

Integrating Peer-teaching Element into Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education Courses

Seyed Farshad Tork Nejad

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 2019
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all 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 Master of Arts in English Language Teaching.

Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oytun Sözüdoğru

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to investigate into the attitudes of both students and instructors in the English Department at Islamic Azad University of Shiraz towards ‘microteaching’ element in some departmental courses. The study also aims to identify their needs, expectations and suggestions as regards the utilization of microteaching component in some of the departmental courses.

This study has been designed as a case study which uses a mixed-methods approach to research. In other words, both qualitative and quantitative data were collected through student and instructor questionnaires and interviews. The participants of the study are sixty-five student teachers and twelve instructors in the English Department at Islamic Azad University of Shiraz.

Overall, the findings of the present study indicate that both the instructors and the student teachers held positive attitudes as regards the inclusion of microteaching element in some of the departmental courses including methodology courses and study skills courses. Also, the results highlighted the effectiveness and necessity of integrating microteaching component into language teacher education programs as perceived by the participants of the study.

Furthermore, some pedagogical implications of the present study such as increasing the teacher candidates’ awareness as regards the importance of microteaching as well as promoting the integration of microteaching in some of the departmental courses are presented. Also, some recommendations are provided to pave the way for the

future researchers who are eager to conduct further studies on the utilization of microteaching component in language teacher education programs.

Keywords: peer-teaching, student teacher, teacher education programs, instructors' attitudes, student teachers' attitudes.

ÖZ

Bu çalışma, bazı bölüm derslerinde, Şiraz İslam Azad Üniversitesi İngilizce Bölümündeki öğrencilerin ve öğretmenlerin, “mikro-öğretim” öğelere yönelik tutumlarını araştırmayı amaçlamaktadır. Ayrıca çalışma, bölüm derslerinin bazılarında mikro-öğretim bileşeninin kullanımına ilişkin ihtiyaç, beklenti ve önerileri de belirlemeyi amaçlamaktadır.

Bu çalışma, araştırmada karma yöntem yaklaşımı kullanan bir durum çalışması olarak tasarlanmıştır. Başka bir deyişle, hem nitel hem de nicel veriler öğrenci ve öğretmen anketleri ve görüşmeleri yoluyla toplanmıştır. Araştırmanın katılımcıları, Şiraz İslami Azad Üniversitesi İngilizce Bölümü'nde bulunan altmış beş öğretmen adayı ve on iki eğitmendir.

Genel olarak, bu çalışmanın bulguları hem öğretmenlerin hem de öğretmen adaylarının, mikroöğretim öğesinin metodoloji ve çalışma becerileri dersleri de dahil olmak üzere bazı bölüm derslerine dahil edilmesine ilişkin olumlu tutumlarının mevcut olduğunu göstermektedir. Ayrıca, sonuçlar, mikro-öğretim bileşeninin, çalışmanın katılımcıları tarafından algılandığı gibi dil öğretmeni eğitim programlarına entegre edilmesinin etkinliğini ve gerekliliğini vurgulamaktadır.

Ayrıca, bu araştırmanın pedagojik sonuçları, öğretmen adaylarının mikro-öğretimin önemi ile ilgili farkındalıklarını arttırması ve bazı bölümlerde mikro-öğretimin kalitesi ile ilgili farkındalıklarını arttırmaları gibi bazı önerileri sunmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, bu araştırmada dil öğretmenliği eğitim programlarında mikro-öğretim

bileşeninin kullanımı konusunda daha fazla araştırma yapmak isteyen gelecek araştırmacıların önünü açmak için bazı önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: mikro-öğretim, öğretmen adayı, öğretmen eğitimi programları, öğretmen tutumları, öğretmen adaylarının tutumları.

To my dearest father,
For his never-ending support

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Initially, I would like to thank God and appreciate my dedicated parents, specially my father for his never-ending support and inspiration. I would also like to appreciate my dear wife for her encouragement and patience throughout this journey.

In addition, I would like to truly appreciate my supervisor, Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatoş Erozan who always helped me during the whole challenging process of my thesis. I am also highly grateful for her support, patience, feedback, and guidance throughout my whole master program at Eastern Mediterranean University.

With great pleasure I would like to show my gratefulness to the jury members Assoc. Prof. Dr. Javanshir Shibliyev, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Oytun Sözüdoğru, and all other instructors of FLE Department at EMU. In addition, my special thanks go to the instructors and the teacher candidates of the English Department at Islamic Azad University of Shiraz for their cooperation throughout the process of data collection of my thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ	v
DEDICATION	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xii
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	2
1.3 Aim of the Study	3
1.4 Research Questions	3
1.5 Significance of the Study	4
1.6 Definition of Terms	4
1.7 Summary	4
2 LITRATURE REVIEW	6
2.1 Teacher Knowledge	6
2.2 Microteaching (peer-teaching) Component in Teacher Education	8
2.2.1 The Benefits of Microteaching	9
2.3 Possible Difficulties of Microteaching	12
2.4 Similar Studies on Microteaching	14
2.5 Summary	17
3 METHOD.....	18
3.1 Research Design	18
3.2 Setting.....	19

3.3 Research Questions	20
3.4 Participants	21
3.4.1 Students	21
3.4.2 Instructors	21
3.5 Data Collection Instruments	22
3.5.1 Student Questionnaire	22
3.5.2 Instructor Questionnaire	23
3.5.3 Student and Instructor Interviews	24
3.6 Data Collection Procedures	24
3.7 Data Analysis	25
3.8 Summary	25
4 RESULTS	26
4.1 Student Questionnaire	26
4.1.1 Students' Attitudes towards the Integration of Microteaching Element .	26
4.1.2 Students' Attitudes towards the Desirability of Microteaching Element.	31
4.1.3 Students' Suggestions regarding Microteaching Element.....	33
4.2 Student Interviews	38
4.3 Instructor Questionnaire	41
4.3.1 Instructors' Attitudes towards the Integration of Microteaching Element...	42
4.3.2 Instructors' Attitudes towards the Desirability of Microteaching Element..	46
4.3.3 Instructors' Suggestions regarding Microteaching Element	49
4.4 Instructor Interviews	52

4.5 Summary	56
5 DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION	57
5.1 Discussion of Results	57
5.1.1 What are the students' attitudes towards the integration of peer-teaching element into some of their courses?.....	57
5.1.2 What are the instructors' attitudes towards the integration of peer- teaching element into some of their courses?.....	59
5.1.3 What do the students suggest regarding peer-teaching element in some of their courses?	62
5.1.4 What do the instructors suggest regarding peer-teaching element in some of their courses?.....	64
5.2 Conclusion.....	66
5.3 Implications of the Study	67
5.4 Limitations of the Study	68
5.5 Suggestions for Further Research.....	69
REFERENCES.....	70
APPENDICES	79
Appendix A: Permission Letter	80
Appendix B: Approval Letter from Ethics Committee of EMU	81
Appendix C: Student Questionnaire	82
Appendix D: Instructor Questionnaire	89
Appendix E: Student Interview	96
Appendix F: Instructor Interview	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1: Students' attitudes towards the integration of microteaching element	27
Table 4.2: Student teachers' attitudes towards the desirability of microteaching element	31
Table 4.3: Instructors' attitudes towards the integration of microteaching element..	42
Table 4.4: Instructors' attitudes towards the desirability of microteaching element .	46

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The present chapter, which is the introduction of this study contains four sections. Initially, it tends to present the background of the study. Then, the next two sections explain the statement of the problem and the aim of the study, respectively. The fourth section focuses on the research questions, and the last two sections clarify the significance of the study and the definition of terms.

1.1 Background of the Study

As it is obvious in some studies (Mennim, 2016; Klopper & Drew, 2015; Spratt & Leug, 2000), the inclination towards learner-centred approaches has considerably increased in language teacher education programs over the past few decades. One of the indications of this is the existence of peer teaching component in most of the teacher education programs. It is believed that integrating peer teaching into pre-service courses provides collaborative learning opportunities and brings many benefits in language classrooms such as autonomous learning, high motivation and creativity. Therefore, pre-service English language teachers, i.e. teacher candidates, can benefit from this component both as language learners and as future teachers.

Moreover, it is noteworthy to say that the integration of ‘peer teaching’ element into pre-service English language teacher education courses reduces the anxiety among the candidates and helps them boost their self-confidence (Benson & Ying, 2013; Assinder, 1991). Furthermore, as Mennim (2016) states, “the use of peer teaching in

the language classroom offers a creative way for students to participate more fully in the learning process” (p. 37). Additionally, Assinder (1991, cited in Spratt & Leung, 2000) found out that “this new way of involving students had increased their in-depth understanding, their sense of responsibility for their own learning, and their commitment to the course, as well as their self-confidence and respect for each other” (p.218). Finally, engaging in peer teaching helps pre-service teachers put their theoretical knowledge into practice, and develop their teaching and managerial skills.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Recently the teaching practice has become absolutely important in language teacher education programs due to the fact that it might be the only chance for the students to shape their theoretical insights and put them into practice in order to gain sufficient experience to be able to teach and control the future language classrooms effectively (Ismail, 2011; Seferoğlu, 2006).

To the knowledge of the researcher, in the English Department at Islamic Azad University of Shiraz (IAUSH), the topic of peer teaching has not been studied, so it could be considered as a kind of need to work on this topic meticulously in order to investigate into this topic. Moreover, based on the researcher’s informal observations it is worth mentioning that the student teachers in the English Department of IAUSH do not have sufficient opportunity to do microteaching in their departmental courses; in other words, they have only practicum course in which the microteaching component is integrated. Therefore, the researcher found it quite necessary to conduct the present study in order to contribute to the mentioned context as well as considering both trainee teachers’ and their instructors’ attitudes and expectations towards the utilization of microteaching element into pre-service courses.

1.3 Aim of the Study

This research study aims to investigate into the instructors' and the student teachers' attitudes towards peer-teaching (microteaching) element in the English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz. In addition, it aims to investigate into their needs, expectations and suggestions as regards the integration of peer-teaching (microteaching) element into some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions have been formulated to address the purpose of the study which is to investigate into the attitudes of both instructors and student teachers towards peer-teaching (microteaching) element, as well as into their suggestions as regards the integration of peer-teaching element into some of the departmental courses:

1. What are the students' attitudes towards the integration of peer-teaching element into some of their courses?
2. What are the instructors' attitudes towards the integration of peer-teaching element into some of their courses?
3. What do the students suggest regarding peer-teaching element in some of their courses?
4. What do the instructors suggest regarding peer-teaching element in some of their courses?

1.5 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study are expected to increase the awareness of the student teachers and their instructors in the English Department at Islamic Azad University of Shiraz about the importance of peer-teaching component in language teacher education courses. As a result, it may promote to integrate a peer-teaching element into the courses in the curriculum. In addition, the findings may shed some light on the needs, expectations and suggestions of the stakeholders. This information can be used as a basis for integrating a peer-teaching element into the existing courses.

1.6 Definition of Terms

This section aims to define the relevant concepts as they are used in the present study. The definitions of three terms are as the following:

Teacher education program refers to both undergraduate and graduate programs in which the students are educated to become a teacher.

Student teacher is a student who is studying in a teacher education program to be a teacher.

Microteaching or Peer-teaching is the teaching in which the student teacher plays the role of the teacher in the classroom and teaches his or her peers (classmates) English as if they are real students who are learning English. These two terms are used interchangeably in this thesis to mean the same thing.

1.7 Summary

In this chapter, the background of the study was explained; the reasons for conducting the study were provided; the research questions were presented; and,

lastly, the significance of the present research study was indicated. The next chapter will be the review of the related literature.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The present chapter generally focuses on the previous studies on peer-teaching (microteaching) in the related literature. Firstly, some studies related to the teacher knowledge are reviewed. Then, different aspects of microteaching component in teacher education program are explained. After that, the efficiency of microteaching as well as possible pitfalls of microteaching are discussed. In the last section of this chapter, similar studies on peer-teaching (microteaching) are reviewed.

2.1 Teacher Knowledge

Teacher education programs have been housed in various departments including education, language and literature, and applied linguistics. However recently, applied linguistics has shaped the core of teacher education program (Crandall, 2000). The mentioned disciplines have offered an atmosphere for both experienced and prospective teachers to increase their teaching awareness as well as developing their teaching skills and abilities (Bardovi-Harlig and Hartford, 1997; Crandall, 1995). As it is cited in Crandall (2000), during the last decade the educational theory and practice have had a stronger focus on practical experiences, i.e. practice teaching, materials development and observation, teacher research as well as the importance of teacher cognition and teacher beliefs in language teacher education which resulted in an exploration into the theory of language teaching at both ‘micro and macro’ levels (Crandall, 1994; Larsen-Freeman, 1990; Pennington, 1990; Richards and Nunan, 1990).

