



## Lesson Plans Alignment with Teaching Performance of Pre-Service Teachers: A Quantitative Study in Micro-Teaching Context

Received: 21-04-2026; Revised: 26-05-2026; Accepted: 09-06-2026

### Aryuliva Adnan\*)

Universitas Negeri Padang, Sumatera Barat,  
Indonesia

E-mail: [aryuliva.adnan@fbs.unp.ac.id](mailto:aryuliva.adnan@fbs.unp.ac.id).

### Caca Yunisari

Universitas Negeri Padang, Sumatera Barat,  
Indonesia

Email: [cacayunisari@student.unp.ac.id](mailto:cacayunisari@student.unp.ac.id).

### Fadilah Habibul Hasna

Monash University, Australia

Email: [fhas0019@student.monash.edu](mailto:fhas0019@student.monash.edu)

\*) *Corresponding Author*

**Abstract:** This quantitative descriptive study examined micro-teaching performance of 30 pre-service English teachers and alignment between lesson plan (LP) and teaching performance (TP). Performance was assessed across introduction, main activities, and closure. Descriptive statistics showed moderate-to-strong performance in introductions ( $M = 78.23$ ) and main activities ( $M = 82.47$ ), but weaker closures ( $M = 72.10$ ; 23% Excellent). Spearman's correlation revealed a very weak, non-significant LP-TP relationship ( $r_s = 0.151$ ,  $p = 0.425$ ), indicating aligned plans do not reliably translate into performance. High closure inconsistency ( $SD = 10.74$ ) partially explains this. Findings imply pre-service preparation should prioritize rehearsed closure routines. The study contributes empirical evidence on the planning-enactment gap and identifies lesson closure as a critical target for curriculum improvement in Indonesian pre-service English teacher education.

**Abstrak:** *This quantitative descriptive study examined micro teaching performance of 30 pre-service English teachers and alignment between lesson plan (LP) and teaching performance (TP). Performance was assessed across introduction, main activities, and closure. Descriptive statistics showed moderate to strong performance in introductions ( $M = 78.23$ ) and main activities ( $M = 82.47$ ), but weaker closures ( $M = 72.10$ ; 23% Excellent). Spearman's correlation revealed a very weak, non significant LP TP relationship ( $r_s = 0.151$ ,  $p = 0.425$ ), indicating aligned plans do not reliably translate into performance. High closure inconsistency ( $SD = 10.74$ ) partially explains this. Findings imply pre-service preparation should prioritize rehearsed closure routines. The study contributes empirical evidence on the planning enactment gap and identifies lesson closure as a critical target for curriculum improvement in Indonesian pre-service English teacher education.*

**Keywords:** higher education, lesson planning, micro teaching, pre-service teachers, teaching performance

## INTRODUCTION

Effective teacher preparation remains one of the most critical determinants of instructional quality, particularly in the field of English language education where pedagogical decisions directly shape learners' engagement, participation, and achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2023). Within teacher education programs, micro-teaching has long been recognized as a structured and controlled environment enabling pre-service teachers to practice essential teaching skills before entering real classrooms (Halimah et al., 2025; Rahayu et al., 2025; Seon-Ho Park, 2024). A core expectation in such programs is that teacher candidates are able to demonstrate competence in lesson introductions, main instructional activities, and lesson closures which are three components commonly used to evaluate teaching readiness (Kamlasi et al., 2024).

However, despite its widespread use, the quality of pre-service teachers' micro-teaching performance remains inconsistent across institutions. Remesh (2013) and Zeichner (2010) argued that some issues have happened in the pre-service teachers microteaching performance such as teacher-centered instructional delivery (Kartal & Tillett, 2021; Medina et al., 2026), limited student engagement (Coşgun, 2024; Handayani et al., 2023), unclear lesson closure (Effendi et al., 2025), and insufficient activation of prior knowledge (Khoza, 2024). Additionally, many micro-teaching lessons lack clear and purposeful lesson closures, leaving learners without a coherent summary or connection to future content (Kamlasi et al., 2024). Another common shortcoming is the insufficient activation of students' prior knowledge, which undermines the scaffolding essential for meaningful learning (Amineh & Asl, 2015; Hailikari et al., 2008). These issues highlight the need for continuous evaluation of micro-teaching performance as well as the development of evidence-based improvements

in teacher education programs (Darling-Hammond, 2023; Kpanja, 2001).

