The Reflectivity of EFL Preservice Teachers in Microteaching Practice

Eunjeong Park ID
Sunchon National University, Suncheon Jeonnam, South Korea

Abstract. Microteaching as a teaching practice helps preservice teachers develop their teaching and restructure their pedagogical schemes through reflection and feedback, particularly in teacher education. In particular, critical reflection helps preservice teachers describe their instructional experiences and perceptions and analyze what they have learned from those experiences. The study aimed to investigate how English as a foreign language (EFL) preservice teachers implement and reflect on their teaching performance in microteaching activities. The participants were 22 Korean EFL preservice teachers at a college of education. Grounded in Amobi's (2005) conceptual framework of microteaching reflectivity, the preservice teachers' self-reflection on microteaching and peer feedback checklists were collected and analyzed. Content analysis was used for data analysis. The findings revealed that the participants' teaching practice had a range of reflectivity patterns of describing, informing, conforming, and reconstructing. This study also found that the participants made progress through microteaching practice. The pedagogical implications of these results encompass the usefulness of microteaching in three groups of preservice teachers, teacher educators, and institutions.

Keywords: microteaching; preservice teachers; reflective practice; reflectivity; teacher education

1. Introduction
Teacher education in English as a foreign language (EFL) context is a field in which innovation and change should progress, along with a focus on bridging theory and practice (Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Savić, 2019). According to Johnson (2013), "what is learned will be fundamentally shaped by how it is learned" (p. 75); therefore, quality teacher education programs for preservice teachers' innovative and reflective practice are crucial.

Applying microteaching could be an avenue to bridge theory and practice and expand reflective teaching in teacher education. It encourages preservice teachers to connect pedagogical concepts with practice, and develop their concepts of

learning, teaching and professional expertise (Savić, 2019). Microteaching also supports preservice teachers making their teaching behaviour effective and reflective (Amobi & Irwin, 2009).

Hence, preservice teachers need to appreciate their learning and experience from varied perspectives and stay broad-minded in accordance with "professional knowledge developed through effective reflective practice" (Loughran, 2002, p. 40). Reflection on pedagogical knowledge and experience is "a process of learning that starts during preservice training" (Savić, 2009, p. 169), which should persistently advance in teacher education.

Reflective practice through microteaching has long been highlighted in teacher education (Lane et al., 2014). Critical reflection helps preservice teachers describe instructional experiences and analyze what they learned from those experiences (Brookfield, 1995). In reflective practice, inquiries arise in accordance with classroom observations and pedagogical experiences (Cavanagh & Prescott, 2010), which are essential for integrating and making sense of self (Warin et al., 2006). Engaging in reflective practice requires explicit teaching modelling and constructive feedback to preservice teachers (Lane et al., 2014; Rodgers, 2002; Russell, 2005; Shoffner, 2008). Preservice teachers' understanding and application of teaching can be enhanced by thinking about why particular strategies are employed in a certain instructional context (Alger, 2006).

Although microteaching is widely used for preservice teachers' pedagogical and reflective practices across teacher education programs, little research has focused on how it influences their subsequent teaching behaviour (Amobi, 2005; Amobi & Irwin, 2009; Jay & Johnson, 2002). Furthermore, preservice teachers often experience difficulty implementing appropriate teaching methodologies and strategies (Yunus et al., 2010), developing innovative pedagogical practices (Gan, 2013), and modifying or restructuring their lessons during the process of microteaching. Consequently, it is crucial to investigate how EFL preservice teachers perform and reflect on teaching behaviour in microteaching practice. This study was guided by three research questions:
1) What are the recurring reflectivity themes in the preservice teachers' microteaching practice before and after microteaching?
2) What are the recurring themes of the preservice teachers' confronting activities of peers' evaluations in their microteaching practice?
3) How did the preservice teachers reconstruct their microteaching practice regarding reflectivity after microteaching?

2. Microteaching as Reflective Practice
Microteaching has been considered a crucial pedagogical and reflective tool in education (Courneya et al. 2008; Crumley & James, 2009; Kloet & Chugh, 2012). As a teaching tactic, microteaching dates to the 1960s. Allen and Eve (1968) coined and defined microteaching as a system of pedagogical practice that focuses on teaching behaviour and attitude in structured conditions. In 1961, a teacher education team under the direction of Dwight Allen at Stanford University developed a cycle of microteaching with the steps of "plan, teach, observe, re-

plan, re-teach and re-observe" (Brown 1976). This was modified by the University of Ulster to a three-stage model of "plan, teach and observe" (Higgins & Nicholl, 2003).

With the history of microteaching, Quinn (2000) explained it as "a small group activity that can be a potent tool for the acquisition of skills" (p. 388). Richards and Schmidt (2010) defined microteaching as "a technique used in the training of teachers, in which different teaching skills are practiced under carefully controlled conditions" (p. 365). Wallace (2010) explained it as "a training context in which a teaching situation has been reduced in scope and/or simplified in some systematic way" (p. 92).

Microteaching is a cycle of events with the performance of language skills teaching and classroom management. It enables preservice teachers to become cognizant of the values, attitudes, and assumptions about teaching and learning (I'anson et al., 2003). Amobi and Irwin (2009) supported microteaching' various strengths, such as practicing teaching skills, reflecting on teaching actions, and advancing teaching practice. For these reasons, microteaching is an essential element of teacher education programs for preservice teachers to simulate teaching in a classroom context.