As Katitia (2015) declared, as regards some factors such as the influence of new technologies, and the world demands towards the appropriate way of teaching and learning in our schools, teacher development has become a crucial field of study in every educational setting in the 21st century. Also, he stated that “Teachers are at the heart of the educational process and teacher quality is always cited as the most significant efficiency of teacher preparation programs” (p. 57). In addition, it has been widely accepted that in education the most important role is played by the teacher who has to meet the needs of learners by managing and organizing a successful learning environment.

However, being able to educate others and to perform as an expert in the field requires a noticeable background knowledge, a great sort of ‘cultural training’, practical abilities, sufficient confidence and so forth (Khatitia, 2015). Therefore, teacher education programs have contributed to both ‘pre-service’ and ‘in-service’ teachers in a way that they can develop their knowledge and competence as well as their skills. Also, they may become aware of how to apply their theoretical knowledge in the real classrooms and to have some hands-on experience of whatever takes place on the ground (Loughran, 2006). Besides, Ismail (2011) declared that “The major goal of a successful teacher-training program is to expose prospective teachers to effective teaching strategies and experiences” (p. 1044).

Moreover, Katitia (2015) noted that “If teacher educators are to develop more coherent and ongoing experiences and programs, they will need a better understanding of how teachers’ knowledge of teaching grows and is connected from one set of experiences to the next” (p. 58). Hence, the cultivation of suitable activities is quite essential in teacher education in order to have such teachers and it

is worth mentioning that peer-teaching (microteaching) plays a crucial role throughout this process (Arnistine, 1990).

2.2 Microteaching (peer-teaching) Component in Teacher Education

In teacher education programs, peer-teaching (microteaching) has been considered as a useful element which contributes the student teachers in enormous dimensions. As Ogeyik (2009) stated that “micro teaching component provides student teachers with opportunities to explore and reflect on their own and others’ teaching styles and to acquire new teaching techniques and strategies” (p. 205). Lately, in many teacher development programs the role of microteaching element has been highlighted due to the fact that it has become quite beneficial in the eyes of teacher candidates. That is to say, via peer-teaching the teacher trainees could master different teaching skills as well as gaining sufficient experience and awareness in order to run the real classrooms (Amobi, 2005). Also, in a microteaching model, the pre-service teacher trainees intended to be exposed to various teaching styles and therefore they might have the chance of reflecting upon their peers’ teaching procedures (Ismail, 2011).

Microteaching was developed as a method in 1960s by Dwight Allen and other colleagues at the Stanford Teacher Education Program (Cruickshank et al., 1996). Microteaching or peer teaching is considered as a remarkable element in practice teaching sessions of pre-service teachers (Görge, 2003). Microteaching includes new strategies used by future teachers in order to touch their weaknesses and strengths as well as planning to apply them in their teaching lessons. Allen and Eve (1968) defined microteaching as “A system of controlled practice that makes it possible to concentrate on specific teaching behavior and to practice teaching under controlled conditions” (cited in Saban & Çoklar, 2013, p. 234). Furthermore, it has

been argued that microteaching component refers to the teacher candidates' attempts towards transferring their abstract knowledge to action or making a so-called bridge between theory and practice (Gürses et al., 2005).

Likewise, in parallel studies by Kubukcu (2010), Fernandez and Robinson (2007), Johnson (2006), it has been assumed that according to 'theory/practice dichotomy', the student teachers might be capable to put the pedagogical approaches into practice; in other words, under the light of microteaching element they will be able to transfer the learned theories within the teacher development lessons to their future careers. However, microteaching has contributed to teacher candidates in terms of making a bridge between 'theory and practice' by conducting mini-lessons among their peers or colleagues to develop their teaching abilities and confidence in such lessons (Ismail, 2011).

As Mennim (2016) implied, peer teaching utilization in the language classroom provides student teachers a creative way of participating in the learning process and also paves the way for them to benefit from the merits of peer taught lessons, which are "improved motivation, enhanced learning, and authentic communication" (p. 37).

2.2.1 The Benefits of Microteaching

In a research study on possible benefits of microteaching, Assinder (1991) found out that this new way of student teachers' involvement "had increased students' motivation, participation, *real* communication, in-depth understanding, their sense of responsibility for their own learning, and their commitment to the course, as well as their self-confidence and respect for each other" (pp. 225-226).

Furthermore, a great emphasis has been placed by many scholars upon the fact that beginning to teach might be the most sophisticated stage in teacher learning (Benson & Ying, 2013). Accordingly, it is needless to say that practice teaching is at the core of teacher development and has to be meticulously taken into consideration as a fundamental component in teacher education. In addition, self-efficacy of the teachers, which has been considered as one of the key factors in teacher education, requires teaching experience and will be shaped through practicum due to the fact that it might be the only way for the student teachers to ponder over what is going on in the actual classroom, and also it might be the only chance for them to shape their theoretical insights and put them into practice in order to gain sufficient experience to be able to teach and control the future language classrooms effectively (Mule, 2006).

According to an investigation by Ismail (2011) on the views of sixty-one female teacher candidates from the English Language Education Program in the Faculty of Education in the United Arab Emirates University (UAEU) regarding the microteaching element offered in two courses of English language teaching methods, the salient benefits of integrating microteaching into their pre-service courses were highlighted. The results illustrated a clear evidence regarding the positive influences on the ESL teacher trainees' teaching and language competencies. Also, with the help of microteaching component they could develop their instructional strategies, and they had a beneficial experience for their teaching performance.

The efficiency of microteaching element in teacher development is widely agreed upon issue. For instance, Ogeyik (2009) stated that "microteaching helps student

teachers analyze their present teaching performance in order to discover their strengths and weaknesses by engaging in reflective practice” (p. 205). Moreover, according to Kottcamp (1990) the tendency towards reflective teaching is considered as one of the key factors in practice teaching sessions in which the student teachers are capable to make decisions and right judgments in terms of improving their teaching skills and ways of acting in real classrooms in their future career.

In addition, Kilic (2010) in his research study investigated into the effectiveness of learner-centered microteaching on teaching competencies of student teachers. Accordingly, he declared that by considering all constructive and favorable consequences throughout the research, the salient improvement of teacher candidates in terms of their teaching behaviors including class management, interaction, evaluation and etc. during the learner-centered microteaching session was quite striking. Also, in his article he shed light on the fact that “teacher training has shifted from theoretical teacher-centered approach to practice oriented learner-centered approach” (p. 78).

Ogeyik (2009) introduced micro lesson as an occasion in which the student teachers may have a clear view of “what/how/where/whom you teach and offer opportunities for getting feedback on teaching styles, material evaluation, teaching performance, repertoire improvement, etc.” (p. 205). Furthermore, as for microteaching session the teacher trainees would adapt the time limitation which they encounter during their teaching practice. In other words, the student teachers might gain the ability of time managing time and also becoming well-organized in a limited time (Çakır, 2000).

Furthermore, it is believed that microteaching has helped the teacher candidates to become more conscious of preparing appropriate lesson plans and applying them in

classrooms. Also, they are able to consider other students' individual differences, i.e. attitudes, expectations, needs, learning differences, etc. during microteaching sessions (Ogeyik, 2009). Additionally, Karamustafaoğlu and Akdeniz, (2002) declared that microteaching element has brought several practical implications including classroom management, testing and evaluation, implementation of new technologies, and so forth which student teachers could enrich their teaching performance by attempting to practice them consciously and efficiently.

The opportunity to participate in pre-service teacher education program in learner-centered education may lead to become skilled and well-prepared teachers who are able to implement learner-centered teaching after their graduation. However, it is quite obvious that newly graduated teachers are less capable in terms of their teaching skills in comparison with experienced teachers (Oddens, 2004).

To conclude, it has been strongly accepted by many scholars that the implementation of microteaching, which is an important component in education, can help trainee teachers learn various techniques and methods, improve their self-confidence, and become aware of their shortcomings and how to overcome them (Ananthakrishnan, 1993).

2.3 Possible Difficulties of Microteaching

In accordance with the relevant empirical studies, despite all the positive outcomes and merits brought by microteaching (peer teaching) component in language teacher education programs, the pre-service teachers may encounter some difficulties and problems. For example, conscious or unconscious negative treatments and behaviors done by student teachers may psychologically hurt other candidates (Benson & Yin,

2013). Additionally, prospective teachers' lack of awareness and experience in dealing with individual differences as well as the unforeseen incidents may result in some trouble or may increase anxiety. Brown (1999) indicated that "apprenticeship is the basis for field work in teacher education, but field work does not allow enough room for errors" (p. 308); errors or undesirable behaviors cannot be easily undone by student teachers in the traditional way of practice teaching and the peers might be influenced by such 'unintended mistakes'.

Spratt and Leung (2000) pointed out to some of the existing negative facts towards the utilization of microteaching in an English language course. Their study was conducted in Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the participants were final year university students. Twelve candidates stated that there is too much work due to preparation or assignment; eight of them identified the lack of input; and the rest of the respondents complained about too many presentations, uninteresting topic, and irrelevant materials.

Seferoğlu (2006) aimed to explore the attitudes of 176 trainee teachers regarding the utilization of microteaching component in a pre-service English teacher education program at the Middle East Technical University in Ankara, Turkey. The participants claimed that "they did not have enough opportunities for microteaching and practice teaching and it would be better if they could observe many different teachers, students with various proficiency levels, and many different school settings" (p. 376).

It is strongly believed by many scholars that microteaching has been used as a professional development tool in teacher education programs. However, sometimes

the teacher candidates are unenthusiastic to be involved in microteaching (peer teaching) activities due to some factors including “non-natural classroom environments, material production procedures, time limited course schedules, etc.” (p. 206). Therefore, this unwillingness may have a negative impact on the effectiveness of microteaching component (Stanley, 1998; cited in Ogeyik, 2009).

Moreover, lack of awareness as regards microteaching activities, the difficulties concerning materials preparation and production, and the artificial environment in which microteaching sessions take place might lead to some obstacles for student teachers (Cripwell & Geddes, 1982). Consequently, the reviewed complications regarding the application of microteaching element in practice teaching sessions may lead to some reluctant attitudes in the teaching process of teacher trainees in teacher preparation program.

2.4 Similar Studies on Microteaching

Ogeyik (2009) conducted a study at Trakya University in Turkey upon the opinions of 57 ELT student teachers regarding the advantages of microteaching. In accordance with the findings of the study, the participants held positive attitudes towards the application of microteaching element and they found it quite beneficial for both their academic purposes and professional experiences. Likewise, based on the results of a research study upon the attitudes of twelve students on a full-time ‘English for further studies’ course in Australia, Assinder (1991) considered microteaching as a highly successful approach which resulted in “increased responsibility, increased participation, increased accuracy, and sustained motivation” (p. 218).

In a relevant study, Benton-Kupper (2001) investigated the pre-service teachers’ perceptions regarding the utilization of microteaching component in a methodology

course. The quantitative and qualitative data demonstrated positive views of the participants. The student teachers indicated that they could easily recognize their strengths and weaknesses throughout mini lessons. Additionally, they considered microteaching component as an efficient teaching tool in a teacher education program. In line with the mentioned study, Ismail (2011) in his research study, looked at the views of teacher trainees in an ESL pre-service education program and he declared that the inclusion of microteaching element into the teacher preparation program had a tremendous impact on the student teachers' language and teaching competencies. Moreover, he justified that the overwhelming aids of microteaching element resulted in the development of trainee teachers' instructional strategies as well as their teaching performances.

Moreover, in a parallel study, Mennim (2016) made an attempt to evaluate the practice of microteaching (peer teaching) during microteaching sessions in a Japanese university. He found out that the integration of microteaching component encouraged the student teachers "to make use of processes such as cooperation, scaffolded assistance, and negotiation of form and meaning" (p. 48). Likewise, Brown et al. (2013) conducted a similar study at another university in Japan; the results revealed that apart from the enormous benefits of microteaching, the use of this practical element led to the development and engagement of academic skills of the prospective teachers in the teacher preparation program.

Similarly, Benson and Ying (2013) conducted a research study on the effect of microteaching element on the trainee teachers' awareness of autonomy in teaching and learning at Hong Kong Institute of Education. They used different research

instruments in their study including observations, interviews, and questionnaires. Accordingly, they stated that during the process of microteaching “issues such as awareness of teaching elements, opportunities for peer learning, cultural diversity, and English as a medium of instructions brought both benefits and challenges for students” (p. 50).