In the Indonesian context, teacher education programs emphasize competence-based instruction aligned with national teaching standards, as articulated in Permendiknas No. 16 Tahun 2007 on Academic Qualification and Teacher Competency Standards (Pemerintah Indonesia, 2007). Micro-teaching, therefore, becomes a vital benchmark for assessing whether pre-service teachers demonstrate pedagogical, content, and technological competencies expected for real classroom teaching (Durrani et al., 2014). Yet, empirical studies focusing specifically on the quality of micro-teaching performance in English language teacher education remain limited. Micro-teaching, therefore, serves as a vital benchmark for assessing whether pre-service teachers demonstrate the pedagogical, content, and technological competencies expected for real classroom teaching.

Recent research has highlighted the importance of integrating the Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework into micro-teaching courses, as it helps pre-service English teachers effectively combine content knowledge with appropriate pedagogical strategies and digital tools (Adnan & Yunisari, 2023; Koehler et al., 2014). In micro-teaching settings, TPACK enables pre-service teachers to design technology-enhanced lessons that are both pedagogically sound and contextually appropriate for Indonesian English language learners (Farmasari et al., 2025). Yet, empirical studies focusing specifically on the quality of micro-teaching performance in English language teacher education remain limited, particularly those that systematically evaluate how well pre-service teachers apply integrated competencies in simulated teaching environments (Hikmat et al., 2025; Rahayu et al., 2025).

Despite the growing recognition of micro-teaching as a preparatory tool for pre-service English teachers, empirical evidence on the alignment between lesson plans and actual teaching performance remains limited, particularly in the Indonesian context. To address this gap, the present quantitative descriptive study examines the micro-teaching performance of 30 pre-service English teachers, focusing specifically on the relationship between lesson plan (LP) scores and teaching performance (TP) scores. The following research questions guide the investigation:

1. What are the levels of micro-teaching performance of pre-service English teachers in terms of introduction, main activities, and closure?
2. Is there a statistically significant correlation between lesson plan (LP) scores and teaching performance (TP) scores among pre-service English teachers in a micro-teaching course?
3. Which instructional component (introduction, main activities, or closure) shows the highest inconsistency in performance, as indicated by the standard deviation, and how does this relate to the overall LP-TP alignment?

By answering these questions, the study aims to provide empirical evidence on the planning-enactment gap in micro-teaching and to identify specific components that require pedagogical strengthening in pre-service teacher preparation.

## **METHOD**

### **Research Design**

This study employed a quantitative descriptive design to examine the alignment between teaching modules and teaching performance among pre-service English teachers in a micro-teaching context. The study focused on investigating the extent to which the quality of instructional planning, as

reflected in teaching modules, corresponded with participants' teaching performance during micro-teaching sessions.

### **Participants**

The participants of this study were 30 pre-service English teachers enrolled in the Micro Teaching course at the English Education Program, Universitas Negeri Padang, during the January–June 2025 semester. The participants consisted of 7 male students and 23 female students. In selecting the samples, purposive sampling was employed because all participants had completed both the teaching-module preparation and teaching-practice activities required in the course.

The inclusion criteria were active enrollment in the Micro Teaching course and completion of both the teaching-module submission and teaching-performance assessment. Students who failed to complete either component were excluded from the study. Therefore, the sample size ( $N = 30$ ) was considered adequate for exploratory correlational analysis in educational research, particularly given the practical constraints of a single-class micro-teaching setting and the use of nonparametric statistics (Spearman's rho), which is robust to small samples and violations of normality (de Winter et al., 2016).

