

Students' and Instructors' Attitudes towards Peer Teaching Component in ELT Courses

Farhad Aliaskari

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
English Language Teaching

Eastern Mediterranean University
January, 2017
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Mustafa Tümer
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev
Chair, Department of Foreign
Language Education

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Mater of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1.Assoc. Prof. Dr. Naciye Kunt

2.Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

3.Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan

ABSTRACT

The present study attempted to investigate into the students' and the instructors' attitudes towards the 'peer teaching' component in the Department of Foreign Language Education of Eastern Mediterranean University. In addition, aims to identify the students' and instructors' suggestions regarding how the quality of the peer-teaching component can be improved.

The participants of the present study comprised two groups which are thirty-three third and fourth year undergraduate ELT students and the six instructors in the department. In order to collect the data for the study, a set of four instruments were used, including student questionnaire, instructor questionnaire, interviews with students, and interviews with instructors.

The results of the data analyses indicated that both the students and the instructors expressed positive attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT teacher education programs held at the EFL Department of EMU. The results of the study also indicated that the instructors and students were aware of the benefits that peer-teaching would have for ELT teacher education programs and for the students' future teaching careers. The participants also mentioned some suggestions as to how to enhance the micro-teaching component of ELT courses.

Overall, based on the results of the study, it can be concluded that ELT peer-teaching has been successful in proving itself as an effective instructional strategy in the eyes of both students and their instructors. However, based on the suggestion that students

and instructors have made, some improvements can be done to enhance the micro-teaching component of ELT courses.

Further, in the present study, some implications and suggestions for further research on attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT teacher education programs are made to guide other researchers who are willing to conduct research in this area.

Keywords: peer-teaching, teacher education programs, students' attitudes, instructors' attitudes

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü'ndeki öğrenci ve öğretim elemanlarının arkadaş öğretimine karşı tutumlarını incelemektedir. Ayrıca, öğrenci ve öğretim elemanlarının arkadaş öğretiminin iyileştirilmesine yönelik önerilerini de belirlemeyi hedeflemektedir.

Bu çalışmaya katılanlar, 33 Yabancı Diller Eğitimi Bölümü üçüncü ve dördüncü sınıf öğrencisi ve Bölüm'deki altı öğretim elemanı olmak üzere iki gruptan oluşmaktadır. Bu çalışma için veri toplamak amacıyla, öğrenci anketi, öğretim elemanı anketi, öğrencilerle görüşmeler ve öğretim elemanları ile görüşmeler olmak üzere dört yöntem kullanılmıştır.

Veri analiz sonuçları, hem öğrencilerin hem de öğretim elemanlarının 'arkadaş öğretimi' ile ilgili tutumlarının olumlu olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca, çalışmanın sonuçları, öğrencilerin ve öğretim elemanlarının arkadaş öğretiminin yararları konusunda farkındalıklarının bulunduğunu da göstermektedir.

Genel olarak, çalışmadan elde edilen sonuçlara dayanarak, hem öğrencilere hem de öğretim elemanlarına göre İngiliz dili öğretiminde 'arkadaş öğretimi' yönteminin etkili olduğu sonucuna varılabilir. Ancak, öğrenci ve öğretim elemanlarının sunmuş oldukları önerilere bakılırsa, İngiliz dili öğretimi derslerindeki 'arkadaş öğretimi' kısmı bazı iyileştirmelerledaha da etkili hale getirilebilir.

Ayrıca, bu çalışmada, ileride hazırlanacak olan İngiliz dili öğretimi öğretmen yetiştirme programlarında bulunan ‘arkadaş öğretimi’ ögesine karşı tutum belirleme çalışmaları için bazı önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar kelimeler: Arkadaş öğretimi, öğretmen yetiştirme programları, öğrenci tutumları, öğretim elemanı tutumları

To my dearest mother,

Who is always there for me

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

It has been a long and challenging process and I am grateful to those who have supported me throughout the whole process of my thesis.

Foremost, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my family, specially my mother for her endless encouragement and support. I want to truly thank you mother for being there for me throughout my whole life and whenever I needed you. I would also like to express my appreciation to my father who never let me give up throughout my whole adventure. Last but not least, a special thank to you my dear sister for all the support and encouragement you provided throughout this process. I hope I have made you all proud.

With great pleasure I would also like to thank my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan who helped me throughout my thesis adventure. I am highly thankful for her patience, guidance, comments, feedback, support, and contribution she provided not only in my thesis adventure, but throughout the whole process of my English Language Teaching development.

I would also like to express my gratitude to the examining committee members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Naciye Kunt and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev, and all the instructors and the students of FLE Department of EMU who participated in my study and helped me to conduct the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATION.....	xiii
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem.....	2
1.3 Purpose of the Study.....	3
1.4 Research Questions.....	4
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	4
1.6 Summary.....	5
2 LITERATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Language Teacher Education Programs.....	6
2.2 Peer teaching in Language Teacher Education.....	9
2.2.1 Theory of Peer teaching.....	10
2.2.2 Practice of Peer teaching.....	13
2.3 Research Studies on Peer teaching.....	16
2.4 Summary	22
3 METHOD.....	23
3.1 Overall Research Design.....	23
3.2 The Context of the Study.....	25

3.3 Research Questions.....	27
3.4 Participants.....	27
3.4.1 ELT Students.....	27
3.4.2 Instructors.....	28
3.5 Data Collection Instruments.....	28
3.5.1 Student Questionnaire.....	29
3.5.2 Instructor Questionnaire.....	30
3.5.3 Student Interviews.....	32
3.5.4 Instructor Interviews.....	32
3.6 Data Collection Procedures.....	32
3.7 Piloting.....	33
3.8 Data Analysis.....	34
3.9 Summary.....	34
4 RESULTS.....	36
4.1 Results of the Student Questionnaire.....	36
4.1.1 Analysis of the Closed Items.....	36
4.1.2 Analysis of the Open-ended Questions.....	49
4.2 Results of the Student Interviews.....	54
4.3 Results of the Instructor Questionnaire.....	59
4.3.1 Analysis of the Closed Items.....	59
4.3.2 Analysis of the Open-ended Questions.....	70
4.4 Results of the Instructor Interviews.....	73
4.5 Summary.....	79
5 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION.....	81
5.1 Discussion of Results.....	81

5.1.1 Research Question 1: What Are the ELT Students’ Attitudes towards the Peer teaching Component in ELTE Courses?.....	81
5.1.2 Research Question 2: What are the ELT Instructors’ Attitudes towards the Peer teaching Component in ELTE Courses?.....	85
5.1.3 Research Question 3: What do the ELT Students and Instructors Suggest for the Improvement of the Peer teaching Component in ELTE Courses?.....	87
5.2 Conclusion.....	92
5.3 Implications for Practice.....	93
5.4 Limitations of the Study.....	95
5.5 Suggestions for Future Research.....	95
5.6 Summary.....	96
REFERENCES.....	98
APPENDICES.....	107
Appendix A: Student Questionnaire.....	108
Appendix B: Instructor Questionnaire.....	113
Appendix C: Student Interview Questions.....	119
Appendix D: Teacher Interview Questions.....	120

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Frequencies and descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) for responses in the student questionnaire	37
Table 4.2: Frequencies and descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) for responses in the instructor questionnaire	60

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EMU	Eastern Mediterranean University
L2	Second/ Foreign Language
ESL	English as a Second Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
FLE	Foreign Language Education

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter includes several sections. First, it presents the background of the study. Then, it proceeds to explain the statement of the problem. In the next section, it clarifies the purpose of the study. After this, the research questions are presented. Lastly, it explains the significance of the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

A long-established belief is that experience is the key to the English language teacher development, meaning that teachers learn to become more effective over years as they take more classes to teach (Wright & Beaumont, 2014). However, some scholars have recognized that it is not needed to push English teachers into the classroom and let them figure out for themselves how to manage the class. So, they began to design English Language teacher education programs which helped teachers be prepared for the chaos in advance (see Johnson, 2009; Tedick, 2013).

Effective teacher education programs attempt to give theoretical information and subject matter knowledge as well as providing opportunities for putting all this theoretical knowledge into practice (Korthagen & Kessels, 1999). More specifically, the teacher candidates are given such practice opportunities through peer teaching (i.e. microteaching) sessions in the departmental courses and practice teaching sessions in real school environment (Arsal, 2014; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011). Peer-teaching is a component of English Language teacher education programs in which student

teachers adopt the role of the teacher in the classroom so that they can practice their theoretical and experiential knowledge of how the second language (L2) is taught. They receive feedback on their practice from the instructor of the course and from their classmates (Ismail, 2011; Johnson & Golombek, 2011).

Researchers have found English Language teacher education a fruitful area for understanding the processes of instructed L2 acquisition better. Consequently, the research on the topic of teacher education programs proliferated in the last decades, with some volumes written on the subject (e.g., Johnson, 2009; Johnson & Golombek, 2011; Tedick, 2013; Wright & Beaumont, 2014) and some special issues of high-quality journals in the field devoted to the topic (e.g., TESOL Quarterly, Volume 32, Issue 3; Language Teaching Research, Volume 14, Issue 3). One area that researchers have focused on is peer-teaching. Researchers have come to the idea that getting students to take on teacher roles through peer teaching can help them in various ways such as, developing teaching skills, classroom management skills and autonomy (Allwright, 1988; Cotterall, 1995). In addition, peer teaching motivates students (i.e. candidate teachers) and gives them confidence about their future teaching career (Arsal, 2014). Furthermore, it can be argued that students and instructors should have a voice in designing the peer teaching component of English Language teacher education programs. In other words, their suggestions as to how the quality of the component can be improved should be taken into account by program designers and researchers (Yavuz & Topkaya, 2013).

1.2 Statement of the Problem

According to the previous studies (e.g., Assinder, 1991; Edge 1984; Ismail, 2011; Johnson, & Arshavskaya, 2011), the outcome of peer teaching in EFL teacher

education programs is mostly positive. Peer teaching is useful for teacher candidates to be prepared for their own classrooms and their future career (see Assinder, 1991; Johnson, & Arshavskaya, 2011). In addition, peer-teaching is believed to help prospective EFL teachers improve their proficiency in the English language (Assinder, 1991; Ismail, 2011). Therefore, if English language teaching programs do not provide students with enough opportunities to practice teaching through peer teaching or micro-teaching sessions, they cannot be expected to enhance their teaching and gain experience in teaching. So, considering the important role of the peer teaching component in English language teaching courses, providing enough micro-teaching opportunities for teacher candidates is deemed very important.

However, the reason for choosing to investigate the current topic is to find the students' and instructors' attitudes towards micro-teaching in this specific English Language teacher education program. This is of importance because attitudes towards teacher education programs have significant influences on the efficacy of these programs, helping/restraining the trainees in becoming skillful teachers (Alkharusi, Kazem & Al-Musawai, 2011). Further, this prescription means that student teachers and their instructors, particularly the former group, do not usually have a voice in how the peer-teaching component can be improved so that it would bear the best results for educating prospective EFL teachers (Gebhard, Gaitan, & Oprandy, 1987; Yavuz & Topkaya, 2013).

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the present study is to investigate into the students' and the instructors' attitudes towards the 'peer teaching' component in the Department of Foreign Language Education of Eastern Mediterranean University. More specifically,

the study aims to find out what difficulties or problems the students and the instructors have in peer teaching sessions as presented by them, whether or not they support the idea of peer teaching, and how they evaluate peer teaching component in ELTE courses. In addition, the study aims to identify the students' and instructors' suggestions and feedback as regards how the quality of the peer-teaching component can be improved.

1.4 Research Questions

As mentioned earlier, the main purpose of the study is to investigate the teacher candidates' and their instructors' attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT teacher education programs. So, the following three research questions have been formulated to serve the purpose of the study.

1. What are the ELT students' attitudes towards the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?
2. What are the ELT instructors' attitudes towards the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?
3. What do the ELT students and instructors suggest for the improvement of the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The findings of the study can have significance for both theory and practice in EFL teacher education. As far as the theoretical significance of the study is concerned, the findings of the study may contribute to our understanding of students' and instructors' attitudes towards the peer-teaching component in EFL teacher education programs. This point is of importance because the effectiveness of any teacher education program depends in part upon the attitudes that the participants in the program hold towards it

(Alkharusi et al. 2011). Furthermore, the study may contribute to increasing students' and instructors' awareness regarding the importance of micro-teaching component. The finding of the study may also help other researchers to make their contributions to the development of a framework for the peer-teaching component. Development of such a framework seems necessary for the implementation of the peer-teaching component in EFL teacher education programs (Assinder, 1991; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011). The framework can also set the ground for more studies on EFL peer-teaching in the future.

As far as practice of the peer-teaching component is concerned, the findings of the study may provide feedback to the students and the instructors regarding the effectiveness of peer teaching sessions, and therefore may encourage their participation in micro-teaching sessions. Moreover, the study is set to see whether the students and the instructors can propose suggestions as to how the quality of the peer-teaching component in ELT teacher education programs can be improved. These suggestions can be utilized by the designers to increase the outcomes of this component.

1.6 Summary

This chapter provided information about the background of the study, explained the reason for conducting the study, elaborated on the aim of the study, presented the research questions and finally, it discussed the significance of the study. The next chapter will review the related literature.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents literature review related to the study. After the discussion on language teacher education programs, the concept of peer-teaching is defined, and a brief history on the origin of this technique is presented. Furthermore, peer-teaching in EFL teacher education including theory of EFL peer-teaching, practice of EFL peer-teaching, and research studies on EFL peer teaching, is focused on.

2.1 Language Teacher Education Programs

Language teacher education has been appealing as an independent research subject for scholars in the last two decades. Of course, this issue was also of interest to researchers in “methods era” of 1970s and 1980s (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Many factors play significant roles in second language (L2) teacher education programs and the teacher is one of them. In fact, it can be claimed that the teacher is one of the most important variables that determine the success with which learners acquire the L2 given that he/she usually claims an authoritative stand in the classroom (Kanno & Stuart, 2011). Those involved in the second language pedagogy came to realize that teachers themselves had different levels of teaching expertise and special training should be designed for those with lower levels (Bernhardt & Hammadou, 1987; Freeman, 1989). This realization led to the development of second language teacher education programs. Further, it is believed that EFL teacher education programs are the place where communication between ESL theoreticians and practitioners can happen (Richards, 2008).

Second language teacher education programs are usually based on several grounds that emphasize why instructing pre-service and in-service teachers on the knowledge and skills of L2 teaching is deemed necessary. The first one emerges from the camp of L2 theorizing. According to Johnson (2009), these programs usually “operate under the assumption that it is necessary to provide teachers with discrete amounts of disciplinary knowledge, usually in the form of general theories and methods that are assumed to be applicable to any teaching context (p. 12). In other words, second language teacher education researchers contend that it is necessary for L2 teachers to have knowledge about a wide range of L2 factors (e.g., L2 teaching techniques, L2 learning processes, teacher role, learner role, cross-linguistic influences, etc.) and the best way for them to acquire such knowledge is to participate in second language teacher education programs.

Some researchers, however, reject this idea as the idea assumes an authoritative role for researchers while teachers have to apply whatever prescribed to them by these authorities in their classrooms without any variations. Such a perspective is particularly posed by the proponents of the ‘post-method’ pedagogy in language teaching and learning (e.g., Arıkan, 2006; Allwright, 2003; Kumaravadivelu, 2003, 2006). Allwright (2003) emphasizes that a teacher can undertake the roles of both the researcher and the practitioner at the same time in his classroom. Nonetheless, the proposition that L2 teachers can learn a lot from ELT teacher education programs has been supported by empirical investigations in the field (e.g., Harman, Ahn, & Bogue, 2016; Macalister, 2016; Peacock, 2009).

In addition, designers of L2 teacher education programs came to realize that they should reconsider the role of these teacher education programs. These designers

noticed that a large group of L2 teachers are unaware about the developments that were made in the related fields of psychology, linguistics, second language acquisition (SLA), and sociology. This unawareness was attributed to the fact that L2 teachers were usually unable to comprehend the discourse of scientific research. So, program designers incorporated modules into ELT teacher education programs to get ELT teachers become familiar with the theoretical advancements made in the related fields of study (Crandall, 2000; Yates & Muchisky, 2003). This in return encouraged researchers to focus more of their research attention on the investigation of ELT teachers programs to see whether these programs have been successful in preparing prospective ELT teachers.

Finally, the relationship between teacher education programs and theorizing is a two-way street. That is, not only does theorizing contribute to the design and development of ESL teacher education programs but also the programs can help L2 researchers construct more comprehensive theories of language pedagogy. This last point is particularly relevant to the area of peer-teaching in language teacher education programs because peer-teaching was initiated in the field as a response to the practical concerns in language teacher education and then became the subject of empirical studies.

Peer teaching (also known as microteaching) is one of the components of ELT teacher education programs that has attracted to the interest of ELT researchers in the last decades. Peer-teaching is a technique in which the teacher candidate adopts the role of the classroom teacher to teach to his/her classmates and receives feedback on his/her teaching from the instructor and the classmates. A good number of experimental studies on ELT peer-teaching have been undertaken in the last decades (Edge, 1984;

Ismail, 2011; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Seferoglu, 2006; Verity, 2011). In the next section, peer-teaching in language teacher education will be explained precisely.

2.2 Peer-teaching in language Teacher Education

The concept of peer-teaching (also known as *microteaching*) is somehow an innovation in the realm of EFL teacher education; however, some writings on the issue in the field of EFL teacher education can be traced back to 1990s (e.g., Assinder, 1991; Richards, 2008). In peer teaching, instead of the instructor, the students take the control of the class, prepare their own materials, and teach their peers. Putting students (i.e. candidate teachers) in control of the classroom teaching and management through peer teaching could make them responsible for what they are doing and it is useful for them in the whole process of learning to teach. Seen in this way, the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs can be effective in changing the direction of contemporary ELT teacher education from being teacher-centered to more student-centered (Nunan, 1996; Gardner and Miller, 1997, as cited in Spratt and Leung, 2000). In many instances it also promotes learner autonomy in the language classroom (Allwright, 1988; Cotterall, 1995).

As Richards (2008) argued, in the early years, EFL peer-teaching was thought to be strongly rooted in the concept of ‘teacher training’ which is more concerned with equipping EFL teachers with an effective repertoire of skills for teaching the L2, no matter whether student teachers have acquired the theoretical knowledge as to why particular techniques should be applied to particular EFL teaching contexts.

In the 1990s the practice versus theory distinction was sometimes resolved by distinguishing ‘teacher training’ from ‘teacher development’, the former being identified with entry-level teaching skills linked to a specific teaching context,

and the latter to the longer-term development of the individual teacher over time. Training involved the development of a repertoire of teaching skills, acquired through observing experienced teachers and practice-teaching in a controlled setting, for example through micro-teaching or peer-teaching. (p. 160)

However, so much has happened since 1990s with respect to both the research on and practice of EFL peer-teaching. Now, EFL peer teaching is usually considered useful and interesting for the student teachers and the outcome of peer teaching in English language teaching programs has usually been positive for the teacher candidates (Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Mennim, 2012; Spratt & Leung, 2000; Verity, 2011).