Besides, Savas (2012) investigated into the perspectives of forty student teachers in the Middle East Technical University in Turkey as regards the influence of watching microteaching videos on their teaching skills. The results of the study indicated that the participants shared positive opinions about watching the mentioned videos. They stated that watching such informative videos would significantly enhance their teaching skills as well as their English language proficiency. It is noteworthy to say that the findings of this study are in congruent with what Assinder (1991) and Ismail (2011) concluded in their research studies upon the effectiveness of microteaching element.

Furthermore, Merc (2015) examined the microteaching experience of Turkish trainee teachers through a 12-week online microteaching sessions. The researcher used different instruments to collect the data including open-ended questions, questionnaires, interviews, and dialogue journals. The teacher candidates who participated in the study shared positive attitudes towards various implications of online microteaching sessions. She indicated that online microteaching sessions contributed to her classroom time management, and helped her to become familiar with the effective impacts of technology on teaching foreign languages. Besides, the findings of the study declared that the students in online microteaching sessions had some degrees of anxiety. Hence, Merc (2015) stated that it is quite normal that the

prospective teachers worldwide usually get annoyed by teaching anxiety and nervousness during their first microteaching sessions.

2.5 Summary

The major issues as regards the application of microteaching (peer teaching) component in pre-service courses were reviewed in this chapter. Previous studies in the literature considered microteaching component as a beneficial and practical teaching tool in teacher preparation programs, which provides teacher candidates a chance to enhance their teaching awareness and teaching skills. Moreover, it is worth mentioning that the researchers have pointed out the positive attitudes of the trainee teachers towards the inclusion of microteaching element in some of their courses.

Yet, in the literature there seems to be a gap which is the instructors' perspectives as regards the utilization of microteaching component in language teacher education programs. Therefore, the present research study aimed to investigate into both instructors' and student teachers' attitudes towards microteaching component. Moreover, the investigation into the instructors' and student teachers' needs, expectations, and suggestions regarding integrating microteaching element into some of the departmental courses was another purpose of the present study.

Chapter 3

METHOD

This chapter mainly focuses on the methodology of this research study and consists of seven sections. In the first section, the overall research design is presented. The second and the third sections are about the setting and the research questions. Then, the fourth section introduces the participants of the study. In the fifth and sixth sections, the data collection instruments and the data collection procedures are explained in detail. In the last section, the data analysis procedures are described.

3.1 Research Design

This study was designed as a case study which used a mixed-methods approach to research. In other words, both qualitative and quantitative data were collected to investigate into the instructors' and the student teachers' attitudes towards microteaching (peer teaching) element in some of the departmental courses such as teaching methodology courses, literature courses, practicum course, etc.

Yin (2014) defines case study as “an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon (the ‘case’) in depth and within its real-world context” (p. 16). Moreover, Mackey and Gas (2005) stated that “case studies provide detailed descriptions of specific learners within their learning setting” (p. 171).

As it is mentioned previously, a mix-methods approach was employed in this study to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. The researcher aimed to combine the

two approaches together in order to strengthen the validity of the research study. Five basic purposes of the application of mixed-methods approach have been declared by the scholars in the literature as triangulation, complementarity, development, initiation, and expansion (Greene et al., 1989). One of the highlighted aims of using the mixed-methods design is ‘triangulation’. According to Greene et al. (1989) “The core premise of triangulation as a design strategy is that all methods have inherent biases and limitations, so use of only one method to assess a given phenomenon will inevitably yield biased and limited result” (p. 256). Furthermore, they declared that “complementarity seeks elaboration, enhancement, illustration, clarification of the results from one method with the results from the other method” (p. 259). Another purpose of the mixed-methods research is development which refers to the “sequential use of qualitative and quantitative methods, where the first method is used to help inform the development of the second” (Greene et al., p. 260). Moreover, ‘initiation’ which is considered as another purpose of the mixed-methods design seeks to discover contradiction, paradox, and new frameworks. The ‘expansion’ of the research intends to increase the scope of the study by selecting the most appropriate method (Greene et al., 1989). Finally, Dörnyei (2015) and Hashemi (2012) indicated that mixing quantitative and qualitative methods would provide the researchers a better understanding as well as a deeper investigation into the case.

3.2 Setting

The present study was conducted in the Spring Semester of 2017-2018 Academic Year with the undergraduate students and their instructors in the English Department at Islamic Azad University of Shiraz (IAUSH) in Islamic Republic of Iran (IRI).

Islamic Azad University of Shiraz was established in 1987 and it is a part of private chain of universities in Iran called the Islamic Azad Universities and the headquarters located in Tehran. The Islamic Azad University of Shiraz has over 290 academic staff, and it is located in Shiraz, Iran. Currently, the university has 17,000 students in different fields of studies and degrees. The English Department offers four-year undergraduate as well as graduate programs in the field of English Language Teacher Training, English Literature, and English Translation. In the present study, English Language Teacher Training undergraduate program was chosen as a context, and this program basically aims to prepare and train student teachers for the future educational settings. In the mentioned department many courses are offered, namely teaching methodology courses, linguistics courses, literature courses, practicum course, translation courses, education courses, etc.

3.3 Research Questions

The present study aims to investigate into the attitudes of both students and instructors towards 'peer teaching' element in some courses such as teaching methodology courses, literature courses, practicum course, etc. The study also aims to identify their needs, expectations and suggestions as regards peer-teaching element. Accordingly, the study attempts to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the students' attitudes towards the integration of peer-teaching element into some of their courses?
2. What are the instructors' attitudes towards the integration of peer-teaching element into some of their courses?
3. What do the students suggest regarding peer-teaching element in some of their courses?

4. What do the instructors suggest regarding peer-teaching element in some of their courses?

3.4 Participants

The present study was conducted with the 3rd and 4th year undergraduate student teachers and their instructors in the English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz in Iran. After distributing consent forms among the student teachers and the instructors, totally 65 student teachers and 12 instructors agreed to participate in the research study. The participants are introduced in detail in the following subsections.

3.4.1 Students

In this study the student participants were the 3rd and 4th year undergraduate ELT students who agreed to respond to the survey. The total number of the student participants was 65 including 44 third-year students (67.7%) and 21 fourth-year students (32.3%). It is noteworthy to mention that all of the student participants were Iranian with the same native language which was Persian, whereas, only one of them was a native speaker of English. Also, their ages ranged between 19 to 40 years old. The majority of them were between the ages of 19 and 23 (52, 80%). More specifically, 9 students (13.8%) were between 23 and 27 years old, and only four students (6.2%) were between the ages of 27 and 40. As for the gender distribution, most of the student participants were female (59 students, 90.8%), and only 6 students (9.2%) were males.

3.4.2 Instructors

The total number of the instructors who agreed to participate in the present research study was 12. All of the instructor participants were Iranian with the same native language, which was Persian. As regards the level of education and years of experience, their experience varied between 9 to 30 years of teaching. Eight

instructors (66.7%) were PhD holders whereas four instructors (33.3%) were with master degree.

3.5 Data Collection Instruments

In the present research study, the student and instructor questionnaires as well as interview sessions with both students and instructors were used to collect the quantitative and qualitative data. Both student and instructor questionnaires as well as the interview questions are parallel to each other and have been adapted from the studies by Aliaskari (2017), Ismail (2011), and Ogeyik (2009).

3.5.1 Student Questionnaire

The student questionnaire (Appendix C) aimed to investigate into the instructors' and the student teachers' attitudes towards microteaching element in some of the departmental courses such as teaching methodology courses, literature courses, practicum course, etc. as well as their expectations and suggestions as regards peer-teaching element. The student questionnaire was designed by the researcher by adapting the items from various sources (Aliaskari, 2017; Ismail, 2011; Ogeyik, 2009). Regarding the reliability of the questionnaire, the obtained Cronbach Alpha value was .883.

The student questionnaire consisted of three major parts. In the first part, the main focus was on the students' personal information including their age, gender, nationality, native language, and their class. The second part consisted of 43 five point Likert-scale type of closed-items [*Strongly agree* (5), *Agree* (4), *Not sure* (3), *Disagree* (2), *Strongly disagree* (1)] which focused on the student teachers' attitudes towards the integration of microteaching (peer teaching) element into their courses. In the third part, the student teachers' needs and expectations regarding the

microteaching component in some of the departmental courses were identified through 21 five point Likert-scale type of closed-items [*Very desirable (5), Desirable (4), Neutral (3), Undesirable (2), Very undesirable (1)*]. Finally, Part 4 which consisted of 6 open-ended questions generally focused on the beliefs, attitudes, and suggestions of trainee teachers as regards the utilization of microteaching element in some of the departmental courses.

3.5.2 Instructor Questionnaire

The instructor questionnaire (Appendix D) was adapted from the sources used for developing the student questionnaire (Aliaskari, 2017; Ismail, 2011; Ogeyik, 2009). The questionnaire given to the instructors intended to identify their attitudes as well as their students' expectations and suggestions as regards the integration of microteaching element into some of the departmental courses. As for the reliability of this questionnaire, the Cronbach Alpha value was found out to be .843. The instructor questionnaire was made up of three main parts.

The instructors' background information including their age, gender, nationality, native language, level of education, and their teaching experience was obtained from the first part. Then, in the second part, 43 five point Likert-scale type of closed-items [*Strongly agree (5), Agree (4), Not sure (3), Disagree (2), Strongly disagree (1)*] were included in order to investigate into the instructors' perspectives regarding the integration of microteaching component into some the departmental courses. The third part was completely related to the instructors' needs and expectations as for the microteaching element in some of the departmental courses, and consisted of 21 five-point Likert-scale type of closed-items [*Very desirable (5), Desirable (4), Neutral*

(3), *Undesirable* (2), *Very undesirable* (1)]. Lastly, part 4 dealt with the beliefs, attitudes, and suggestions of the instructors through 6 open-ended questions.

3.5.3 Student and Instructor Interviews

After obtaining the consents of the student teachers and instructors, five teacher trainees and four instructors volunteered to take part in the interview sessions (Appendices E & F), and they responded to the questions. Accordingly, eight parallel questions were designed by the researcher in order to identify the attitudes of both students and instructors as well as their needs, and expectations regarding ‘peer teaching’ element in some of the departmental courses. Also, they were asked to indicate their recommendations and opinions as regards peer teaching component. The interview questions were adapted from the previous studies by Aliaskari (2017), Ismail (2011), and Ogeyik (2009).

3.6 Data Collection Procedures

The data for the present study were collected during the Spring semester of 2017-2018 Academic Year. Some steps were taken orderly by the researcher in order to collect the data: (1) the permission letter (Appendix A) was collected from the English Department of the Islamic Azad University of Shiraz. (2) The approval letter (Appendix B) was collected from the Ethics Committee of Eastern Mediterranean University. (3) Consent forms and the questionnaires were distributed among the student teachers as well as their instructors in the English Department of IAUSH, and after collecting the Consent forms, the participants spent roughly 30 minutes to respond to the questionnaires. (4) Likewise, the Consent forms for the interviews were signed by the instructors and the student teachers. They agreed to participate in the interview sessions. Their responses to the interview questions were audio recorded and each interview took approximately 15 minutes.

3.7 Data Analysis

Since the present research study included both qualitative and quantitative data, the data analysis was done through different phases. As regards the analysis of the quantitative data which were collected from closed-items in the student and instructor questionnaires, the researcher used the Statistic Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) in order to analyze the data, and the frequencies and means were calculated through descriptive statistics.

On the other hand, for analyzing the qualitative data, the researcher applied content analysis. As for the qualitative data the open-ended questions in both student and instructor questionnaires were taken into account. The researcher categorized similar responses under different themes, and then the themes and keywords were coded by the researcher, and lastly, the frequencies were calculated from the coded data.

Additionally, as regards the analysis of interviews the researcher firstly transcribed the audio-recorded interviews and followed the same procedure that was explained above regarding the analysis of open-ended questions.

3.8 Summary

This chapter mainly dealt with the methodology of the present survey. In the first two sections, research design and the context of the research were introduced. The third and fourth sections presented the research questions as well as the participants of the study. The next two sections were basically about the data collection instruments and procedures. And the last section focused on the data analysis procedures. In the next chapter, the results of the study will be explained.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

The results of the present research study are explained in this chapter. Initially, the results of the student questionnaire are provided which are followed by the results of the student interviews. Then, the results of the instructor questionnaire are presented. And lastly, the results of the instructor interviews are explained.