### **Ethical Considerations**

Ethical principles were observed throughout the study. Prior to data collection, participants were informed about the purpose and procedures of the research. Participation was voluntary, and informed consent was obtained from all participants. The confidentiality and anonymity of participants were maintained throughout the research process, and all collected data were used solely for academic purposes.

### **Instruments**

Two assessment rubrics were used to collect the data. The first rubric evaluated the quality of participants' teaching modules, including learning objectives, instructional

procedures, learning activities, teaching materials, assessment strategies, and lesson organization. The second rubric assessed participants' teaching performance during micro-teaching sessions. The teaching-performance rubric covered three instructional components: Introduction, Main Activities, and Closing. Scores for both assessments ranged from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating better performance.

### Data Collection

Data were collected from participants' teaching modules and their corresponding teaching-practice performances. Each participant prepared a teaching module based on an assigned English language teaching topic. The teaching modules were assessed using the teaching-module evaluation rubric. Subsequently, participants conducted micro-teaching sessions, which were evaluated using the teaching-performance rubric. The scores from both assessments were recorded and compiled for analysis.

### Data Analysis

In quantitative analysis, a scoring rubric was developed based on established micro-teaching frameworks (Brown & Lee, 2015; Richards, 2015). The rubric was content-validated by three experts in English language teaching and teacher education, who assessed its relevance, clarity, and coverage of the three instructional components: introduction, main activities, and closing. Each component was scored on a 0–100 scale across five criteria (clarity, organization, delivery, learner engagement, and instructional effectiveness). To ensure inter-rater reliability, two trained raters independently scored 30% of the micro-teaching videos ( $n = 9$ ). Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC) were computed, revealing good to excellent agreement for all components ( $ICC > 0.85$ ). To examine the correlation between lesson plan alignment (LP) and teaching performance (TP), a Spearman's rho test was conducted because

the LP variable significantly deviated from normality (Shapiro–Wilk,  $p = 0.001$ ).

Moreover, examining the qualitative result as supported evidence, written teaching reflections and observational notes from peer feedback were analyzed using thematic analysis. The procedure involved open coding, categorization, and theme generation (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

As for the descriptive statistics (mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum) were used for each instructional component, and categorical distributions (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor) were tabulated. Qualitative findings were integrated with quantitative results to provide a deeper explanation of performance trends, following a convergent mixed-methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Results

#### 1. Quantitative Findings

The analysis of scores from 30 pre-service teachers shows that performance across the three instructional components varied, with Main Activities receiving the highest average score and Closing receiving the lowest.

*Table 1 Descriptive Statistics of Micro-Teaching Performance (N = 30)*

Component	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Introduction	78.23	8.55	60	95
Main Activities	82.47	6.91	68	96
Closing	72.10	10.74	48	92

The distribution of performance categories across components indicates that while a substantial percentage achieved “Excellent” and “Good” levels in Introduction and Main Activities, performance in Closing was significantly weaker.

*Table 2 Distribution of Performance Categories Across Components*

Category	Score Range	Introduction (%)	Main Activities (%)	Closing (%)
Excellent	85–100	40	53	23
Good	70–84	50	43	50

Fair	55-69	10	3	20
Poor	0-54	0	0	7

The uneven performance profile across instructional components, particularly the marked weakness in lesson closures, offers a lens to interpret the non-significant Spearman correlation between lesson plan alignment and overall teaching performance in Table 3 ( $r_s = 0.151$ ,  $p = 0.425$ ). Even when lesson plans were well-aligned, pre-service teachers systematically struggled with lesson closures, a component that is often underemphasized in planning or easily rushed during live teaching. The relatively stronger performance in Main Activities and Introduction did not compensate for this weakness, because the closing component introduced substantial variance that diluted any global relationship. Thus, the low and insignificant correlation reflects the fact that alignment scores alone cannot capture specific, persistent execution gaps such as rushed or incomplete closures.