2.2.1 Theory of Peer teaching

In general, peer-teaching has been more motivated by practice concerns than research concerns (Assinder, 1991; Richards, 2008; Ten Cate & Durning, 2007). In fact, researchers too have begun to focus on this component of teacher education programs, especially because they have come to realize that peer-teaching is a good candidate for filling the divide between theory and practice in EFL teacher education programs. Johnson and Arshavskaya (2011) state, “the microteaching simulation, in which teacher candidates plan and teach “mini-lessons” in front of their peers as a component of a methodology course, has been the standard practice for bridging this theory/practice divide” (p. 168).

Microteaching has its roots in the concept of *mediation* which has been introduced by sociocultural school of education into the field of teacher education programs (Johnson, 2009; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Verity, 2011). According to the sociocultural theory, people learn an activity or skills when they are situated in a

context in which they have the opportunity to interact with other people (Lantolf, 1995, 2000). Two concepts are central to the sociocultural theory. The first one is Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). As defined by Lantolf (1995), ZPD is “the difference between what someone can do alone and what he or she can do with mediation” (p. 460). The second concept is the related to the distinction that is usually made between *novice* and *expert* in the sociocultural theory. The novice is the person who has less able to do an activity or perform a skill while the expert is someone who is more able to do the activity or perform the skill (Lantolf 2000).

Basing his arguments on Vygotsky’s (1980) notion of constructivism and scaffolded learning, the learning of an activity or skill happens when the social interaction occurs between a novice and his peer expert in which the novice received feedback and scaffolded help on his next level of ZPD from the peer expert. This is exactly what occurs in the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs (Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Verity, 2011). In the peer-teaching component of teacher education programs, the student teachers (novice) and the instructor (expert) become involved in social interaction through the program designed to train EFL teachers. In this way, the student teachers have to improve their EFL teaching skills through receiving scaffolded feedback to their EFL teaching practices from the instructors or the classmates so that they can move along the ZPD of EFL teaching development.

Another group of researchers have provided theoretical arguments on the benefits that the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs can have for prospective EFL teachers in their future profession. For instance, Tsui (2003) suggests that micro-teaching would provide EFL student teachers with opportunities to reflect upon their theoretical and experiential knowledge of how an L2 should be taught.

According to Akbari (2007), the importance of reflective teaching becomes highlighted when the EFL teacher “confronts a problem in the classroom while teaching” (p. 194). Peer-teaching would improve the teacher’s ability to reflect upon his teaching experiences and would make him more able to predict teaching problems even before they happen (Tsui, 2003). According to some researchers (e.g., Gunn, 2010; Yassaei, 2012), the improvement of the ability of reflection in student teachers is related to the lesson planning and classroom management skills because language teachers who are more reflective of their language teaching experiences and teaching challenges would be more able to handle their classrooms.

Similarly, discussing in the area of pedagogical English grammar, Verity (2011) argues that mediation tools in EFL teachers education programs would help MA TESOL students reanalyze their conceptions of what the EGP consists of and how best it can be taught to learners in their classrooms. This is an interesting point as it shows that the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs can be modularized so that different modules of peer-teaching component are designed for EFL teacher with particular needs. Thus, separate peer-teaching modules for different EFL skills (i.e., speaking, listening, writing, and reading) and for different EFL components (pronunciation, spelling, grammar, and vocabulary) can be designed for EFL teachers who have weaknesses in teaching these skills and components.

Researchers have also agreed that the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs would improve EFL student teachers’ classroom management skills and autonomy through providing them with opportunities to practice managing L2 classrooms (Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011). Especially, in the early years of their profession, teachers are confused by the chaos emerging from the dynamic nature of

the language classroom. Most novice teachers feel frustrated about their ability to manage this chaos (Gatbonton, 2008; Tsui, 2003). Peer-teaching can help student teachers overcome this frustration by practicing EFL classroom management skills even before they enter real-world language classrooms (Savas, 2012; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011).

There are some counterarguments against peer-teaching in the field. According to Edge (1984), peer-teaching is attacked on the argument that “the trainee is given no practice in dealing with learners’ errors as they arise in context, because the level of English of the peer group will almost always be far in advance of the language being “taught” (p. 117). Furthermore, peer-teaching is believed to suffer from the lack of a comprehensive framework explaining how it should be practiced, and what advantages and disadvantages it has for educating prospective EFL teachers (see Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011). However, these counterarguments have not stopped instructors from practicing peer-teaching and training their students through this technique. Instead of giving up, the researchers and practitioners have chosen to overcome its practical limitations (Edge, 1984) or to undertake an increasing number of research studies so that a comprehensive model for the technique can be developed in the future. In the following sub-section, the practice of the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs is designated with a focus on the practical elements that are of significance in this component of EFL teacher education programs.

2.2.2 Practice of Peer teaching

Peer-teaching is a teacher education technique that mainly has its roots in the attempts to increase EFL teacher candidates’ theoretical and experiential knowledge of how an L2 should be taught in the classroom (Ismail, 2011; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011). There are several core practical features that characterize microteaching. In the

following paragraphs, these features will be discussed one by one but it is necessary to point out that the list of the features of EFL peer-teaching is not limited to the ones discussed below as EFL peer-teaching is usually employed with wide variations in different EFL teacher education contexts all over the world.

First, ‘teacher role adoption’ is a characteristic feature distinguishing peer-teaching from other L2 teacher education techniques (e.g., classroom lectures, teacher-training workshops, etc.). The adoption of the teacher role in peer-teaching from teacher candidates can be either obligatory or optional. In obligatory role adoption, the teacher calls on some of EFL student teachers in the classroom to adopt his/her role as the teacher of the classroom one by one. In the optional role adoption, the student teachers are asked who volunteers to adopt the role of the classroom teacher.

Second, the grant of the teacher role to the student teachers entails all the responsibilities that come with the role to be able to handle the classroom. Peer-teaching is not only about teaching the classmates but it also involves planning lessons, preparing materials, and assessing learning outcomes (Savas, 2012). In fact, some researchers (e.g., Savas, 2012; Verity, 2011) warn that, although the element of actual teaching is usually highlighted in the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs, the instructors of EFL teacher education programs should improve, among others, lesson planning, classroom management, and achievement assessment skills in their teacher candidates. That is why some supporters (Benson & Ying, 2013; Verity, 2011) argue that the peer-teaching component does not necessarily need to be complementary to EFL teacher education programs as it can stand alone as a self-contained, independent EFL teacher education program which can teach student teachers all the skills required to be successful in their profession.

A third core practical feature of the peer-teaching component is the importance of feedback to the student teachers adopting the role of the teacher. The feedback can be either from the teacher of the classroom or from the classmates. Feedback can help the teacher student who has adopted the role of the classroom teacher figure out the complexities of EFL teaching and learn the management skills that are needed for efficient EFL teaching (Merc, 2015).

Feedback given to the student teachers in the peer-teaching component can be either direct or indirect (see Benson & Ying, 2013; Merc, 2015; Seferoglu, 2006). In direct feedback, the instructor or the classmates would make the candidate teacher aware that some of her/his teaching behaviors would not satisfy the purposes of EFL teaching and she/he needs to either modify or replace them with more effective behaviors. In indirect feedback, on the other hand, the instructors would not mention the candidate's EFL teaching mistakes; rather, the candidate would become aware that something is wrong about her/his teaching attempts by comments that the teacher makes on his/her teaching in the classroom.

A final practical feature of EFL peer-teaching is related to the fact that peer-teaching is not only about acquiring an eclectic repertoire of EFL teaching skills. In other words, student teachers should know why particular activities are appropriate for specific EFL teaching and learning context. This is where knowledge and practice of EFL teaching come to meet each other. This is usually done through the use of different activities that would encourage student teacher to reflect upon their peer-teaching experience. Example of such activities are dialogue journals, group discussions, reflection sessions, etc. (Akbari, 2007; Harman et al. 2016; Yassaei, 2012).

2.3 Research Studies on Peer teaching

Though concerns with peer-teaching in EFL teacher education have been more practical, a number of studies (e.g., Assinder, 1991; Ismail, 2011; Savas, 2012; Seferoğlu, 2006) have been carried out to determine whether the benefits claimed for peer-teaching can be substantiated through empirical evidence. These studies have targeted different aspects of the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs as the focus of their investigation. In the following, review of these studies is presented.

To begin with, Benson and Ying (2013) conducted an action research to explore the effectiveness of peer-teaching for raising pre-service language teachers' awareness of autonomy in learning and teaching. Benson and Ying (2013) aimed to address three issues in their research study: "(a) student engagement with peer teaching and learning, (b) students' reflections on peer teaching as a potential teaching strategy, and (c) their views on the benefits and challenges of peer teaching" (p. 57). To address these three issues, the researchers collected data from a group of pre-service language teachers with the use of different data collection techniques. The techniques included video recordings, course materials and students' written assignments, group interviews, interview with the course teacher, and a post-course questionnaire.

The results of Benson and Ying's (2013) study were as the following. As the participants' engagement with peer teaching and learning was concerned, the results of the study demonstrated that, in their study, "most of the students understood what peer teaching involved and demonstrated their understanding by participating in informal and formal peer teaching sessions during the course". Benson and Ying

(2013) interpreted this result as an indication of the students' uptake of peer-teaching as an effective pedagogical strategy. The participants in the study also found the peer-teaching component of the course as "fun and enjoyable" (p. 61) which could result from the fact that the participants did not feel as if their teaching mistakes would have negative consequences. On the other hand, Benson and Ying (2013) contended that the participants did feel pressured to face in front of their classmates; however, according to the researchers, the pressure was not necessarily negative because the participants could make use of the pressure to assure that their EFL peer-teaching experience is going well.

As the participants' reflection on the peer-teaching experience was concerned, the participants came to realize several opportunities that the experience provided for them. The participants asserted that the peer-teaching experience provided them with the opportunity to interact more with their classmates and to get to know them better. The peer-teaching also allowed the participants to arrange their assignments more flexibly. Finally, as the participants' views of the peer teaching experience were concerned, nearly all of the participants expressed positive attitudes towards peer teaching, believing that the course would help them become more effective EFL teacher in the future.

Ismail (2011) set a study to investigate students' conceptions of peer-teaching at the United Arab Emirates University (UAEU). For this purpose, Ismail (2011) had sixty-one female teacher trainees complete a questionnaire investigating the conceptions of the participants on EFL peer-teaching. The participants were sampled from two EFL teacher education programs held at the UAEU. Thirty of the participants were sampled from a course entitled 'Teaching Methods of English to Young Learners' while the

remaining thirty-one participants were sampled from a course entitled ‘Teaching Methods of English in Elementary Schools’.

Ismail (2011) targeted four areas of EFL teacher education as the focus of his investigation: ‘language improvement and course satisfaction’, ‘teaching practice competence and satisfaction’, ‘preparation and management’ and ‘attitudes and personal feelings’. In addition, Ismail (2011) aimed to discover whether there were differences between the participants from ‘Teaching Methods of English to Young Learners’ and those from ‘Teaching Methods of English in Elementary Schools’. Ismail (2011) found that the participants held positive attitudes towards peer-teaching as a strategy for training them become successful EFL teachers. In addition, the participants’ answers to the questionnaire items indicated that they believed peer-teaching would help them with the acquisition of necessary EFL teaching skills, improve classroom management skills in them, and lead them to feel satisfied about the teacher education courses in general. Based on these findings, Ismail (2011) recommends that peer-teaching be included in EFL teacher education programs.

However, the findings of Ismail’s (2011) investigation should be interpreted with caution. First, as mentioned above, all the teacher trainees who participated in the study were female student teachers and this would constrain the generalizability of the findings to both genders. There are some findings in the literature of EFL teaching practice and education indicating that the knowledge and behaviors of EFL teaching differ between male and female language teachers (e.g., Sunderland, 2000; Yenez, 1994). Thus, it is possible that different genders (i.e., male and female) would hold varying conceptions on the peer-teaching component of EFL teacher education programs. Second, the participants’ peer-teaching scores were partially determined by

their participation in the research project conducted by Ismail (2011). This could have strongly distorted the responses of the participants to the questionnaire items in the study because the participants might have been inclined to favor peer-teaching in their responses to achieve higher grades in the teacher education courses.

Finally, Seferoğlu (2006) investigated students' reflections on micro-teaching sessions in a Turkish setting, and she reported that there are not enough opportunities for micro-teaching. Seferoglu (2006) investigated 176 teacher candidates' attitudes towards general L2 teacher education programs in a Turkish university. The interesting finding was that teacher candidates in her study seriously complained that they did not have enough opportunities to practice peer-teaching in pre-service EFL teacher education programs held in their university (i.e., the Middle East Technical University). With respect to peer-teaching, the participants suggested the following to be included in EFL teacher education programs:

- There should be more opportunities for micro-teaching and practice teaching.
- In school experience and practice teaching courses it should be possible to observe many different teachers, various proficiency levels, and many different school settings.
- Several more focused observation forms for observing different aspects of the teaching/learning process should be provided. (p. 373)

This shows that the participants in Seferoglu's (2006) study did not only favored peer-teaching but also had clear conceptions of what has to be done for an appropriate education in peer-teaching and also delivered good suggestions as to how the effectiveness of the peer-teaching component can be improved by the decision makers.

Another group of researchers have shown interest in using technological advancements as supplementary tools for improving the peer-teaching component of teacher education programs. The use of technology has increasingly grown in the field of second and foreign language teaching and learning and it is not surprising that the supporters and researchers of EFL peer-teaching has sought to explore the benefits that peer-teaching in EFL teacher education programs can get from the use of technological advancements.

One example of such studies is undertaken by Merc (2015) who was interested in examining the peer-teaching experience in a distance course on English language teacher education. In Merc's (2015) study, a single Turkish student teacher attended a 12-week, online (i.e., internet-based) teacher education program in which she practiced distant EFL peer-teaching though the guidance of an experienced EFL teacher educator. The researcher employed different data collection instruments to examine the participant's experience with the online course administered including online questionnaires, dialogue journals, and open-ended questions. These instruments were administered both before and after the online course to track the participant's changes in behaviors, conceptions, and attitudes resulting from attending the distant peer-teaching course. The researcher also conducted an interview with the participant to ask about her opinion on the course itself.

The results of the study showed that the participant in the study reported having some degrees of foreign language anxiety as a result of participating in the course. Merc (2015) attributed this to the reason that the technique (i.e., distance learning) was rather new to the participant of the study and this has increased L2 use anxiety levels in the participant. In addition, Merc (2015) stresses that raise in foreign language anxiety is

common of the majority of those participating peer-teaching sessions; “it is no surprise that the student teacher experienced anxiety in her first teaching experience during the microteaching process as many of her peers worldwide suffer from teaching anxiety as teacher candidates” (p. 14).

On the other hand, the participant reported significant benefits that the online course has for her. With respect to the course, the participant reported that peer-teaching would help her learn how to manage the classroom time more effectively and it would help her become familiarize with the implications that technology can have for the teaching of foreign languages. In addition, in the interview, the participant mentioned that, although the course was online and distant, it had advantages for when she would embark on teaching the L2 face to face. Finally, the participant also believed that the online EFL peer-teaching course she attended was friendly because, as she came to become familiar with the purposes of the course and with how it worked over the sessions (12 weeks), she felt less anxious and stressed about it.

Another study which investigated the attitudes of students towards EFL peer-teaching was conducted by Savas (2012). The study was specific in purpose as it targeted the participants’ attitudes towards the effectiveness of micro-teaching videos. For this purpose, the researcher asked 40 prospective EFL teachers to fill out a questionnaire after watching micro-teaching videos. The participants were sampled from two English language teaching methodology courses in the Middle East Technical University in Turkey. The results of the study indicated that the majority of the participants believed watching peer-teaching videos was effective as an EFL teacher education technique. The participants in Savas’s (2012) study reported that watching such videos would not only improve their EFL teaching skills and expertise but would

also help them improve their own English language proficiency. This shows that peer-teaching can function both as a teacher education technique and an effective language learning activity, a conclusion already made by other researchers (Assinder, 1991; Ismail, 2011).

2.4 Summary

This chapter provided a review of major issues related to peer teaching component of methodology courses. Previous research investigated ELT peer-teaching with respect to its effectiveness, distance learning, teaching of L2 skills, teaching awareness and autonomy, and the use of technology, among others. Most importantly, the researchers have also been interested in the attitudes that learners held towards the peer teaching component of methodology courses.

However, there is a gap in the literature which is the attitudes that instructors of such programs hold towards peer teaching component of methodology course. Thus, the present study aimed to examine the attitudes of both students and their instructors towards peer teaching component of methodology courses. Furthermore, the present study aimed to investigate students' and instructors' suggestions as to how the quality of peer teaching component in methodology course could be improved.

Chapter 3

METHOD

In this chapter, the overall design of the research is presented in the first section. Then, the context of the study is explained and the research questions are given in the following two sections. In the fourth section, the participants are described and in the next section, information about the data collection instruments used in the study is presented. Data collection procedures are explained in the sixth section. In the last two sections, information about piloting is given and the data analysis procedures are clarified, respectively.

3.1 Overall Research Design

The overall research design of the study is a mixed-methods research design which includes collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. Mixed-method research design can combine the strengths of the two methods (i.e., quantitative research methods and qualitative research methods) so that the strengths of one method can compensate for the shortcomings of the other. Seen in this way, combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods would help us have a better understanding of the phenomena because we can make sure that there is little left out when a mixed-methods research methodology is adopted to investigate the phenomenon (Dörnyei, 2007). So, it is not surprising that we hear the term *mixed-method research* a lot these days (e.g., Dörnyei, 2007; Hashemi, 2012; Jang, Wagner, & Park, 2014; Riazi & Candlin, 2014). In fact, it was after the advent of Dörnyei's (2007) volume on research in applied linguistics that the number of studies adopting a

mixed-method methodology for collecting research data proliferated in the literature. Jang et al. (2014) define mixed-method research as “an inquiry approach that includes both qualitative and quantitative methods within a single study or program of inquiry” (p. 124). There are some technicalities that researchers adopting a mixed-methods research methodology should take into consideration. For example, a mixed-methods research methodology is based on both “(post) positivist and constructivist paradigms to investigate its subject matter and provide useful knowledge to its various stakeholders” (Riazi & Candlin, 2014, p. 135). The implication of this point is for how we interpret data we collect in a study. Mixed-methods research studies are therefore both confirmatory and exploratory at the same time. That is, they intend not only to test hypotheses previously formulated in the respective field but also to formulate new ones to pave the way for further studies (see Dörnyei, 2007; Riazi & Candlin, 2014).

The quantitative data were collected from the closed items in the student and instructor questionnaires which aimed to investigate the students’ and instructors’ attitudes towards the peer-teaching component or ELTE courses in the FLE Department. Quantitative research has its roots in the thought school of (post) positivism (Riazi & Candlin, 2014, p. 139). The quantitative research methods would help researcher trace patterns in human behaviors that might be unobservable (Goertz & Mahony, 2012).