4.1 Student Questionnaire

The student questionnaire consists of three parts and aims to identify the teacher candidates' attitudes, needs, expectations, and suggestions concerning the integration of microteaching element in some of their departmental courses. The results of each part are provided separately.

4.1.1 Students' Attitudes towards the Integration of Microteaching Element

The first part of the questionnaire contains 43 closed-items in the form of five-point Likert scale. In accordance with the findings of the study, a great majority of the student teachers showed a positive tendency as regards the utilization of microteaching (peer teaching) component in their courses; almost all of the participants strongly agreed or agreed with the items in the first part. The results of part 1 are presented in table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: Students' attitudes towards the integration of microteaching element

	Microteaching...	SA+A %	Not sure	D+SD %	Mean
1	increases student teachers' motivation.	97	1.5	1.5	4.42
2	helps student teachers to become more interested in the course.	86.1	10.8	3.1	4.25
3	develops creativity.	87.7	10.8	1.5	4.25
4	increases autonomy.	70.8	26.2	3.0	3.91
5	helps student teachers to be organized.	90.7	7.8	1.5	4.22
6	develops planning skills.	86.2	13.8	0	4.31
7	helps student teachers to prepare their own materials and activities.	81.6	16.9	1.5	4.32
8	helps student teachers to learn how to manage the class.	95.4	4.6	0	4.45
9	helps student teachers to develop the actual teaching skills they will need in future.	86.2	9.2	4.6	4.34
10	helps student teachers to learn how to predict classroom problems.	80	18.5	1.5	4.15
11	helps student teachers with their time management.	86.2	12.3	1.5	4.22
12	develops student teachers' listening skills.	78.5	13.8	7.7	4.15
13	develops student teachers' reading skills.	86.1	10.8	3.1	4.25
14	develops student teachers' writing skills.	73.9	20.0	6.1	4.05
15	develops student teachers' speaking skills.	95.4	3.1	1.5	4.60
16	develops student teachers' vocabulary.	97	1.5	1.5	4.57
17	develops student teachers' grammar.	86.2	9.2	4.6	4.37
18	gives student teachers an opportunity to learn by observing their peers.	80	18.5	1.5	4.18
19	helps student teachers to put theory into practice.	86.2	12.3	1.5	4.23
20	enables student teachers to learn by doing.	89.2	7.8	3.0	4.34
21	creates awareness of how to teach.	93.8	4.7	1.5	4.46
22	improves student teachers' teaching skills.	90.7	9.3	0	4.45

	Microteaching...	SA+A %	Not sure	D+SD %	Mean
23	makes student teachers aware of the qualities of a good teacher.	86.2	10.8	3.0	4.29
24	prepares student teachers for their teaching career.	93.9	4.6	1.5	4.51
25	helps student teachers to use various teaching approaches/methods/techniques appropriately.	86.2	12.3	1.5	4.22
26	helps student teachers to learn how to use teaching materials.	86.2	10.8	3.0	4.15
27	helps student teachers to realize how to use body language effectively.	87.6	9.4	3.0	4.37
28	helps student teachers to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching.	90.8	7.7	1.5	4.37
29	helps student teachers to learn how to evaluate learners.	78.5	18.5	3.0	4.02
30	helps student teachers to learn how to use praise and encouragement.	72.3	24.6	3.1	3.94
31	helps student teachers to learn how to give appropriate feedback.	78.5	20.0	15	4.03
32	helps student teachers to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses.	92.3	6.2	1.5	4.38
33	helps student teachers how to use technology in teaching.	75.4	18.5	6.1	3.92
34	is fun.	67.7	23.1	9.2	3.85
35	is easy to do.	27.7	26.2	46.1	2.78
36	is beneficial.	86.2	10.8	3.0	4.18
37	causes anxiety.	53.8	23.1	23.1	3.40
38	is waste of time.	9.2	7.7	83.1	1.80
39	is carried out in an artificial environment.	23.1	49.2	27.7	2.94
40	offers very limited teaching experiences.	35.4	36.9	27.7	3.08
41	attracts peers' attention.	66.2	30.8	3	3.77
42	makes student teachers embarrassed when teaching their peers.	32.3	24.6	43.1	2.85
43	makes student teachers feel bored.	20.0	21.5	58.5	2.51

According to the results presented in Table 4.1 above, 63 out of 65 student teachers (97%) indicated a strong agreement (SA/A) with item 1 (*Microteaching increases student teachers' motivation*), and item 16 (*Microteaching develops student teachers' vocabulary*). Among all the closed-items the highest agreement was with item 1 and item 16 and the mean for these items were 4.42 and 4.57, respectively. Moreover, a large number of the student teachers agreed (SA/A) with item 8 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to learn how to manage the class*) with 95.4%, item 15 (*Microteaching develops student teachers' speaking skills*) with 95.4%, item 21 (*Microteaching creates awareness of how to teach*) with 93.8%, item 32 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses*) with 92.3%, item 28 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching*) with 90.8%, item 5 (*Microteaching increases autonomy*) with 90.7%, and item 22 (*Microteaching improves student teachers' teaching skills*) with 90.7%. The mean score for item 8 and item 22 was 4.45, and 4.60 for item 15, and 4.46 for item 21, and 4.38 for item 32, and 4.37 for item 28, and it was 4.22 for item 5. The above-mentioned items basically focused on the student teachers' teaching skills. Based on the strong agreement with the above-mentioned statements, it is absolutely obvious that the teacher candidates considered microteaching as a motivating source and helpful component in the pre-service English language teacher education courses.

As regards the impact of microteaching on developing teaching skills and the use of different teaching approaches and methods as well as teaching materials, 56 out of 65 student teachers (86.2%) showed agreement (SA/A) with items 9 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to develop the actual teaching skills they will need in future*),

19 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to put theory into practice*), 25 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to use various teaching approaches/methods/techniques appropriately*) , and 26 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to learn how to use teaching materials*). Moreover, the majority of the teacher trainees (95.4%) expressed agreement (SA/A) with item 15 (*Microteaching develops student teachers' speaking skills*), 86.1% with item 13 (*Microteaching develops student teachers' reading skills*), 78.5% with item 12 (*Microteaching develops student teachers' listening skills*), and 73.9% with item 14 (*Microteaching develops student teachers' writing skills*), which shows that they had positive attitudes towards the influence of microteaching on their speaking, reading, listening, and writing skills.

Comparatively, fewer student teachers agreed with some items; they were unsure about these statements. For instance, 23.1% of the student teachers strongly agreed or agreed with and 49.2% were not sure about item 39 (*Microteaching is carried out in an artificial environment*), and 35.4% expressed agreement with (SA/A) while 36.9% were not sure about item 40 (*Microteaching offers very limited teaching experiences*), and for item 41 (*Microteaching attracts peers' attention*) 66.2% of the student teachers strongly agreed or agreed and 30.8% were not sure.

On the other hand, the student teachers stated a strong disagreement (D/SD) towards few items in this part of the questionnaire. However, it is worth mentioning that these were negative items. To exemplify, 83.1% of them disagreed or strongly disagreed with item 38 (*Microteaching is waste of time*) which had the highest disagreement among all items; item 43 (*Microteaching makes student teachers feel bored*) with 58.5% disagreement; item 35 (*Microteaching is easy to do*) with 46%, and item 42

(*Microteaching makes student teachers embarrassed when teaching their peers*) with 43.1% disagreement. The mean for the above-given items were 1.80, 2.51, 2.78, 2.85, respectively.

To sum up, it is noteworthy to say that a large number of the teacher candidates found microteaching element very beneficial, valuable, and meaningful in teacher education courses; they had positive attitudes towards peer-teaching (microteaching).

4.1.2 Students' Attitudes towards the Desirability of Microteaching Element

The second part of the student questionnaire comprised 21 closed type items (five-point Likert scale) which mainly focused on the student teachers' beliefs as regards the desirability of the existence of microteaching component in some of the departmental courses. According to the findings, a large number of the participants indicated that the application of such component was either *very desirable* or *desirable* in some of their courses. The results can be seen in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Student teachers' attitudes towards the **desirability** of microteaching element

Items		VD+D %	N %	UD+VUD %	Mean
1	Doing microteaching in methodology courses	86.2	10.8	3.0	4.12
2	Doing microteaching in literature courses	63.1	20.0	16.9	3.58
3	Doing microteaching in education courses	75.4	20.0	4.6	3.97
4	Doing microteaching in linguistics courses	49.2	32.3	18.5	3.40
5	Doing microteaching in translation courses	61.6	24.6	13.8	3.60
6	Doing microteaching in practicum courses	69.2	23.1	7.7	3.86

Items		VD+D %	N %	UD+VUD %	Mean
7	Being asked to prepare lesson plans before each microteaching	73.9	20.0	6.1	3.92
8	Getting feedback from the course instructor before each microteaching session	66.1	26.2	7.7	3.80
9	Getting feedback from the course instructor after each microteaching session	76.9	16.9	6.2	4.03
10	Doing microteaching to teach listening skills	78.5	15.4	6.1	4.02
11	Doing microteaching to teach reading skills	78.5	16.9	4.6	4.12
12	Doing microteaching to teach writing skills	80.0	15.4	4.6	4.11
13	Doing microteaching to teach speaking skills	83.1	13.8	3.1	4.17
14	Doing microteaching to teach vocabulary	84.7	12.3	3.0	4.17
15	Doing microteaching to teach grammar	80.0	13.9	6.1	4.05
16	Being asked to apply different teaching strategies in microteaching lessons	67.7	23.1	9.2	3.85
17	Giving and receiving feedback on others' (peers') microteachings	69.3	24.6	6.1	3.91
18	Being asked to prepare our own teaching materials in microteaching sessions	75.4	18.5	6.1	3.86
19	Doing microteaching to reteach the same lesson to improve my performance	75.4	20.0	4.6	4.02
20	Using PowerPoint presentations in the microteaching sessions	66.1	26.2	7.7	3.78
21	Using technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials in microteaching sessions	81.6	13.8	4.6	4.02

As it can be seen in Table 4.2 above, a striking proportion of the student teachers pointed out the desirability (VD/D) of doing/ having microteaching sessions. The highest desirability went to item 1 (*Doing microteaching in methodology courses*) with 86.2% and the mean was 4.12. It means that 56 out of 65 student teachers showed an outstanding desire towards having a microteaching component in the methodology courses. In contrast, by looking at item 4 (*Doing microteaching in*

linguistics courses) with 18.5% undesirability (UD/VUD) rate, item 2 (*Doing microteaching in literature courses*) with 16.9%, and item 5 (*Doing microteaching in translation courses*) with 13.8%, it can be said that comparatively more teacher candidates believed that in linguistics, literature, and translation courses it is undesirable to have microteaching element, and the highest undesirability went to item 4 with the mean 3.40.

In addition, as regards teaching different skills, i.e. reading skills, writing skills, etc., a majority of the student teachers indicated a great desirability for item 14 (*Doing microteaching to teach vocabulary*) with 84.7%, item 13 (*Doing microteaching to teach speaking skills*) with 83.1%, item 12 (*Doing microteaching to teach writing skills*) with 80.0%, and item 15 (*Doing microteaching to teach grammar*) with 80.0%. The mean for items 14 and 13 was 4.17, while it was 4.11 for item 12, and 4.05 for item 15. On the other hand, fewer participants expressed desirability for item 10 (*Doing microteaching to teach listening skills*) and item 11 (*Doing microteaching to teach reading skills*) with 78.5%, and the mean was 4.02 for item 10 and 4.12 for item 11.

To conclude, the results obtained for this part clearly show that almost all of the student teachers in the English Department of IAUSH found microteaching as a necessary and crucial component as the desirability of such element was quite obvious.

4.1.3 Students' Suggestions regarding Microteaching Element

The last part of the questionnaire consisted of six open-ended questions which basically shed light on the student teachers' beliefs, needs, expectations, and suggestions as for the application of microteaching element in some of the pre-

service courses in the English department of IAUSH. Generally speaking, the responses revealed that the majority of the participants were optimistic and enthusiastic to have microteaching element in some of their courses.

Concerning the first question (“Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, literature courses, etc.? Why or why not?”), 75.3% of the responses were ‘Yes’ supported with various positive opinions; the student teachers believed that the integration of microteaching ‘increases self-confidence and creativity’, ‘provides new methods and teaching skills’, and ‘it is quite necessary and helpful’. For instance, S63 mentioned “Yes, it helps us to improve our self-confidence and teaching skills”; S57 reported “Yes, it is practical and useful for the students’ future, also they may become familiar with different teaching methods”; and S48 stated “Yes, I think microteaching is a useful element in education as if it helps the student teachers to improve important skills.” However, a small proportion of the student teachers (10.7%) thought that the existence of microteaching element is not necessary and it is waste of time. Also, 4.6% of the participants had no idea regarding this question and the responses were ‘No idea’ and 9.4% of them did not respond to the question.