Table 3 Correlational Test  
Correlations

		LP	TP
Spearman's rho	LP	1.000	.151
	Correlation Coefficient	.	.425
	Sig. (2-tailed)	30	30
TP	Correlation Coefficient	.151	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.425	.
	N	30	30

## 2. Qualitative Findings

The thematic analysis generated three major themes:

Table 4 Summary of Thematic Findings from Qualitative Analysis

Theme	Description
Instructional clarity with limited interaction	Participants provided clear explanations but relied heavily on teacher-centered techniques.
Incomplete or rushed lesson closures	Many lessons ended without proper review, reflection, or consolidation.
Limited activation of prior knowledge	Introductions were often formulaic and did not cognitively prepare students for learning.

### a. Instructional Clarity

Participants consistently demonstrated the ability to deliver content clearly. Reflections frequently noted that peers “explained step-by-step,” “used simple language,” and “provided examples that made the material easy to follow.” However, this clarity was almost always achieved through teacher-centered methods. One pre-service teacher wrote: “My friend explained the whole lesson from the front of the class. I understood everything, but students only listened and answered a few closed questions.” Self-reflections echoed this: “I focused on getting my explanations right, but I forgot to ask students what they thought.”

Thus, while instructional clarity was a strength, it rarely translated into interactive or student-centered learning. The alignment between lesson plans (which often included group activities) and actual teaching was weak in this aspect—teachers defaulted to lecturing even when the plan suggested otherwise.

### b. Incomplete or Rush Lesson Closure

Many reflections reported that lessons ended abruptly without proper closure. A common observation was: “The teacher finished the last example, looked at the clock, and said ‘that’s all for today’ without summarizing anything.” Self-reflections admitted feeling pressured by time: “I realized I spent too long on the introduction, so I skipped the review at the end. I just told students to read the next section at home.”

Several notes mentioned the absence of reflection questions, exit tickets, or any form of consolidation. One peer observer noted: “The lesson just stopped. Students were confused about what they were supposed to take away.” This pattern suggests that even when lesson plans included a closure phase, time management issues and lack of automaticity led to its omission in practice.

### c. Limited Activation of Prior Knowledge

The third theme concerns the beginning of lessons. Reflections frequently described

introductions that were “routine,” “too quick,” or “not connected to what students already knew.” For example: “The teacher started by saying ‘today we will learn about X’ and then immediately gave a definition. No question, no short activity, no link to previous lessons.”

Self-reflections revealed that many pre-service teachers were aware of the importance of activating prior knowledge but struggled to design or implement it effectively. One wrote: “In my plan I wrote ‘ask students what they remember from last week.’ But when I actually taught, I just asked ‘any questions?’ and when nobody answered, I moved on.”

Peer observers noted that this lack of activation made lessons feel disconnected: “It was like a new topic dropped from nowhere. Students looked confused for the first ten minutes.” Consequently, even well-aligned lesson plans that specified a prior-knowledge activity often failed to realize that component during teaching.

### **3. Alignment of Lesson Plan and Teaching Performance**

A Spearman’s rank-order correlation was conducted to examine the relationship between the alignment of lesson plans (LP) and teaching performance (TP), as the assumption of normality was violated for the LP variable (Shapiro–Wilk test,  $p = 0.001$ ). The sample consisted of 30 observations ( $N = 30$ ). The results revealed a very low positive correlation between LP and TP (Spearman’s  $\rho = 0.151$ ). However, this correlation was not statistically significant ( $p = 0.425$ , two-tailed). Therefore, there is insufficient evidence to conclude that higher alignment of lesson plans is associated with higher teaching performance in the current sample. The null hypothesis of no monotonic relationship cannot be rejected.