Preservice teachers' reflective thinking may emerge by analyzing their teaching performance and eliciting inquiries through varied feedback. Amobi and Irwin (2009) maintained that microteaching is an insightful and reflective activity, as preservice teachers demonstrate micro-lessons to their instructor and peers, which is a replica of teaching, receive instant feedback from them, and have an opportunity to watch their performance through video recording. These help preservice teachers reflect on how they perform in their microteaching presentations.

The main components of implementing microteaching are self-analysis of video recording (Rich & Hannafin, 2008; VanLone, 2018; Zilka, 2020) and feedback (Ekşi, 2012; Kloet & Chugh, 2012; Prilop et al., 2021). First, self-analysis of teaching performance enables preservice and in-service teachers to gain insights into the cognitive and pedagogical aspects of teaching and the relationships between practice and theory (Rich & Hannafin, 2008). Videorecording practice lessons during teacher training and practicum bring about changes in preservice teachers' behaviour and affect their attitudes by promoting self-awareness, instructional development, and openness to teaching (Zilka, 2020).

Specifically, preservice teachers may be able to identify the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching performance in their microteaching videos. Zilka (2020) revealed that most preservice teachers in Israel were critical of themselves and tried to improve their teaching demonstrations by changing some procedural activities. VanLone (2018) also found that using video self-analysis helped preservice teachers monitor their teaching skill growth and apply them in a real classroom context.

Second, feedback is another important element in microteaching. It can be received from experts, such as teacher educators, professionals and researchers (Prilop et al., 2021), and peer cohorts (Ekşi, 2012; Kloet & Chugh, 2012).

Prilop et al. (2021) examined the effects of expert feedback to preservice teachers' classroom management skills in an online blended learning environment. The results showed that preservice teachers who received expert feedback improved their classroom room management skills compared to those who did not receive any feedback on their performance.

Preservice teachers can also receive feedback from their peers. Observing others' teaching performance is "a refreshing and insightful experience" (Donnelly & Fitzmaurice, 2011, p. 339) for preservice teachers. Donnelly and Fitzmaurice (2011) showed that observing others in a microteaching group allowed the participants to refine their performance in describing and differentiating characteristics for quality teaching. Discussions on microteaching became a learning environment where preservice teachers realized the importance of planning, constructing, and delivering lessons for student learning and engagement (Donnelly & Fitzmaurice, 2011).

Ekşi (2012) aimed at developing a constructivist approach in microteaching sessions for Turkish preservice teachers. The findings showed that the participants recognized the merits of peer feedback on their teaching practices. However, they were often reluctant to provide explicit feedback due to concerns about others' feelings. Moreover, the study revealed that teaching performance improved through a structured feedback form.

Kloet and Chugh's (2012) mixed-methods study also focused on the peer feedback of microteaching. A total of 10 microteaching peer evaluation forms drawn from a Canadian post-secondary education program were sampled and examined to identify how peer feedback forms may illustrate preservice teachers' perceptions of what constitutes 'good' teaching. The findings revealed that the participants were triggered to reflect on and modify their teaching behaviour after receiving peer feedback, to conform to projected expectations and exemplify the status as a 'good' teacher.

Based on the literature, this study encompassed the effectiveness of microteaching in the three domains of preservice teachers, teacher educators, and institutions.

3. Methodology
3.1. Participants and context
This study was a part of the "Materials and Methods in ELT" course at a medium-sized university in South Korea. A total of 22 preservice teachers took this course to obtain a second-degree teacher certification and become English language teachers in secondary schools. There were 15 females and seven males, and the participants' ages ranged between 21-28 years old. To recruit the participants, a convenience sampling method was used in this study.

This course was required for preservice teachers planning to take the national teacher certification exam after graduation. The main objective of the course is to provide prospective English teachers with a contemporary account of major trends in English language teaching (ELT) materials and methodology, designed especially for seniors in the Department of English Language Education.

3.2. Instructional procedures

The preservice teachers met weekly for 15 weeks, including the mandatory four-week practicum. During the practicum, the participants observed other English teachers' classrooms, prepared their lessons, and taught English in secondary schools. To prepare for the practicum, they learned how to write lesson plans and conduct microteaching. Therefore, two microteaching activities were provided to preservice teachers.

In the first microteaching activity, they prepared a micro-lesson for 10 minutes before the practicum, focusing on language skills such as listening/speaking or reading/writing. In the second microteaching activity, they implemented a 20-minute micro-lesson after the practicum, integrating four language skills.

These microteaching activities were graded by both instructors and peers. The grading checklist was distributed to the preservice teachers so that they could evaluate their peers' microteaching with feedback in both spoken and written registers.

3.3. Data collection

3.3.1. Self-reflection on microteaching

The preservice teachers were given the task of writing self-reflection on their microteaching practices. They wrote one-page self-reflection after the second microteaching practice. It consisted of three aspects: 1) the intention of the microteaching, 2) strengths and weaknesses of the microteaching, and 3) any changes if teaching the lesson again. This format was a replica of Amobi's (2005) post-analysis reflection.

3.3.2. Written peer feedback checklist

The preservice teachers were grouped into teams of three or four participants and assigned to evaluate their team members' first microteaching. While preservice teachers presented their microteaching, their peers put checkmarks in the relevant boxes of fifteen components, as shown in Figure 1. They also composed the strengths and improvements as general feedback about the presented microteaching.

