영어어문교육, 14권 3호 2008년 가을

# Prospective English Teachers' Reflection on Their Microteaching

**Jiwon Paek**
(The Catholic University of Korea)

**Paek, Jiwon. (2008). Prospective English teachers' reflection on their microteaching. *English Language & Literature Teaching*, *14*(3), 241-257.**

This present study examined how and what undergraduate students reflected on their microteaching. Seven undergraduate students voluntarily participated in the study. The data was collected through microteaching reflective journals and stimulated-recall interviews while reviewing microteaching videotapes. Findings indicated the participants generated three times more reflective comments in the stimulated-recall interviews than in the reflective journals. The participants showed high level of reflection—comments with an explanation and alternative in more than 50 % of reflective comments in both journals and interviews. However, 70 % and 80 % of reflective comments in interviews and journals respectively were revealed as regret comments about their teaching performance. The reflection on areas indicated that comments were widely distributed over 15 categories in the stimulated-recall interview data. 40 % of reflective comments in the interviews were about teacher-students interaction, giving instruction and lesson contents whereas 30 % of reflective comments in the journals addressed class activities, giving instruction, and planning intention. In reflection on areas in the journals, the participants addressed more emotional sides than specific areas to improve their future teaching. I made several suggestions for training prospective teachers so that reflective practice can be fostered throughout long-term teaching profession.

**[microteaching/reflection/reflective journal]**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Reflective teaching is a term often used by educators in teaching fields (Bartlett, 1990; Cruickshank, Kennedy, Williams, Holton, & Fay, 1981; El-Dib, 2007; Richards & Lockhart, 1996; Valli, 1997; Wallace, 1991). Some students in teacher education programs may take reflection as finding wrong aspects in their teaching events. Reflective practice in

teaching means to "revisit the sequence of one's teaching for the purpose of making thoughtful judgment and decisions about improved ways of acting in the future, or in the midst of the action itself" (Amobi, 2005, p. 116).

Preparation for teaching has emphasized teachers' behaviors, teaching methods and skill development apart from critical thinking about behaviors and decisions in class. They are not asked to explain why they act in a certain way or why they make a particular decision. They are taught to become proficient in basic teaching tasks or skills. This technical preparation leads prospective teachers to follow scripted lessons and practice teaching routines. However, it excludes thoughtful consideration of teaching beliefs, assumptions, and the consequences of and alternatives to actions.

Why is reflective teaching important to a language teacher? Reflective teaching gives prospective teachers opportunities to ask 'what' and 'why' questions which are regarded as much more desirable and effective to their long-term development in teaching profession. Prospective teachers have to move from the 'how to' questions to the 'what' and 'why' questions. Asking 'what' and 'why' questions gives them a certain power over their teaching such as autonomy and responsibilities over their actions. In reflecting on those questions, prospective teachers can open up the possibilities to transform everyday classroom life (Bartlett, 1990).

Though used to varying degrees in teacher education in Korea, reflection on microteaching has only infrequently been mentioned or received little attention in recent literature in teacher education in Korea. The purpose of this study is to investigate how prospective teachers reflect on their teaching through microteaching experience and whether they are equipped with ability to critically think about their teaching performance. In this regard, this study will provide how reflective practice can be used for training undergraduate students in English education. The present study inquired into the varying kinds and degrees of reflectivity of undergraduate students who planned to be an English teacher in Korea. This study specifically addresses the following research questions:

1) To what extent do undergraduate students reflect on their microteaching?

2) On what areas of teaching do undergraduate students reflect?

## II. STUDY BACKGROUND

Teaching is a sequence of actions which teachers decide intentionally and deliberately while planning and performing in class. Microteaching has been used as a viable method to educate pre-service teachers and retrain in-service teachers in teacher education programs (Benton-Kupper, 2001; Fernández & Robinson, 2006; Metcalf, Hammer, & Kahlich, 1996; Richards, 1998). Microteaching is defined as "a training context in which a teacher's

situation has been reduced in scope or simplified in some systematic way" (Wallace, 1991, p. 87). The original development of microteaching at Stanford University was initially related to the psychological behaviorism. Microteaching was designed to shape or reshape prospective teachers teaching behaviors from undesirable to acceptable prescribed standards through immediate feedback and reinforcement. It was used to help pre-service teachers master specific teaching skills such as presenting instructions, asking questions or introducing a new concept with a visual aid. Recently, the use of microteaching has expanded to giving pre-service teachers complete teaching experience (Benton-Kupper, 2001; Fernández & Robinson, 2006; Metcalf et al., 1996).