As for the second question (“Into which courses in the curriculum do you think the microteaching component should be integrated? Please list these courses.”), except for 29.2 % of the student teachers who did not respond to the mentioned question or had no idea about it, the participants reported noteworthy statements. For example, 16 out of 65 student teachers (24.6%) preferred to have microteaching session in the study skills and methodology courses. Additionally, 15 out of 65 student teachers (23.1%) tended to have it in their skill-based courses i.e. speaking, listening, writing,

and reading. Besides, 14% of the student teachers stated that they desire to have microteaching component in the translation and literature courses; also, a small proportion of them (9.2%) were eager to have it in all departmental courses.

As regards the third question (“What are your needs and expectations regarding microteaching element in these courses? In other words, what do you need/expect to have about microteaching sessions? Please explain.”) 18 out of 65 student teachers (27.7%) expected to be trained on how to do microteaching before doing it, in other words, they needed some preparation lessons before the actual microteaching sessions, as S48 said “I expect to receive feedback before each microteaching session from the instructors to get prepared for an efficient performance.” Also, 9.2% of the teacher candidates indicated that they need to receive more support from the instructors and administrators and to be given the authority to run the class freely without any interruption by the instructors during the microteaching session; S62 mentioned “The directors should care about this important element and support us as much as possible.” Furthermore, the responses from five student teachers (7.7%) indicated that they expected to have a friendly and interactive atmosphere among their classmates during the microteaching sessions. S25 said “I expect a friendly atmosphere among classmates and teachers in a way that nobody feels embarrassed” Likewise, 7.7% of the participants wanted to have the chance to use various technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials in microteaching sessions. Besides, 6.2% of the teacher trainees needed to do/have microteaching as a group activity rather than an individual task. Finally, it is important to notice that as for the present question 16 out of 65 student teachers (24.5%) had no idea and 11 of them (17%) left the question blank.

In response to the fourth question (“What might be some benefits of integrating microteaching element into these courses?”), the student teachers shared different ideas as for the benefits of integrating microteaching element into their courses. For example, forty-six percent of the prospective teachers stated that the inclusion of microteaching increases self-confidence and motivation, which ends up with satisfactory outcomes in terms of their teaching performance. S40 said “It may have a positive effect on our teaching performance and boost our self-confidence”, while S3 stated “It could have tremendous effects on increasing self-confidence and self-esteem and also the teaching experience specially in difficult courses”. Moreover, 18.5% of them believed that the integration of microteaching increases interaction among the students which has a positive impact on the learning outcome. Therefore, S19 indicated “It provides cooperation and mutual understanding among students.” Besides, 9 of 65 student teachers (14%) stated that during microteaching sessions they have got the chance to reflect on their teaching performances. For instance, S 58 said “We can evaluate ourselves and improving our teaching skills”. Finally, 21% of the responses referred to those participants who had no idea or did not answer the question.

As regards the fifth question (“What might be some problems or difficulties you may face while preparing for or doing microteachings in these courses?”), the trainee teachers expressed their opinions in a variety of ways such as ‘having difficulties in terms of their teaching skills’ with 31%, ‘being stressed and annoyed by making mistake during their microteaching’ with 21.5%, and ‘lack of information about microteaching’ with 9.2%. For instance, S22 said “Timing, planning, being away from the anxiety, and preparing teaching materials”; S54 stated “The students make

mistakes and become nervous in front of the classmates and teachers.”; and S34 indicated “When the students don’t have enough information about microteaching they may become demotivated.” However, a small number of the participants (4.6%) indicated that they do not have any problem during their microteaching performances. Also, 33.7% of the responses were either ‘no idea’ or left blank.

Regarding the last question (“How do you think the microteaching element should be like in these courses?”), 18 out of 65 prospective teachers (27.7%) stated that they prefer to have the chance to do microteaching as an optional activity. As S48 expressed “Microteaching element is better to be optional in any courses throughout the first and second semesters in order to give student encouragement.” Furthermore, 9.2% of them required an extra course which basically put the focus on the ‘microteaching element’ in the first semester. Also, 9.2% of them wanted to do microteaching without being interrupted by the instructors; S 38 mentioned “The instructors should give the permission to the students to run the class by themselves without any interruption”. A small proportion of the student teachers (4.6%) reported that they prefer to do/have one microteaching session in each semester. Moreover, 4.6% of them preferred to have microteaching session in classes with fewer classmates. S 44 said “When there are fewer students in the class we can do microteaching more efficiently”. However, a majority of the student teachers (44.7%) had no idea or did not respond to the question.

To sum up, it can be obviously realized that the majority of the student teachers were enthusiastic regarding the inclusion of microteaching component in some of their departmental courses especially in study skill and methodology courses. Moreover, a bulk of them shared various ideas as regards the enormous benefits of microteaching

element which help them to overcome the common difficulties including psychological barriers, i.e. anxiety, lack of confidence, and etc. Lastly, it is worth mentioning that many of them expected to receive more administrative support as for the utilization of microteaching element in some of the demanding departmental courses which ends up with favorable learning outcomes as well as preparing them for the future classrooms.

4.2 Student Interviews

Student interviews were done in the English Department of IAUSH in order to collect in-depth data as regards the students' beliefs and suggestions regarding the inclusion of microteaching element in some of the pre-service courses. The interview consisted of eight questions aligned with the open-ended questions in the student questionnaire. Each interview took about 20 minutes and six student teachers in the department volunteered to take part in the interviews.

In the present section the student teachers' responses to the eight interview questions have been presented in detail.

As regards the first question ("How do you feel about the integration of microteaching element into your departmental courses?"), all of the student teachers shared positive attitudes towards the application of microteaching element in their departmental courses. Every and each of them tried to point out to the enormous benefits brought by microteaching element. It is worth mentioning that all of them included the constructive influences of microteaching component on their teaching skills and teaching performances in their responses. For example, S1 declared "Microteaching for student teachers can be really effective. They can gain some sorts of experience in teaching different courses."

As to the second question (“Should there be a microteaching element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, literature courses, etc.? Why or why not?”), all of the trainee teachers’ responses were ‘Yes’ supported by various reasons including ‘increasing motivation’, ‘improving teaching skills’, ‘preparation for real classrooms’, and so forth. For example, S3 mentioned “Of course, for learning how to teach these courses with suitable methods we should do microteaching.”

Concerning the third question (“In which courses in the curriculum do you think the microteaching element should be integrated?”), it was quite interesting that four of the six student teachers reported that they prefer to do/have microteaching in the courses which mainly focus on the teaching skills and teaching strategies such as study skills, practicum, and methodology courses. For example, S 2 said “In courses like methodologies and approaches, and practicum microteaching should be integrated.” On the other hand, two of them expected to have microteaching element in speaking and grammar courses in the curriculum. S 5 mentioned “Doing microteaching is really important in courses which focus on grammar and speaking.”

Regarding the forth question (“How do you think microteaching sessions can help you? What are your expectations?”), four of the teacher candidates declared that through microteaching session they might be able to become well-organized. Also, they might be able to work on their class management and timing. However, the rest of the responses were different. For example, S3 said “It helps us to recognize our strengths and weaknesses.”, and S1 indicated that “Microteaching increases our self-confidence and self-esteem.”, and S4 mentioned “Microteaching can show us to find our individual way of teaching.”

In response to the fifth question (“Do you think you will have enough opportunities to do microteaching in your departmental courses? How many microteachings do you want/need to do in each course? Please explain.”), all of the trainee teachers stated that they did not have enough opportunities to do microteaching and their responses were ‘NO’. Besides, regarding the second part of the question, S5 said “I think I need three or four microteaching in each semester or one in each course.”, while S1, S4, and S6 expected to have one or two microteaching sessions in each course. Moreover, S2 and S3 reported that they prefer to have two or three microteaching in each offered course in the English Department.

As to the sixth question (“What might be some advantages of microteaching element in these courses?”), all the student teachers discussed about countless benefits of microteaching element in many ways. For instance, S4 and S5 said that with the help of microteaching session they could become experienced teachers and be ready for teaching in real classrooms in the future. While the rest of them briefly pointed out to the merits of having such component such as ‘improving their class management and timing’, ‘receiving constructive feedback from their professors’, ‘increasing self-confidence and self-esteem’, ‘recognizing strong points and weak spots’, and ‘becoming creative teachers’.

With regard to the seventh question (“What might be some problems you may encounter during the microteaching sessions?”), lack of facilities and equipment, high level of anxiety and stress, and lack of motivation and cooperation were the striking comments that the student teachers provided during the interview sessions. However, it is worth mentioning that almost all of the interviewees strongly agreed

that the advantages of microteaching component outweigh the disadvantages in general.

When asked the last question (“What are your needs regarding microteaching element in these courses? How should they be like? What do you suggest?”), it was absolutely significant that five out of six student teachers in their responses tried to highlight the necessity and the high desirability of using different technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials in their microteaching sessions. For instance, all of them specifically pointed out to the crucial role of PowerPoints in their teaching performance. S1 stated:

Firstly, before micro teaching the professor should provide students the essential information and materials; moreover, it is important that the professors should give proper feedback and provide a real-like atmosphere for student teachers to teach their classmates freely; then, the professor should reteach the lesson himself with more details after each microteaching session.

To sum up, according to the results, it can be said that the student teachers in the English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz were aware of the effectiveness of microteaching component in language teacher education programs. Besides, they were eager to do/have microteaching element in some of their departmental courses. More importantly, they shared their needs, expectations, and suggestions as regards the integration of microteaching element into some of the courses in the curriculum.

4.3 Instructor Questionnaire

The instructor questionnaire aimed at investigating into the instructors’ attitudes, needs, expectations, and suggestions regarding the utilization of microteaching

element in some of the departmental courses in the English Department. This questionnaire was composed of three major parts as follows.

4.3.1 Instructors' Attitudes towards the Integration of Microteaching Element

In the first part of the instructor questionnaire, 43 closed-items parallel to the student questionnaire were analyzed which generally presented the results about the instructors' perceptions as for the integration of microteaching element (Refer to Table 4.3). It is worth mentioning that almost all of the instructors had positive attitudes regarding the use of microteaching component in the pre-service courses.

4.3: Instructors' attitudes towards the integration of microteaching element

Microteaching...	SA+A %	Not sure	D+SD %	Mean
1 increases student teachers' motivation.	100	0	0	4.42
2 helps student teachers to become more interested in the course.	91.7	8.3	0	4.25
3 develops creativity.	58.3	41.7	0	3.83
4 increases autonomy.	91.7	8.3	0	4.08
5 helps student teachers to be organized.	91.7	8.3	0	4.33
6 develops planning skills.	91.7	8.3	0	4.33
7 helps student teachers to prepare their own materials and activities.	91.7	8.3	0	4.25
8 helps student teachers to learn how to manage the class.	91.7	8.3	0	4.42
9 helps student teachers to develop the actual teaching skills they will need in future.	91.7	8.3	0	4.42
10 helps student teachers to learn how to predict classroom problems.	83.3	16.7	0	4.25
11 helps student teachers with their time management.	100	0	0	4.42
12 develops student teachers' listening skills.	50.0	41.7	8.3	3.67
13 develops student teachers' reading skills.	66.7	33.3	0	3.83

Microteaching...	SA+A %	Not sure	D+SD %	Mean
14 develops student teachers' writing skills.	50.0	50.0	0	3.58
15 develops student teachers' speaking skills.	58.4	33.3	8.3	3.92
16 develops student teachers' vocabulary.	75.0	25.0	0	4.08
17 develops student teachers' grammar.	66.7	33.3	0	3.83
18 gives student teachers an opportunity to learn by observing their peers.	91.7	8.3	0	4.17
19 helps student teachers to put theory into practice.	83.3	16.7	0	4.08
20 enables student teachers to learn by doing.	83.3	16.7	0	4.42
21 creates awareness of how to teach.	100	0	0	4.33
22 improves student teachers' teaching skills.	83.4	16.6	0	4.25
23 makes student teachers aware of the qualities of a good teacher.	75.0	25.0	0	4.08
24 prepares student teachers for their teaching career.	100	0	0	4.42
25 helps student teachers to use various teaching approaches/methods/techniques appropriately.	75.0	16.7	8.3	4.08
26 helps student teachers to learn how to use teaching materials.	66.7	25.0	8.3	3.92
27 helps student teachers to realize how to use body language effectively.	75.0	16.7	8.3	3.92
28 helps student teachers to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching.	66.7	25.0	8.3	3.92
29 helps student teachers to learn how to evaluate learners.	50.0	41.7	8.3	3.67
30 helps student teachers to learn how to use praise and encouragement.	50.0	33.3	16.7	3.75
31 helps student teachers to learn how to give appropriate feedback.	91.7	0	8.3	4.17
32 helps student teachers to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses.	100	0	0	4.33
33 helps student teachers how to use technology in teaching.	66.6	16.7	16.7	3.67
34 is fun.	50.0	41.7	8.3	3.67
35 is easy to do.	41.7	50.0	8.3	3.42