PEER MICRO-TEACHING EVALUATION CHECKLIST

EVALUATION OF MICRO-TEACHING   DATE: _April 27, 2021_

YOUR NAME AS PEER EVALUATOR: _____

I HAVE OBSERVED _____ P.J. _____ 'S MICRO-TEACHING.   (listen/speak)

		Micro-teaching points	Check
	1	Reminding the previous lesson	✓
	2	Schema activation, motivation to learn (interesting)	✓
	3	Presenting the objectives of the lesson	✓
	4	Providing different skill-based activities	✓
	5	Groupwork/pair work (Individualized learning)	✓
	6	Interacting with peers and the teacher	✓
	7	Procedural learning (pre-, while-, post-activities)	✓
	8	Comprehension check, feedback, and compliment	✓
	9	Organization of the lesson (whole-individual-pair-group)	✓
	10	Wrap-up (formative assessment) and giving homework	✓
	11	Use of materials	✓
	12	Accurate pronunciation (accuracy) and fluency	✓
	13	Neat hand-writing on the blackboard	✓
	14	Eye contact, voice, speed, gesture (Nonverbal communication)	✓
	15	Time management (Intro, pre-, while-, post-, wrap-up)	✓

General Comment	
Good	**Improvement**
fluent speaking comprehension check Fill-the blank activity / Info card activity gesture natural ✻ Modelling – perfect!	font size – small (한글) voice should be louder (Hawalut~ How do you like –) you should write on the b...

PEER MICRO-TEACHING EVALUATION CHECKLIST

EVALUATION OF MICRO-TEACHING   DATE: 2021.4.27.

YOUR NAME AS PEER EVALUATOR: _____

I HAVE OBSERVED _____ 'S MICRO-TEACHING.

		Micro-teaching points	Check
	1	Reminding the previous lesson	✓
	2	Schema activation, motivation to learn (interesting)	✓
	3	Presenting the objectives of the lesson	✓
	4	Providing different skill-based activities	✓
	5	Groupwork/pair work (Individualized learning)	✓
	6	Interacting with peers and the teacher	✓
	7	Procedural learning (pre-, while-, post-activities)	✓
	8	Comprehension check, feedback, and compliment	✓
	9	Organization of the lesson (whole-individual-pair-group)	✓
	10	Wrap-up (formative assessment) and giving homework	✓
	11	Use of materials	✓
	12	Accurate pronunciation (accuracy) and fluency	✓
	13	Neat hand-writing on the blackboard	✓
	14	Eye contact, voice, speed, gesture (Nonverbal communication)	✓
	15	Time management (Intro, pre-, while-, post-, wrap-up)	✓

General Comment	
Good	**Improvement**
• Very confident, clear Pronunciation • Motivating student's interest using video • Help students relate to the lesson with their real life	

Figure 1: Samples of a peer feedback checklist

3.3.3. Framework for analyzing microteaching reflectivity

Amobi's (2005) conceptual framework of microteaching reflectivity was employed in this study. Amobi developed four stages of reflectivity: describe, inform, confront, and reconstruct. These categories originated from Smyth's (1989) work, but Amobi described that Smyth's components targeted teachers' concerns about the political and ethical issues underlying teaching, whereas Amobi's categories represented the progression of preservice teachers' reflectivity on the sequence and consequences of their microteaching. Thus, the present study followed Amobi's framework of the four stages of microteaching reflectivity described in Table 1:

Table 1: The four stages of microteaching reflectivity (Amobi, 2005, pp. 118-119)

Stage	Description
Describe	The stage of reflective thinking and planning of the micro-lesson. This *describing* stage includes: a. named or implied the teaching model selected for the micro-lesson, b. established the subject area or the content for the micro-lesson, c. identified the learning outcome(s) for the micro-lesson, d. presaged instructional procedures.
Inform	The stage of retrospective reflective thinking on the micro-lesson. This *informing* stage includes: a. reviewed the events of the lesson as taught, b. expressed positive perception of instructional performance, c. expressed mixed positive and negative perceptions of instructional performance, d. recalled first microteaching experience.
Confront	The stage of reflectivity beyond the preservice teacher's envisions of the micro-lesson and the inclusion of peers' voices about the lesson. This *confronting* stage includes: a. passive confronting, b. defensive confronting, c. affirmative confronting, d. self-critique confronting.
Reconstruct	The stage of reflective thinking of specific teaching actions that the preservice teachers developed and explicated. This *reconstructing* stage includes: a. no reconstructing, b. implicit reconstructing, c. explicit reconstructing.

Briefly, the four categories of microteaching reflectivity can converge toward three aspects, with specific questions (Amobi, 2005, p. 119):

1) Describe (*what did I intend to do in this micro-lesson?*),
2) Inform (*what did I do?*), and
3) Confront and reconstruct (*what would I do differently if I were to teach this micro-lesson again?*)

Amobi's (2005) framework of microteaching reflectivity was used to analyze the preservice teachers' reflective thinking and sequence and consequences of their instructional actions.

3.4. Data analysis

The data were analyzed using content analysis grounded in the qualitative research paradigm. Content analysis enables researchers to examine a large set of

data systematically, and discover the focus of various levels of individuals, groups, institutions and societies (Weber, 1990).

Directed content analysis was used in this study. It begins by identifying key concepts or themes as initial coding categories, using existing theories or previous research (Potter & Levine-Donnerstein, 1999). Thus, coding categories are predetermined based on prior research or existing theory. For instance, the content analysis of this study began coding immediately with the predetermined codes such as 'describe,' 'inform,' 'confront,' and 'reconstruct' to investigate preservice teachers' reflectivity on the sequence and consequences of microteaching practice.