The approach of reflective teaching has been acknowledged as a useful tool to teacher education in various fields (Amobi, 2005; Bartlett, 1990; Chant, Heafner, & Bennett, 2004; Lee, 2007). According to Dewey's original definition of reflection, reflection "involves active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or practice in light of the reasons that support it and the further consequences to which it leads" (Stanely, 1998, p. 584). Sequence and consequence are at the heart of reflective thinking. Thought is considered "reflective only if it is logically sequenced and includes a consideration of the consequences of a decision" (Valli, 1997, p. 68). Why is reflective thought in teaching necessary? Because "it converts action that is merely appetitive, blind, and impulsive into intelligent action" (Dewey cited in Valli, 1997, p. 69). Reflection is an action to examine the reasons and beliefs underlying their teaching and to generate alternatives for the future and centrally concerned with finding solutions to real problems (Adler, 1991). Quality of reflection is decided by the teachers' ability to make and justify good decisions based on their own situation and experience. According to Hatton and Smith (1995), in order to foster effective reflection, what is needed is time and opportunity for development. It is necessary to adopt a developmental approach—early concerns for survival skills, then the focus for attempts at descriptive reason-giving, and moving on to other forms of reflection taking account of a wide range of factors including broader socio-political contexts.

## III. METHODOLOGY

### 1. Research Context

Seventeen students took 'Principles and Practice of Teaching English' as a requirement for students pursuing an English teaching certificate at school. The class met once a week for two hours each time. Before the midterm examination, the students submitted four response journals to reading assignments. As one of the course requirements, the students completed one microteaching lesson at the end of the semester. They were told to prepare

10 minute peer microteaching in the first class. The students were free to decide teaching topics, language skills, class types, and students' age and proficiency upon their choices. On the contrary, they had to teach in English. Most of the students did not have experience to make a lesson plan, teach, and write a reflection paper before this course. Microteaching was videotaped for students to analyze and write a reflective journal which was required to submit in the very next week. Data for the study were collected after the semester finished. They were asked by their own professor to sign up if they were willing to participate in the study in the last week of the semester. As a researcher, I did not involve in the class at any time for any reason until I started collecting data.

## 2. Participants

Seven students out of 17 voluntarily participated in the study. Two of them were seniors; one a sophomore; the rest of them juniors. Three of the participants had experience to study English abroad and two of them were in a TESOL certificate program in Canada. In terms of their final grades in the course, two participants received "A," four of them received "A+," and only one participant received "C."

## 3. Data Source and Collection

The primary data for the study consisted of participants' written reflective journals on their microteaching and interview transcripts. Other materials such as participants' lesson plans, teaching materials, microteaching videotapes and written feedback from their peers were collected as the secondary data.

I conducted an individual interview with each participant, which lasted between 2 and 3 hours. Each interview was comprised of two parts. The first part was intended to collect general information about the participants' teaching experiences, taken courses related to teaching in general or teaching English in particular and beliefs about teaching and learning in English. The second part was designed for the participants to reflect on their microteaching through a stimulated-recall method. The participants were asked to stop their microteaching videotape whenever they wanted to comment on their teaching without a special guidance. After they finished, I stopped the videotapes at transitory points from one phase to another phase, asking if they wanted to comment or add. At the end of the interview, I provided feedback to the participants about their teaching if they wanted.

## 4. Data Analysis

The data set for this study consisted of the stimulated-recall interviews and the reflective

journals. Two separate analyses were conducted to code the data. The first one was done to identify to what extent the participants reflected on their microteaching. I conducted the second data analysis to find out areas they reflected on such as comments related to their body movement, teaching materials they used and giving instruction. Examples and explanations of the coding categories for each analysis are given in the following sections.

1) Levels of Reflection

According to El-Dib (2007), a reflective unit is a single idea or thought about a particular topic or event regardless of the length of a unit. Furthermore, reflection exists at more than one level. Based on the concept of reflection, I distinguished three levels of reflection: comments with no explanation, comments with an explanation or a possible reason, and comments with an alternative. Further, I categorized each comment into positive, neutral and regret based on the attitudes of the participants. Comments with no explanation are considered the lowest in reflection. Comments with an explanation or a reason, or multiple explanations or reasons are considered the medium level while comments with an explanation or reason along with an alternative are considered the highest. Examples of each of these categories, taken from data in the current study, appear in (1) – (5).

