research and Development Memorandum No. 44.

REFERENCES

- Stones, E. 1984. *Supervision in Teacher Education, A Counselling and Pedagogical Approach*. London: Methuen.
- Stones, E. and Morris. 1972. *Teaching Practice: Problems and Perspective*. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd.
- Stevens, P. 1974. Some Basic Principles of Teacher Training. *ELT Journal* 34/1.
- Trott, A.J. 1977. *Microteaching - An Examination in Trott, A.J. et al. Selected Microteaching Papers*. Rushden: Stanley L. Hunt (Printer) Limited.
- Wallace, M.J. 1979. *Microteaching: Skills and Strategies in Holden, S. (ed.). Teacher Training*. London: Modern English Publications Limited.
- Williams, W.E. 1975. *The Training of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language (A Balance between Knowledge and Skill)*. *ELT Journal* 34/2.

Index

- administrative, 14
- advantage, 9
- artificial procedure, 13
- assessment, 27
- basic educational, 22
- behavior modification theory, 7
- behaviouristic, 14
- campus, 21
- class size, 6
- classroom, 7
- coherent bundle, 6
- competent, 7
- controlling, 13
- criticism, 13
- criticisms, 13
- critique, 5
- curriculum, 31
- definition, 4
- demand, 1
- discussion, 26
- education, 21
- evaluation, 26, 27
- feedback, 4, 5
session, 9
- focus, 9
- fied service, 22
- Field Experience One, 1, 35
- finding, 43
- flexibility, 8
- flexibility of microteaching, 12
- general knowledge, 22
- guidance, 27
- imitate teacher, 7
- imited bundle, 6
- improving, 29
- in-service, 3
- innovation, 8
- learning process, 22
- lesson, 5
- lesson length, 6
- method, 3
- microteaching, 4, 22
- development of, 10
- exploratory, 9
- non-participant, 9
- variations of, 8
- motivating, 13
- observe stage, 5
- opportunity, 31, 40, 41

INDEX

- organizing, 23
- pedagogic problem, 9
- peer-teaching, 22, 24
- performance, 27
- period, 24
- period of observation, 7
- plan, 26
- practical components, 12
- practical teaching experience,
3
- practice, 3, 23
- practice teaching, 11
- Prè-service, 3
- questionnaire, 29
- real teaching, 4
- replay the recording, 26
- respondent, 29, 31
- role, 2
- schools, 13
- semester credit system, 21
- session, 28
- simplified condition, 8
- simulation, 22
- sitting with Nellie approach, 7
- small group, 5
- Sriwijaya University, 1, 21
- stage, 26
- stimulus variation, 12
- student, 5
- student teacher, 1
- subject, 1
- supervisor, 2, 11
- supporter, 13
- teach, 26
- teacher trainer, 8, 10, 12
- teacher training, 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 12,
13, 21, 26
- teaching, 4
 - behavior, 6
 - behaviour, 7
 - complexity, 6
 - practice, 13, 24
 - process, 22
 - skill, 3, 4, 9-14, 16, 18, 23-
25
- TEFL, 4
- theory, 3
- threatening, 14
- trainees, 3
- training, 7
- videotape recording, 8



Sofendi was born in Palembang, South Sumatra, Indonesia. He did his elementary, junior and senior high schools in Palembang. In Palembang, he also did his undergraduate study at Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University majoring in English Education. He did his diploma degree in English Language Teaching and Administration and master degree in English for Specific Purposes at Warwick University, England in 1988 and 1989 respectively. He also did his doctorate degree in England and completed it in 1998 at London University.

Since 1987, he has been teaching at English Education Study Programme, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University. As a lecturer, he has written many articles presented in national as well as international seminars and 15 English textbooks used by the students of Sriwijaya University to learn English as one of their courses. In addition to his regular teaching, he is also appointed to be, some of them, (1) Secretary of Sriwijaya University Job Service Centre, (2) Secretary of Language and Arts Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, (3) Vice Dean for Academic Affairs, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University, (4) Director of Sriwijaya University Language Institute, and (5) Dean of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University.

Sofendi

microteaching



MICROTEACHING

ISBN 978-602-1160-01-5