On the other hand, the qualitative data were obtained from the open-ended questions in the questionnaires and from the interviews with both students and instructors which aimed to reach in-depth data regarding their attitudes and also to identify their suggestions as to how the effectiveness of the peer-teaching component in ELTE courses could be improved. Qualitative research has its origin in constructivism/postmodernism (Riazi & Candlin, 2014) which states that human

behavior would be artificial if it is detached from the social context in which it is happening. Core to qualitative research is the use of techniques that try to collect richer data on human behaviors. Examples of such data collection techniques are interviews, focus-group discussions, grounded theory, journal diaries, and observation (see Corbin and Strauss (2014) for a more comprehensive list of data collection techniques in qualitative research). The common characteristic of these data collection techniques is that they are descriptive in nature. In other words, they tend to collect descriptive data on phenomena (i.e., to explain a phenomenon in details) rather than trying to transform the phenomena into some kind of quantitative data (Flick, 2008).

In the present case study, a mixed-methods research design was preferred over either quantitative or qualitative research design because mixed-methods research designs allow for a deeper understanding of the research phenomenon through compensating for the weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative research designs (Dörnyei, 2007; Riazi & Candlin, 2014). Moreover, since the data has been collected through ‘triangulation’ technique which requires the necessary data be collected by using different techniques so that we can investigate the research phenomenon more deeply, a mixed method research design is used.

3.2 The Context of the Study

The context of the present study is the BA in English Language Teaching (ELT) program of the Department of Foreign Language Education (FLE) at Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU). The department was established in 1995 in response to the national drive to improve the quality of English language education as well as to the growth in student demand for this field (Student Handbook, p. 1). It holds language teacher education programs at the levels of Bachelor of Arts/BA (4 years),

Master of Arts/MA (2 years), and Doctor of Philosophy/Ph.D. The mission of these programs is to ensure “quality standards in teaching and research at the undergraduate and postgraduate levels, to keep abreast of the academic developments and professional innovations, and to meet the educational challenges in the globalizing world” (p. 1). The vision of the department is “to become one of the leading ELT departments in the region, receptive to innovations as well as improvement, training well-rounded language teaching professional in a multicultural environment” (p. 2).

According to the Student Handbook issued to the new students entering the FLE Department at the EMU, the following are the values that are pursued by the authorities in the department (p. 2):

- Learner-Centeredness
- The Code of Practice
- Contemporary Language Practice
- High Standards in Teaching
- Quality Research
- Multilingualism
- Multiculturalism

ELT peer-teaching is one of the techniques which has been used in the FLE Department of EMU to achieve the above goals.

However, we don't know much about the students' and instructors' attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of the ELTE courses. This is important because knowing about their attitudes can help improve the effectiveness of this component as the students and the instructors are those who are directly involved with the use of peer-

teaching as a technique for preparing prospective ELT teachers. So, the purpose of the present study is to investigate the students' and instructors' attitudes towards the peer-teaching component in ELTE courses offered by the FLE department at EMU. The study also continues to see whether the students and the instructors have any suggestions as to how the quality and effectiveness of this component can be improved in the future.

3.3 Research Questions

To the above explained aims, the study attempts to answer the following three research questions:

1. What are the ELT students' attitudes towards the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?
2. What are the ELT instructors' attitudes towards the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?
3. What do the ELT students and instructors suggest for the improvement of the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?

3.4 Participants

The participants of the present study comprised two groups: the third and fourth year undergraduate ELT students, and the instructors in the Department of Foreign Language Education of Eastern Mediterranean University. The two groups of participants are described in the following subsections.

3.4.1 ELT Students

In total, 33 third and fourth year ELT students participated in the study. More specifically, 16 students were male and the remaining 17 students were female. Their ages ranged from 19 to 34, with the mean of 23. As for their native languages, 21

students, reported Turkish as their native language, 7 students were bilingual (English and Turkish), and 2 students, reported Russian as their native language. One student reported Persian as his native language, one student reported Urdu as her native language, and one student reported to be bilingual in English and French. These students (i.e., third and fourth year ELT students) have been chosen because of their knowledge and experience regarding micro-teaching. In other words, they have had experience in peer teaching in some of their ELTE courses.

3.4.2 Instructors

The second group of participants included 6 ELT instructors in the Department of FLE at EMU. Three of them were male instructors and the remaining three were female instructors. Their age range was between 43 and 65 (mean=52.6). Their teaching experiences ranged from 20 years to more than 40 years. Four of the instructors reported Turkish as their native language, one instructor reported Azeri as his native language, and one instructor was bilingual in Russian and Azeri.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

A set of four instruments were used to collect the data required in the present study, including student questionnaire, instructor questionnaire, interviews with students, and interviews with instructors. These data collection instruments are described in the following sections.

As for the development and adoption of the data collection instruments, a rather comprehensive literature review was undertaken. Areas such as ELT peer-teaching, ELT teacher education, practitioner research, attitudes towards ELT teacher education programs, etc. were reviewed in the search of instruments that fitted the purposes of the study. Previous questionnaires (e.g., Ismail, 2011) on ELT peer-teaching were

meticulously scrutinized and qualitative studies (e.g. Seferoğlu, 2006) were well read to find items which could serve the purposes of the study. In the following sections, these data collection instruments are described.

As for the reliability of the questionnaires, analysis of the data from the participants of the study indicated that the student questionnaire had a reliability coefficient of .91 and the instructor questionnaire had a reliability coefficient of .84. The lower reliability of the instructor questionnaire in comparison to the student questionnaire can be attributed to the small number of instructor participants in the present study. As Reliability coefficient is a function of both the number of questionnaire items and questionnaire respondents (see Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009), it would be expected that the instructor questionnaire would have a lower reliability coefficient than the student questionnaire. Yet, the coefficient of both questionnaires were well above the recommended minimum level of .70 (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009, p. 95), showing that both questionnaires were reliable measures of attitudes towards ELT peer teaching.

3.5.1 Student Questionnaire

The student questionnaire was developed to collect data on the students' attitudes towards ELT peer-teaching. The questionnaire was designed based on a rather comprehensive review of the literature on ELT peer teaching.

Previous studies and questionnaires on ELT peer-teaching were well scrutinized to find appropriate items that fitted the purposes of the present study. Therefore, the student questionnaire was developed on the basis of the instruments used in some previous studies (e.g., Ismail, 2011; Seferoğlu, 2006).

The student questionnaire is made up of two main parts. The first part of the questionnaire comprises 43 closed items. A five-point, Likert scale with the ratings ranging from 5 to 1 (Strongly Agree 5, Agree 4, Unsure 3, Disagree 2, Strongly Disagree 1) was used in the closed items.

On the other hand, the second part of the student questionnaire includes four open-ended items to delve more deeply into the participants' attitudes towards the peer-teaching component in their ELTE courses. The four open-ended items were as the following; 1) Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT methodology courses (i.e., ELT courses in which students do microteachings)? Why or who not? 2) What are the benefits of the microteaching component in these ELT courses? 3) What are the problems you have about the microteaching component in these courses? and 4) What are your recommendations for the improvement of the microteaching component in these courses? The students' answers to these four open-ended items provided qualitative data for the study. (Appendix A)

The student questionnaire was submitted to two experts in the field of ELT who were asked to provide feedback on the validity and appropriateness of the items as measures of attitudes towards ELT peer-teaching. They confirmed the validity of the questionnaire and made some minor suggestions to improve some items. Analysis of the data from the participants of the study indicated that the questionnaire had a reliability coefficient of .91 which was well above the recommended minimum level of .70 (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009, p. 95).

3.5.2 Instructor Questionnaire

A parallel questionnaire was developed to collect data on the instructors' attitudes towards ELT peer-teaching. In other words, the instructor questionnaire was the

adopted version of the student questionnaire; it was also developed based on a comprehensive review of the literature on ELT peer teaching.

Similar to the student questionnaire, the instructor questionnaire consisted of 43 closed items (which were parallel to the ones in the student questionnaire). The difference was related to the perspective from which attitudes towards ELT peer-teaching was measured. In the instructor questionnaire, the closed items were written from the instructors' perspective (e.g., peer-teaching helps *my students* to develop the actual teaching skills *they'll* need later). The rating scale for the instructor questionnaire was also a five-point Likert scale with the ratings ranging from 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree).

Also, four open-ended items were included in the instructor questionnaire to examine the instructors' attitudes more deeply. The items were as the following: 1) Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT methodology courses (i.e., ELT courses in which students do microteachings)? Why or who not? 2) What are the benefits of the microteaching component in these ELT courses? 3) What are the problems you have about the microteaching component in these courses? and 4) What are your recommendations for the improvement of the microteaching component in these courses? The answers to these four open-ended items provided qualitative data for this study. (Appendix B)

The similar procedures were followed to obtain the validity and reliability of the instructor questionnaire. The data obtained from the instructor questionnaire indicated that the questionnaire had a reliability coefficient of .84. The lower reliability of the instructor questionnaire in comparison to the student questionnaire can be attributed

to the small number of instructors in this study as reliability is in part a function of the number of respondents (see Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009); yet, the reliability coefficient for the questionnaire was well above the recommended level of .70 (Dörnyei & Taguchi, 2009, p. 95).

3.5.3 Student Interviews

Questions for interviews with the students were designed to investigate further into students' opinions regarding the use of ELT peer-teaching and identify their suggestions for its improvement in ELTE courses. Some questions were the same as open-ended items in the student questionnaire, however, some more questions were added to the interview questions to delve more deeply into the participants' attitudes towards peer-teaching. Overall, the students were asked 8 questions. (Appendix C)

3.5.4 Instructor Interviews

Interviews with the instructors were concluded to obtain in depth data regarding their opinions about the use of peer-teaching as a pedagogical strategy in ELTE courses and whether they could offer some suggestions for the improvement of this component. Some questions were the same as the open-ended items in the instructor questionnaire, but some more questions were added to the interview questions to delve more deeply into the participants' attitudes towards peer-teaching. In total, 9 questions were posed. (Appendix D)

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

The following steps were taken to collect the required data in the present study. First, before collecting the data, the researcher requested official permission to conduct the current study. After the approval (Appendix E), the process started. Second, the researcher entered the classrooms from which he intended to collect the data required in the present study. He explained the purposes of the study to the students to inform

them about the study. To observe the research ethics (see Kono, 2013), the students were also told that the data collected from them would be anonymous and kept confidential. The student questionnaires were then administered to the participants and they were asked to complete them. The researcher was present on data collection procedure to clarify the misunderstandings the participants might encounter when completing the questionnaires or answering the written open-ended questions. After that, the researcher administered the instructor questionnaire by going to each instructor's office. Some of the instructors handed back the instructor questionnaire the same day, however, some other instructors gave the questionnaires back after a few days.

Once the both groups of participants completed the questionnaires, the researcher conducted a series of interviews with 10 volunteer student teachers and 5 of the instructors, individually. The instructor interviews took place in the instructors' offices and each lasted for about 10 minutes. Student interviews also lasted for about 10 minutes. The interviews were structured in that the researcher only asked the participants a set of prepared interview questions and did not interrupt them while they were answering the questions. After the interviews were conducted, the researcher transcribed the audio recorded interviews for the next stage of study which involved the analysis of the data collected for the purposes of the study.

3.7 Piloting

A pilot study was undertaken to see whether two of the instruments developed and adopted in the present study would work efficiently. For this purpose the student questionnaire and the student interview questions were submitted to 5 ELT students to complete. The purpose was to see whether the pilot-study participants would encounter misunderstandings when completing the questionnaires. The pilot study indicated that

the questionnaires had been developed and written effectively, therefore, the participants had very few minor misunderstandings about the language of the questionnaire. A few wording problems with the language of the questionnaire mentioned in the pilot study were taken into account and respective changes were made to the questionnaires to eradicate these problems.

3.8 Data Analysis

For the analysis of the data collected in the present study the following two steps were followed. Firstly, the quantitative data collected from the student questionnaire and the instructor questionnaire were analyzed by using descriptive statistics. (Frequencies, mean and standard deviation) for each closed item in the questionnaires were calculated. Frequencies are presented in ‘percentages’.

Secondly, the qualitative data obtained from the open-ended items in the questionnaires and the student and teacher interviews, were analyzed. The guidelines provided by Dörnyei (2007) and Flick (2008) were employed to analyze the qualitative data in the second phase of data analysis. The qualitative data were coded according to the recurring patterns observable in the open ended items and interviews and the identified patterns were then condensed into more general categories. Frequency information and examples from the qualitative data are presented in chapter 4.

3.9 Summary

This chapter firstly explained the overall design of the study. Next, the context of the study was described in detail. In the third section, the purpose of the study and the research questions were explained. In the fourth section, the participants of the study were introduced. Next, information about the data collection instruments was provided in detail. In the last two sections, the data collection procedures and data analysis were

explained. In the following chapter, the results of the study obtained from the data analysis will be presented.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

In the present chapter, the results of the study obtained from the analysis of student and instructor questionnaires and interviews are presented. The results explain the students' and instructors' attitudes towards the microteaching or peer-teaching component of ELTE courses in the Department of Foreign Language Education (FLE) at Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU).

4.1 Results of the Student Questionnaire

The student questionnaire aimed to investigate the attitudes of the students towards the peer-teaching component of ELTE courses offered in the Department of FLE at EMU. The results of the student questionnaire are presented under two subheadings: i.e., analysis of the closed items and analysis of the open-ended questions.

4.1.1 Analysis of the Closed Items

The student questionnaire consisted of 43 closed items that investigated into the students' attitudes towards the microteaching or peer-teaching component of ELTE courses in the FLE Department of EMU. Table 4.1 presents the students' responses to each of the items in the questionnaire. Item 43 had the lowest mean ($M = 2.57$,) and items 28 and 32 had the highest mean (item 28, $M = 4.45$; item 32, $M = 4.45$) in the student questionnaire.

Overall, the results show that the student teachers had positive attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT methodology courses. In addition, the student teachers were aware that the peer teaching component has some negative aspects.

Table 4.1: Frequencies and descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) for responses in the student questionnaire

Item	SA	A	US	D	SD	M (SD)
Microteaching:						
1. increases my motivation.	33.3 %	45.5 %	15.2 %	3.0%	3.0%	4.03 (.95)
2. helps me to become more interested in the course.	24.2 %	45.5 %	21.2 %	6.1%	3.0%	3.81 (.98)
3. helps me to develop creativity.	48.5 %	33.3 %	15.2 %	0.0%	3.0%	4.24 (.93)
4. increases my autonomy.	33.3 %	57.6 %	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	4.15 (.87)
5. helps me to be organized.	39.4 %	42.4 %	15.2 %	0.0%	3.0%	4.15 (.90)
6. helps me to develop planning skills.	54.5 %	42.4 %	0.0%	0.0%	3.0%	4.45 (.79)
7. helps me to prepare my own materials and activities.	54.5 %	27.3 %	15.2 %	0.0%	3.0%	4.30 (.95)
8. helps me to learn how to manage the class.	42.4 %	45.5 %	6.1%	3.0%	3.0%	4.21 (.92)
9. helps me to develop the actual teaching skills I'll need later.	39.4 %	42.4 %	12.1 %	3.0%	3.0%	4.12 (.96)
10. helps me to learn how to predict classroom problems.	18.2 %	42.4 %	27.3 %	9.1%	3.0%	3.63 (.99)
11. helps me with my time management.	33.3 %	48.5 %	12.1 %	6.1%	0.0%	4.09 (.84)
12. helps me to develop my listening skills.	15.2 %	39.4 %	21.2 %	18.2 %	6.1%	3.39 (1.14)

Item	SA	A	US	D	SD	M (SD)
Microteaching:						
13. helps me to develop my reading skills.	18.2 %	30.3 %	21.2 %	21.2 %	9.1%	3.27 (1.25)
14. helps me to develop my writing skills.	12.1 %	39.4 %	21.2 %	15.2 %	12.1 %	3.24 (1.22)
15. helps me to develop my speaking skills.	42.4 %	27.3 %	15.2 %	9.1%	6.1%	3.90 (1.23)
16. helps me to develop my vocabulary.	33.3 %	33.3 %	12.1 %	18.2 %	3.0%	3.75 (1.19)
17. helps me to develop my grammar.	24.2 %	39.4 %	15.2 %	18.2 %	3.0%	3.63 (1.14)
18. gives me an opportunity to learn by observing my peers.	39.4 %	51.5 %	9.1%	0.0%	0.0%	4.30 (.63)
19. helps me to put theory into practice.	57.6 %	30.3 %	9.1%	0.0%	3.0%	4.39 (.89)
20. enables me to learn by doing.	42.4 %	42.4 %	6.1%	6.1%	3.0%	4.15 (1.00)
21. creates awareness of how to teach.	48.5 %	42.4 %	6.1%	0.0%	3.0%	4.33 (.85)
22. improves my teaching practice.	48.5 %	42.4 %	6.1%	3.0%	0.0%	4.36 (.74)
23. makes me aware of the qualities of a good teacher.	33.3 %	51.5 %	12.1 %	0.0%	3.0%	4.12 (.85)
24. prepares me for my teaching career.	51.5 %	33.3 %	12.1 %	0.0%	3.0%	4.30 (.91)
25. helps me to use various teaching approaches/methods/techniques appropriately.	36.4 %	51.5 %	9.1%	3.0%	0.0%	4.21 (.73)

Item	SA	A	US	D	SD	M (SD)
Microteaching:						
26. helps me to learn how to use teaching materials.	36.4 %	57.6 %	3.0%	3.0%	0.0%	4.27 (.67)
27. helps me to realize how to use body language effectively.	39.4 %	42.4 %	12.1 %	3.0%	3.0%	4.12 (.96)
28. helps me to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching.	45.5 %	54.5 %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	4.45 (.50)
29. helps me to learn how to evaluate learners.	27.3 %	33.3 %	24.2 %	12.1 %	3.0%	3.69 (1.10)
30. helps me to learn how to use praise and encouragement.	39.4 %	45.5 %	3.0%	9.1%	3.0%	4.09 (1.04)
31. helps me to learn how to give appropriate feedback.	36.4 %	27.3 %	24.2 %	6.1%	6.1%	3.81 (1.18)
32. helps me to discover my teaching strengths and weaknesses.	60.6 %	30.3 %	6.1%	0.0%	3.0%	4.45 (.86)
33. helps me to learn how to use technology in teaching.	48.5 %	18.2 %	24.2 %	6.1%	3.0%	4.03 (1.13)
34. is fun.	18.2 %	36.4 %	9.1%	24.2 %	12.1 %	3.24 (1.34)
35. is easy to do.	3.0%	15.2 %	30.3 %	36.4 %	15.2 %	2.54 (1.03)
36. is beneficial.	51.5 %	33.3 %	6.1%	6.1%	3.0%	4.24 (1.03)
37. causes anxiety.	21.2 %	36.4 %	24.2 %	12.1 %	6.1%	3.54 (1.14)

Item	SA	A	US	D	SD	M (SD)
Microteaching:						
38. takes a lot of my time.	27.3 %	24.2 %	36.4 %	9.1%	3.0%	3.63 (1.08)
39. is carried out in an artificial environment.	18.2 %	36.4 %	39.4 %	6.1%	0.0%	3.66 (.85)
40. offers very limited teaching experience.	24.2 %	39.4 %	21.2 %	15.2 %	0.0%	3.72 (1.00)
41. suffers lack of interest of peers.	9.1%	27.3 %	36.4 %	18.2 %	9.1%	3.09 (1.10)
42. makes me feel embarrassed when teaching my peers.	12.1 %	9.1%	24.2 %	39.4 %	15.2 %	2.63 (1.22)
43. makes me feel bored.	9.1%	15.2 %	21.2 %	33.3 %	21.2 %	2.57 (1.25)

Note: SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; US = Unsure; A = Agree; and SA = Strongly Agree.