3.5. Reliability
The reliability of the coding was assessed using the data analysis procedure. To obtain intercoder reliability, the data were provided to a graduate teaching assistant. The two coders shared predetermined codes and discussed how to determine preservice teachers' actions along with the codes. Then, they analyzed the data separately.
Intercoder reliability was checked by comparing the agreement and disagreement with the thematic occurrences of teaching actions. Cohen's Kappa statistics were calculated for intercoder agreements. The results yielded a 0.87 for the analyzed datasets. The reliability statistics range indicates a high level of intercoder reliability with the interpretation of Kappa between 0.81 to 1.00 (here, '1' indicates perfect agreement) (McHugh, 2012).

4. Findings
4.1. "Describing" themes in the pre-microteaching
The analysis of the preservice teachers' pre-microteaching sequencing entailed four describing reflectivity themes as the initial stage of reflectivity:
D(a). named or implied the teaching model selected for the micro-lesson,
D(b). established the subject area or the content for the micro-lesson,
D(c). identified the learning outcome(s) for the micro-lesson, and
D(d). presaged instructional procedures.

Each describing reflectivity theme appeared with 4 D(a), 20 D(b), 13 D(c), and 8 D(d), respectively, as shown in Table 2.
Describing reflectivity implies preservice teachers' decision-making on teaching models, content, learning outcomes, and instructional procedures of the microteaching (Amobi, 2005). Excluding two participants, all preservice teachers incorporated at least one describing reflectivity theme in their pre-microteaching activities. A further three preservice teachers featured all four describing themes, while others incorporated two to three themes of describing reflectivity. A preservice teacher (S20), who captured the four themes, described his lesson as follows:
> "*The targeted content was 'suit your taste', referring to one's preference*
> *(b). In this lesson, I wanted to involve skimming as a reading activity (a).*
> *So, the objective of the lesson was that students will be able to find the*
> *main idea of the text via skimming (c)... What I did was I explained the*

definition of 'skimming' (d), which is a speed reading method to find the gist, and how to skim the text" (S20, self-reflection on microteaching).

Most preservice teachers (except for two) established content in their teaching. However, only four people identified teaching models and methods in their teaching performance. Furthermore, less than half of the preservice teachers (n=8) conveyed clear instructions in their microteaching.

4.2. "Informing" themes in the post-microteaching

The following four informing reflectivity themes emerged through the content analysis:

I(a).   reviewed the events of the lesson as taught,
I(b).   expressed positive perception of instructional performance,
I(c).   expressed mixed positive and negative perceptions of instructional performance, and
I(d).   recalled first microteaching experience.

Each occurrence of informing reflectivity theme included 21 I(a), 19 I(b), 3 I(c), and 15 I(d) respectively, as presented in Table 2. Excluding one preservice teacher, the participants' post-microteaching yielded two or three informing activity themes. Informing reflectivity refers to "retrospective reflectivity thinking" (Amobi, 2005, p. 118) in the micro-lesson. Amobi described the informing reflectivity stage as revisiting one's microteaching. In this stage, preservice teachers reflect on their teaching actions and express whether their performance is either positive or negative. By self-reflecting on "what did I do?", preservice teachers may recall their previous microteaching performance.

Most of the preservice teachers reviewed their teaching actions and how they worked. For their post-microteaching, 19 preservice teachers expressed their microteaching performance as positive, whereas, three among them had a mixed feeling of positive and negative. The following are the perceptions of some preservice teachers' instructional performance related to informing reflectivity themes:

> *"I realized that I mispronounced some vocabulary in the first teaching demonstration. But, in the second time, I got more confidence in giving instruction in English"* (S4, self-reflection on microteaching).

> *"I think I made one-sided instruction at first, but I allocated the given time as I planned. With less anxiety, I was able to perform my teaching in the second round"* (S7, self-reflection on microteaching).

> *"There was a lack of interactions in the first microteaching. After recognizing the weakness, I applied different instructional strategies in my microteaching. So, I'm very satisfied with my performance"* (S10, self-reflection on microteaching).

> *"I thought I could make it, but it turned out that I was too scary and couldn't manage the time allotment. I am not that confident nor satisfied with my teaching performance. I need to work harder to make my microteaching better"* (S22, self-reflection on microteaching).

The last quote shows that S22 had some difficulty in a public presentation of her microteaching. Although it was her second trial, she was anxious and afraid of showing her presentation in front of others. Her case was critical because teaching performance was required for the completion of the undergraduate program and the acquirement of second-degree teaching certification. Eventually, she practiced more to reduce her anxiety about the public presentation of microteaching.

Table 2: Occurrences of the themes of describing and informing reflectivity

* Participants (N=22)	Describing Themes: D(a). named teaching models D(b). established content D(c). identified learning outcome(s) D(d). presaged instruction				Informing Themes: I(a). reviewed the events of the lesson I(b). expressed positive perception of instructional performance I(c). expressed mixed perceptions of instructional performance I(d). recalled first microteaching experience			
	D(a)	D(b)	D(c)	D(d)	I(a)	I(b)	I(c)	I(d)
S1		X				X		
S2	X	X	X		X	X		X
S3	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
S4							X	X
S5		X	X		X	X		X
S6		X	X	X	X	X		X
S7		X			X	X		X
S8		X	X		X	X		X
S9		X			X	X		X
S10		X	X	X	X	X		X
S11		X		X	X	X		
S12		X	X	X	X	X		X
S13		X	X		X	X		X
S14		X	X		X	X		X
S15		X			X	X		X
S16		X	X		X	X		
S17					X	X		X
S18		X	X		X	X		
S19	X	X	X	X	X		X	
S20	X	X	X	X	X	X		
S21		X		X	X	X		X
S22		X			X		X	
Occurrences	n=4	n=20	n=13	n=8	n=20	n=19	n=3	n=15

* S indicates 'student'.