## **Discussion**

The purpose of this study was to examine the micro-teaching performance of pre-service English teachers and to identify

specific areas requiring pedagogical strengthening. The results show that while pre-service teachers demonstrate relatively strong performance in lesson introductions ( $M = 78.23$ ) and main teaching activities ( $M = 82.47$ ), their lesson closures remain insufficiently developed ( $M = 72.10$ ; only 23% rated Excellent). This pattern, stronger in earlier lesson phases but weak in closure, is consistent with previous observations that novice teachers often prioritize content delivery over lesson consolidation (Kamlasi et al., 2024).

The substantial standard deviation for closing ( $SD = 10.74$ ) compared to main activities ( $SD = 6.91$ ) indicates not only lower average performance but also greater variability among pre-service teachers in this component. This suggests that some individuals attempt closure strategies, albeit inconsistently, while others omit the phase almost entirely – a finding echoed in the qualitative reflections where participants admitted rushing or skipping closures due to time pressure. Thus, the identified weakness in closure is not merely a low score – it represents a structural gap in pre-service teacher preparation. Unlike introductions and main activities, which receive extensive modeling during training, closures are often treated as trivial or optional (Kamlasi et al., 2024).

The current results challenge this assumption, demonstrating that closure performance is both the weakest and most variable, pointing to an urgent need for targeted micro-teaching interventions focused on exit tickets, student self-assessment, and concise lesson synthesis. This pattern is consistent with international research suggesting that micro-teaching effectively enhances basic instructional skills but does not automatically foster comprehensive lesson orchestration among novice teachers (Allen & Eve, 1968; Barrett-Zahn, 2024; Grossman et al., 2009).

The relatively high scores in main teaching activities suggest that teacher candidates possess an adequate understanding of lesson content and procedural aspects of instruction. Previous studies have shown that micro-teaching supports the development of instructional clarity, confidence, and structured content delivery, particularly during the core teaching phase of a lesson (Amobi, 2005). However, the observed reliance on teacher-centered instructional practices reflects a common tendency among novice teachers, who often prioritize content transmission over learner interaction due to limited pedagogical experience (Darling-Hammond, 2023). This finding reveals that this reliance on teacher-centeredness is not simply a matter of preference but may be a compensatory mechanism. The qualitative reflections in this study consistently noted that pre-service teachers “explained everything themselves” and “asked only closed questions,” which they perceived as safer and more time-efficient than managing open-ended student engagement. This highlights that novice teachers often default to direct instruction when under the cognitive load of simultaneous classroom management and content delivery.

Importantly, the non-significant Spearman correlation between lesson plan alignment and overall teaching performance ( $r_s = 0.151$ ,  $p = 0.425$ ) suggests that even when lesson plans explicitly included student-centered activities, pre-service teachers frequently abandoned them during live teaching. This disconnection between planned and enacted practice indicates that high scores in main activities may reflect technical proficiency in teacher-centered routines rather than genuine pedagogical flexibility. As Hattie (2023) notes, visible teaching becomes effective only when it is responsive to learner cues. It is a skill that requires deliberate practice with feedback, which micro-teaching alone does not automatically guarantee.

Thus, while the relatively high scores in main activities appear encouraging, they mask a critical gap: teacher candidates can deliver content clearly but struggle to facilitate student thinking and interaction. This finding underscores the need for stronger preparation in student-centered pedagogies, including effective questioning strategies, collaborative learning, and formative assessment practices (Hattie, 2023; Walsh & Sattes, 2004). Moreover, micro-teaching interventions should explicitly target the transition from teacher-centered to interactive instruction, for instance, by requiring candidates to script and rehearse open-ended questions, peer discussions, or brief student response routines during the main activity phase (Grossman et al., 2009).