In Table 4.1, items 1, 2, 34, 37, 42, and 43 were related to the affective dimensions of the peer-teaching component in ELTE courses. The results indicated that the participants had generally positive attitudes towards the idea that ELT peer-teaching increases their motivation and interest in the course. The participants chose 'Agree' 45.5% of times for both items 1 and 2. They also chose 'Strongly Agree' 33.3% of times for Item 1 (*Microteaching increases my motivation*, M = 4.03) and 24.2% of times for Item 2 (*Microteaching helps me to become more interested in the course*, M = 3.81). The participants also thought that ELT microteaching was fun as, for Item 34 (*Microteaching is fun*, M = 3.24), 36.4% chose 'Agree' and 18.2% chose 'Strongly Agree' as their answers; however, the participants did not think ELT microteaching is

as fun as it is motivating and interesting as they also chose 'Disagree' 24.2% of times for Item 34.

Although the students thought that microteaching was motivating, interesting, and fun, they also believed that it would increase their anxiety. For Item 37 (*Microteaching causes anxiety*, $M = 3.54$), the students chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree' 36.4% and 21.2% of the times respectively. However, they did not believe that ELT microteaching was embarrassing and boring. When asked if ELT peer-teaching was embarrassing through Item 42 (*Microteaching makes me feel embarrassed when teaching my peers*, $M = 2.63$), the participants chose 'Disagree' and 'Unsure' 39.4% and 24.2% of times respectively. For Item 43 (*Microteaching makes me feel bored*, $M = 2.57$) which asked if ELT microteaching was boring, the participants chose 'Disagree' and 'Unsure' 33.3% and 21.2% of times, respectively.

In Table 4.1, items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 were related to the classroom management skills that the student teachers would acquire through the implementation of micro-teaching. Generally, the student teachers held positive attitudes towards the idea that peer-teaching would improve their classroom management skills. In Item 3 when they were asked about the extent to which ELT microteaching would help them to develop creativity, 81.8% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree' while 15.2% of the participants chose 'Unsure' as their responses to Item 3 (*Microteaching helps me to develop creativity*, $M = 4.24$), showing that the participants favored the idea that microteaching would increase their ELT creativity. Item 4 asked whether microteaching would improve student teachers' autonomy. 57.6% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 33.3% of the participants chose 'Strongly Agree' as their answers to Item 4 (*Microteaching increases my autonomy*, $M = 4.15$). This shows that the

students in the present study held positive attitudes towards the idea that micro-teaching would help them become more autonomous.

Items 5, 6, 7 and 8 were concerned with the question of whether ELT microteaching would help students qualify as effective organizers, planners, and managers of ELT classrooms. For Item 5 (*Microteaching helps me to be organized*, $M = 4.15$), 42.4% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 39.4% of them chose 'Strongly Agree'. Similarly, for Item 6 (*Microteaching helps me to develop planning skills*, $M = 4.45$), 42.4% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 54.5% chose 'Strongly Agree'. Item 7 asked about whether microteaching would help students prepare materials and activities for the classroom; 27.3% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 54.5% chose 'Strongly Agree' for Item 7 (*Microteaching helps me to prepare my own materials and activities*, $M = 4.30$). Thus, the participants had strong positive attitudes towards item 7. For Item 8 (*Microteaching helps me to learn how to manage the class*, $M = 4.21$), the participants chose 'Agree' 45.5% of times and 'Strongly Agree' 42.4% of times. These results show that the students strongly believed that microteaching would improve their organization, planning, and management skills.

Items 10 and 11 were also concerned with classroom management. Item 10 was concerned whether the ability of students to predict unforeseen classroom problems would improve as a result of microteaching, and Item 11 asked whether ELT microteaching would help students with time managements. 42.4% marked 'Agree' and 18.2% marked 'Strongly Agree' for Item 10 (*Microteaching helps me to learn how to predict classroom problems*, $M = 3.63$); and, 48.5% ticked 'Agree' and 33.3% ticked 'Strongly Agree' for Item 11 (*Microteaching helps me with my time management*, $M = 4.09$). Thus, the participants had strong positive attitudes towards item 11. In

addition, even though their attitudes towards Item 10 was comparatively less strong, their attitudes towards this item was still positively strong enough as shown by the mean score for this item. These results show that the participants believed in the positive effect of ELT microteaching on the development of abilities for preparing materials and activities, predicting problems, and managing time in the language classroom.

In Table 4.1, items 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17 were related to the impact of ELT peer-teaching or microteaching on different dimensions of students' L2 proficiency development. Items 12, 13, 14, and 15 asked the participants about the effect of microteaching on their L2 skills development; i.e., listening, reading, writing, and speaking, respectively. For Item 12 (*Microteaching helps me to develop my listening skills*, $M = 3.39$), 39.4% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 15.2% chose 'Strongly Agree' while 21.2% selected 'Unsure' as their responses to the item. For Item 13 (*Microteaching helps me to develop my reading skills*, $M = 3.27$), 30.3% chose 'Agree' and 18.2% chose 'Strongly Agree' and 21.2% chose 'Unsure'. For Item 14 (*Microteaching helps me to develop my writing skills*, $M = 3.24$), 39.4% selected 'Agree' and 12.1% selected 'Strongly Agree' and 21.2% chose 'Unsure'. Finally, for Item 15 (*Microteaching helps me to develop my speaking skills*, $M = 3.90$), 27.3% marked 'Agree' and 42.4% marked 'Strongly Agree' and 15.2% marked 'Unsure'. These results show that students had positive attitudes as regards the idea that ELT peer-teaching would improve their L2 skills; yet, they reported that the effects of ELT peer-teaching on their oral L2 skills (i.e., speaking and listening) was higher than on their written L2 skills (i.e., reading and writing).

Items 16 and 17 asked the participants about the effects of microteaching on their knowledge of L2 components, namely vocabulary and grammar. Item 16 was concerned with the impact of microteaching on their knowledge of L2 vocabulary while Item 17 was concerned with its influence on their knowledge of L2 grammar. For Item 16 (*Microteaching helps me to develop my vocabulary*, $M = 3.75$), 66.6% of the participants expressed agreement or strongly agreement. For Item 17 (*Microteaching helps me to develop my grammar*, $M = 3.63$), 39.4% chose 'Agree' and 24.2% chose 'Strongly Agree'. These results show that the participants believed that ELT peer-teaching would improve their knowledge of L2 vocabulary and grammar.

In Table 4.1, items 9, 18, 19, 20, 22, and 24 were related to the opportunity that microteaching would provide for students to prepare them for actual L2 teaching situations and to put what they had learned in theory into practice. The participants were strongly positive about this issue as the items concerning this issue obtained high ratings from the participants, as shown by the mean for each item. Items 9, 22, and 24 were concerned with students' having the opportunity to develop teaching skills which would be needed in their actual teaching situations in the future. For Item 9 (*Microteaching helps me to develop the actual teaching skills I'll need later*, $M = 4.12$), the participants chose 'Agree' with 42.4% and 'Strongly Agree' with 39.4%. For Item 22 (*Microteaching improves my teaching practice*, $M = 4.36$), the participants chose 'Agree' 42.4% of times and 'Strongly Agree' 48.5% of times. For Item 24 (*Microteaching prepares me for my teaching career*, $M = 4.30$), 33.3% of the participants marked 'Agree' and 51.5% marked 'Strongly Agree' as their responses to the item. These results for items 9, 22, and 24 show that they believed microteaching would help them get prepared for their future teaching.

Items 18, 19, and 20 were related to the extent that the participants thought they would have the opportunity to put what they had learned into practice as a result of microteaching. Item 19 asked about this idea more directly. For Item 19 (*Microteaching helps me to put theory into practice*, $M = 4.39$), 87.9% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree' which shows that they strongly defended the idea that microteaching would get the students to practice what they had learned in theory about ELT. Items 18 and 20 were more specific about the process of putting ELT theory into practice in peer-teaching sessions. Item 18 asked about the opportunity microteaching would provide for each student to learn teaching through observing their classmates. With respect to Item 18 (*Microteaching gives me an opportunity to learn by observing my peers*, $M = 4.30$), 90.9% of the participants in the study expressed agreement (i.e. 'agree' or 'strongly agree'). Item 20, on the other hand, was concerned with whether microteaching allows students to learn by doing. For Item 20 (*Microteaching enables me to learn by doing*, $M = 4.15$), the participants chose 'Agree' 42.4% of times and chose 'Strongly Agree' 42.4% of times. Thus, these results show that the participants considered microteaching as an effective tool which helps them to learn by observing and doing.

Items 21, 23, and 32, on the other hand, were related to awareness raising. The overall responses to these three questionnaire items indicated that the students in the study believed in the awareness-raising function of microteaching component. More specifically, Item 21 asked if microteaching would result in awareness about how to teach L2. In Item 21 (*Microteaching creates awareness of how to teach*, $M = 4.33$), 90.9% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree', showing that they strongly believed that microteaching would make them more aware of how to teach. Item 23, however, focused on whether microteaching would make students aware of

the qualities of a good language teacher. For Item 23 (*Microteaching makes me aware of the qualities of a good teacher*, $M = 4.12$), more than half (51.5%) of the students in the study chose 'Agree' and 33.3% chose 'Strongly Agree', demonstrating their strong belief in that microteaching would make them more aware of what it means to be a good language teacher. Finally, Item 32 was related to students' awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses. For Item 32 (*Microteaching helps me to discover my teaching strengths and weaknesses*, $M = 4.45$), high majority (90.9%) of the students in the study expressed agreement or strongly agreement, demonstrating that peer-teaching would have the capacity to make them more conscious of their ELT teaching strengths and weaknesses.

Items 25 to 31 and Item 33 were related to the extent that microteaching would make students form a rich repertoire of effective L2 teaching techniques and strategies i.e. how to teach. The overall responses to these items in the questionnaire indicated that the students thought of peer-teaching as an effective tool to learn teaching techniques and strategies, as demonstrated by the mean for each of these items. Item 25 asked if microteaching would help students employ more various ELT approaches/methods/techniques appropriately in the classroom. For Item 25 (*Microteaching helps me to use various teaching approaches/methods/techniques appropriately*, $M = 4.21$), the participants chose 'Agree' 51.5% of times and 'Strongly Agree' 36.4% of times. Item 26 asked whether microteaching would help students use ELT materials appropriately. For Item 26 (*Microteaching helps me to learn how to use teaching material*, $M = 4.27$), 57.6% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 36.4% chose 'Strongly Agree'. This shows that the participants strongly favored the idea that peer-teaching would increase their ability to employ ELT materials effectively in the classroom.

Items 27 and 28 were concerned with the use of body language and eye contact in the classroom. For Item 27 (*Microteaching helps me to realize how to use body language effectively*, $M = 4.12$), 42.4% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 39.4 % chose 'Strongly Agree' while, for Item 28 (*Microteaching helps me to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching*, $M = 4.45$), 54.5% chose 'Agree' and 45.5% chose 'Strongly Agree'. This shows that high majority of the participants believed that microteaching would teach them how to make use of body-language mechanisms while teaching. On the other hand, items 29, 30, and 31 were concerned with the L2 evaluation and feedback. These items were asked to investigate the students' opinion as to whether microteaching would improve their abilities to evaluate learners and give appropriate feedback to them. Item 29 asked if microteaching would help students learn how to evaluate their learners. For Item 29 (*Microteaching helps me to learn how to evaluate learners*, $M = 3.69$), 12.1% of the participants chose 'Disagree', 24.2% chose 'Unsure', 33.3% chose 'Agree', and 27.3% chose 'Strongly Agree'. Item 30 asked if microteaching would enable students to appropriately encourage and praise their learners' L2 use and learning attempts; i.e., to give them appropriate feedback. For Item 30 (*Microteaching helps me to learn how to use praise and encouragement*, $M = 4.09$), 45.5% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 39.4% chose 'Strongly Agree' while 9.1% chose 'Disagree' as their responses. Item 31, was also concerned with giving feedback. For Item 31 (*Microteaching helps me to learn how to give appropriate feedback*, $M = 3.81$), generally the participants chose 'Agree' (30.3%) or 'Strongly Agree' (60.6%). The mean scores for these three items indicate that the participants held strongly positive attitudes towards the effects of microteaching on the development of students' abilities to evaluate L2 learners and give appropriate feedback to them. Finally, Item 33 was concerned with the question of whether peer-

teaching would familiarize students with the use of technology in their teaching. For Item 33 (*Microteaching helps me to learn how to use technology in teaching*, $M = 4.03$), while 24.2% of the participants chose 'Unsure', 18.2% chose 'Agree', and 48.5% chose 'Strongly Agree'. These results and the mean score for this item show that the participants believed that microteaching would help them learn how to use technology in their language classrooms.

Items 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, and 41 were related with the positive and negative aspects of microteaching. Items 35 and 36 were concerned with the positive aspects and asked whether the microteaching component was easy and beneficial for students. For Item 35 (*Microteaching is easy to do*, $M = 2.54$), 15.2% of the participants chose 'Strongly Disagree', 36.4% chose 'Disagree', and 30.3% chose 'Unsure'. Only 18.2% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree'. These frequencies show that the participants considered the implementation of microteaching as a difficult task. For Item 36 (*Microteaching is beneficial*, $M = 4.24$), the participants chose 'Agree' 33.3% and 'Strongly Agree' 51.5% of times. This shows that the participants considered doing microteaching in ELT courses very advantageous for themselves.

On the other hand, items 38 to 41 were included in the questionnaire to ask about the weaknesses of microteaching. The shortcomings targeted were as to whether ELT microteaching takes a lot of students' time, is done in an artificial environment, offers limited teaching experience, and suffers lack of peers' interest. For Item 38 (*Microteaching takes a lot of my time*, $M = 3.63$), 36.4% of the participants chose 'Unsure', 24.2% chose 'Agree' and 27.3% chose 'Strongly Agree'. For Item 39 (*Microteaching is carried out in an artificial environment*, $M = 3.66$), 39.4% of the participants chose 'Unsure', and 54.6% chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree'. For Item

40 (*Microteaching offers very limited teaching experience*, $M = 3.72$), the participants chose 'Disagree' 15.2% and 'Unsure' 21.2% of times. On the other hand, for this item, the participant, chose 'Agree' 39.4% and 'Strongly Agree' 24.2% of times. Finally, for Item 41 (*Microteaching suffers lack of interest of peers*, $M = 3.09$), 9.1% of the participants chose 'Strongly Disagree', 18.2% chose 'Disagree', and 36.4% chose 'Unsure' while 27.3% and 9.1% of the participants chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree', respectively. These frequencies for item 38 to 41 indicate that the participants noticed some weaknesses of peer-teaching.

4.1.2 Analysis of the Open-ended Questions

For the first open-ended item in the student questionnaire, the following question was asked: "*Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT methodology courses (i.e., ELT courses in which students do microteachings)?*" 97% of the students replied that peer-teaching should be part of ELT methodology courses. When asked "*Why or why not*", the most prominent reason, with 73% frequency, was that peer-teaching is an effective pedagogical strategy which would help prospective teachers practice their theoretical knowledge of how to teach English. For example, Student 31 answered that "There should be micro-teaching component in ELT because we haven't got too many chances to do the teaching in real classrooms so this helps us to practice". Using the metaphor of learning how to ride a bicycle, Student 23 was even more creative in his belief that peer-teaching would provide the opportunity to practice ELT theories: "Yes, definitely. Otherwise, it is like teaching in theory someone to ride a bicycle. It just would not work".

Some other students wrote that ELT peer-teaching should be included in ELT methodology courses because it is different from traditional techniques usually employed in ELT teacher education programs. 42% of the students expressed that

peer-teaching was an interesting experience although it is artificial. For example, Student 19 expressed the reason as the following: “Yes, because microteaching prepares us for the real classroom environment” and Student 22 wrote that “Yes, there should be micro-teaching [sessions]. It is a good experience”. Student 31 said:

There should be micro-teaching component in ELT because we haven't got too many chances to do the teaching in real classroom so this (micro-teaching sessions) helps us to practice.

With this respect Student 16 said:

Yes, there should be micro-teaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT courses because it allows students to gain hands on experience in teaching and make them aware of different methodology in teaching which they can adopt accordingly. Peer-teaching would give a better chance to the students to observe their peers and learn from them. Peer-teaching would allow them to collaborate and interact.

For the second open-ended question in the student questionnaire, the following question was asked: “*What are the benefits of the microteaching component in these ELT courses?*” The most prominent benefit mentioned by the students was that peer-teaching would provide students with feedback to their teaching attempts. More specifically, 61% of the students expressed that they could learn to reflect on their ELT practices according to the feedback they would receive from their peers and also from their instructors. In this way, they would have the chance to become aware of their teaching strengths and weaknesses. For example, Student 26 wrote that “(Peer-teaching) helps to understand one's strong/weak sides and improves the weaknesses (for example, tone of voice, speaking skills, level of confidence, etc.)”. Student 7 however, stated that “It gives us the chance of seeing our weaknesses and strengths and it helps us to develop our skills in teaching”.

In addition, for the second open-ended question in the student questionnaire, 33% of the participants stated that peer-teaching would improve their abilities to manage their classroom and time so that they could become more effective language teachers. For instance, Student 19 wrote “(Through peer-teaching,) I learned how to become an effective teacher and how to manage the time during teaching”. The students also wrote about some other reasons why ELT peer-teaching should be part of the process of teacher education. They stated that peer-teaching would help them develop the following abilities which they considered necessary for their ELT classrooms:

- engagement in collaborative learning,
- learning how to give feedback
- Improving one’s own L2 proficiency (e.g., L2 vocabulary and grammar and knowledge of L2 skills)
- And getting familiar with the processes of language acquisition.