4.3. "Confronting" themes in the preservice teachers' microteaching practice

Confronting reflectivity themes were based on how preservice teachers reacted to their peers' evaluations of their microteaching. For the confronting reflectivity themes, post-microteaching, peer feedback, and self-reflections were corroborated by data triangulation. In this stage, different voices are mingled to represent the consequences of microteaching.

Confronting reflectivity themes are listed as:

C(a). passive confronting,

C(b). defensive confronting,

C(c). affirmative confronting, and

C(d). self-critique confronting.

These confronting reflectivity themes are not exclusively distributed. These may occur coincidently. As shown in Table 2, the confronting reflectivity themes in this study comprised of seven different patterns:
(1) passive (7 occurrences),
(2) self-critique (5 occurrences),
(3) defensive (4 occurrences),
(4) affirmative (3 occurrences), and
(5) affirmative and self-critique (3 occurrences).

Amobi (2005) explained that the spectrum of confronting reflectivity extends to peers' voices about the consequences of teaching actions. According to Amobi, passive confronting represents preservice teachers' submissive compliance with peers' evaluations of teaching actions. Self-critique confronting refers to the appraisal of preservice teachers' teaching performance. Regardless of peer feedback, preservice teachers acknowledge their own teaching actions and identify their strengths and improvements in microteaching. Defensive confrontations embody rebuttals to peers' critiques of the teaching action. Participants justify their teaching performance by responding to peer feedback. Affirmative confronting indicates agreement with the peer feedback on teaching actions. The last pattern is the combination of affirmative and self-critique themes that seem to overlap considering the confronting reflectivity.

In this study, the passive confronting reflectivity theme was the most frequently occurring pattern (7 occurrences).
The preservice teachers demonstrated the passive pattern of confronting reflectivity as follows:

> "*I appreciate my peers who made comments on my microteaching. I didn't notice I used a lot of fillers while talking until my peer mentioned this*" (S5, self-reflection on microteaching).

> "*My peer critiqued the entire structure of my microteaching. She commented on the missing part, which was presenting the instructional objectives of the lesson. I admit that I forgot presenting them earlier*" (S16, self-reflection on microteaching).

> "*My peer said that there is no interaction with students in my lesson. Knowing from her, I found that I did my teaching as I did in my private institute. It's common to do one-sided teaching in the academy*" (S19, self-reflection on microteaching).

The self-critique reflectivity theme occurred five times.
Some of them are displayed:

> "*Reflecting on my microteaching, I think my lesson is a little monotonous and boring. If I had a chance to make another lesson, I could include various activities like games and pop songs. I also realized that it must be pretty difficult for the middle school students. I should have met the students' levels of English proficiency*" (S2, self-reflection on microteaching).

> *"I would divide the time evenly for each activity if I could do it again. I found that listening activities were dominant, and I skipped some steps of doing speaking activities"* (S9, self-reflection on microteaching).

> *"I watched the video of my microteaching. I felt shamed to watch it, but I did it because I really want to improve my teaching skills. I found too many mistakes and awkward situations in my microteaching. First, my hand-writing on the blackboard is a mess. Second, I used informal language such as "guys". Third, I murmured a lot. All of the poor performance made me feel ashamed, but next time I'll try to fix the issues that I made for my future teaching"* (S15, self-reflection on microteaching).

The four occurrences of the defensive reflectivity theme were found in the preservice teachers' self-reflection writing. The preservice teachers' defensiveness mostly originated from the misguided conception that microteaching is not authentic:

> *"My professor suggested doing gesture naturally, but it was very awkward to act naturally because there were no students while microteaching"* (S9, self-reflection on microteaching).

> *"In my microteaching, I skipped some parts but it wasn't real teaching. If I had students in real, the instruction could be more structured"* (S20, self-reflection on microteaching).

> *"I got a comment from my peer that I should first provide several examples and then the grammar rule. I understand giving examples is important, but I wanted to give clear instruction of the grammar rule so that my students have a clear sense of what is taught"* (S21, self-reflection on microteaching).

Regarding the last reflectivity theme, the affirmative and affirmative-critique themes were shown with three occurrences of each.
Each representative example is presented as:

> *"I've got a lot of confidence as I did microteaching several times"* (S6, self-reflection on microteaching).

> *"In the second microteaching, I think my teaching got improved a lot. I think the structure of the lesson was good. But, I think I failed to meet the students' proficiency levels"* (S12, self-reflection on microteaching).

Overall, all four confronting reflectivity themes were revealed by content analysis. Self-critique reflectivity themes (with the combination of three affirmative cases) occurred more frequently than other themes. Passivity (7 occurrences) and affirmativeness (6 occurrences) were found in similar proportions. The defensive themes occurred the least in the confronting reflectivity.