(1) PWE (Positive with an Explanation)

When starting the lesson, I let the students stretch in order to refresh them and asked whether they felt better. I think the start was fresher than those of other students' microteaching. The starts of other students' microteaching were not as active as mine.

(2) NWE (Neutral with an Explanation)

I prepared the power point slides because I could save time for writing something on the board. We only have 10 minutes for microteaching.

(3) NWA (Neutral with an Alternative)

The order of pictures in listening and in repeating was the same. But I think that adding a distracter or changing the order of pictures in repeating could be possible.

(4) RWE (Regret with an Explanation)

When I made the student do pair work, I didn't monitor students. I just stood there (in front of the classroom) and watched them. I didn't check whether the students did well or not.

(5) RWA (Regret with an Alternative)

One of my classmates (in her microteaching) naturally introduced what students were going to learn. But I told directly to my students what they were going to learn. I made a mistake [sigh]. I didn't make my students interested or motivated. If I just had used comparatives in my story and made them guess like her, it could have been better to students.

Out of nine categories, only five categories appeared. Regarding PWA (Positive with an Alternative), the participants did not suggest any alternatives because they considered the parts were strong points in their microteaching. The line between neutral comments and regret comments was not always obvious. When the participants expressed regrets for their actions such as "feel sorry or regret," "it was a weak point," or "it could have been better if ~" the comments were categorized as either RWE or RWA. On the contrary, when the participants stated another possibility without regrets, those comments were categorized as NWA. Categorizing sometimes depended on the voice tone of the participants in the interviews.

2) Areas of Reflection

The analysis of reflective areas was data-driven in nature. No previous categories were set from theory or teaching practice. At first, reflective comments from the analysis of reflective levels were grouped by similarities. As done in the analysis of reflective levels, two separate analyses were done on the two sets of the data: the reflective journals and the stimulated-recall interviews. To simplify categories, each category was reread and recategorized based on similarities and differences. Finally, 15 categories in total emerged: comments related to (1) Class Activities, (2) Class Interaction, (3) Class Management, (4) Correction, (5) Instruction, (6) Lesson Contents, (7) Monitoring, (8) Planning, (9) Questioning/Responding, (10) Teacher's Body, (11) Teacher's English Proficiency, (12) Teaching Materials, (13) Understanding Checking, (14) Visual Aids, and (15) Others. Detailed information of each category is presented below.

(1) Class Activities

Comments that belong to this category were about activity implementation, activity diversity, and strong points or weak points in activities the participants used.

(2) Class Interaction

The participants made many comments about teacher-students interaction along with a few comments related to student-student interaction.

(3) Class Management

Comments related to class management were about dealing with late students in class and putting them in a group.

(4) Correction

Only two participants mentioned about hesitation when peers produced incorrect sentences or wrong answers. However, the comments were not about how to correct students' errors, rather regrets that the participants did not correct wrong answers.

(5) Instruction

The participants were concerned about whether instruction was clear, appropriate, and loud enough. In addition, comments were about forgetting to give instruction and the use of metalinguistic terms.

(6) Lesson Contents

Comments in this category related to whether the participants chose the right amount of contents—for example, too much or too little, or appropriateness to students' proficiency.

(7) Monitoring

Comments in this category related to monitor students in a group work or a pair work.

(8) Planning

Comments were defined as Planning when the participants addressed the intention of activities or lesson objectives in a planning stage.

(9) Questioning/Responding

This category means whether the participants questioned and responded appropriately.

(10) Teacher's Body

This category included teachers' body movement, hand gestures, and eye contacts with students during microteaching.

(11) Teacher's English Proficiency

Some of the participants worried about their English proficiency itself, which could affect their teaching performance. Comments related to teachers' English proficiency included the use of incorrect sentences, poor pronunciation, and self-repair of incorrect sentences when giving instruction to students.

(12) Teaching Materials

Comments such as the quality of teaching materials or use of right materials were included in this category.

(13) Understanding Checking

Comments in this category were about whether they checked students' understanding appropriately.

(14) Visual Aids

Comments relating to visual aids were about writing on the whiteboard or using power point slides to help students understand the lesson better.

(15) Others

Comments belonging to this category addressed the necessity to practice or rehearse microteaching in advance and the participants' emotions such as anxiety, worry, or stress about their microteaching.

## IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

For microteaching experience to be useful, prospective teachers are required to review the videotape of their individual lesson for the purpose of analyzing and reflecting on the lessons as taught. Individual reviewing of the videotaped lesson and writing a critique of their teaching performance is a common practice aimed at developing self-analysis ability and consequently, reflective practice. In order to understand undergraduate students' reflection on microteaching, I divide the results into two parts: one about the level of reflection and the other about the areas of reflection.

### 1. Levels of Reflection on Microteaching

To what extent do undergraduate students reflect on their microteaching? To answer the question, levels of reflection were identified from two date sets. Further, reflective comments were divided into positive, neutral, and regret comments. Five categories appeared such as PWE (Positive with an Explanation), NWE (Neutral with an Explanation), NWA (Neutral with an Alternative), RWE (Regret with an Explanation), and RWA (Regret with an Alternative). As can be seen from the data presented in Table 1, the participants generated from 6 to 13 reflective comments in the reflective journals they

submitted one week after their microteaching, with an average of 8. However, as illustrated in Table 2, the number of reflective comments ranged from 16 to 30 per participant, with an average of 22.14, in the stimulated-recall interviews.

**TABLE 1**

**Individual Participants' Reflective Comments from Journals**

| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PWE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| NWE | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| RWE | 2 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 16 |
| RWA | 4 | 0 | 12 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 29 |
| | 6 | 7 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 55 |

**TABLE 2**

**Individual Participants' Reflective Comments from Interview Transcripts**

| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PWE | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 17 |
| NWE | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 17 |
| NWA | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| RWE | 3 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 35 |
| RWA | 18 | 13 | 6 | 13 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 74 |
| | 28 | 20 | 15 | 21 | 30 | 20 | 19 | 153 |

The participants generated three times more reflective comments in the stimulated-recall interviews. It could be due to the fact that the participants were required to review their own microteaching and to stop the tape in order to make comments. The nature of interview context may have made the participants more conscious of their teaching, thus generating more reflective comments. On the contrary, the participants reviewed by themselves in the context of writing a reflective journal, where such pressures may not have been present. Whenever they made reflective comments in either the interviews or the reflective journals, they provided explanations on actions, original intentions in planning or decisions. Because most of the participants did not have experience to plan a lesson, teach a lesson, and prepare teaching materials before, they seemed generally not satisfied with their teaching performance in microteaching. The participants generated 109 regret comments out of 153 in the stimulated-recall interviews and 45 regret comments out of 55 in the reflective journals. They predominantly showed regrets for their microteaching.

On the contrary, it should be noted that P7 in particular made the most positive comments—3 (out of 8) and 7 (out of 17) comments in the journal and in the interview respectively. The positive comments consisted of about 30 % of her total comments. However, P7 received the lowest grade on her microteaching among 17 classmates from the course professor. It could be due to her personal characteristics. Here are two examples

of P7's positive comments from the stimulated-recall interview.

Example #1
When starting the lesson, I let the students stretch in order to refresh them and asked whether they felt better. I think the start was fresher than those of other students' microteaching. The starts of other students' microteaching were not as active as mine.

Example #2
I cut the word "Excellent" from an ice cream box [a brand name of ice cream]. When I said, "Excellent!" to a student, I gave the cut to the student. I think that was a good idea to make students motivated in class, not just saying, "Excellent!" to students because students would want to get as many cuts as possible.

The target students of P7 were middle school students. Considering the age of target students, it is doubtful that the action in example #2 was a really strong point in her teaching. It is possible that P7 showed avoidance to face her microteaching. However, at the time of the stimulated-recall interview, I did not inquire why P7 so positively evaluated her teaching because the purpose of the interview was to explore the extent the participants reflected on microteaching to. Future research in reflective practice of prospective teachers needs to be done about how prospective teachers feel and respond during microteaching reflection.

As explained earlier, the research question concerns the levels of reflection on their microteaching. Table 3 shows that the participants were equipped with the ability to provide reasons for their own actions or explanations about results of actions.