Finally, some students also reported that peer-teaching is more action-based, meaning that they would have the chance to experience the actual practice of teaching English which is in contrast to other teacher education techniques which usually provide students with abstract knowledge about how a foreign/second language should be taught. Some of the students expressed their reason regarding the second open-ended question. For example, Student 4 wrote “It enables to learn by doing” and Student 5 wrote “you have chance to practice on what you have learned for many times”. Finally, for the second open-ended question, some students wrote about the awareness-raising benefits of peer-teaching. The participants expressed that peer-teaching would raise their awareness in the following areas:

- Understanding one’s own strengths and weaknesses in teaching L2

- Awareness of how best to teach the language

For the third open-ended item in the student questionnaire, the following question was asked: “*What are the problems you have about the microteaching component in these courses?*” The students’ answers to this open-ended items indicated that they were aware of the fact that peer-teaching component is not necessarily perfect and it has some problems. Most of the problems the participants mentioned were related to negative emotions students were experiencing when asked to manage the class.

Forty five percent of the students reported experiencing anxiety, low levels of self-confidence, and shyness, perhaps, because they knew that their teaching in peer-teaching sessions was under critical evaluation of their classmates and the instructor. For example, Student 32 expressed “I feel shy in front of my peers. They are trying their best but they cannot be real students for beginners”. Student 7, on the other hand, said “I am a shy person so this was my biggest problem”.

Moreover, twenty for percent of the participants believed students would experience these negative emotions during peer-teaching sessions because they might not have the required speaking abilities to manage the class in L2. For instance, Student 21 mentioned such problem as “weaknesses of my speaking”.

The students also focused on some other problems; the problems were specific to applying peer-teaching at the FLE Department in EMU. Some students (21%) considered ‘time limits’ as one of the most challenging problems. They also referred to other problems such as lack of appropriate peer-teaching materials (12%), limited access to technology (9%), and the artificiality of peer-teaching sessions (18%). The

followings are some examples from the students' answers to the third open-ended item which manifest the above reasons:

One of the students (Student 16) referred to different problems regarding the peer teaching:

The main problem in micro-teaching is lack of time, unavailability of real audience/learners, and looking for the materials which are suitable for micro-teaching. (Student 16)

Some other students (Students 1 and 28) mentioned the artificiality of micro-teaching sessions:

It should provide a realistic environment. (Student 1)

It doesn't fully give the real life teaching experience. (Student 28)

Another student (Student 5) believed technological equipment can be problematic:

(The problems) mostly technological problems. (Student 5)

The fourth open-ended question asked the students if they had any suggestions for how to improve microteaching component in ELT methodology courses. The question was "*What are your recommendations for the improvement of the microteaching component in these courses?*" The results for this question indicated that 42% of the recommendations made were related to practical aspects of peer-teaching component such as the number of students in each class, access to technology in the classroom (e.g., computers, video-recording, etc.), etc. Student 13 said "first of all, more technological equipment, sound system, big screen". Also 36% of the participants were more concerned with the amount of time in peer-teaching sessions allowed to each

participant. For example, Student 10 wrote that “[I recommend that we] reduce the time limits of micro-teaching sessions”. Student 9 was more specific about how much time should be allocated to each student teacher. It was added that “Maybe, [each student should be allowed] more than 15 minutes”. Moreover, Student 3 said that “microteaching sessions, should be increased in terms of time limit and quantity.”

Twenty four percent of the participants recommended that peer-teaching sessions must be less artificial though they failed to make suggestions as to how the sessions can become more real-life. For instance, Student 20 wrote that “It should be less artificial”. With this respect, student 3 also mentioned that “microteachings were done in an artificial environment”.

The participants also suggested the following ideas for improving the quality of microteaching component in their ELT courses:

- More peer-teaching sessions should be allocated to each student (more than twice a semester)
- Instructors should try to decrease stress and anxiety during peer-teaching
- Real learners should be included in the classroom.

4.2 Results of the Student Interviews

The student interviews were conducted to get more in-depth understanding of the students’ attitudes towards peer-teaching or microteaching component. The student interview sessions consisted of eight questions, some of which were also included in the open ended part of the questionnaire. The first question asked in the interview was “*Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT methodology courses (i.e., ELT courses in which students do microteachings)? Why or why not? Of*

the 10 students with whom interviews were conducted, all expressed that ELT peer-teaching should be included in ELT methodology courses. Putting theory into practice and receiving feedback to their teaching practice were also mentioned with high frequency in the interviews. All eight of the interviewees told that they had the opportunity to put theory into practice through peer-teaching. For instance, Interviewee 8 told that “there should be (microteaching), because I don’t believe that everything is in theory because if you don’t have practice, you don’t learn anything”. Interviewee 5 believed “there should be microteaching because it gives teacher candidates practice so they can improve their teaching”. In addition, six participants told peer-teaching is particularly fruitful because they can receive feedback on their teaching. According to the interviewees, the feedback received would show them what they did right and where they went wrong in their teaching. For instance, Student 7 said “there should be microteaching as while you are doing microteaching you know the negatives and the positives so when you really teach in school you can learn how to teach better”. Furthermore, three other participants reported that they liked the experience of peer-teaching. For example, Student 1 said “(microteaching) is of course a good opportunity to practice”.

The second interview question was “*How do you feel about micro-teaching sessions in your ELT courses?*” Some of the students believed that there should be more micro-teaching sessions in their ELTE courses. For example, Student 8 said: “I feel like honestly we need more. I wish we had more practice. I don’t think we have enough”. In a similar way, Student 5 stated: “personally I think there is not enough micro-teaching, which is bad”. On the other hand, Student 1 mentioned “it’s too much and it makes it really really boring for us. Some other students, like students 2 and 3, mentioned about the artificial environment of the micro-teaching sessions. The

participants also expressed the following regarding their feelings about the micro-teaching component: Confidence, anxiety, nervousness, relaxation.

The third question asked “*How do micro-teaching sessions help you? What are your gains from micro-teaching sessions?*” Six of interviewees reported that they could receive feedback to their teaching practice through peer-teaching. As a response to this question, student 3 told “I can see how I am performing, I can see my presentation skills like how much I use my body language, am I fluent in the language, I can see reactions from people about what I’m doing”. In the same respect, Student 6 said “it [micro-teaching] helps us to gain experience in teaching”. Four students, talked about the effects that peer-teaching would have on improving classroom management skills. For example, some students believed peer-teaching would help with managing classroom time while others believe that it would help them to learn about designing materials and techniques. In the same respect, Student 10 stated: that “it [micro-teaching would help] for preparing lesson plan first of all”.

The students also mentioned the following as the benefits of ELT peer-teaching:

- Familiarity with different types of teaching feedback
- Motivating ELT students
- Development of English language proficiency
- Awareness of L2 learning and teaching

Regarding the fourth question (“*Do you think you have enough opportunities to practice micro-teaching in ELT courses?*”), most of the participants believed that they do not have enough opportunities to practice micro-teaching. Students 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 10 didn’t think that they have done enough micro-teaching. For instance, Student 6

said “we don’t have enough practice sessions”. Student 7 said “we only have the chance to do micro-teaching twice. There should be more so we can improve ourselves better”. On the other hand, Student 1 said “it’s more than enough”. Similarly, student 3 said that “we have too many micro-teaching sessions”. Student 2 said he had no idea but he thought it might be a good idea to have more. Also, Student 9 believed that there are enough opportunities to practice micro-teaching in the ELT courses.

The fifth question in the student interviews asked “*What are the main problems you encounter during the micro-teaching sessions?*” Almost half of the participants reported that they felt time-pressured when undertaking peer-teaching. Student 10 told to the interviewer that “(the problem is) time limit; the time cannot be enough sometimes”. Student 7 similarly mentioned about time limit in peer-teaching and said “sometimes I have problem with timing”.

Most of the students in the present study also pointed out the artificial environment of the micro-teaching sessions. For example, Student 3 said “(micro-teaching sessions) becomes dull very quickly”. He/she added “(micro-teaching) is not real. It is artificial”. In a very similar way, Student 1 also used exactly the same words to describe micro-teaching sessions. The students also mentioned the following as the problems of peer-teaching sessions: Technological problems, Lesson planning, Being shy.

The sixth question asked “*what are the strengths of the micro-teaching component in ELT courses?*” Regarding the strengths of the micro-teaching component in ELTE courses, most of the students repeated what they mentioned in the third question. Moreover, with respect to the strengths of the micro-teaching component of ELT courses, Student 2 said: “it prepares us better for our own teaching, so it is something

necessary.” Furthermore, Student 7 said: “the best strengths is that you can improve yourself.” With the same respect Student 9 said: “it (microteaching) gives you the chance to see yourself, your weak points and improve them and gain much more confidence.”

The seventh question, on the other hand, asked “*What are the weaknesses regarding the micro-teaching in these courses?* As weaknesses regarding the micro-teaching, most of the students repeated what they said in question number five. Moreover, with respect to the weaknesses regarding the micro-teaching in ELTE courses, Student 9 raised an interesting point and said “sometimes we don’t get enough feedback and we can’t know what our weaknesses are”. Another issue which Students 8 and 4, 2 mentioned was about the classmates. For instance, student 8 said “if they have a problem with the person, they don’t answer the questions”. In a similar matter, student 2 said “sometimes our peers, they don’t take it seriously because it is an artificial environment”.

The eighth question in the interview (“*What can be done to enhance the micro-teaching component in these courses? Give your suggestions.*”) focused on the students’ suggestions. The interviewees’ answers to this last question were a little more diversified. Four of the participants told that more time should be allocated to each student during peer-teaching sessions, and the other four told that peer-teaching sessions should be less artificial and be more like real-world classrooms. With respect to the former recommendation, Student 8 stated “I think instead of doing 15 minutes micro-teaching, it should be half an hour, because it’s not enough time to get across skills and your teaching points”. Student 20 also suggested: “we can extend the time limit in micro-teaching because it is always 15 minutes or 20 minutes”. With respect

to the latter recommendation, Student 2 suggested that in order to make it less artificial, instead of his classmates, other students should be invited to the class. Similarly, Students 3 and 7 suggested the same.

Most of the participants, including Students 4 and 7, suggested that in order to enhance microteaching, there should be more micro-teaching sessions. To make micro-teaching component better and more effective, Student 5 said “more practice is needed, definitely.” On the other hand, Student 1 said “they (micro-teaching sessions) should be less”. Student 6, however, proposed that there should be more ELT courses which include micro-teaching component.

4.3 Results of the Instructor Questionnaire

Like the student questionnaire, the instructor questionnaire aimed to investigate the attitudes of the instructors towards the peer-teaching or microteaching component in ELTE courses taught in the FLE Department at EMU. The results of the instructor questionnaire are also presented under two subheadings, namely Analysis of the Closed Items and Analysis of the Open-ended questions.

4.3.1 Analysis of the Closed Items

The instructor questionnaire was parallel to the student questionnaire in that it consisted of 43 closed items investigating the instructors’ attitudes towards the peer-teaching or microteaching component in ELTE courses. Table 4.2 presents the instructors’ responses to each of the closed items in the questionnaire. Item 41 had the lowest mean ($M = 2.83$) and items 6 and 20 had the highest mean (item 6, $M = 4.66$; item 20, $M = 4.66$) in the instructor questionnaire.

In general, the results show that like the students, the instructors had positive attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT methodology courses. Furthermore, the instructors were aware that peer-teaching has some negative aspects as well.

Table 4.2: Frequencies and descriptive statistics (mean and standard deviation) for responses in the instructor questionnaire

Microteaching:	SA	A	US	D	SD	M (SD)
1. increases my students' motivation.	1	4	1	0	0	4.00 (.63)
2. helps my students to become more interested in the course.	2	3	1	0	0	4.16 (.75)
3. helps my students to develop creativity.	2	4	0	0	0	4.33 (.51)
4. increases my students' autonomy.	2	4	0	0	0	4.33 (.51)
5. helps my students to be organized.	1	5	0	0	0	4.16 (.40)
6. helps my students to develop planning skills.	4	2	0	0	0	4.66 (.51)
7. helps my students to prepare their own materials and activities.	2	4	0	0	0	4.33 (.51)
8. helps my students to learn how to manage the class.	1	3	1	1	0	3.66 (1.03)
9. helps my students to develop the actual teaching skills they'll need later.	1	5	0	0	0	4.16 (.40)
10. helps my students to learn how to predict classroom problems.	0	4	2	0	0	3.66 (.51)
11. helps my students with their time management.	1	5	0	0	0	4.16 (.40)
12. helps my students to develop their listening skills.	0	3	2	1	0	3.33 (.81)

Microteaching:	SA	A	US	D	SD	M (SD)
13. helps my students to develop their reading skills.	0	3	2	1	0	3.33 (.81)
14. helps my students to develop their writing skills.	0	3	2	1	0	3.33 (.81)
15. helps my students to develop their speaking skills.	0	3	3	0	0	3.50 (.54)
16. helps my students to develop their vocabulary.	0	3	2	1	0	3.33 (.81)
17. helps my students to develop their grammar.	0	2	4	0	0	3.33 (.51)
18. gives my students an opportunity to learn by observing their peers.	3	3	0	0	0	4.50 (.54)
19. helps my students to put theory into practice.	2	4	0	0	0	4.33 (.51)
20. enables my students to learn by doing.	4	2	0	0	0	4.66 (.51)
21. creates awareness of how to teach.	3	3	0	0	0	4.50 (.54)
22. improves my students' teaching practice.	4	1	1	0	0	4.50 (.83)
23. makes my students aware of the qualities of a good teacher.	1	3	2	0	0	3.83 (.75)
24. prepares my students for their teaching career.	3	3	0	0	0	4.50 (.54)
25. helps my students to use various teaching approaches /methods/techniques appropriately.	1	5	0	0	0	4.16 (.40)
26. helps my students to learn how to use teaching materials.	1	5	0	0	0	4.16 (.40)
27. helps my students to realize how to use body language effectively.	0	4	2	0	0	3.66 (.51)

Microteaching:	SA	A	US	D	SD	M (SD)
28. helps my students to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching.	1	3	2	0	0	3.83 (.75)
29. helps my students to learn how to evaluate learners.	1	1	3	1	0	3.33 (1.03)
30. helps my students to learn how to use praise and encouragement.	5	1	0	0	0	3.83 (.40)
31. helps my students to learn how to give appropriate feedback.	0	5	1	0	0	3.83 (.40)
32. helps my students to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses.	1	4	1	0	0	4.00 (.63)
33. helps my students to learn how to use technology in teaching.	1	4	1	0	0	4.00 (.63)
34. is fun.	2	2	2	0	0	4.00 (.89)
35. is easy to do.	1	1	3	1	0	3.33 (1.03)
36. is beneficial.	3	3	0	0	0	4.50 (.54)
37. causes anxiety.	3	3	0	0	0	4.50 (.54)
38. takes a lot of their time.	1	2	2	1	0	3.50 (1.04)
39. is carried out in an artificial environment.	2	4	0	0	0	4.33 (.51)
40. offers very limited teaching experience.	1	2	0	2	1	3.00 (1.54)
41. suffers lack of interest of peers.	0	1	4	0	1	2.83 (.98)
42. makes my students feel embarrassed when teaching their peers.	1	0	3	2	0	3.00 (1.09)
43. makes my students feel bored.	1	1	2	2	0	3.16 (1.04)

Note: SD = Strongly Disagree; D = Disagree; US = Unsure; A = Agree; and SA = Strongly Agree.

In Table 4.2, items 1, 2, 34, 37, 42, and 43 were related to the affective effects of peer teaching in ELTE courses. The results show that the instructors believed peer-teaching increases their students' motivation and interest in the course. For Item 1 (*Microteaching increases my students' motivation*, $M = 4.00$), four of the instructors chose 'Agree', 1 chose 'Strongly Agree' and one chose 'Unsure'. For Item 2 (*Microteaching helps my students to become more interested in the course*, $M = 4.16$), half of the instructors chose 'Agree', two chose 'Strongly Agree' and one chose 'Unsure'. For Item 34 (*Microteaching is fun*, $M = 4.00$), answers were equally distributed among 'Unsure', 'Agree', and 'Strongly Agree'. Each of these options was chosen by two of the instructors. In addition, none of the instructors chose 'Disagree' and 'Strongly Disagree' as their response to the item. These frequencies indicate that, like the students, the instructors held positive attitudes towards the affective effects of peer-teaching as shown by the mean scores obtained for items 1, 2, and 34.

On the other hand, Item 37 asked the instructors if microteaching would increase students' anxiety level. In response to Item 37 (*Microteaching causes anxiety*, $M = 4.50$), half of the instructors chose 'Agree' and the other half chose 'Strongly Agree'. For Item 42 (*Microteaching makes my students feel embarrassed when teaching their peers*, $M = 3.00$), two of the instructors marked 'Disagree', and half of them chose 'Unsure', while, one chose 'Strongly Agree'. For Item 43 (*Microteaching makes my students feel bored*, $M = 3.16$), two of the instructors chose 'Disagree' and the other two instructors chose 'Unsure'. In addition, for this item, two of the instructors chose 'Agree' and 'strongly agree'. The mean scores for these two items indicate that the instructors held neutral attitudes towards the idea that ELT peer-teaching would be embarrassing and boring for students though they expressed a little more positive

attitude towards Item 43 than Item 42. Their attitudes towards Item 42 were neutral with a mean score of 3.00.

In Table 4.2, items 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 were related to the development of classroom management skills through microteaching sessions. Items 3 and 4 focused on the effects of microteaching on students' creativity and autonomy from the instructors' viewpoint. For Item 3 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop creativity*, $M = 4.33$), four of the instructors chose 'Agree' and the remaining two chose 'Strongly Agree' as their responses to the item. Identically, for Item 4 (*Microteaching increases my students' autonomy*, $M = 4.33$), four and two instructors chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree', respectively. These numbers show that the instructors believed that peer-teaching would help students develop creativity and autonomy.

Items 5, 6, 7 and 8 asked the instructors whether microteaching helps students to be effective organizers, planners, and managers in their classrooms. five of the instructors expressed agreement and one expressed strong agreement for Item 5 (*Microteaching helps my students to be organized*, $M = 4.16$); two of the instructors chose 'Agree' and four of the instructors chose 'Strongly Agree' for Item 6 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop planning skills*, $M = 4.66$); four of the participants chose 'Agree' and two of the participants chose 'Strongly Agree' for Item 7 (*Microteaching helps my students to prepare their own materials and activities*, $M = 4.33$); and one of the instructors chose 'Disagree', one chose 'Unsure', three chose 'Agree', and one chose 'Strongly Agree' for Item 8 (*Microteaching helps my students to learn how to manage the class*, $M = 3.66$). These numbers show that the instructors believed peer-teaching would improve students' organization, planning, and management skills.

Items 10 and 11 were also related to classroom management skills; i.e., prediction of classroom problems, and time management skills. Two instructors chose 'Unsure' and 4 instructors chose 'Agree' for Item 10 (*Microteaching helps my students to learn how to predict classroom problems*, $M = 3.66$); and, 5 chose 'Agree', and 1 instructor chose 'Strongly Agree' for Item 11 (*Microteaching helps my students with their time management*, $M = 4.16$). These results show that the instructors had positive attitudes towards the influence of peer-teaching on students' abilities to predict classroom problems, and manage time in their classrooms.