4.4. Preservice teachers' reconstruction of their teaching activities in the post-microteaching

The final sequence of teaching performance was the reconstructing reflectivity. Reconstructing reflectivity themes can emerge as preservice teachers modify their

teaching actions in post-microteaching. Amobi illustrated that the responses of the reconstructing reflectivity were elicited by any change in teaching actions through peer evaluations or self-critiques.

Its types include:
R(a). no reconstructing,
R(b). implicit reconstructing, and
R(c). explicit reconstructing.

The results of the reconstructing reflectivity themes are presented in Table 3. According to Amobi, no reconstructing indicates that there is no alternative teaching performance in post-microteaching, despite peers' evaluations in the second round. Amobi (2005) explained that the pattern of no reconstructing may represent "complete satisfaction with their microteaching performance" (p. 123). In this study, however, two occurrences of no reconstructing reflectivity had no intention or effort to modify their teaching actions. Thus, they did not share any thoughts or comments on reconstructing reflectivity. Interestingly, these two preservice teachers had a pattern of defensive confronting reflectivity.

The second theme of implicit reconstructing reflectivity was characterized by the preservice teachers' speculations of peers' evaluations and obscure teaching actions. They acknowledged the need for change, but they did not fully enact their actions in post-microteaching.

A total of ten occurrences showed implicit reconstructing reflectivity in post-microteaching. Among them, several preservice teachers stated:

> "…especially, I need to do eye contact with people in front of me. I know that my gesture is very awkward when I present my teaching" (S8, self-reflection on microteaching).

> "I need to get my students' attention because interacting with them is important… I should speak more accurately" (S14, self-reflection on microteaching).

Explicit reconstructing reflectivity was evidently characterized by preservice teachers' alternative teaching performance in post-microteaching. Furthermore, they implemented their teaching performance as if it occurred in a real classroom context. A total of 10 preservice teachers executed their microteaching with explicit reconstructing reflectivity. Similar to Amobi's (2005) findings of explicit reconstructing reflectivity, the participants explicitly showed diagnostic patterns of reflecting their teaching actions. Some examples of quotes are as follows:

> "I received the feedback from my peer that giving chocolate as incentive may be sensitive depending on some contexts. And I agree with her. So, this time, I thought about different things such as giving stickers as incentive. Giving stickers to those who did well work quite well. It was very smooth in my second microteaching, so I'm very satisfied with it" (S6, self-reflection on microteaching).

> "My professor and peers said my English pronunciation is good, but my gesture was awkward. That's because I thought it's not real teaching at

first. However, in the second time, I changed my mindset that it's real teaching. Surprisingly but happily, I found my teaching style got more natural…" (S10, self-reflection on microteaching).

"I had some difficulty writing neatly on the board. But, I practiced writing, and I got some compliments from my professor in the second microteaching… I also got the comment of my low voice at first. I tried to raise my voice, and I'm satisfied with my louder voice in the second time" (S15, self-reflection on microteaching).

Table 3: Corresponding occurrences of the themes of confronting and reconstructing reflectivity

* Participants (*N*=22)	Confronting Themes: C(a). passive confronting C(b). defensive confronting C(c). affirmative confronting C(d). self-critique confronting				Reconstructing Themes: R(a). no reconstructing R(b). implicit reconstructing R(c). explicit reconstructing			Confronting Reflectivity Clusters
	C(a)	C(b)	C(c)	C(d)	R(a)	R(b)	R(c)	
S1			X	X			X	Affirmative-Self-critique
S2				X		X		Self-critique
S3				X			X	Self-critique
S4	X					X		Passive
S5	X					X		Passive
S6			X				X	Affirmative
S7				X			X	Self-critique
S8				X		X		Self-critique
S9		X					X	Defensive
S10			X				X	Affirmative
S11		X			X			Defensive
S12			X	X			X	Affirmative-Self-critique
S13	X						X	Passive
S14			X			X		Affirmative
S15				X			X	Self-critique
S16	X					X		Passive
S17			X	X			X	Affirmative-Self-critique
S18	X					X		Passive
S19	X					X		Passive
S20		X			X			Defensive
S21		X				X		Defensive
S22	X					X		Passive
Occurrences	*n*=7	*n*=4	*n*=6	*n*=8	*n*=2	*n*=10	*n*=10	

There was a seemingly positive relationship between affirmative/self-critique confronting and explicit reconstructing reflectivity, as shown in Table 3. A further eight participants aligned sequence of self-critique confronting and explicit reconstructing reflectivity. However, passive and/or defensive confronting reflectivity did not correspond to no reconstruction. This may indicate that the preservice teachers tried to reconstruct their teaching demonstrations regardless of passivity or defensiveness.

5. Discussion

In the *describing* stage of reflective thinking and planning of the micro-lesson, 20 out of 22 preservice teachers established the subject area and the content for their micro-lessons. However, only four preservice teachers presented a specific teaching model for their microteaching. Less than half of the participants gave instructions in the describing stage. The participants were too focused on content, with little consideration for teaching models or frameworks. This may indicate that the preservice teachers were not strategic in designing their micro-lessons and had little knowledge of instructional and theoretical underpinnings of teaching. Another reason could be that they considered microteaching as a pedagogical exercise on the continuum of apprenticeship. However, even during the preparation stage, preservice teachers should acknowledge the alignment of teaching components and integrate learned knowledge and skills from their coursework in the development of teaching competency (Jita, 2018).