**TABLE 3**

**Percentage of Reflection Level**

| | Analysis Units from Interviews | | Analysis Units from Journals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| PWE | 17 | 11.11% | 9 | 16.36% |
| NWE | 17 | 11.11% | 1 | 1.82% |
| NWA | 10 | 6.54% | 0 | 0% |
| RWE | 35 | 22.87% | 16 | 29.09% |
| RWA | 74 | 48.37% | 29 | 52.73% |
| | 153 | 100% | 55 | 100% |

Valli (1997) stated that reflection is an action to examine the reasons and beliefs underlying their teaching and to generate alternatives for the future. Teachers need to generate alternatives to improve their teaching in the future. Thus, the reflective comments

with an alternative are considered the highest level in the participants' reflection. The participants generated alternatives in more than 50 % of reflective comments (NWA and RWA) in both sets of data. Though the participants provided alternatives in NWAs and RWAs, more often the alternatives were not specific as seen in the RWA example below.

RWA example from P6

It could have been better if I had used more active activities. The activities I used were passive.

It was not clear what active activities were, how good the class could be when she used active activities, and why active class was important. She did not mention any of those questions. This example shows that the participants needed to be carefully supervised for reflection to be helpful for their future teaching. Here is another example.

In addition, it was noticed that regret comments comprised 70 % (in the interviews) and 80% (in the journals) of total reflective comments. Sighing and frowning, the participants frequently expressed regrets while reviewing their microteaching with me, the researcher. Here is an example.

RWA example from P5

One of my classmates (P1) naturally introduced what students were going to learn. But I told directly to my students what they were going to learn. I made a mistake [sigh]. I didn't make my students interested or motivated. If I just had used comparatives in my story and made them guess like her, it could have been better to students.

The attitudes of participants should be noted in reflecting on microteaching. There were different ways to introduce what target students would learn in class. However, the participants frequently showed guilty or self-doubt while reviewing their microteaching. According to Stanely (1998), examining their own teaching may trigger responses of guilt, pain and self-doubt. If teachers experience a great deal of pain while reviewing and reflecting, teachers may resist learning to reflect. Teacher educators need to carefully supervise prospective teachers so that they may not experience pain or guilty when engaging in reflection.

In cases of NWE and RWE, the participants did not provide alternatives at the time of reflective moments. However, these comments were still considered to show possibilities to improve their teaching in the future because they at least identified reasons for and explanations about the decisions and actions in microteaching.

## 2. Areas of Reflective Comments

On what areas of teaching do undergraduate students reflect? To answer this question, the categories of reflective areas were identified with a data-driven approach. Table 4 shows how reflective comments in journals were distributed in different areas. The number of comments ranged from 0 to 11 with an average of 3.67 per area. There was no comment related to correction and visual aids. On the other hand, 11 comments were categorized as 'Others' because these comments were more or less related to their emotions about microteaching performance, not related to any specific areas.

**TABLE 4**

**Reflection Areas of Individual Participants from Journals**

| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Class Activities | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| Class Interaction | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Class Management | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Correction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Instruction | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Lesson Contents | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Monitoring | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Planning | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Questioning/Responding | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Teacher's body | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Teacher's English proficiency | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| Teaching Materials | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| Understanding Checking | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Visual aids | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Others | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 11 |
| | 6 | 7 | 13 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 55 |

Table 5 illustrates how reflective comments in the interviews were distributed across categories. The number of reflective comments in each category ranged from 3 to 24 with an average of 10.2.

**TABLE 5**

**Reflection Areas of Individual Participants from Interviews**

| | P1 | P2 | P3 | P4 | P5 | P6 | P7 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Class Activities | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 11 |
| Class Interaction | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 22 |
| Class Management | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Correction | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Instruction | 4 | 4 | 0 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 24 |
| Lesson Contents | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 16 |
| Monitoring | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Planning | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Questioning/Responding | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Teacher's body | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Teacher's English proficiency | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 |
| Teaching Materials | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 10 |
| Understanding Checking | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 8 |
| Visual aids | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 9 |
| Others | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| | 28 | 20 | 15 | 21 | 30 | 20 | 19 | 153 |

The least frequent comments were about correcting students' wrong answers or incorrect sentences during microteaching whereas the participants were most concerned about giving instruction to students. Sometimes, the participants forgot to give instruction, finding later that they did not instruct how to do group work. It was considered a burden to teach English in English. Teaching is a complex process and the participants should take care of so many things during their microteaching. As a result, giving clear instruction appeared the most problematic part for them when teaching English in English as seen the example below.

'Instruction' Example from P4

Even though these students knew what they were supposed to do in this activity, I wonder whether students in a real classroom could understand my instruction as well. We [the students in the course] as a student were trying to help our classmates in microteaching because we would be a teacher next time.