While the tendency toward teacher-centered instruction is a concern, an even more pressing issue emerged from the data: lesson closure. Lesson closure emerged as the weakest instructional component in this study ( $M = 72.10$ ,  $SD = 10.74$ ; only 23% rated Excellent), indicating that many pre-service teachers have not yet internalized its pedagogical significance. International literature emphasizes that effective lesson closure is essential for consolidating learning, reinforcing key concepts, and promoting metacognitive reflection among learners (Ganske, 2017; Tan & Lee, 2020). The tendency to rush or omit lesson closures observed in this study aligns with previous research showing that novice teachers frequently struggle with time management and coherent lesson structuring during early teaching experiences (Soto et al., 2018; Veenman, 1984).

A more nuanced interpretation of the current data reveals that weak closure performance is not merely a symptom of time pressure but also reflects a conceptual gap: many pre-service teachers view closure as an optional add-on rather than an integral phase of a lesson. Qualitative reflections repeatedly

noted that participants “ran out of time and just said ‘that’s all for today’” or “forgot to ask students what they learned.” This suggests that closure is rarely rehearsed during teacher preparation, unlike introductions and main activities, which receive extensive modeling (Richards, 2015).

Critically, the large standard deviation for closure ( $SD = 10.74$ ) is the highest among all components – indicates not only low average performance but also extreme inconsistency. Some teacher candidates attempted quick summaries or exit questions, while others provided no closure at all. This variability helps explain the non-significant Spearman correlation between lesson plan alignment and overall teaching performance ( $r_s = 0.151, p = 0.425$ ). Even when lesson plans specified a well-designed closure activity, the actual enactment was unpredictable, diluting any global relationship between planning quality and enacted teaching.

Thus, the weakness in lesson closure is not an isolated scoring issue; it represents a structural flaw in pre-service training that directly undermines lesson effectiveness. Without explicit instruction and guided rehearsal of closure routines such as exit tickets, two-minute summaries, or student self-assessment, the future teachers will continue to leave learners without synthesis or reflection, perpetuating a pattern of incomplete lessons (Ganske, 2017).

While lesson closure represents an underdeveloped phase at the end of instruction, a parallel weakness appears at the beginning: limited activation of prior knowledge.

Although introductions scored relatively well descriptively ( $M = 78.23$ ), qualitative reflections revealed formulaic openings that failed to cognitively prepare learners – pre-service teachers admitted “just asking ‘any questions?’ without waiting.” Learning theories (Cook & Ausubel, 1970; David

Merrill, 2002) emphasize that meaningful learning requires connecting new content to existing cognitive structures; superficial openings undermine this. The non-significant Spearman correlation ( $r_s = 0.151, p = 0.425$ ) further indicates that even when lesson plans specified prior-knowledge activation, actual enactment was weak or omitted. Thus, strengthening introductions requires rehearsed, specific routines (e.g., think-pair-share, prediction questions) practiced until automatic (Darling-Hammond, 2023). Without such targeted preparation, lesson introductions will remain procedural rather than genuinely activating, undermining learner readiness and lesson coherence (Bransford et al., 2000; Wang, 2024).

Overall, the findings highlight the importance of targeted pedagogical interventions within micro-teaching courses, particularly in the areas of interactive instruction, learner engagement, activation of prior knowledge, and structured lesson closure. These weaknesses are not merely low scores; they represent structural gaps in teacher preparation that undermine lesson coherence and learning effective. Therefore, micro-teaching programs should go beyond performance rehearsal and explicitly cultivate reflective practice, pedagogical reasoning, and learner-centered instructional design among pre-service teachers (Barrett-Zahn, 2024; Zeichner, 2010). Future research should examine whether targeted rehearsal of these phases improves both alignment and performance.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study examined the micro-teaching performance of 30 pre-service English teachers and identified strengths and weaknesses across three instructional components. The quantitative results indicate strong performance in Main Activities and moderate performance in Introductions, while lesson closures require substantial improvement. The

qualitative findings reveal recurring issues such as teacher-centered delivery, insufficient activation of prior knowledge, and incomplete lesson consolidation.

The findings underscore the need for enhanced pedagogical training focused on interactive teaching, cognitive preparation, and structured closure techniques. Strengthening these areas is essential for preparing pre-service teachers to meet instructional standards and succeed in real classroom contexts.