Stoynoff (1999) suggests that microteaching experiences should be structured in a way that the knowledge and teaching are effectively integrated. Preservice teachers tend to rely on their personal experiences and common sense in developing teaching skills despite the vitality of theoretical and pedagogical knowledge (Sağlam, 2007, as cited in Mutlu, 2014). The effective integration of theoretical knowledge and pedagogical skills should be achieved through the enhancement of quality teacher preparation programs.

In the *informing* reflectivity stage, through revisiting of microteaching, preservice teachers had opportunities to reflect on their teaching performance. The reflective inquiry "what did I do" produced a positive outcome. Although not all participants expressed their microteaching performance positively, the majority perceived it as a productive teaching experience. These findings are similar to many other studies on microteaching (e.g., Courneya et al., 2008; Crumley & James, 2009; Kloet & Chugh, 2012), including Amobi's (2005) seminal work. They confirmed that microteaching functions well as reflection-for-action (Farrell, 2013; Olteanu, 2017; Ruys et al., 2012) and reflection-on-action (Marcos et al., 2009; Schön, 1987).

The former refers to the power of instructional planning, providing preservice and inservice teachers with the choices for instructional materials and methodologies based on their prior experiences of teaching and learning. Thus, reflection-for-action through microteaching is effective and useful in increasing content quality in teaching situations (Olteanu, 2017). Reflection-on-action comprises domains of research (validated knowledge construction), teacher education/dissemination (knowledge sharing), and practice (professional knowledge development) (Marcos et al., 2009). Acknowledging its domains, preservice teachers will be equipped with well-established sequences of teaching practice.

In the *confronting* reflectivity stage, the participants' affirmative/self-critique confronting reflectivity was positively correlated with explicit reconstructing. It is obvious that positive manners and self-critiques lead to better performance in enactment. Hall's (2020) ethnographic study revealed that self-critiquing

enhanced preservice teachers' reflective practice. With the development of technology, recent studies focusing on preservice teachers have evidenced self-critiquing to improve teaching practice (Rich & Hannafin, 2008; VanLone, 2018; Zilka, 2020).

An increasing number of preservice teachers tend to video record their microteaching, and video recordings have become useful in self-critiquing and reflecting on their teaching behaviour. Rich and Hannafin (2008) found the practicality of using video recordings to highlight preservice teachers' pedagogical and instructional concerns, actions, reasoning, and reflection. When they self-analyze or self-critique their microteaching, preservice teachers happen to realize what has been going wrong or what needs to change for future practice. VanLone (2018) also argued that self-critiquing enables preservice teachers to consider how to interweave instruction, practice opportunities, and performance feedback throughout the microteaching procedure. Zilka's (2020) perspective is similar as self-critiquing from microteaching brings about a change in the teaching behaviour of preservice teachers to endorse self-awareness, openness, and development. Briefly, self-critiquing confronting reflectivity enables preservice teachers to reflect on their teaching practices and restructure the teaching sequence in their performance.

6. Conclusion

This study investigated preservice teachers' reflective thinking with the categories of describing, informing, conforming, and reconstructing reflectivity patterns based on Amobi's (2005) framework. The findings highlight the importance of the alignment of teaching components and sequences, the integration of theoretical knowledge and pedagogical skills, and the development of the abilities to self-analyze and self-critique through video recording and tolerate feedback from others.

Regarding the findings, this study draws pedagogical implications for three levels: preservice teachers, teacher educators, and institutions. First, preservice teachers should be able to take opportunities to demonstrate and reflect on their microteaching to integrate theoretical knowledge into their pedagogical teaching skills in the classroom setting. Second, for teacher educators, microteaching sessions should become the opportunity to gain insights into their roles and prospects as effective professional guides to preservice teachers by engaging in productive dialogues with them. Third, postsecondary institutions should fully support both preservice teachers and teacher educators to develop successful programs or sessions of microteaching by providing physically affordable spaces, equipment, and financial provisions.

This study had limitations regarding generalizability. The participants were sampled using the purposive sampling method because the aim of the research was to examine reflective practice through microteaching, specifically targeting the EFL preservice teachers. Therefore, the results of this study may not be generalizable. However, they can be utilized and examined in other contexts with other populations of preservice teachers.

Overall, this study can contribute to the field of teacher education by providing insights on how to navigate various ways of promoting preservice teachers' reflectivity in microteaching. Teacher education programs should seek to train productive and reflective teachers by offering opportunities to connect theoretical knowledge and pedagogical practice. Teacher educators must inquire about preservice teachers' varied patterns of reflectivity that could foster the development of best teaching practices.

7. References

Alger, C. (2006). 'What went well, what didn't go so well': Growth of reflection in pre-service teachers. *Reflective Practice, 7*, 287-301.

Allen, D. W., & Eve, A. W. (1968). Microteaching. *Theory into Practice, 7*, 181-185.

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

Amobi, F. A., & Irwin, L. (2009). Implementing on-campus microteaching to elicit preservice teachers' reflection on teaching actions: Fresh perspective on an established practice. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 9*(1), 27-34.

Brookfield, S. D. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. Jossey-Bass.

Brown, G. (1976). Microteaching: A programme of teaching skills. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 24*(2), 180.

Courneya, C., Pratt, D. D., & Collins, J. (2008). Through what perspective do we judge the teaching of peers? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 69-79.

Crumley, H., & James, D. (2009). Lessons from graduate student instructors on peer review of teaching. *Journal of Faculty Development, 23*(2), 25-29.

Donnelly, R., & Fitzmaurice, M. (2011). Towards productive reflective practice in microteaching. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 48*(3), 335-346.