Table 6 shows the result comparison in the two data sets. Comments in 'Others' category decreased from 20 % in the reflective journals to 7.84 % in the stimulated-recall interviews. Because the participants should stop the videotape to make comments, the comments were more specific about teaching actions or results. As a result, "Others" category seemed to decrease in the stimulated-recall interviews. Reflective comments were more widely distributed in the stimulated-recall interviews. Furthermore, all categories appeared in the stimulated-recall interviews.

**TABLE 6**

**Percentage of Each Area**

| | Areas from Interviews | | Areas from Journals | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percentage | Number | Percentage |
| Class Activities | 11 | 7.19% | 5 | 9.09% |
| Class Interaction | 22 | 14.38% | 4 | 7.27% |
| Class Management | 3 | 1.96% | 1 | 1.82% |
| Correction | 4 | 2.61% | 0 | 0% |
| Instruction | 24 | 15.69% | 6 | 10.91% |
| Lesson Contents | 16 | 10.46% | 4 | 7.27% |
| Monitoring | 6 | 3.92% | 3 | 5.46% |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Planning | 12 | 7.84% | 5 | 9.09% |
| Questioning/Responding | 5 | 3.27% | 4 | 7.27% |
| Teacher's body | 5 | 3.27% | 2 | 3.64% |
| Teacher's English proficiency | 6 | 3.92% | 4 | 7.27% |
| Teaching Materials | 10 | 6.54% | 4 | 7.27% |
| Understanding Checking | 8 | 5.23% | 2 | 3.64% |
| Visual aids | 9 | 5.88% | 0 | 0% |
| Others | 12 | 7.84% | 11 | 20% |
| | 153 | 100% | 55 | 100% |

Only four participants addressed comments related to 'Teacher's body' which includes body movement, hand gestures and eye contacts with peer students. However, reviewing the videotapes revealed that the participants without exception looked at the computer screen or the handouts most of time. As a result, the participants did not have appropriate eye contacts with peer students. Nonetheless, three out of seven participants did not mention at all about their appropriate eye contact. It indicates that reflection of the participants was limited in quality and quantity.

Besides, certain categories did not appear such as a category about teacher's underlying beliefs or assumptions about language learning and teaching or about theory or principles the participant learned during the semester. Teachers' beliefs and assumptions about language learning and teaching affect their teaching in class (Kyung Ja Kim, 2006; Tae-Eun Kim, 2007). Teachers need to reexamine their teaching beliefs and assumptions to transform their everyday class. The participants did not address any efforts they made to apply theory or principles to their microteaching. Dewey originally defined reflection as "active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or practice in light of the reasons that support it and the further consequences to which it leads" (Stanely, 1998). Amoi (2005) stated that reflective practice is to "revisit the sequence of one's teaching for the purpose of making thoughtful judgment and decisions about improved ways of acting in the future." There was no comment showing that the participants revisited the sequence of their teaching when reflecting. In these respects, the reflection of the participants in the present study did not achieve the original purpose of reflective practice and was short in quality.

## V. CONCLUSION

In the study of undergraduate students' reflective practice ability, the undergraduate students were equipped with general ability to analyze their teaching and find ways to improve teaching in the future. However, given the result that more than 70 % of regret reflective comments were generated in the data sets, it is important to make a caution when

training prospective teachers through microteaching and reflective practice. As stated in Stanely (1998), pain while reflecting may hinder prospective teachers' learning in reflection. The participants may have experienced pain, guilty, or self-doubt since they expressed regrets for their microteaching. Reflection is "a difficult process because it requires critical thought, self-direction, and problem solving coupled with personal knowledge and self-awareness" (Chant et al., 2004, p. 25).

The number of comments in the interviews was three times more in the interview than in the reflective journals. The quality of reflective comments did not reach satisfying level, especially in their reflective journals. The comments were less specific and more emotional comments appeared. On the other hand, reflective comments in the stimulated-recall interviews were more specific in content than those in the reflective journals. However, even in the stimulated-recall interviews, there was a limitation in quality because there was no comment examining participants' teaching beliefs in and assumptions about language learning and teaching. In order to help preservice teachers develop into reflective practitioners, reflective practice has to be fostered from the early stage of training (Lee, 2007). Teaching experience does not guarantee the ability to reflect on their teaching if they are not appropriately trained.