Items 12 to 17 asked the instructors to express their opinions about the effects of microteaching on their students' L2 proficiency development. Items 12, 13, 14 and 15 were concerned with the effect of microteaching on L2 listening, reading, writing and speaking. The results for items 12 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop their listening skills*, $M = 3.33$), 13 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop their reading skills*, $M = 3.33$), and 14 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop their writing skills*, $M = 3.33$) were identical. For each of these items, one instructor chose 'Disagree', two instructors chose 'Unsure', and the remaining half chose 'Agree'. For Item 15 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop their speaking skills*, $M = 3.50$), the instructors were a little more positive as half of them marked 'Unsure' and the remaining half marked 'Agree' as their answers to the item. These results show that the instructors had positive attitudes towards the effect of peer-teaching on their students' development of L2 skills although these positive attitudes were not very strong. On the other hand, items 16 and 17 were concerned about the effect of peer-teaching on students' knowledge of L2 vocabulary and grammar from their instructors' viewpoints. For Item 16 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop their vocabulary*, $M = 3.33$), one instructor chose 'Disagree', two instructors chose 'Unsure', and the

half of the instructors chose 'Agree'. For Item 17 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop their grammar*, M = 3.33), four of the instructors chose 'Unsure', and two of the instructors chose 'Agree'. The mean scores for items 16 and 17 were similar to the mean scores for items 12, 13, and 14, which means that the instructors held positive attitudes towards the effect of peer-teaching on developing students' knowledge of L2 vocabulary and grammar.

In Table 4.2, items 9, 18, 19, 20, 22, and 24 focused on the opportunity that microteaching would provide for students to prepare them for L2 teaching and to practice their theoretical knowledge in teaching. The results demonstrated that these items obtained high ratings from the instructors. With respect to Item 9 (*Microteaching helps my students to develop the actual teaching skills they'll need later*, M 4.16), five of the instructors chose 'Agree' and one instructor chose 'Strongly Agree'. For Item 22 (*Microteaching improves my students' teaching practice*, M = 4.50), one instructor chose 'Unsure', one chose 'Agree, and four instructors chose 'Strongly Agree'. For Item 24 (*Microteaching prepares my students for their teaching career*, M = 4.50), half of the instructors chose 'Agree' and the remaining half chose 'Strongly Agree'. The results show that, the instructors favored the idea that peer-teaching would prepare students for their future teaching career.

In Item 19 the instructors were asked to express their ideas about whether or not microteaching helps students put theory into practice. In respect to this item (*Microteaching helps my students to put theory into practice*, M = 4.33), four of the instructors chose 'Agree' and two of the instructors chose 'Strongly Agree'. In other words, they all expressed agreement. Items 18 and 20 asked the instructors more specifically about opportunities the microteaching provides for students to practice

their theoretical knowledge of ELT. Concerning Item 18 (*Microteaching gives my students an opportunity to learn by observing their peers*, M = 4.50), all the instructors either agreed or strongly agreed. For Item 20 (*Microteaching enables my students to learn by doing*, M = 4.66), two of the instructors chose 'Agree' and the remaining four chose 'Strongly Agree'. These results show that, like the students, the instructors considered peer-teaching as an opportunity to learn through observation or doing.

The impact of microteaching on awareness raising was dealt with in items 21, 23 and 32. When responding to Item 21 (*Microteaching creates awareness of how to teach*, M = 4.50), all the instructors chose 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree'. For Item 23 (*Microteaching makes my students aware of the qualities of a good teacher*, M = 3.83), however, two of the instructors chose 'Unsure', three instructors chose 'Agree', and one instructor chose 'Strongly Agree'. Finally, for Item 32 (*Microteaching helps my students to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses*, M = 4.00), one instructor chose 'Unsure' while four instructors chose 'Agree; and one instructor chose 'Strongly Agree'. These results show that the instructors believed in the awareness-raising function of peer-teaching which would help students to become more aware of L2 teaching qualities of good language teachers, and their strengths and weaknesses in teaching.

Items 25 to 31 and Item 33 focused on the extent to which microteaching helps students acquire a repertoire of effective teaching techniques and strategies, as perceived by the instructors. Generally, the instructors' responses to these items indicated that they believed peer-teaching helps students learn more effective teaching techniques and strategies. Item 25 asked the instructors whether microteaching helps students be able to employ more various ELT approaches/methods/techniques appropriately in their

language classrooms (*Microteaching helps my students to use various teaching approaches/methods/techniques appropriately*, $M = 4.16$), and five of the participants chose 'Agree' and 1 instructor chose 'Strongly Agree'. Moreover, Item 26 asked the instructors whether peer-teaching helps students use ELT materials appropriately in their language classrooms. (*Microteaching helps my students to learn how to use teaching materials*, $M = 4.16$), and similarly, five of the instructors chose 'Agree' and one instructor chose 'Strongly Agree', showing that they strongly favored the idea that peer-teaching increases students' abilities to effectively use ELT materials in their own language classrooms.

Items 27 and 28 were related to the use of body language and eye contact in the language classroom. Responding to Item 27 (*Microteaching helps my students to realize how to use body language effectively*, $M = 3.66$), two of the instructors marked 'Unsure' and four of the instructors marked 'Agree' and, for Item 28 (*Microteaching helps my students to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching*, $M = 3.83$), two instructors chose 'Unsure', three instructors chose 'Agree', and one instructor chose 'Strongly Agree'. These results show that the instructors believed peer-teaching would help students to use their body language better and to establish eye contact with their students while teaching.

Another set of items, items 29, 30 and 31 were concerned with L2 evaluation and feedback. The instructors were asked to express their opinion as regards whether microteaching helps students to learn how to evaluate learners and how to give appropriate feedback to them. Item 29 asked the instructors if they believed microteaching would make students learn how to evaluate their learners and (*Microteaching helps my students to learn how to evaluate learners*, $M = 3.33$), one

instructor chose 'Disagree' and three instructors chose 'Unsure'. In addition, two instructors chose 'Agree' and 'Strongly Agree'. Item 30 was concerned with the question of whether microteaching enables students to give learners appropriate feedback through encouragement and praise, (*Microteaching helps my students to learn how to use praise and encouragement*, $M = 3.83$), and one instructor chose 'Agree' and the rest of the instructors chose 'Strongly Agree'. Item 31, on the other hand, asked the instructors about whether microteaching would teach students how to give appropriate feedback. For Item 31 (*Microteaching helps my students to learn how to give appropriate feedback*, $M = 3.83$), while one of the instructors chose 'Unsure', the remaining five chose 'Agree'.

Item 33 asked the instructors to give their opinion about if peer-teaching helps students to use technology in their teaching. For Item 33 (*Microteaching helps my students to learn how to use technology in teaching*, $M = 4.00$), while one of the instructors chose 'Unsure', four instructors chose 'Agree' and one chose 'Strongly Agree'. The mean score for this item demonstrated that the instructors in the present study defended the proposition that students would become more familiar with the use of technology in teaching through peer-teaching sessions.

Finally, items 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, and 41 were related with the positive and negative aspects of the microteaching component from the instructors' viewpoints. On one hand, Items 35 and 36 were concerned with its positive aspects. For Item 35 (*Microteaching is easy to do*, $M = 3.33$), half of the participants chose 'Unsure' and each of the options 'Disagree', 'Agree', and 'Strongly Agree' was chosen by one instructor. For Item 36 (is beneficial), half of the participants chose 'Agree' and the other half chose 'Strongly Agree'. Thus, the instructors thought that microteaching is

easy and beneficial for students. On the other hand, items 38 to 41 focused on the negative aspects of microteaching. For Item 38 (Microteaching takes a lot of their time, $M = 3.50$), one instructor chose 'Disagree' and two instructors chose 'Unsure' while two of the instructors chose 'Agree' and one instructor chose 'Strongly Agree'. For Item 39 (*Microteaching is carried out in an artificial environment*, $M = 4.33$), four of the instructors chose 'Agree' and the remaining two chose 'Strongly Agree'. For Item 40 (*Microteaching offers very limited teaching experience*, $M = 3.00$), two of the instructors chose 'Disagree', two chose 'Agree' and one chose 'Strongly Agree'. Finally, for Item 41 (*Microteaching suffers lack of interest of peers*, $M = 2.83$), four of the instructors chose the rating 'Unsure' while one instructor chose 'Agree' and another instructor chose 'Strongly Disagree'. The mean scores for these closed items in the instructor questionnaire indicate that the instructors' attitudes towards the negative aspects of peer-teaching ranged from positive to neutral.

4.3.2 Analysis of the Open-ended Questions

The open-ended items in the instructor questionnaire aimed to obtain a deeper understanding of the instructors' attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELTE courses in the FLE Department of EMU. The first open-ended question asked the instructors the following: "*Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT methodology courses (i.e., ELT courses in which students do microteachings)?*" five instructors stated that peer-teaching should be a part of ELT methodology courses (one of the instructors did not answer this question). When asked "*Why or who not?*", the instructors referred to the idea that peer-teaching would provide the chance for students to practice their theoretical knowledge. For example, Instructor 2 wrote: "They (i.e., students) have a chance to put theory into practice and instructors will have a chance to see what students can do in terms of practical

applications of theories”. Instructor 4 also argued that “peer-teaching would provide students with the opportunity to experience teaching. Instructor 3, on the other hand, believed that “it prepares students for their future teaching career”. Instructor 3 added “they (students) can put their theoretical knowledge into practice through microteaching”.

When asked the second open-ended question: (“*What are the benefits of the microteaching component in these ELT courses?*”) one instructor did not answer this question while three of them stated that students would be able to become more conscious of different aspects of ELT. For instance, regarding the benefits, Instructor 1 stated that “many, but time management, giving instructions, adapting materials, etc.”. He/ she added “[through microteaching] they learn by doing”. Instructor 3 also mentioned that “[microteaching] is a rehearsal for real teaching”.

Two of the instructors also noted that peer-teaching would help students acquire management skills and would decrease their anxiety when teaching the L2. Instructor 4 wrote that “Envisaged benefits would be developing such indispensable skills as planning, managing the classroom, as well as, helping student teacher overcome anxiety”.

Similarly, one of the instructors didn’t respond to the third open-ended question (“*What are the problems you have about the microteaching component in these courses?*”). However, the other instructors mentioned some problems. The problem that all the instructors referred to was related to negative emotions that peer-teaching may cause in students. Instructor 1 stated: “students are reluctant to show their plans. They need to be pushed a little bit for this”. According to the instructors’ answers,

students may feel anxious and frightened. As one of such problems, Instructor 3 stated “shy student teachers [can be problematic]”. The participants also expressed that some of the students may not have the required speaking abilities to handle the classroom in L2. Instructor 3 added “language problems of the student teachers (is another issue)”. As we notice, instructors stated that the peer-teaching experience might be frightening for some of the students and the fear might increase as a result of lack of proficiency in L2 or the students’ individual characteristics.

The fourth open-ended question asked the instructors the following: “*What are your recommendations for the improvement of the micro-teaching component in these courses?*” The analysis of the data showed that the instructors had some suggestions for improving the quality of peer-teaching component. Again, the suggestions made were more related to the practical aspects of peer-teaching. Although one instructor did not make any suggestions, the rest of the instructors made practical recommendations for improving the peer-teaching. For instance, Instructor 5 stated “(we should) give more opportunities for micro-teaching”. The following are two examples for their recommendations.

Classroom size should be small so that each student can do more than one micro-teaching. The more practice they have, the better they become in teaching. Video-recording of students’ teaching should be done. Later they can watch themselves (self-observation) and this may increase their awareness as regards how they teach, their weaknesses and strengths as teachers. (Instructor 3)

Having smaller classes (maximum 5 students). Having the chance to take them [students] to real classes. Getting feedback from their classmates. (Instructor 1)

4.4 Results of the Instructor Interviews

Of the six instructors filling out the instructor questionnaire, five instructors agreed to take part in an interview with the researcher. Interviews with the instructors were conducted to obtain an in-depth understanding of their attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT methodology courses in the department. The instructor interview consisted of nine questions, again some of which were also asked as open-ended questions in the questionnaire.

The first question of the interview was “*Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT methodology courses (i.e., ELT courses in which students do microteachings)?*” As an answer to this question, all of the instructors strongly argued that peer-teaching should be part of ELT teacher education programs. When asked “Why or why not” they thought peer-teaching should be included in such programs, they all answered that this component would give students a chance to put their theoretical knowledge into practice. For example, Instructor 2 said: “there must be (micro-teaching) because without practical applications we will never be sure whether what you teach is or can be effective or not”. With respect to this, Instructor 1 answered “well. Yes. I personally believe that there should be component of micro-teaching for methodology courses because it is quite helpful for the ELT students.” In addition, Instructor 4 said:

Of course there should be microteaching. I can't imagine ELT methodology courses without this component. The reason for that is that, we have to give our students the chance to put their theoretical knowledge into practice.

Upon the second question (“*how do you feel about micro-teaching session in your ELT courses?*”) all of the instructors expressed positive ideas about the micro-teaching

component in ELT courses. To exemplify, Instructor 5 said: “I feel (micro-teaching) is useful because students get the opportunity to make lesson plans and to practice.” Instructor 4, also mentioned positive feelings saying “they (micro-teaching sessions) are very positive. I am very happy about micro-teaching sessions”. Similarly, Instructor 3 said: “I’m feeling quite happy with it (micro-teaching).” Finally, with respect to this matter, Instructor 1 stated:

I feel great about micro-teaching. Micro-teachings are important and they are informative for the students and it helps them a lot to develop as a teacher and it is a nice opportunity for them to practice in the class before they start to go to the actual teaching. It is a nice experience for them.

In the third question, the instructors were asked “*How do micro-teaching sessions help your students? What are their gains from micro-teaching sessions?*” All of the instructors believed that micro-teaching will help the students to gain experience. For example, instructor 1 mentioned “it is an opportunity for them to gain some experience”. Instructor 3 also believe that the gain of micro-teaching is the experience. He/she said: “the biggest gain I believe is the experience.”

Regarding the gains of micro-teaching sessions in ELTE courses, Instructor 4 stated:

The more you practice, the better you become in whatever you are doing. So, it helps them to learn how to teach. It helps them to see whether or not they can teach effectively. It also helps them to gain awareness of their weaknesses and strengths in teaching. It gives them a chance to check if they have really understood the theoretical aspects. Also it helps them to learn how to prepare materials, how to plan lessons. Also it helps them to learn about time management, classroom management.

The instructors also mentioned the following benefits of ELT peer-teaching:

- Receiving feedback on one’s ELT techniques

- Creating good relationship with peers and the instructors
- Learning how to manage classroom and time
- Learning how to design and use ELT materials

The fourth question asked “*Do you think your students have enough opportunities to practice micro-teaching in ELT courses?*” and all of the instructors except one, believed that their students don’t have enough opportunities to practice micro-teaching. For instance, Instructor 1 said: “no, not at all. We don’t have enough opportunities to let them practice micro-teaching. It is very limited and it is problematic”. Similarly, Instructor 4 said: “unfortunately no because of the class size sometimes or the number of the topics we have to cover.” On the other hand, in the same matter, Instructor 3 said: “I do believe yes. I do believe that they do have enough opportunities. We give them plenty of opportunities in several courses.”

The fifth question in the interview with the instructors asked “*What are the main problems your students encounter during the micro-teaching sessions?*” Most of the instructors referred to the timing, artificiality of the environment. Instructor 1 for example said: “the major problem here is we don’t have enough time to let them practice micro-teaching”. He/she added “the major thing here is they are not in front of the real students. They are in front of their classmates and that is problematic”. Instructor 4 mentioned “the main problem is time management. They (students) cannot manage the class time.”

Having appropriate resources (technology and materials) for handling peer-teaching sessions was another issue that was mentioned by Instructor 2 who said: “there can be technical or technological problems. Unfortunately now we do not have good

classroom equipment.” On the other hand, Instructor 4 mentioned that technological problem is not a problem in microteaching sessions. The instructors also mentioned the followings as problems with peer-teaching sessions:

- Boredom of classroom environment
- Shortage of peer feedback in the sessions.
- Planning
- Giving Instructions
- Language problems and mistakes
- Lack of enough opportunities to practice micro-teaching
- Students’ anxiety

The sixth question in the interview asked “*What are the main problems you encounter during the micro-teaching sessions?*” Regarding the problems that instructors may encounter during the micro-teaching sessions, Instructor 5 stated:

One problem is time limitation. Some students go over the time limit that is also a problem. With big classes you may not be able to do two or more sessions which is another problem. Feedback sessions which I think should be an important part of any micro-teaching also take time and you have to meet individual students to give them feedback.

In this regard Instructor 1 stated: “the major problems is the classroom environment.”

Furthermore, Instructor 4 stated:

Sometimes it (micro-teaching sessions) can be very tiring to observe, to write detailed feedback, but overall, I can say I don’t have any big problems in micro-teaching. As far as you organize and plan well, you don’t have any problems.

Seventh question in the interview asked “*what are the strengths of the micro-teaching component in ELT courses?*” “The answers were same as the answers in question

number three and the experience the student gain from these micro-teaching sessions.

With respect to the strengths of the micro-teachings, Instructor 5 stated:

Gaining the experience of lesson planning. Knowing how to start, how to proceed, how to finish. Knowing the main stages of a lesson and having the experience to follow each stage. I think they are the main strengths of the micro-teaching.

Furthermore, instructor 4 stated:

It really helps students to get ready for their real teaching, it increases their awareness of themselves as teachers. Also by observing their friends and peers, they gain awareness. They can learn a lot from each other as well and of course they have a chance to put all their knowledge into practice.

Instructor 3 also said: “it (micro-teaching) is a good chance. They start having this experience (of teaching).”

The eighth question in the instructor interview asked “*What are the weaknesses regarding the micro-teaching in these courses?*” Most of the answers for this question were parallel to the answers which the instructors gave for questions five and six. Most of the instructors also mentioned the artificiality of the micro-teaching sessions and time limitation of these sessions. Regarding the weaknesses of micro-teaching sessions, Instructor 1 stated: “students, they don’t like micro-teaching. They struggle a lot. They don’t want to get in front of the class.” As one of the weaknesses, Instructor 3 stated: “the weakness is the natural environment. No matter how hard you try, it (the environment) is artificial. Moreover, Instructor 4 mentioned about time limitation and stated:

(The weakness) is time limit. We just give them the chance to do only one micro-teaching or ideally two, but not more than two. Another weakness is again related with the time limit which is after each micro-teaching, we could

have given more time for feedback but in order to not to lose time we just make general comments.

The last question in the interview asked the instructors the following: “*What can be done to enhance the micro-teaching component in these courses? Give your suggestions.*” All of the instructors made recommendations that were related to the practical aspects of the peer-teaching component of ELTE courses. Two of the instructors suggested that more time should be allocated to peer-teaching sessions in ELT methodology courses. For example, Instructor 1 said: “More time. More time is needed”. They also mentioned that technology and facilities available should be used more in peer-teaching sessions. To exemplify, Instructor 2 said: “There must be more recent technological developments”.

