

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION**

#### **5.1 Summary**

This study has emphasized the need to listen to student teachers' voice in understanding classroom practice. In particular the study is an attempt to understand teaching from the "inside" rather than the "outside in" (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1990 in Richards, 1998). With such a title "Students' voice on their teaching in real classes at school: What does it reveal?" this study then seeks to understand teaching practice of student teachers in its own terms and in ways it is understood by student teachers. In other words, It explores student teachers' voice – an insider's perspective by scrutinizing their perspective of teaching practice which might in the long run reveal student teachers' motivation for their decisions and actions – revealing somewhat implicit theories of teaching.

The classroom is an uncertain place where it is difficult to anticipate how a particular activity will work out. This applies especially to student teachers – those who are just 'launched' from campus to real classes in schools. However, the knowledge and skills they get from campus are indeed useful as this study reveals. How student teachers cope with the complexities of their work in real classes has been assisted by the knowledge and skills they get from campus.

The study finds that the majority of the student teachers thought the pre-evaluation activities are useful for them. The chance to observe the school tutor's teaching, the chance to consult the lesson plan to the school tutor and to the lecturer were greatly useful for them.

Similarly, it is also found that the majority of the student teachers thought that the post-evaluation activities are beneficial to them. The feedback from the school tutor, and the feedback from the lecturer were to a great extent useful for them.

Teaching demonstration is perceived to be advantageous owing to some factors covering (1) the student teachers' own teaching, (2) the student teachers' self-reflection, (3) the peer comments, (4) the student teacher's being a student, (5) the student teacher's being a student, (6) the student teacher's being a private teacher and (6) the student teacher's joining other subjects like TEFL and TEYL.

Lesson Plan making experience is considered useful. The useful experience in making Lesson Plan includes formulating teaching objectives, developing teaching materials, developing teaching methods and techniques, developing media and other learning resources, and developing assessment.

The implementation of the Lesson Plan is perceived positively by the majority of the student teachers. They believed they had learnt five basic teaching skills of opening and closing a class, of questioning (making questions and responding to the questions), of explaining instructional materials clearly, of giving appropriate feedback to the students or skill of providing informal assessment, of applying appropriate teaching techniques (e.g. games, group work), and using media & other learning resources. They also got the experience in classroom management.

Student teachers' steady answers indicated positively that they experienced a very big gap teaching in two different settings. The majority claimed that the difference between teaching in Micro Teaching class and the one in a real class. was great (*pretty much or very much*). The student teachers highlighted the following issues: the number of the students, classroom management, experience to teach in real class, different characteristics of students, and Lesson Plan issue.

Those perceiving that the gap arises a problem outnumbered the NO group by slightly below 10%. A situation resulting from such a disparity in experience between Micro Teaching and Teaching Practice is deemed problematic by almost 55% student teachers.

The student teachers in this study showed high perception on the extent to which Micro Teaching assists them in real classroom instruction with regard to the knowledge and teaching skills. The student teachers positively viewed the transfer of knowledge of Lesson Plan making in Teaching Practice evaluation because they had learnt to do so in on-campus Micro Teaching. The student teachers also positively viewed the transfer of teaching skills and teaching ideas in Teaching Practice evaluation because they had learnt to do so in on-campus Micro Teaching. It is likewise proved that the student teachers considered they had transferred *pretty much* and *very much* knowledge of preparation before teaching. Furthermore, the student teachers definitely assumed grand overall transfer of knowledge and skills from on-campus Micro Teaching to Teaching Practice in real classroom at schools.

Based on the findings related to the eight minor research questions presented above, the major research finding is that Teaching Practice in real classes at school has been positively perceived. The student teachers have voiced quite confidently that their Teaching Practice is assisted to a large extent by on-campus teaching demonstration. Accordingly, the good practice of teaching demonstration is not to be underestimated, and general suggestion/comments from student teachers are worth listening. It is, for instance, suggested that models of teaching can be provided by asking the student teachers to watch a recorded real teaching and comment on it.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

The student teaching experience is noted as one of the most influential factors in the preparation of beginning teachers (Wilson, 2006 referring to [Clark, Smith, Newby, & Cook, 1985](#); [Koehler, 1988](#); and [Lemma, 1993](#)). It is therefore essential to maintain the good practice especially the one perceived as advantageous by the respondents in this study. Comments (peer's and lecturers') to the Lesson Plan and to the student teachers' implementing the Lesson Plan should be kept serious. The practice of self-reflection after teaching demonstration is not without its merits. Bridging the gap between campus-based and school-based components should be attempted sternly.

As mentioned previously, the situation resulting from such an inequality in experience between on-campus Micro Teaching and Teaching Practice in real classrooms is deemed problematic by almost 55% student teachers. This implies the need to listen to the student teachers' voice. One of them is that the audience of on-campus Micro Teaching should be matched as closely as possible to the real students in actual schools. Bridging the gap can be performed by careful arrangement of the audience who are strictly required to lower their level as university students.

It might also be important to examine ways to improve the role of the lecturers - college supervisors. All teacher education programmes should ensure that college supervisors have time to discuss important issues and collaborate with the school teachers or 'cooperating teachers' and do more than observe lessons on an infrequent basis as noted by the participants in this study.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, R. T. 1981. *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics: Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. London: B.T. Batsford Ltd.
- Cannon, R. and D. Newble. 2000. *A Handbook for Teachers in Universities and Colleges: A Guide to Improving Teaching Methods* (4<sup>th</sup> edition). London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Dweikat, K. A. (n.d). *Investigating Attitudes of ELT (2) Learners Towards Microteaching*. Retrieved on February 19, 2012 from <http://www.gou.edu/english/conferences/firstNationalConference/pdfFiles/drKhaledDweikat.pdf>
- Joice, B., M. Weil and E. Calhoun. 2009. *Models of Teaching*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Mann, G. 2004. An evaluation approach towards feedback improvement in the context of initial teacher training in ELT. *The Journal of ASIA TEFL* 1 (1), 149-165.
- Mullock, B. 1999. What makes a teacher education course not applicable to non-Western teaching context. In J. Hung, V. Berry, V. Crew & C. Davison (Eds.) *Discourses and Development in Language Education* (pp. 173-83). Hongkong: The Department of English & the Faculty of Education.
- Nunan, D. 1999. *Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Richards, J. C. 1998. *Beyond Training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya. 2002. *Buku Pedoman Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Tahun Kuliah 2002/2003*.
- Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya. 2011. *Buku Pedoman Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Tahun Kuliah 2011/2012*.
- Wilson, E.K., 2006. The Impact of an Alternative Model of Student Teacher Supervision: Views of the Participants. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 22, pp. 22–31.