Microteaching can be used as an alternative to field-based experience in teacher education in Korea. Microteaching may help prospective teachers develop more useful and rigorous ways of performing and reflecting professionally before they face the overwhelming complexity of real classrooms. However, microteaching itself may not provide appropriate opportunities to develop into effective teachers throughout the whole teaching profession. Reflective practice need to be included in microteaching.

I make some suggestions based on the results of undergraduate students' reflection on microteaching. Students need to be carefully supervised regarding how to reflect and what to reflect on microteaching. First, the concept of reflection should be explained before undergraduate students engage in reflection. Second, for reflection experience not to be painful and self-doubted, it is advisable for students to keep a balance between positive reflective comments and negative reflective comments. Third, teacher educators need to provide students with inventory about reflection areas so that students can widely reflect, not reflect on small areas. Inventory should include such areas as examining teaching beliefs and assumptions on language teaching and reexamining whether individual activities achieve lesson objectives in order to analyze their microteaching comprehensively. Fourth, microteaching should be videotaped so that students can review their teaching alone or with a course instructor later. The participants in the present study mentioned they did not remember their microteaching when finishing it. To help them reflect on their microteaching, microteaching videotaping is necessary. Fifth, students need to specifically find multiple reasons and alternatives in teaching, and the consequences of

alternative decisions. Last, we need to guide students to write a reflective journal thoroughly and include the reflective journal in the microteaching final grade.

In order to obtain more complete knowledge about effectiveness of microteaching and reflective practice among undergraduate students in Korea, I suggest more than one microteaching session be included in research to see whether reflective practice is indeed effective. Furthermore, it is needed to investigate how undergraduate students feel and respond to reflective practice on microteaching from students' perspectives.

## REFERENCES

Adler, S. (1991). The reflective practitioner and the curriculum of teacher education. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 17*(2), 139-150.

Amobi, F. A. (2005). Prospective teachers' reflectivity on the sequence and consequences of teaching actions in a microteaching experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(1), 115-130.

Bartlett, L. (1990). Teacher development through reflective teaching. In J. C. Richards & D. Nunan (Eds.), *Second language teacher education* (pp. 202-214). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Benton-Kupper, J. (2001). The microteaching experience: Student perspectives. *Education, 121*(4), 830-835.

Chant, R. H., Heafner, T. L., & Bennett, K. R. (2004). Connecting personal theorizing and action research in prospective teacher development. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 32*(1), 25-42.

Cruickshank, D. R., Kennedy, J. J., Williams, E. J., Holton, J., & Fay, D. E. (1981). Evaluation of reflective teaching outcomes. *Journal of Educational Research, 75*(1), 26-32.

El-Dib, M. (2007). Levels of reflection in action research: An overview and an assessment tool. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 24-35.

Fernández M. L., & Robinson, M. (2006). Perspective teachers' perspectives on microteaching lesson study. *Education, 127*(2), 203-215.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 11*(1), 33-49.

Kim, Kyung Ja. (2006). The beliefs about language learning of Korean college students and their teachers of English. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 12*(3), 1-24.

Kim, Tae-Eun. (2007). Exploring teachers' beliefs and knowledge about English writing and their writing instruction in ESL context. *English Language & Literature*

*Teaching, 13*(4), 87-108.

Lee, I. (2007). Preparing prospective English teachers for reflective practice. *ELT Journal, 61*(4), 321-329.

Metcalf, K. K., Hammer, M. A. R., & Kahlich, P. A. (1996). Alternatives to field-based experiences: The comparative effects of on-campus laboratories. *Teaching & Teacher Education, 12*(3), 271-283.

Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond training: Perspectives on language teacher education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1996). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stanley, C. (1998). A framework for teacher reflectivity. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*(3), 584-591.

Valli, L. (1997). Listening to other voices: A description of teacher reflection in the United States. *Peabody Journal of Education, 72*(1), 67-88.

Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Examples in: English**
**Applicable Language: English**
**Applicable Levels: Tertiary**

Jiwon Paek
Institute of Foreign Language Education
The Catholic University of Korea
43-1 Yeokgok 2-dong, Wonmi-gu,
Bucheon-si, Gyeonggi-do, 420-743
Tel: (02) 2164-4884
Email: jwpaek@catholic.ac.kr

Received in July, 2008
Reviewed in August, 2008
Revised version received in September, 2008