Ekşi, G. (2012). Implementing an observation and feedback form for more effective feedback in microteaching. *Education and Science, 37*(164), 267-282.

Farrell, T. S. (2013). Reflecting on ESL teacher expertise: A case study. *System, 41*(4), 1070-1082.

Gan, Z. (2013). Learning to teach English language in the practicum: what challenges do non-native ESL student-teachers face. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 38*(3), 92-108.

Hall, J. M. (2020). A self-critique of facilitating dialogic reflective practice with novice teachers. *Reflective Practice, 21*(5), 672-685. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2020.1798920

Higgins, A., & Nicholl, H. (2003). The experiences of lecturers and students in the use of microteaching as a teaching strategy. *Nurse Education in Practice, 3*(4), 220-227. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1471-5953(02)00106-3

I'anson, J., Rodrigues, S., & Wilson, G. (2003). Mirrors, reflections and refractions: The contribution of microteaching to reflective practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 26*(2), 189-199. https://doi.org/10.1080/0261976032000088729

Jay, J. K., & Johnson, K. L. (2002). Capturing complexity: A typology of reflective practice for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(1), 73-85.

Jita, T. (2018). Exploring pre-service teachers' opportunities to learn to teach science with ICTs during teaching practice. *Journal of Education, 71*, 73-89. http://dx.doi.org/10.17159/2520-9868/i71a05

Johnson, K. E. (2013). Innovation and change in teacher education. In K. Hyland & L. Wong (Eds.), *Innovation and change in English language education* (pp. 75-89). Taylor & Francis.

Kloet, M. A., & Chugh, B. P. (2012). An interdisciplinary analysis of microteaching evaluation forms: How peer feedback forms shape what constitutes "good teaching". *Educational Research and Evaluation*, *18*(6), 597-612.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Lane, R., McMaster, H., Adnum, J., & Cavanagh, M. (2014). Quality reflective practice in teacher education: a journey towards shared understanding. *Reflective Practice*, *15*, 481-494. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.900022

Loughran, J. (2002). Effective reflective practice: In search of meaning in learning about teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *53*(1), 33-43.

Marcos, J. J. M., Miguel, E. S., & Tillema, H. (2009). Teacher reflection on action: What is said (in research) and what is done (in teaching). *Reflective Practice*, *10*(2), 191-204. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14623940902786206

McHugh, M. L. (2012). Interrater reliability: The kappa statistic. *Biochemia Medica*, *22*(3), 276-282.

Mutlu, G. (2014). Challenges in practicum: Pre-service and cooperating teachers' voices. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *5*(36), 1-7.

Olteanu, C. (2017). Reflection-for-action and the choice or design of examples in the teaching of mathematics. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, *29*(3), 1-19. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s13394-017-0211-9

Potter, W. J., & Levine-Donnerstein, D. (1999). Rethinking validity and reliability in content analysis. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *27*, 258-284.

Prilop, C. N., Weber, K. E., & Kleinknecht, M. (2021). The role of expert feedback in the development of pre-service teachers' professional vision of classroom management in an online blended learning environment. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *99*, 1-12.

Quinn, F. M. (2000). *Principles and practice of nurse education* (4th ed.). Stanley Thrones Publishers.

Rich, P. J., & Hannafin, M. J. (2008). Decisions and reasons: Examining preservice teacher decision-making through video self-analysis. *Journal of Computing in Higher Education*, *20*(1), 62-94.

Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (Eds.). (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Rodgers, C.R. (2002). Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. *Teachers College Record*, *104*, 842-866.

Russell, T. (2005). Can reflective practice be taught? *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, *6*, 199-204.

Ruys, I., Van Keer, H., & Aelterman, A. (2012). Examining pre-service teacher competence in lesson planning pertaining to collaborative learning. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *44*(3), 349-379.

Sağlam, G. (2007). *Perceived roles, responsibilities and challenges of CT's in the procedure of teaching practice course in practicum*. Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey. https://hdl.handle.net/11511/17205

Savić, V. (2019). Innovation in preservice English language teacher education: Applying microteaching to develop effective reflective practice. In J. L. Vodopivec (Ed.), *Innovative teaching models in the system of university education: Opportunities,*

challenges and dilemmas (pp. 77-89). University of Kragujevac, University of Primorska.

Schön, D. A. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. Jossey-Bass.

Shoffner, M. (2008). Informal reflection in pre-service teacher education. *Reflective Practice*, *9*, 123-134.

Smyth, J. (1989). Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *40*, 2-9.

Stoynoff, S. (1999). The TESOL practicum: An integrated model in the U.S. *TESOL Quarterly*, *33*(1), 145-151.

VanLone, J. (2018). *The effects of video self-analysis on pre-service teachers' use of behavior specific praise*. University of Connecticut. https://opencommons.uconn.edu/dissertations/1945

Wallace, M. J. (2010). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Warin, J., Maddock, M., Pell, A., & Hargreaves, L. (2006). Resolving identity dissonance through reflective and reflexive practice in teaching. *Reflective Practice*, *7*(2), 233-245.

Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Yunus, M. M., Hashim, H. Ishak, N. M. & Mahamod, Z. (2010). Understanding TESL PTs' teaching experiences and challenges via post-practicum reflection forms. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 722-728.

Zilka, G. C. (2020). Openness and development or self-criticism of preservice teachers watching videos of themselves teaching a lesson. *Review of European Studies*, *12*(4), 1-11. https://doi.org/10.5539/res.v12n4pl