Two instructors also suggested that attempts should be made to decrease the artificiality of the classroom environment during peer-teaching sessions. For example, Instructor 3 stated:

Regarding the artificiality of the classroom situation, I don't think there is much to be done but we should try to create a context and tell our students in the classroom to imagine, to try to think themselves in real classroom situations and act accordingly.

Instructor 3 also suggested “we can try to raise awareness in the students. They (students) should take it more seriously”. More cooperation was also suggested by Instructor 2 and 3. For instance, Instructor 3 said: “we can cooperate. We can work on it (micro-teaching) together trying to raise awareness of the students. Students should be guided regarding the ways of preparation.”

Smaller class size was another issue that was suggested by the instructors 1 and 4. To exemplify, Instructor 4 stated: “The class size should be around 10. So if the class size is around 10, this means that students will have a chance to do three, four micro-teachings”. Another suggestion which was raised by Instructors 4 and 5 was giving more opportunities to students to practice micro-teaching. With this respect, Instructor 5 said: “if possible, students should be given more opportunities for micro-teaching”.

4.5 Summary

This chapter presented the results obtained in the present study. Analyses of the student and instructor questionnaires and interviews revealed that the students and the instructors generally held positive attitudes towards the peer-teaching or microteaching component of ELT courses. However, the attitudes are slightly different in different item categories. Both the students and the instructors stated that peer-teaching has positive influence on classroom management skills, the chance to put theory into practice, awareness, and the learning of ELT methods and techniques. In addition, both the students and the instructors held positive attitudes towards the idea that peer-teaching would improve students’ English language proficiency. However, the students stated that ELT peer-teaching would have more positive effects on oral L2 skills (speaking and listening) than on written L2 skills (reading and writing) while the instructors thought that the effects would be rather equal on all L2 skills. The descriptive statistics also showed that the instructors were more sensitive to the affective dimensions of ELT peer-teaching than the students because they rated the negative dimensions more highly. Furthermore, while both groups expressed positive attitudes in general, they pointed out both strengths and weaknesses of the ELT peer teaching component.

The analysis of qualitative data also showed that the students and their instructors believed peer-teaching should be part of ELT methodology courses as they saw significant benefits for students in peer-teaching. Both groups of participants were aware of the problems that peer-teaching had for the students although there was some differences and similarities between the two groups as to what the problem might be. Finally, both groups recommended some suggestions for improving the quality of the peer-teaching component in ELT teacher education programs such as more microteaching sessions and devoting more time to each session.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

In this chapter, a discussion on the results of the present study is presented. Particular attention is paid to how the findings of this study are consistent with the findings of the previous research studies and with the claims made in the literature. After discussing the results, a conclusion is provided. Furthermore, the implications for practice of peer-teaching in ELT programs are discussed. Finally, the limitations of the study are explained and suggestions for further research on peer-teaching are made.

5.1 Discussion of Results

In the following sub-sections, the results of the present study are discussed with reference to the previous studies on peer-teaching in ELT. The discussion has been organized on the basis of the research questions posed in the present study. In other words, the research questions are answered in this discussion of the results.

5.1.1 Research Question 1: What are the ELT students' attitudes towards the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?

The results obtained from the student questionnaire indicate that the students held generally positive attitudes towards the peer-teaching component in ELTE courses taught at the FLE Department of EMU. However, it can be seen that the students had more positive attitudes towards some features regarding microteaching than others. For example, generally, the students believed that microteaching component helps them in terms of 'management skills', 'putting theory into practice', 'awareness-raising', and 'teaching techniques and strategies' comparatively more because the

items related to these points received more positive responses (i.e. higher degree of agreement) from the students than other items.

With respect to the categories ‘putting theory into practice’ and ‘awareness-raising’, all the mean scores for the closed items in these two categories were higher than 4.00. For the categories ‘classroom management skills’ and ‘teaching techniques and strategies’, only one closed item in the former category (Item 10) and two items in the latter category (items 29 and 31) had mean scores lower than 4.00; yet, the mean scores for these three items were above 3.00 which shows that the participants held positive attitudes towards these aspects of peer-teaching. These results also indicate that the practical aspects of peer-teaching were positively perceived by the students in the study. Furthermore, the students had strongly positive attitudes towards the awareness-raising function of peer-teaching. These results are consistent with those of the previous studies. For instance, Ismail’s (2011) participants welcome the opportunities that peer-teaching provide for them to practice ELT and get familiar with effective ELT techniques and strategies. Seferoğlu’s (2006) participants, on the other hand, wished for a peer-teaching component in their ELT teacher education programs which would put them in the position of “observing different aspects of the teaching/learning process” (p. 373). Finally, the participants in Benson and Ying’s (2013) study reported that peer-teaching forced them to reflect on different aspects of ELT processes. In all the above mentioned studies, the student teachers had positive attitudes toward peer-teaching.

The students’ attitudes towards the closed items concerning the ‘effectiveness of microteaching’ and ‘L2 skills’ were comparatively less positive; yet, the mean scores for the items in these two categories still indicated that the students had moderately

positive attitudes towards the peer-teaching component. They found it interesting and motivating for them. This finding is in congruence with what Ismail (2011) found out in his study. Similarly, in Ismail's (2011) study students considered ELT peer-teaching as a strategy that would increase their motivation in English Language Teaching through providing them with opportunities to practice teaching. Moreover, the students in the present study believed that peer-teaching helps them improve their English language proficiency although they thought that the effects would be stronger on oral L2 skills (i.e., speaking and listening) than on written L2 skills (reading and writing). They also believed that the effects would not be limited to L2 skills as peer-teaching would also help them improve their knowledge of English vocabulary and grammar. In the same way, the participants in Merc's (2015) and Benson and Ying's (2013) studies reported that peer-teaching would have positive effects on their L2 knowledge.

Finally, with respect to the items regarding the 'positive and negative aspects of microteaching', the mean scores ranged from moderately negative to moderately positive. The students thought that peer-teaching is a difficult task, it takes time and suffers from the lack of peers' interest. Also, they believed that peer-teaching offers limited teaching experience in an artificial environment. Nevertheless, they assumed that peer teaching would be beneficial for them. These results show that although the students were aware of some negative aspects of peer-teaching, they welcome its inclusion in ELT courses because they believed that it would bear fruitful outcomes for them at the end.

The main reason for why the students expressed positive attitudes towards peer-teaching might have been the innovative and practice-based nature of peer-teaching. Many students are still trained on how to teach English through traditional methods of

teacher education which usually involve the transfer of theoretical knowledge from the instructor to students (Akbari, 2007; Arikan, 2006; Richards, 2008). Peer-teaching would probably appeal more to ELT students because it presents itself as a new experience for students. This interpretation is supported in the literature as well. For example, Benson and Ying (2013) indicated that the students welcome the use of peer-teaching as part of their teacher education programs even though they were rather confused at first about how it would work and what purposes it would serve for teacher education programs. Discussing the concept of language teacher education in the post-method era, Arikan (2006) also stresses that language teacher education should move away from the traditional methodologies towards innovations which are more practice-based. According to these researchers, these innovations would willingly be accepted by the students and boost reflection in students which is a necessary requirement to become an efficient language teacher (Akbari, 2007). In addition, , Levine, Howard, and Gort (2014) reported that the chance to engage in collaborative mediation with the classmates and teacher education instructors increases the motivation of students in teacher education programs at the University of Connecticut.

To conclude, the student teachers who participated in the present study favored ELT peer-teaching as an effective teacher education tool. Their positive attitudes can be related to the opportunities peer-teaching, as an innovative technique of teacher education, would provide for them to improve their teaching skills. However, they were at the same time aware that peer-teaching has some negative aspects that may limit its effectiveness.

5.1.2 Research Question 2: What are the ELT instructors' attitudes towards the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?

The results show that, generally, the instructors also had positive attitudes towards peer-teaching component in ELT courses offered at the FLE Department of EMU. They held more positive attitudes towards some categories of items in the instructor questionnaire. For example, the closed items regarding 'putting theory into practice' received the highest ratings from the instructors in the present study. All the mean scores for the items in this category were above 4.00. The closed items regarding 'awareness-raising' also received high ratings from the instructors as shown by the mean scores for these items. Two items in this category had mean scores equal to or more than 4.00 and one item had a mean score of 3.83.

Also, on average, the items regarding the 'effectiveness of microteaching' and 'classroom management skills' received more positive responses from the instructors. Four closed items regarding 'effectiveness of microteaching' had mean scores above 4.00 and two mean scores were equal to or more than 3.00. In contrast to the above results, the instructors held comparatively less positive attitudes towards the items regarding the development of 'L2 skills' and 'teaching techniques and strategies' yet, their attitudes towards the items in these two categories were still moderately positive. Finally, the instructors expressed moderately positive or moderately negative attitudes towards the closed items regarding the 'positive and negative aspects of microteaching'.

There is not much research in the literature on instructors' attitudes towards peer-teaching to enable the researcher to interpret the results as regards the instructors' attitudes towards peer-teaching by referring to other studies in the literature. The

positive attitudes of the instructors in the present study might have arisen from the ‘experience’ of the instructors in employing peer-teaching as an effective instructional strategy for training students on how to teach English. Similarly, based on their experience in preparing teachers how to teach L2 at the University of Connecticut, Levine et al. (2014) state that peer-teaching (which they call as *teaching coaching*) would “position (teaching) peers to offer constructive criticism while learning from others’ dilemmas or artifacts of their work” (p. 49). Therefore, Levine et al. (2014) argue that instructors at the University of Connecticut show positive attitudes towards the opportunity peer-teaching provides for them to increase students’ learning and achievement in teacher education programs. The same argument has also been posed by other researchers working on the issue of ELT peer-teaching (Benson & Ying, 2013; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Kaur, 2015).

The positive attitudes of the instructors in the present study can also be related to the idea that peer-teaching would boost positive rapport between them and their students (and among the students themselves) and, thus, instructors welcome such an opportunity. Although reciprocal interaction and positive rapport between instructors and their students are increasingly encouraged in the area of ELT teacher education (see Johnson & Golombek, 2011), less success has been achieved in this regard. This can be partly attributed to the proposition that teacher education instructors are still willing to hold their authoritative role in ELT teacher education programs (Benson & Ying, 2013; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011). However, the instructors’ positive attitudes in the present study is a sign that instructors are ready to compromise their authoritative role if they become aware that more success can be achieved in these courses through peer-teaching. This proposition has been previously supported in the field (Assinder, 1991; Benson & Ying, 2013; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Kaur,

2015). On the other hand, reciprocal interaction and positive rapport would be boosted on one condition, that is, students should come to believe that their classmates and the instructor are supportive and that their mistakes would not be laughed at during the peer teaching practice.

Overall, in the present study, both the instructors and the students seemed to have positive attitudes towards the effectiveness of peer-teaching, although, instructors had comparatively more positive attitudes than the students. In general, instructors see peer-teaching courses more as a context for motivating students in ELT (Richards, 2008), and the students see it as a chance to improve their L2 proficiency (Benson & Ying, 2013; Merc, 2015).

Overall, same as the students, the instructors participated in the present study favored the use of ELT peer-teaching component. It can be mentioned that, based on their experience, these instructors believed peer-teaching would have fruitful results for the students' future teaching career. The instructors were also aware that the positive effects of ELT peer-teaching would be limited by some practical limitations of this technique.

5.1.3 Research Question 3: What do the ELT students and instructors suggest for the improvement of the peer teaching component in ELTE courses?

The results of the qualitative part of the present study indicated that both the students and the instructors favored the inclusion of peer-teaching in ELTE courses. This finding supports the results of the quantitative part and it is congruent with the results of some studies on peer-teaching in the literature (e.g., Benson & Ying 2013; Ismail, 2011; Seferoglu's, 2006).

The students welcome the chance that peer teaching would provide for them to practice their theoretical teaching knowledge. This is consistent with the findings obtained in Benson and Ying (2013) and Ismail (2011). The students in both of these studies held strongly positive attitudes towards the idea that peer-teaching should be part of teacher education programs.

Similarly, the instructors in the present study believed in the inclusion of peer teaching sessions in methodology courses. Although less research has been done on instructors' attitudes towards ELT peer teaching to enable us to make comparisons, this can be related to the proposition that the instructors hold positive attitudes towards those teacher education strategies which bear fruitful outcomes for their teacher students (Levine et al. 2014; Richards, 2008).

Although the participants of the present study expressed positive attitudes as regards peer-teaching, they at the same time, pointed out some weaknesses or problems and put forward some suggestions for its improvement. The students referred to the negative emotional situations that they had experienced during peer teaching sessions. According to Benson and Ying (2013) and Johnson and Arshavskaya (2011), these negative emotional experiences are prevalent in the early sessions of ELT peer teaching, particularly because students may not feel confident about their L2 abilities to handle peer teaching sessions. The teacher students in the present study also complained about the time limits of peer teaching sessions. The students in the present study believed that it would be more advantages for them if they are given more time to practice peer teaching.

The instructors mentioned the practical problems of ELT peer teaching. They argued that peer teaching might cause anxiety for the students; yet, they suggested that the anxiety experienced might be related to students' personality characteristics. However, the proposition that the students' personality characteristics interacts with their performance of teacher education programs has not been established in the literature (William & Burden, 1997).

The participants of the present study also made some recommendations as to how the quality of the peer-teaching component of ELTE courses could be improved. These recommendations were more concerned with the practical aspects of peer-teaching. For instance, the participants expressed that more classroom time should be devoted to the peer-teaching practice; micro-teaching sessions should be increased; technological advancement (e.g., computers, video-recorders, etc.) should be employed in the classroom; and peer-teaching sessions should become more realistic. Some of these recommendations made by the students in the present study were also suggested by the students in Benson and Ying (2013). The students in Benson and Ying (2013) also mentioned about time limitation in peer teaching session and that the time allowed for peer teaching should be extended. They also defended the use of technology in peer-teaching sessions. Moreover, the students in Benson and Ying (2013) were also concerned about a focus on the use of materials in their language classrooms and mentioned about the "need to thoroughly understand the material that one is going to teach" (p. 61). On the other hand, the students in the present study were less concerned about what ELT peer teaching can offer to them with respect to the use of language classroom materials.

However, regarding some of the suggestions, the participants were unable to point out how these recommendations can be operationalized in ELT classrooms. Yet, it is worth to reflect upon these recommendations to see whether appropriate changes can be made in current practice of peer teaching to improve the quality of the practice.

As reviewed in Chapter Two, one main complaint expressed by the participants in Seferoglu's (2006) study was that there should be more opportunities for peer-teaching in the Turkish context. Studies by Benson and Ying (2013) and Ismail (2011) also indicated that students favored the idea that peer-teaching should comprise a main part of ELT teacher education programs. Similarly, the students in the present study also stressed that peer-teaching should be included in the ELT courses because it would give them the chance to practice what they had learned in theory. Furthermore, the students expressed that they would benefit from the feedback to their teaching they received from the classmates and from the instructor. These are very parallel to the reasons pointed out in the literature on peer-teaching (e.g., Benson and Ying, 2013; Kaur, 2015; Richards, 2008; Savas, 2012).

The participants mentioned some benefits of the peer-teaching component of ELT courses while expressing their awareness of the challenges of peer teaching. There are some points that should be taken into consideration with respect to the benefits and challenges mentioned by the participants during the conducted interviews. First, the benefits mentioned by the participants are not necessarily new as the previous literature has prepared a long list of advantages that justify the use of peer-teaching strategy in ELT teacher education (Assinder, 1991; Benson & Ying, 2013; Savas, 2012a, 2012b; Seferoğlu, 2006). Second, the challenges to ELT peer-teaching mentioned by the participants during the interviews have been largely overlooked in the previous

literature on peer-teaching. This can be described by the proposition that peer-teaching is somehow a more recent innovation in the field of ELT teacher education than other techniques and, therefore, the proponents of this technique have generally focused their attention on justifying its use in ELT teacher education, thus consciously overlooking its shortcomings. However, to be able to improve the quality of ELT peer-teaching, it is of importance that these problems are identified and attempts are made to overcome them.

In the present study, finding out that the participants were aware of the benefits and problems of ELT peer-teaching is good news as it means that student teachers and instructors know what their role is in peer-teaching sessions. This would have a classroom-management function for ELT teacher education programs into which peer-teaching has been incorporated. As Peacock, M. (2009) states, teacher education programs could be sometimes confusing to students who may enter these programs with presuppositions as to how a foreign/second language should be taught. These presuppositions may interfere with what is taught to students in the programs. However, peer-teaching is clearer about its objectives (Benson & Ying, 2013) and, therefore, students' and instructor's awareness of the expectations and roles would facilitate the process of employing this technique in the classrooms.

To conclude, both the students and the instructors presented suggestions as to how the quality of ELT peer-teaching could be improved. The majority of the suggestions they made were related to the practical aspects of ELT peer-teaching. They mentioned some practical problems and limitations that ELT peer-teaching suffered from and recommended some ways to overcome these problems and limitations.

5.2 Conclusion

The present study attempted to investigate into the third and fourth year ELT students' and their instructors' attitudes towards the 'peer teaching' component in ELT methodology courses in the Department of Foreign Language Education of Eastern Mediterranean University. The participants of the present study comprised two groups which were 33 third and fourth year undergraduate ELT students and the 6 instructors in the department. In order to collect the data for the study, a set of four instruments were used, namely student questionnaire, instructor questionnaire, interviews with students, and interviews with instructors.

The results of the data analyses in the quantitative phase indicated that both the students and the instructors expressed positive attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT courses in the undergraduate ELT program of the FLE Department of EMU. For the students, the positive attitudes were attributed to the innovative nature of peer-teaching which would appeal to students who saw it as dissimilar to traditional lecture-based techniques usually used for teacher education (Richards, 2008). Furthermore, peer-teaching would provide them a platform for interacting with their classmates and instructors, providing them with the opportunity to receive feedback to their ELT teaching strategies and techniques (Ismail, 2011; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Kaur, 2015).

On the other hand, the positive attitudes of the instructors in the present study could be explained by the proposition that the instructors have had experiences in employing peer-teaching as an effective instructional strategy for training their students on appropriate teaching techniques and methods. In addition, the instructors would be

able to create positive rapport with their own students, which would increase the encouraging atmosphere of the ELT teacher education classroom.

The results of the qualitative phase of the study indicated that the instructors and students were aware of the benefits that peer-teaching would have for teacher education programs and for the students' future teaching careers. However, the participants also mentioned some problems with employing peer-teaching in ELTE courses. According to their beliefs, these problems can be overcome by doing some changes. Based on their suggestions, some of these changes can be related to doing more microteachings in methodology courses and devoting more time to microteaching sessions.

In conclusion it can be concluded that peer-teaching has been successful in proving itself as an effective instructional strategy in the eyes of both students and their instructors. The participants in the present study held generally positive attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT methodology courses. The students favored ELT peer-teaching because they experienced it as an innovative teacher education strategy while the instructors suggested micro-teaching sessions because their experience in employing this technique in their classrooms provided good teaching experience for their students. In addition, both the students and the instructors made some suggestions as to how the practical limitations of ELT peer-teaching could be overcome so that the quality of this component of ELT methodology courses could be improved.