## REFERENCES

- Adnan, A., & Yunisari, C. (2023). TPACK: Teachers' Needs. *Ta'dib*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.31958/jt.v26i1.9072>
- Allen, D. W., & Eve, A. W. (1968). Microteaching. *Taylor & Francis*, 7(5), 181–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405846809542153>
- Amineh, R. J., & Asl, H. D. (2015). Review of constructivism and social constructivism. *Journal of Social Sciences, Literature and Languages*, 1(1).
- Amobi, F. (2005). Preservice teachers' reflectivity on the sequence and consequences of teaching actions in a microteaching experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(1).
- Barrett-Zahn, E. (2024). Redefining Teaching Practices. *Science and Children*, 61(4). <https://doi.org/10.1080/00368148.2024.2366013>
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (2000). How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School. In *Committee on learning research and educational practice: Expanded E*. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2014\(91\)90049-J](https://doi.org/10.1016/0885-2014(91)90049-J)
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp0630a>
- Brown, H. D., & Lee, H. (2015). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Fourth Edition. In *Pearson Education*.
- Cook, H., & Ausubel, D. P. (1970). Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 83(2). <https://doi.org/10.2307/1421346>
- Coşgun, G. E. (2024). Reshaping Teacher Training: Insights from Pre-Service English Teachers' Online Micro Teaching Experiences. *Teaching English Language*, 18(1). <https://doi.org/10.22132/tel.2024.450276.1583>
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research. In *Organizational Research Methods* (Vol. 12, Number 3rd Edition).
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2023). Response to How Teacher Education Matters. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 74(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/00224871231160378>
- David Merrill, M. (2002). First principles of instruction. *Educational Technology Research and Development* 2002 50:3, 50(3), 43–59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02505024>
- de Winter, J. C. F., Gosling, S. D., & Potter, J. (2016). Comparing the pearson and spearman correlation coefficients across distributions and sample sizes: A tutorial using simulations and empirical data. *Psychological Methods*, 21(3). <https://doi.org/10.1037/met0000079>
- Durrani, B. A., Lecturer, S., Ivanauskien, N., Volung, J., Rahmani-Nejad, L., Firoozbakht, Z., Taghipoor, A., Arokiasamy, A. R. A., Pourdehghan, A., Tjan, S., Sukanto, R., Lumintan, D. B., Dhurup, M., Mafini, C., Dumasi, T., Kheng, L. L., Mahamad, O., Ramayah, T., Mosahab, R., ... Wirawan, V. (2014).