Microteaching...	SA+A %	Not sure	D+SD %	Mean
36 is beneficial.	91.7	8.3	0	4.25
37 causes anxiety.	33.3	58.4	8.3	3.25
38 is waste of time.	8.3	0	91.7	1.83
39 is carried out in an artificial environment.	8.3	8.3	83.4	2.17
40 offers very limited teaching experiences.	8.3	25.0	66.7	2.42
41 attracts peers' attention.	66.7	25.0	8.3	3.75
42 makes student teachers embarrassed when teaching their peers.	25.0	33.3	41.7	2.83
43 makes student teachers feel bored.	8.3	25.0	66.7	2.42

As it is illustrated in Table 4.3, all of the instructors (100%) expressed agreement (SA/A) with item 1 (*Microteaching increases student teachers' motivation*) with the mean 4.42, item 11 (*Microteaching helps student teachers with their time management*) with the mean 4.25, item 21 (*Microteaching creates awareness of how to teach*) with the mean 4.33, item 24 (*Microteaching prepares student teachers for their teaching career*) with the mean 4.42, and item 32 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses*) with the mean 4.33.

In other words, all of the instructors believed that microteaching component does motivate teacher trainees to teach; also, it has a tremendous effect on their actual teaching in the future real classrooms.

Similarly, 11 out of 12 instructors (91.7%) either strongly agreed or agreed with items 2 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to become more interested in the*

course), 4 (*Microteaching increases autonomy*), 5 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to be organized*), 6 (*Microteaching develops planning skills*), 7 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to prepare their own materials and activities*), 8 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to learn how to manage the class*), 9 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to develop the actual teaching skills they will need in future*), 18 (*Microteaching gives student teachers an opportunity to learn by observing their peers*), 31 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to learn how to give appropriate feedback*), and 36 (*Microteaching is beneficial*), indicating the effectiveness of microteaching element from the instructors' perspectives. The mean for the above-mentioned items were 4.25, 4.08, 4.33, 4.33, 4.25, 4.42, 4.42, 4.17, 4.17, 4.25 respectively.

Additionally, the findings demonstrate that almost half of the instructors were not sure with a few items with regard to the role of microteaching element in developing creativity, developing writing skills, and learning how to evaluate the learners (item 3,13,29). Also, they were not sure about the idea that microteaching is an easy and funny activity and may cause anxiety for the teacher candidates (item 34,35,37).

On the other hand, the results show that some of the items in this part of the instructor questionnaire received a high percentage of disagreement (D/SD) from the instructors. For instance, item 38 (*Microteaching is waste of time*) with 91.7% received the highest level of disagreement (D/SD) and the mean was 1.83, item 39 (*Microteaching is carried out in an artificial environment*) with 83.4%, item 40 (*Microteaching offers very limited teaching experiences*) and item 43 (*Microteaching makes student teachers feel bored*) with 66.7% disagreement (D/SD). It is noteworthy to say that the above-mentioned items were basically negative.

To conclude, according to the results the instructors had positive attitudes, too. The positive views about the integration of microteaching element outweighed the negative views among the instructors.

4.3.2 Instructors' Attitudes towards the Desirability of Microteaching Element

The second part of the instructor questionnaire contained 21 closed-items (five-point Likert scale) which were parallel to the student questionnaire. Part 2 basically focused on the instructors' viewpoints as regards the desirability of applying microteaching element in some of their lessons. The outcomes obviously revealed that the instructors highlighted the desirability of such component in the pre-service teacher education courses. The results are illustrated in table 4.4 below.

4.4: Instructors' attitudes towards the **desirability** of microteaching element

Items					VD+D %	N %	UD+VUD %	Mean
1	Having microteaching element in methodology courses				83.3	16.7	0	4.08
2	Having microteaching element in literature courses				33.3	41.7	25.0	3.08
3	Having microteaching element in education courses				75.0	25.0	0	4.08
4	Having microteaching element in linguistics courses				33.3	50.0	16.7	3.25
5	Having microteaching element in translation courses				58.3	25.0	16.7	3.67
6	Having microteaching element in practicum courses				75.0	25.0	0	4.17
7	Asking the students to prepare lesson plans before each microteaching				100	0	0	4.17
8	Giving feedback to the students before each microteaching session				91.7	8.3	0	4.17
9	Giving feedback to the students after each microteaching session				100	0	0	4.33

Items		VD+D %	N %	UD+VUD %	Mean
10	Doing microteaching to teach listening skills	66.7	33.3	0	3.92
11	Doing microteaching to teach reading skills	75.0	25.0	0	4.00
12	Doing microteaching to teach writing skills	75.0	25.0	0	3.92
13	Doing microteaching to teach speaking skills	83.3	16.7	0	4.25
14	Doing microteaching to teach vocabulary	75.0	25.0	0	4.00
15	Doing microteaching to teach grammar	75.0	25.0	0	4.00
16	Asking the students to apply different teaching strategies in microteaching lessons	58.3	41.7	0	3.83
17	Asking the students to give and receive feedback on others' (peers') microteachings	83.3	16.7	0	4.33
18	Asking the students to prepare their own teaching materials in microteaching sessions	75.0	25.0	0	4.25
19	Asking the students to do microteaching to reteach the same lesson to improve their performance	91.7	8.3	0	4.17
20	Using PowerPoint presentations in the microteaching sessions	91.7	8.3	0	4.33
21	Using technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials in microteaching sessions	100	0	0	4.50

On the whole, as it is shown in table 4.4, a great majority of the instructors had positive perspectives as regards the desirability of microteaching component. Therefore, some of the items received very high desirability (VD/D) ratio from the instructors. For instance, all of the instructors (100%) pointed out the desirability (VD/D) of item 7 (*Asking the students to prepare lesson plans before each microteaching*), item 9 (*Giving feedback to the students after each microteaching session*), and item 21 (*Using technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials in*

microteaching sessions), and the means for item 7 was 4.17, 4.33 for item 9, and it was 4.50 for item 21.

Additionally, 11 out of 12 instructors (91.7%) found it quite desirable to give feedback to the students before each microteaching session (item 8), and to ask students to do microteaching to reteach the same lessons in order to improve their performance as well as using PowerPoint presentations in their microteaching sessions (items 19 and 20). The mean for the mentioned items were 4.17, 4.17, and 4.33 respectively. Moreover, above 75% of the instructors reported that doing/having microteaching element is desirable or very desirable in order to teach different skills (items 10 to 15) and the means ranged between 3.92 and 4.25.

Concerning the desirability (VD/D) of microteaching element in the departmental courses, 83.3% of the instructors expressed their opinions towards the necessity of having microteaching component in Methodology courses (item 1) with the mean 4.08. Furthermore, item 3 (*Having microteaching element in education courses*) and item 6 (*Having microteaching element in practicum courses*) with 75%, indicated a strong desire regarding the integration of microteaching element in the mentioned courses. However, almost half of the instructors either chose ‘*Neutral*’ or ‘*Undesirable*’ as regards having microteaching element in Linguistics courses, Literature courses, and Translation courses; and the lowest desirability went to item 2 (*Having microteaching element in literature courses*) with the mean 3.08.

To sum up, it is noticeable that the outcomes of this part of the instructor questionnaire were somehow parallel to the results of the student questionnaire as both the instructors and the student teachers highlighted the great desirability of the

application of microteaching element in some of the departmental courses, especially in Methodology courses with the highest desirability (VD/D) ratio.

4.3.3 Instructors' Suggestions regarding Microteaching Element

Parallel to the student questionnaire, the last part of the instructor questionnaire comprised six open-ended questions which focused on the instructors' beliefs, needs, expectations, and suggestions concerning the inclusion of microteaching element. Overall, according to the data obtained from the responses, all of the instructors had positive attitudes towards the utilization of microteaching element.

In response to the first question ("Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, literature courses, etc.? Why or why not?"), 9 out of 12 instructors (75%) gave the response 'Yes' with almost parallel reasons or opinions. For example, T5 explained "Yes, the importance of inclusion of microteaching element in departmental courses have been confirmed by a lot of studies."; T12 indicated "Yes, it can be helpful, it helps a kind of monitoring as well as developing a type of team teaching.", and T10 stated "Sure, practice makes perfect, they should fake it till they make it." However, concerning the rest of the responses, 3 out of 12 instructors did not respond to the present question.

As regards the second question ("Into which courses in the curriculum do you think the microteaching component should be integrated?"), two instructors pointed out the inclusion of microteaching in basic courses which mainly focus on the language skills of the teacher candidates. In addition, two of them indicated that having microteaching element in those courses which basically deal with the teaching strategies and teaching skills of the teacher trainees is the utmost of importance. T1

believed that “Speaking courses are the best or the most appropriate ones for applying microteaching element.” Moreover, other two instructors thought that microteaching element should be included in all pre-service teacher education courses. Finally, it is crucial to mention that 5 out of 12 instructors did not respond to this question.

With reference to the third question (“What are your students’ needs and expectations regarding microteaching element in these courses? Please explain.”), two instructors who had similar opinions stated that the student teachers want to be informed about all the benefits as well as the probable obstacles they may face during their microteaching. T4 indicated: “The students need to be informed of the benefits and the difficulties of such activities, also they need to support and encourage by the teachers.” Furthermore, three of them declared that the teacher trainees need to become familiar with different teaching skills and approaches, and aware of the efficient ways of presenting the materials within the microteaching session. On the other hand, two instructors believed that their students initially need to enhance their self-confidence and make an effort to overcome the stress and tension during microteaching sessions. However, five instructors left the present question with no response.

Concerning the forth question (“What might be some benefits of integrating microteaching element into these courses?”), it is noteworthy to say that four out of 12 instructors mentioned about the discussion of the benefits of the microteaching element in several studies. However, two instructors believed that the integration of microteaching component to the pre-service courses could be a key to prepare more effective teachers for the future classrooms, as T10 mentioned “Producing more

effective teachers.” Additionally, T8 declared: “Learners become familiar with real challenges they may encounter in teaching situations, also prospective teachers can reflect on how they teach and can improve their weaknesses.” Likewise, two of them agreed that with the help of microteaching sessions the teacher trainees might become confident and brave enough to express themselves and gain hands-on teaching experience. Finally, three of them did not respond to this question.

As for the fifth question (“What might be some problems or difficulties your students may face while preparing for or doing microteachings in these courses?”), half of the instructors pointed out to the most common problems and difficulties including ‘lack of cooperation’, ‘lack of confidence’, ‘artificiality’, and ‘high level of anxiety’. For example, T8 said: “Since the students teach their peers this may not create real teaching situations that include real learners.” Similarly, T3 stated: “They may not be aware of the main elements of each lesson which should be covered.” In addition, T4 said: “They may not know what they are expected to do or for what reasons or purposes they are asked to do so.” However, four participants left the question blank.

With regard to the last question (“How do you think the microteaching element should be like in these courses?”), it drew the researcher’s attention that 7 out of 12 instructors (58%) either had no idea or left the question with no response. However, three of them believed that microteaching element should be goal oriented and should take place in a real-like situation; T10 stated “Planned, matching real life, goal oriented”. Moreover, two instructors implied that it would be better to carry out the microteaching in mini-lessons monitored by the instructors. T8 explained: “They should be in the form of short teaching sessions during the methodology sessions,

and the teachers should comment on each student's presentation, the strengths and the weak points should be discussed in the class.”

To conclude, it is obvious that almost all the instructors supported the idea of integrating microteaching component into the departmental courses in the English Department of IAUSH. Besides, they pointed out some benefits of microteaching element, and they found it quite vital in terms of educating effective teachers for future classrooms. Thus, their comments shed light on the necessity of microteaching element in some of the departmental courses. Lastly, they expressed their own ideas about the utilization of such component such that it must be goal-oriented and should be carried out in a real-like atmosphere.