The findings of the present study have important implications for both theory and practice of ELT peer-teaching. In the following paragraphs, these implications are

discussed. Moreover, some suggestions for further research on attitudes towards the peer-teaching component of ELT teacher education programs are made to guide other researchers who are willing to conduct research in this area of ELT teacher education.

5.3 Implications for Practice

The findings of the present study would have some implications for the practice of peer-teaching. The findings confirmed previous evidence that students held positive attitudes towards employing peer-teaching as an effective instructional technique in ELT teacher education programs. However, the present study took a step forward to find out that the instructors too had positive attitudes towards ELT peer-teaching. Thus, the present study may help research on ELT peer-teaching to make more generalizable conclusions about the attitudes of different groups involved with ELT towards ELT peer-teaching by doing more research in the field.

The practical implication of the present study is that peer-teaching is one of the best platforms for ELT students to put into practice what they have learned in theory. This is a point which has been repeatedly supported by previous studies (e.g., Benson & Ying, 2013; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Savas, 2012; Verity, 2011). Therefore, the implication is that designers of ELT teacher education programs should include peer-teaching in more courses. This would help student teachers make practical sense of what they have learned in theory-based teacher education sessions.

Finally, in the qualitative part of the present study, both student teachers and the instructors mentioned some problems of ELT peer-teaching and made some recommendations (such as more microteaching sessions and devoting more time to these sessions) as to how the quality of the peer-teaching component of ELT teacher

education programs could be improved. These findings may provide useful feedback for the instructors in the FLE Department of the efficiencies of the peer teaching component in their ELTE courses and get them to improve this component to address the needs of their students more. These findings may also be helpful for teacher educators in designing courses which include peer teaching component.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

This study has some limitations. The first one is that the study only targeted the students and the instructors in the FLE Department at EMU. So, the generalizability of the findings will be limited to this context until further studies are undertaken to see whether the findings obtained in the present study can be generalized to other ELT teaching and learning contexts in which peer-teaching is practiced. The second limitation is the small number of instructors participating in the present study. This limitation in the study is because of the number of instructors who included peer-teaching in their courses at the FLE Department at the EMU is limited. The third limitation is related to lack of observations to collect data about peer-teaching sessions. The main advantage of using such technique is that, the researcher adopts the role of the observer, meaning that she/he participates in the context where the research phenomenon happens and it helps to gain a better insight and as a result, it leads to a better understanding regarding the microteaching component of methodology courses.

5.5 Suggestions for Future Research

Some suggestions can be made for researchers so that they can follow this line of research in their future studies. First, it is recommended that the present study be replicated by other researchers in other ELT contexts. Recently, replication studies have been strongly recommended in the field of applied linguistics (e.g., Abbuhl, 2012; Mu & Matsuda, 2016; Porte, 2012). The logic is that research conclusions can be

generalized with more confidence if (nearly) the same findings are achieved over studies of the same type and design. So, to see whether the findings obtained in the study can be generalized to other ELT teacher education settings in which peer-teaching is practiced, more studies similar to the present study should be undertaken.

Second, it is recommended that future studies go beyond attitudes towards microteaching and investigate whether peer-teaching can actually help pre-service teachers become more efficient ELT teachers. More importantly, these studies should determine whether any improvement in student teachers' teaching skills will influence learners' L2 achievements. Such studies would be longitudinal in nature (see Ortega & Iberri-Shea, 2005) as it involves targeting student teachers in peer-teaching sessions, observing them when they begin to teach English, and assessing achievements of their learners.

Finally, in addition to the techniques used in the present study to collect the required data (i.e., questionnaires, open ended questions, and interviews,) other techniques such as observation can also be used. More specifically, the main advantage of using such a technique is that, the researcher adopts the role of the observer, meaning that she/he participates in the context where the research phenomenon happens. Thus, it is suggested that future studies adopt this technique in order to understand microteaching component of methodology courses better.

5.6 Summary

In this chapter, the results of the study were discussed with respect to the previous literature on peer-teaching. Then, the chapter went on to present a conclusion to summarize the obtained findings. After that, the practical implications of the findings

were discussed. Next, the chapter proceeded by mentioning the limitations the study, and finally, some suggestions for future research on peer-teaching were made.

REFERENCES

- Abbuhl, R. (2012). Why, when, and how to replicate research. In A. Mackey & S. M. Gass (Eds.), *Research methods in second language acquisition* (pp. 296–312). Oxford, England: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Akbari, R. (2007). Reflections on reflection: A critical appraisal of reflective practices in L2 teacher education. *System*, 35(2), 192-207.
- Alkharusi, H., Kazem, A. M., & Al-Musawai, A. (2011). Knowledge, skills, and attitudes of preservice and inservice teachers in educational measurement. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 39(2), 113-123.
- Allwright, D. (2003). Exploratory practice: Rethinking practitioner research in language teaching. *Language teaching research*, 7(2), 113-141.
- Allwright, R. L. (1988). Autonomy and individualization in whole-class instruction. In A. Brookes & P. Grundy (Eds.), *Individualization and autonomy in language learning* (pp. 35– 44). London: Modern English Publications and the British Council.
- Arikan, A. (2006). Postmethod condition and its implications for English language teacher education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 2, 1-11.
- Arsal, Z. (2014). Microteaching and pre-service teachers' sense of self-efficacy in teaching. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(4), 453-464.

- Assinder, W. (1991). Peer teaching, peer learning: one model. *ELT Journal*, 45(3), 218-229.
- Benson, P., & Ying, D. (2013). Peer teaching as a pedagogical strategy for autonomy in teacher education. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 36(1), 50-68.
- Bernhardt, E., & Hammadou, J. (1987). A decade of research in foreign language teacher education. *The Modern Language Journal*, 71(3), 289-299.
- Corbin, J., & Strauss, A. (2014). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cotterall, S. (1995). Developing a course strategy for learner autonomy. *ELT Journal*, 49(3), 219-227.
- Crandall, J. (2000). Language teacher education. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 20, 34-58.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methodologies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.

- Edge, J. (1984). Error cards—Peer teaching in ELT teacher training. *System*, 12(2), 117-121.
- Flick, U. (2008). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Freeman, D. (1989). Teacher training, development, and decision making: A model of teaching and related strategies for language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 23(1), 27-45.
- Gatbonton, E. (2008). Looking beyond teachers' classroom behaviour: Novice and experienced ESL teachers' pedagogical knowledge. *Language Teaching Research*, 12(2), 161-182.
- Gebhard, J. G., Gaitan, S., & Oprandy, R. (1987). Beyond prescription: The student teacher as investigator. *Foreign Language Annals*, 20(3), 227-232.
- Goertz, G. & Mahony, J. (2012). *A tale of two cultures: Qualitative and quantitative research in the social sciences*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gunn, C. L. (2010). Exploring MATESOL student 'resistance' to rELTecture. *Language Teaching Research*, 14(2), 208-223.
- Harman, R. M., Ahn, S., & Bogue, B. (2016). RELTective language teacher education: Fostering discourse awareness through critical performative pedagogy. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 59, 228-238.

- Hashemi, M. R. (2012). Forum: RELTectons on mixing methods in applied linguistics research. *Applied Linguistics* 33.2, 206–212.
- Ismail, S. A. A. (2011). Student teachers Microteaching experiences in a preservice English teacher education program. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 1043-1051.
- Jang, E. E., Wagner, M., & Park, G. (2014). Mixed methods research in language testing and assessment. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 34, 123-153.
- Johnson, K. E. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. E., & Arshavskaya, E. (2011). Reconceptualizing the micro-teaching simulation in an MA TESL course. In K.E. Johnson & P.R. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development* (pp. 168-186). London and New York: Routledge.
- Johnson, K. E., & Golombek, P. R. (Eds.). (2011). *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kanno, Y., & Stuart, C. (2011). Learning to become a second language teacher: Identities-in-practice. *The Modern Language Journal*, 95(2), 236-252.

- Kaur, K. (2015). The emergent nature of strategic mediation in ESL teacher education. *Language Teaching Research*, 19(3), 374-388.
- Kono, N. (2013). Ethics in research. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of applied linguistics*. (PP. 2014-2024). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Korthagen, F. A., & Kessels, J. P. (1999). Linking theory and practice: Changing the pedagogy of teacher education. *Educational researcher*, 28(4), 4-17.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). A postmethod perspective on English language teaching. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 539-550.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). *Understanding language teaching: From method to postmethod*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lantolf, J. P., & Pavlenko, A. (1995). Sociocultural theory and second language acquisition. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 108-124.
- Lantolf, J. P. (2000). *Sociocultural theory and second language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levine, T. H., Howard, E. R., Gort, M. (2014). Recruiting and organizing learning among busy faculty members. In T. Levine, E. R. Howard, & D. Moss (Eds.) *Preparing classroom teachers to succeed with second language learners: Lessons from a faculty learning community*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Macalister, J. (2016). Tracing it back: Identifying the impact of a trans-national language teacher education program on classroom practice. *RELC Journal*, 47(1), 59-70.
- Mennim, P. (2012). Peer teaching and learner-generated materials: Introducing students to New Roles 1. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(2), 230-242.
- Merc, A. (2015). Microteaching Experience in Distance English Language Teacher Training: A Case Study. *Journal of Educators Online*, 12(2), 1-34.
- Mu, C., & Matsuda, P. K. (2016). Replication in L2 writing research: Journal of Second Language Writing authors' perceptions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 201-219.
- Nunan, D. (1996). Towards autonomous learning: Some theoretical, empirical and practical issues. In R. Pemberton, E. S. L. Li, W. W. F. Orr, & H. D. Pierson (Eds.), *Autonomy in language learning* (pp. 13–26). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Ortega, L., & Iberri-Shea, G. (2005). Longitudinal research in second language acquisition: Recent trends and future directions. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 26-45.
- Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-278.

- Porte, G. (2012). *Replication research in applied linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Riazi, A. M., & Candlin, C. N. (2014). Mixed-methods research in language teaching and learning: Opportunities, issues and challenges. *Language Teaching, 47*(02), 135-173.
- Richards, J. C. (2008). *Second language teacher education today*. *RELC Journal, 39*(2), 158-177.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001) *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Savas, P. (2012). Micro-teaching videos in ELT teacher education methodology courses: Tools to enhance English proficiency and teaching skills among trainees. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 55*, 730-738.
- Savas, P. (2012b). Use of digital video recording in the preparation stage of pre-service foreign language teachers' micro-teachings. *International Journal on New Trends in Education and their Implications, 3*(3), 107-116.
- Seferoglu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates rELTectiions on some components of a pre-service English teacher education program in Turkey. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 32*(4), 369–378.

- Spratt, M., & Leug, B. (2000). Peer teaching and peer learning revisited. *ELT Journal*, 54(3), 218-226.
- Student Handbook. Department of Foreign Language Education. Eastern Mediterranean University.
- Sunderland, J. (2000). Issues of language and gender in second and foreign language education. *Language Teaching*, 33(4), 203-223.
- Tedick, D. J. (Ed.). (2013). *Second language teacher education: International perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Ten Cate, O., & Durning, S. (2007). Peer teaching in medical education: twelve reasons to move from theory to practice. *Medical teacher*, 29(6), 591-599.
- Thomas, M. (2005). Theories of second language acquisition: Three sides, three angles, three points. *Second Language Research*, 21(4), 393-414.
- Tsui, A. B. M. (2003). *Understanding expertise in teaching: Case studies of ESL teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Verity, D. P. (2011). The reverse move: Enriching informal knowledge in the pedagogical grammar class. In K. E. Johnson & P. R. Golombek (Eds.), *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development* (pp. 153-167). New York and London: Routledge.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard university press.
- William, M., & Burden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, T., & Beaumont, M. (2014). *Experiences of second language teacher education*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Yassaei, S. (2012). RELTective practice among MATESOL graduates in the UAE: theoretical construct or ongoing benefit? *RELTective Practice*, 13(2), 255-270.
- Yates, R., & Muchisky, D. (2003). On reconceptualizing teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(1), 135-147.
- Yavuz, A., & Topkaya, E. Z. (2013). Teacher educators' evaluation of the English language teaching program: A Turkish case. *Novitas-Royal*, 7(1), 64-83.
- Yepez, M. E. (1994). An observation of gender-specific teacher behavior in the ESL classroom. *Sex Roles*, 30(1-2), 121-133.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Student Questionnaire

Dear student,

I am a graduate student and I am conducting my thesis research study on peer-teaching component in ELT courses. This questionnaire aims to identify your ideas about the peer-teaching or micro-teaching component in ELT courses. Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential and will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your help.

Farhad Aliaskari

MA student

E-mail: tantan773377@gmail.com

English Language Teaching Department

Faculty of Education

✂-----

Consent Form

Having read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used, I agree to participate in the study.

Name- Surname: -----

Signature: -----

Date: -----

	Microteaching:	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
10	helps me to learn how to predict classroom problems.					
11	helps me with my time management.					
12	helps me to develop my listening skills.					
13	helps me to develop my reading skills.					
14	helps me to develop my writing skills.					
15	helps me to develop my speaking skills.					
16	helps me to develop my vocabulary.					
17	helps me to develop my grammar.					
18	gives me an opportunity to learn by observing my peers.					
19	helps me to put theory into practice.					
20	enables me to learn by doing.					
21	creates awareness of how to teach.					
22	improves my teaching practice.					
23	makes me aware of the qualities of a good teacher.					
24	prepares me for my teaching career.					
25	helps me to use various teaching approaches/methods /techniques appropriately.					
26	helps me to learn how to use teaching materials.					

	Microteaching:	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
27	helps me to realize how to use body language effectively.					
28	helps me to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching.					
29	helps me to learn how to evaluate learners.					
30	helps me to learn how to use praise and encouragement.					
31	helps me to learn how to give appropriate feedback.					
32	helps me to discover my teaching strengths and weaknesses.					
33	helps me to learn how to use technology in teaching.					
34	is fun.					
35	is easy to do.					
36	is beneficial.					
37	causes anxiety.					
38	takes a lot of my time.					
39	is carried out in an artificial environment.					
40	offers very limited teaching experience.					
41	suffers lack of interest of peers.					
42	makes me feel embarrassed when teaching my peers.					
43	makes me feel bored.					

III. Open-ended Questions

1. Should there be a micro-teaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT methodology courses (i.e. ELT courses in which you do microteachings)? Why or why not?
2. What are the **benefits** of the micro-teaching component in these ELT courses?
3. What are the **problems** you have about the micro-teaching component in these courses?
4. What are your **recommendations** for the improvement of the micro-teaching component in these courses?

Appendix B: Instructor Questionnaire

Dear instructor,

I am a graduate student and I am conducting my thesis research study on peer-teaching component in ELT courses. This questionnaire aims to identify your ideas about the peer-teaching or micro-teaching component in ELT courses .Your identity and individual responses will be kept confidential and will be used only for research purposes.

Thank you for your help.

Farhad Aliaskari

MA student

E-mail: tantan773377@gmail.com

English Language Teaching Department

Faculty of Education

✂-----

Consent Form

Having read and understood the purpose of this study and how my responses will be used, I agree to participate in the study.

Name- Surname: -----

Signature: -----

Date: -----

Instructor Questionnaire

I. Background Information

1- Age: -----

2- Gender: Male Female

3- Nationality: -----

4- Native language: -----

5- Years of teaching experience: -----

II. The Questionnaire

Directions: Please put a cross (X) as appropriate:

(5) Strongly agree (4) Agree (3) Unsure (2) Disagree (1)
Strongly disagree

	Microteaching:	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
1	increases my students' motivation.					
2	helps my students to become more interested in the course.					
3	helps my students to develop creativity.					
4	increases my students' autonomy.					
5	helps my students to be organized.					
6	helps my students to develop planning skills.					
7	helps my students to prepare their own materials and activities.					
8	helps my students to learn how to manage the class.					

	Microteaching:	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
9	helps my students to develop the actual teaching skills they'll need later.					
10	helps my students to learn how to predict classroom problems.					
11	helps my students with their time management.					
12	helps my students to develop their listening skills.					
13	helps my students to develop their reading skills.					
14	helps my students to develop their writing skills.					
15	helps my students to develop their speaking skills.					
16	helps my students to develop their vocabulary.					
17	helps my students to develop their grammar.					
18	gives my students an opportunity to learn by observing their peers.					
19	helps my students to put theory into practice.					
20	enables my students to learn by doing.					
21	creates awareness of how to teach.					
22	improves my students' teaching practice.					
23	makes my students aware of the qualities of a good teacher.					

	Microteaching:	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
25	helps my students to use various teaching approaches /methods/techniques appropriately.					
26	helps my students to learn how to use teaching materials.					
27	helps my students to realize how to use body language effectively.					
28	helps my students to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching.					
29	helps my students to learn how to evaluate learners.					
30	helps my students to learn how to use praise and encouragement.					
31	helps my students to learn how to give appropriate feedback.					
32	helps my students to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses.					
33	helps my students to learn how to use technology in teaching.					
34	is fun.					
35	is easy to do.					
36	is beneficial.					

	Microteaching:	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Unsure	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
39	is carried out in an artificial environment.					
40	offers very limited teaching experience.					
41	suffers lack of interest of peers.					
42	makes my students feel embarrassed when teaching their peers.					
43	makes my students feel bored.					

III. Open-ended Questions

1. Should there be a micro-teaching (peer-teaching) component in ELT methodology courses (i.e. ELT courses in which students do microteachings)? Why or why not?
2. What are the **benefits** of the micro-teaching component in these ELT courses?
3. What are the **problems** you have about the micro-teaching component in these courses?
4. What are your **recommendations** for the improvement of the micro-teaching component in these courses?

Appendix C: Student Interview Questions

- 1.** Should there be a micro-teaching component in ELT methodology courses? Why. Why not?
- 2.** How do you feel about micro-teaching sessions in your ELT courses?
- 3.** How do micro-teaching sessions help you? What are your gains from micro-teaching sessions?
- 4.** Do you think you have enough opportunities to practice micro-teaching in ELT courses?
- 5.** What are the main problems you encounter during the micro-teaching sessions?
- 6.** What are the strengths of the micro-teaching component in ELT courses?
- 7.** What are the weaknesses regarding the micro-teaching component in these courses?
- 8.** What can be done to enhance the micro-teaching component in these courses? Give your suggestions.

Appendix D: Teacher Interview Questions

- 1.** Should there be a micro-teaching component in ELT methodology courses? Why. Why not?
- 2.** How do you feel about micro-teaching sessions in your ELT courses?
- 3.** How do micro-teaching sessions help your students? What are their gains from micro-teaching sessions?
- 4.** Do you think your students have enough opportunities to practice micro-teaching in ELT courses?
- 5.** What are the main problems your students encounter during the micro-teaching sessions?
- 6.** What are the main problems you encounter during the micro-teaching sessions?
- 7.** What are the strengths of the micro-teaching component in ELT courses?
- 8.** What are the weaknesses regarding the micro-teaching component in these courses?
- 9.** What can be done to enhance the micro-teaching component in these courses? Give your suggestions.