- Implementation of E-Government in Welcoming the Contemporary Industrial Revolution 4.0 Era in Indonesia. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 1(1).
- Effendi, Moh. M., Ummah, S. K., & Andriyani. (2025). Examining preservice mathematics teachers' basic teaching skills in technology-integrated microteaching. *Kalamatika: Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.22236/kalamatika.vol10no2.2025pp54-78>
- Farmasari, S., Wardana, L. A., Munandar, L. O. A. H., & Suryaningsih, H. (2025). Predictive Validity of Peer Assessment in Micro-Teaching: Correlation with Teacher Ratings among Indonesian Preservice EFL Teachers. *Journal Evaluation in Education (JEE)*, 6(4). <https://doi.org/10.37251/jee.v6i4.2113>
- Ganske, K. (2017). Lesson Closure: An Important Piece of the Student Learning Puzzle. *Reading Teacher*, 71(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/trtr.1587>
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K., & McDonald, M. (2009). Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice Redefining teaching , re - imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15(2).
- Hailikari, T., Katajavuori, N., & Lindblom-Ylänne, S. (2008). The relevance of prior knowledge in learning and instructional design. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 72(5). <https://doi.org/10.5688/aj7205113>
- Halimah, L., Mirawati, Sutisna, M. R., Hopiani, A., & Abdillah, F. (2025). Implementing a microteaching cycle in virtual environments for pre-service teachers in an early childhood program. *Journal of Early Childhood Teacher Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10901027.2025.2523597>
- Handayani, F., Lestari, I. W., & Susanti, A. (2023). Pre-Service English Teachers' Voice on Virtual Teaching Practice: Shifting from Face-to-Face Teaching into Virtual Teaching. *GLENS: Global English Insights Journal*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.61220/glens.v1i1.2023a2>
- Hattie, J. (2023). Visible Learning: The Sequel. In *Visible Learning: The Sequel*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003380542>
- Hikmat, M. H., Hidayat, N., & Prasetyarini, A. (2025). Pre-Service English Teachers' Metacognitive Awareness and Microteaching Problems: An Insight from Microteaching Practice in Indonesia. *International Journal of Learning in Higher Education*, 32(1). <https://doi.org/10.18848/2327-7955/CGP/v32i01/163-180>
- Kamlasi, I., Hartono, R., & Rozi, F. (2024). Unveiling The Students' Opening And Closing Skills During The Micro Teaching In Efl Classroom. *Unnes Teflin National Conference*.
- Kartal, O., & Tillett, W. (2021). Transforming Preservice Teachers' Conceptions and Lesson Plan Designs for Teaching Mathematics from a Direct-Teaching Approach to a Reform-Based Approach. *Investigations in Mathematics Learning*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/19477503.2020.1847988>
- Khoza, H. C. (2024). Exploring the rationale for lesson design as a tool for developing and evaluating science pre-service teachers' topic-specific pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Education (South Africa)*, (95). <https://doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i95a01>
- Koehler, M. J., Mishra, P., Kereluik, K., Shin, T. S., & Graham, C. R. (2014). The technological pedagogical content knowledge framework. In *Handbook of*

- Research on Educational Communications and Technology: Fourth Edition.* [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-3185-5_9)
- Kpanja, E. (2001). A study of the effects of video tape recording in microteaching training. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 32(4). <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8535.00215>
- Medina, J. B., Buan, A. T., Perocho, R. E., & Luib, J. R. T. (2026). Retrospective Analysis of Lesson Planning in Microteaching Lesson Study among Mathematics Preservice Teachers. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.25.1.10>
- Rahayu, V. D., Purwanti, I. T., & Mahdum, M. (2025). English Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions on the Role of Microteaching in the Teaching Practice Program. *Jo-ELT (Journal of English Language Teaching) Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa & Seni Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris IKIP*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.33394/jo-elt.v12i2.17536>
- Remesh, A. (2013). Microteaching, an efficient technique for learning effective teaching. In *Journal of Research in Medical Sciences* (Vol. 18, Number 2).
- Richards, J. C. (2015). Key Issues in Language Teaching. In *Key Issues in Language Teaching*. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024600>
- Seon-Ho Park. (2024). Korean Journal Of English Language And Linguistics Preparing Future Elementary English Educators: Insights from Pre-Service Teachers on Microteaching and Practicum. *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 24.
- Soto, M., Broderick, S., Dick, L., Appelgate, M., & Gupta, D. (2018). Fitting It All In: Time Challenges in Lesson Pacing. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 20(1–2).
- Tan, W., & Lee, N. H. (2020). Promoting metacognition through lesson closure. In *Mathematics Teaching In Singapore - Volume 1: Theory-informed Practices*. [https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811220159\\_0016](https://doi.org/10.1142/9789811220159_0016)
- Veenman, S. (1984). Perceived Problems of Beginning Teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2). <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543054002143>
- Walsh, J. A., & Sattes, B. D. (2004). Quality Questioning : Research-Based Practice to Engage Every Learner. *Journal of Literacy Research*.
- Wang, M. (2024). Rethinking how people learn: A holistic framework for effective learning design. *Knowledge Management and E-Learning*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/10.34105/j.kmel.2024.16.010>
- Zeichner, K. (2010). Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college- and university-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(1–2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109347671>