4.4 Instructor Interviews

Teacher interviews were conducted to attain in-depth information as to the instructors' beliefs, needs, expectations, and suggestions regarding microteaching component. Eight questions were asked during the instructor interview sessions and three instructors in the English Department of IAUSH agreed to cooperate and participate in the interviews. Each interview session took around 10 to 15 minutes. The present section presents the data obtained from the instructors who responded to eight interview questions.

When asked the first question (“How do you feel about the integration of microteaching element into some of the departmental courses?”), all three instructors agreed with such an integration as they believed it would be useful and really necessary to do so. For example, T1 stated:

It would be exceptionally useful as some of the instructors are not experienced enough to teach some specific courses while the department suffers from lack of experienced instructors to teach such courses.

As for the second question (“Should there be a microteaching element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, literature courses, etc.? Why or why not?”), all the responses were a definite ‘Yes’ since they reported that the inclusion of microteaching element in some courses could play a crucial role in helping the prospective teachers to absorb the material as well as becoming aware of their learning and teaching weak points. T2 declared:

There needs to be such elements; however, in some courses such as methodology or practical teaching the necessity is greater as the nature of the course is tied with elements of microteaching.

As regards the third question (“In which courses in the curriculum do you think the microteaching element should be integrated?”), the instructors indicated that having microteaching session in courses like teaching methodology is a real must and should be practiced. T1 explained: “It depends on the kind of courses or major a person is studying. As for teaching methodology, I think it is a real must.”

As for the forth question (“How do you think microteaching sessions can help your students? What are their expectations?”), the responses varied and the instructors expressed various opinions regarding their students’ expectations as to the application of microteaching component. For example, T2 mentioned “It can help them prepare for their future teaching career, also it will reduce their stage anxiety.”, and T1 stated “It can lead to an in-depth understanding of the materials.” Besides, T3 indicated:

The student teachers can have a kind of reflection on what they have done as well as coming up with the real and right picture of what is actually taken place in class and then they will decide upon making further choices as to what kind of teaching techniques have been successful and what kind of materials have been well-taught; as for the students' expectations whenever they have problems understanding something they usually expect review and reinforcement on the part of the teachers so the teachers might be quite helpful in providing expected feedback in the form of corrective feedback or the repetition of already-taught material.

With respect to question 5 ("Do you think your students will have enough opportunities to do microteaching in their courses? How many microteachings do they want/need to do in each course? Please explain."), all the instructors reported that unfortunately the students are not aware of such kind of techniques maybe because of the lack of time and required facilities and equipment; therefore, they have not experienced such a teaching practice so far in the English Department of IAUSH. In addition, T2 said "The student teachers have better to practice it at least couple of times per semester depending on the course objectives."

As to the sixth question ("What might be some advantages of microteaching element in these courses?"), it is noteworthy to say that two of the instructors believed that the utilization of microteaching element leads to several benefits such as preparing the students for their future career, increasing students' involvement, enhancing student' level of self-confidence, and providing motivation. Additionally, T3 indicated:

The most prominent and salient advantage of utilizing microteaching in classes is, it would give both teachers and students an image of what actually takes place in class, also they might gain awareness over how they have behaved in class, for example the kind of techniques they have used, the kind of approaches they have implied and that's why they will have a good picture not only of themselves but also of the other bodies.

Concerning the seventh question (“What might be some problems your students may encounter during the microteaching sessions?”), T2 pointed out to some of the obstacles which the student teachers may face including “fear of making mistakes and losing face, being inhibited, suffering from low self-confidence, not having enough time, and not getting accustomed to such activities.” Likewise, student teachers’ lack of awareness, unfamiliarity, and inappropriate evaluation were the further problems mentioned by the rest of the instructors.

With regard to the last question (“What are your students’ needs regarding microteaching element in these courses? How should they be like? What do you suggest?”), the instructors made constructive and fruitful suggestions which seemed to be noteworthy to discuss in detail. T1 stated:

The following procedures might be useful: (1) Students can be distributed into groups to have microteaching and share their experiences as cooperative learning, and watching relevant videos i.e. teaching samples, and to be given appropriate feedback; (2) To introduce the content through discussion in which the students are going to do microteaching.

Also, T2 identified:

They need to be informed of the benefits and the necessity of running such activities, they need to be given ample opportunities for such activities, and they need to be made sure that they have to practice teaching in an unreal world before they get prepared and experienced for their real teaching profession.

Lastly, T3 explained:

Students need to have an opportunity not only to listen to the teachers while giving them feedback but also reviewing what they have done in the class through a film or at least an audio-recording might help them better come up with the exact nature of the kind of problem they have produced so they can

concentrate better and also receive the feedback with more content and try to improve at more systematic and effective manner.

To sum up, the results obtained from both questionnaires and interviews indicated that the instructors in the English Department held positive attitudes as regards microteaching component in pre-service teacher education programs. They believed that the integration of microteaching element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses is a real must. On the other hand, they pointed out the lack of awareness and willingness towards such elements in most of the educational settings in Iran.

4.5 Summary

In conclusion, this chapter presented the results of both instructor and student questionnaires followed by the results of the instructor and student interviews. In general, the obtained data shed light on the necessity and high desirability of the inclusion of microteaching in some of the pre-service courses in the English Department of IAUSH. Also, the results indicated that both the instructors and the students had positive views upon the utilization of such component in the departmental courses. The discussion of the results under the research questions by referring to the relevant literature is provided in the following chapter.

Chapter 5

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSION

The present chapter contains five parts. In the first part discussion of the findings is presented on the basis of four research questions. The second part focuses on the conclusion of the study. Lastly, the third, fourth, and fifth parts deal with the pedagogical implications, limitations of the study, and suggestions for further research, respectively.

5.1 Discussion of Results

In the following sub-sections, the research questions are answered. In other words, precise attention is paid to how the results of the present research study relate to the former studies on microteaching in teacher education programs.

5.1.1 What are the students' attitudes towards the integration of peer-teaching element into some of their courses?

The results obtained from the student questionnaire reveal that the student teachers in the English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz mostly held positive attitudes towards different aspects of the use of microteaching component in the departmental courses. More specifically, according to the results obtained from closed items in the questionnaire, the student teachers had positive views about some aspects of microteaching sessions more than the other aspects. For instance, item 1 (*Microteaching increases student teachers' motivation*) and item 2 (*Microteaching develops creativity*) which received more positive responses (the mean scores were higher than 4.00) indicated that the trainee teachers strongly believed that

microteaching element was effective and successful. Likewise, the participants of the research study conducted by Ismail (2011) indicated that; the student teachers believed that microteaching session increased their motivation as well as providing different teaching opportunities which lead to become creative and effective teachers.

Moreover, according to the results for items 21, 32, and 22 it is obvious that the teacher trainees held positive views as regards the usefulness of microteaching sessions in terms of contributing to their teaching performance and preparing them for future classrooms. These results also pointed out the student teachers' positive attitudes regarding the practical aspects of microteaching element. Similarly, Aliaskari (2017) conducted a parallel study in the Department of ELT at Eastern Mediterranean University and found out that most of the student teachers held positive views regarding the impact of microteaching sessions on their actual teaching performance. Additionally, in a study by Ismail (2011) the students stated that microteaching provided the opportunity to practice different techniques and strategies. Furthermore, the results obtained for items 21,8, and 5 indicate that microteaching would raise the student teachers' awareness of how to teach as well as their classroom management abilities, which is in line with what Aliaskari (2017) and Ismail (2011) obtained in their studies.

Finally, based on the results of items 12-17, it is worth mentioning that the student teachers' attitudes concerning the development in 'accuracy' and 'basic language skills' through microteaching sessions were remarkably positive since the mean scores for these closed items were higher than 4.00. Likewise, Assinder (1991) also supported that microteaching "increased number of skills and strategies practiced and developed" and "it increased accuracy" among the students who took part in his

research study on microteaching model (p. 226). Also, Ismail (2011) stated that the ‘vocabulary improvement’ variable had a high mean score in his research study, which is quite similar to the results obtained for item 16 (*Microteaching develops student teachers’ vocabulary*) in the present study with the highest mean score (4.57).

It can be interpreted that the ‘practice-based’ nature of microteaching resulted in student teachers’ highly positive attitudes. In other words, the preference for learner-centered and practice-based methods was dramatically high among trainee teachers; as Arikan (2006) stated, in language teacher education a transition should take place between the traditional methodologies and modernizations which include more practice-based approaches.

To conclude, according to the findings of the present study the student teachers mostly desired the inclusion of microteaching in their departmental courses and found it quite practical and innovative element in language teacher education. Although a small number of responses pointed out some negative but not very important features of microteaching, the majority of the participants shared positive attitudes and views regarding the integration of microteaching component into their courses.

5.1.2 What are the instructors’ attitudes towards the integration of peer-teaching element into some of their courses?

Generally, the instructors in the English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz reported positive attitudes towards the application of microteaching component in some of the departmental courses. According to the findings of the study, they held positive attitudes towards almost all aspects of microteaching

element. More specifically, the results obtained from the closed items indicate that some aspects of the microteaching component received very high ratings (i.e. agreement) from the instructors such as the ‘efficacy of microteaching’, ‘improvement in teaching awareness’, ‘improvement in teaching performance’, and ‘providing self-reflection’ for prospective teachers. The mean scores of the related items were all higher than 4.00.

To the knowledge of the researcher, in the literature there is not much research on the instructors’ attitudes towards microteaching element. Hence, the interpretation of the results with reference to previous studies in the literature is somehow limited. However, as Aliaskari (2017) stated “The positive attitudes of the instructors might have arisen from the experience of the instructors in employing peer-teaching as an effective instructional strategy” (p. 86). The instructors who participated in the present research study shared positive views about the effectiveness of microteaching element, which is in line with the results obtained from a parallel study by Aliaskari (2017) on microteaching in a different context. In general, in both studies, the instructors held positive attitudes towards inclusion of microteaching in the pre-service teacher education courses.

Additionally, based on the research study by Levine et al. (2014) at the University of Connecticut on the teacher preparation of how to teach L2, the instructors reported that microteaching provides opportunity for the trainee teachers to achieve favourable learning outcomes. The instructors in the study (Levine et al., 2014) also argued that in microteaching sessions the student teachers would have the chance to criticize their peers’ teaching and to learn from each other.

In the present study, the idea that microteaching component improves teaching awareness among prospective teachers is supported by the positive responses received from the instructors. Based on items 19 and 21, which had the mean scores higher than 4.00, it can be said that the instructors held positive attitudes towards the contribution of microteaching element to the teaching awareness of student teachers. In other words, they strongly believed that through microteaching sessions the student teachers would become aware of how to put theory into practice. Likewise, Aliaskari (2017) stated that the instructors in the ELT Department at Eastern Mediterranean University had similar (positive) perspectives regarding the influence of microteaching sessions on the teaching practice of the teacher trainees including their teaching awareness and teaching performance.

Moreover, it can be argued that the instructors' positive attitudes in the present study could be related to the claim put forward by Johnson and Golombek (2011): Microteaching would provide positive rapport and interaction between the instructors and their students in language teacher education. Also, the positive attitudes of the instructors towards item 32 (*Microteaching helps student teachers to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses*) with mean score 4.33 revealed that they held positive views as regards the constructive impact of microteaching element on the student teachers' self-reflection. Similarly, Aliaskari (2017) in his study found out that the instructors favoured the application of microteaching component in order to promote the trainee teachers' self-reflection.

To sum up, in the present study like the prospective teachers, the instructors were completely optimistic as regards the utilization of microteaching since they shared numerous positive perspectives and attitudes. They also believed that microteaching

element could boost student teachers' motivation which leads to fruitful learning outcomes which has been discussed in the literature (see Richards, 2008).

5.1.3 What do the students suggest regarding peer-teaching element in some of their courses?

The qualitative results of the present study which supported the quantitative data showed that the student teachers in the English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz favoured the integration of microteaching component to their departmental courses. In general, they expected that microteaching element should be part of pre-service teacher education program, which is in consistent with the findings of previous studies in the literature (e.g., Ismail, 2011; Şeferoğlu, 2006; Assinder, 1991).

Concerning the desirability of the microteaching component in some of the departmental courses, the student teachers in the present study indicated that microteaching plays a key role in methodology courses. The results obtained for item 1 (*Doing microteaching in methodology courses*) with the mean score 4.12 in the second part of the student questionnaire, is in congruence with what Seferoğlu (2006) stated in her research study: having microteaching session in methodology courses received the most desirability rate from the participants. On the other hand, the results for item 9 with the mean score higher than 4.00 indicated that student teachers desired to get feedback from their instructors after each microteaching session. Likewise, Assinder (1991) in his study on microteaching argued that feedback sessions seemed to be the paramount importance in accordance with what the participants declared.

Although the student teachers shared positive attitudes towards having microteaching in some of their departmental courses, they pointed out some difficulties and problems which they might face during microteaching sessions. For instance, they pointed out some ‘psychological barriers’ such as anxiety, lack of self-confidence, being annoyed by making mistakes in front of the others, and they focused on some weaknesses as regards their teaching skills and timing. Similarly, Johnson and Arshavskaya (2011) and Benson and Ying (2013) stated that such difficulties and emotional barriers typically occur during microteaching sessions especially in early stages because the trainee teachers may not be confident enough in terms of their L2 abilities to run the microteaching sessions efficiently. In addition, Aliaskari (2017) found out that the student teachers in his study seemed to have difficulties in terms of time management and they preferred to be given more time to practice microteaching, which is in congruence with the findings of the present study.

As regards the recommendations made by the student teachers to enhance the quality of microteaching sessions, it can be mentioned that the majority of them suggested that the time devoted to microteaching sessions as well as the number of sessions should be extended; they suggested to hold the microteaching sessions in a non-artificial environment; and the use of technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials in microteaching sessions should be increased. Likewise, the students who participated in studies done by Aliaskari (2017) and Benson and Ying (2013) also made some of the above-mentioned recommendations. For instance, in Benson and Ying (2013), the students declared that it would be better to increase the number of microteaching sessions as well as holding them in more realistic situations. They also made

recommendations regarding increasing the integration of technology in the teaching materials.

To conclude, it can be stated that almost all of the student teachers were optimistic as regards having microteaching sessions. Hence, they expressed various constructive suggestions for the integration of microteaching element to their courses, and they briefly explained their expectations and needs as regards this component in order to improve the quality of microteaching sessions.

5.1.4 What do the instructors suggest regarding peer-teaching element in some of their courses?

The qualitative data supported by the quantitative results of the present study obviously pointed out the positive perspectives of the instructors in the English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz as regards the inclusion of microteaching component in some of the departmental courses. They shared positive opinions about the effectiveness and various benefits of microteaching sessions. For instance, they believed that microteaching increases self-confidence, teaching awareness, self-reflection as well as improving teaching skills among the prospective teachers in pre-service teacher education programs. Also, they made some fruitful recommendations as regards different aspects of integrating microteaching component into the courses in the curriculum in that specific context. The above-mentioned results and suggestions are in consistence with the findings of the previous studies in which the instructors held positive perspectives towards such teacher education approaches i.e., microteaching which end up with successful outcomes for their students (e.g., Levine et al. 2014; Richards, 2008). However, since

in the literature not much research has been conducted upon the instructors' attitudes regarding microteaching sessions, there is limitation in making comparisons.

According to the results obtained for the first item in the second part of the instructor questionnaire as well as the qualitative data obtained from the interviews and open-ended questions, it can be interpreted that the instructors who participated in this study mostly believed that microteaching element was very desirable in methodology courses and should be integrated in such courses. Likewise, Aliaskari (2017) stated that the instructors in his study highlighted the important role of microteaching component in methodology courses.

Furthermore, the instructors in the present research study indicated that it was quite obvious that the student teachers deal were not much aware of how to do microteaching. In other words, they did not have sufficient preparation and they usually suffered during their microteaching session in terms of their performances. Similarly, Peacock (2009) in his study on the evaluation of EFL teacher-training programs declared that it is always confusing for the trainee teachers to find out how a second/foreign language lesson should be taught in language teacher education programs, so they are in need of more training sessions.

Moreover, in the present study the majority of the instructors specified that microteaching sessions provided the opportunity for student teachers to reflect on their performances and to become aware of their weaknesses and strengths. This idea is in consistence with what Peacock (2009) claimed; such strategies in teacher education program successfully promote 'self-reflection' and 'self-evaluation'. Also, regarding the pedagogical aspect of microteaching sessions Peacock (2009) stated that "there was an appropriate balance among English proficiency and the nature of

language” (p. 273), which is in congruence with what the instructors in this study mentioned during interviews (doing microteaching affects the student teachers’ English proficiency and linguistic competence).

In line with what the teacher candidates who participated in the present study suggested, the instructors highly recommended to increase the number of microteaching sessions in the departmental courses. Also, the majority of them strongly suggested that the technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials should be used in microteaching sessions. Some of the recommendations provided by the instructors were also suggested by the instructors in Aliaskari’s (2017) study.

In the end, it can be concluded that the instructors in the English Department of IAUSH held strongly positive attitudes towards the integration of microteaching in some of the pre-service courses. They found microteaching element quite essential and pointed out some of the benefits and difficulties of peer-teaching sessions. Also, they indicated some practical suggestions as regards the efficiency of integrating microteaching elements into some of the courses in the curriculum.

5.2 Conclusion

Both qualitative and quantitative results in the present study indicated that the inclusion of microteaching component in some of the departmental courses was practical and essential as perceived by both the instructors and the student teachers in the English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz. Additionally, they held positive attitudes as regards different aspects of microteaching sessions, which has been supported by some other scholars in the literature (e.g., Ismail, 2011; Seferoğlu, 2006; Assinder, 1991; Peacock, 2009).

Furthermore, both the instructors and the prospective teachers expressed their opinions and expectations regarding the peer-teaching element. For instance, both the instructors and the teacher candidates expected to have more microteaching sessions in the courses in the curriculum. Besides, they made some noticeable and constructive recommendations in order to improve the quality of such component in the courses in the curriculum. For example, they highly recommended to increase the use of technology in microteaching sessions i.e. digital materials. They also attempted to imply some of the difficulties and barriers of microteaching component including the high level of student teachers' anxiety, which have been considered as emotional or psychological barriers in the literature (Benson & Ying, 2013; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011). In addition, it is quite noticeable that in terms of desirability of microteaching sessions both the instructors and the student teachers in this study believed that microteaching element plays an influential role in methodology courses which could be considered as a parallel finding in the related literature.

To sum up, with reference to what the experienced instructors in the English Department of IAUSH declared as well as the positive perspectives held by the student teachers it can be said that microteaching is considered as a helpful strategy in language teacher education programs. Besides, it is worth mentioning that the results obtained from both the instructors and the student teachers emphasized the necessity of integrating microteaching in some of the pre-service courses in that context.

5.3 Implications of the Study

This section explains the practical implications of this study as regards the integration of microteaching component into some of the departmental courses in the

English Department of Islamic Azad University of Shiraz. In general, the findings of the present study confirmed that both the instructors and the student teachers held positive attitudes towards the utilization of microteaching element in pre-service teacher education courses. The findings may have some implications one of which can be that the student teachers' awareness as regards the effectiveness and necessity of microteaching element may increase.

Another practical implication of this study is that microteaching session is considered as a platform in which the teacher trainees are able to put their theoretical knowledge into practice in pre-service teacher education programs. It is needless to say that the mentioned point has been argued by many scholars in the literature (e.g., Benson & Ying, 2013; Ismail, 2011; Johnson & Arshavskaya, 2011; Şeferoğlu, 2006; Assinder, 1991).

Lastly, the constructive recommendations made by the instructors as well as the expectations received from the prospective teachers could be considered as another implication of the present research study. For example, the participants insisted on increasing the number of microteaching sessions in some courses such as methodology and study skill courses. Accordingly, the findings may have a positive influence on improving the microteaching component in their departmental courses; as a result, the findings provided by this study may contribute to the mentioned educational setting.

5.4 Limitations of the Study

Some limitations exist in the present study. The first one refers to the generalizability of this research study since it targeted only the instructors and the student teachers in

the English Department of IAUSH. Thus, the findings of the study are limited to this particular setting and cannot be generalized. The second limitation is related to the small number of the instructors who participated in this study. It is worth mentioning that the main reason of this limitation is the small number of existing ELT instructors in the mentioned context. The third limitation is the small number the student teachers who volunteered to participate in the interview session and the reason for this limitation is that they were reluctant to take part in this study. Besides, the absence of portfolios and observations could be considered as the last limitation of the present research study.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

As for the future research studies some recommendations can be made. Firstly, it is highly suggested that this investigation be replicated in other English departments by the researcher as receiving parallel conclusions from different research studies may help the researcher to generalize the findings more confidently. Secondly, it is strongly suggested that other researchers take a step forward and collect the data through observations as an additional data collection instrument in order to obtain more in-depth data. Lastly, it is recommended that further studies investigate the actual impact of microteaching sessions on the student teachers' teaching performances through assessment. In other words, to observe and assess the trainee teachers' achievements after microteaching sessions in pre-service language teacher education programs can be suggested.

REFERENCES

- Aliaskari, F. (2017). *Students' and instructors' Attitudes towards Peer Teaching Component in ELT Courses*. Master's thesis. Eastern Mediterranean University.
- Allen, D. W., & Eve, A. W. (1968). Microteaching. *Theory into practice*, 7(5), 181-185.
- Amobi, F. A. (2005). Preservice teachers' reflectivity on the sequence and consequences of teaching actions in a microteaching experience. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(1), 115-130.
- Ananthakrishnan, N. (1993). Microteaching as a vehicle of teacher training--its advantages and disadvantages. *Journal of postgraduate medicine*, 39(3), 142.
- Arıkan, A. (2006). Postmethod condition and its implications for English language teacher education. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 2, 1-11.
- Arnstine, D. (1990). Art, Aesthetics, and the Pitfalls of Discipline- Based Art Education. *Educational Theory*, 40(4), 415-422.
- Assinder, W. (1991). Peer teaching, peer learning: one model. *ELT Journal*, 45(3), 218-229.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Hartford, B. (1997). *Beyond Methods: Components of Second Language Teacher Education. The McGraw-Hill Second Language Professional Series. Directions in Second Language Learning and Teaching.* McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc., Order Services, PO Box 545, Blacklick, OH 43004-0545.

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.

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

Brown, A. H. (1999). Simulated classrooms and artificial students: The potential effects of new technologies on teacher education. *Journal of Research on Computing in Education*, 32(2), 307-318.

Brown, H., Iyobe, B., & Riley, P. (2013). An evaluation of the use of student-generated materials. *Language Teacher*, 37, 3-10.

Çakir, Ö. S. (2000). Öğretmen yetiştirmede teoriyi pratiğe bağlayan mikro-öğretimin Türkiye'deki üç üniversitede durumu. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 18(18).

Cooper, J. M. (1967). Developing specific teaching skills through micro-teaching. *The High School Journal*, 51(2), 80-85.

- Crandall, J. (1994). Strategic integration: Preparing language and content teachers for linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms. *Strategic interaction and language acquisition: Theory, practice, and research*, 255-274.
- Crandall, J. (1995). Reinventing (America's) schools: The role of the applied linguist. In J. E. Alatis (ed.) *Linguistics and the education of language teachers: Ethnolinguistic, psycholinguistic, and sociolinguistic aspects*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 412–427.
- Crandall, J. J. (2000). Language teacher education. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 20, 34-55.
- Cripwell, K., & Geddes, M. (1982). The development of organizational skills through micro-teaching. *ELT journal*, 36(4), 232-236.
- Cruickshank, D. R., et al. (1996). *Preparing America 's Teachers*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2015). *Applied Linguistics*. Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2009). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration, and processing* (2nd ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Farrell, T. (Ed.). (2015). *International perspectives on English language teacher education: innovations from the field*. Springer. 479-481.

- Fernandez, M. L., and Robinson, M. (2007). Prospective teachers' perspectives on microteaching lesson study. *Education*, 127(2), 203–215.
- Görge, İ. (2003). The effect of microteaching practises on student teachers' views of giving lessons in the classroom. *Journal of Hacettepe University Education Faculty*, 24, 56-63.
- Greene, J. C., Caracelli, V. J., & Graham, W. F. (1989). Toward a conceptual framework for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 11(3), 255-274.
- Gürses, A., Bayrak, R., Yalçın, M., Açıkyıldız, M., & Doğan, Ç. (2005). Investigation of effectiveness of microteaching at practicum. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 13(1), 1-10.
- Hashemi, M. R. (2012). Reflections 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.
- Johnson, K. E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *Tesol Quarterly*, 40(1), 235-257.

Johnson, K. E., & Arshavskaya, E. (2011). Strategic mediation in learning to teach: Reconceptualizing the microteaching simulation in an MA TESL methodology course. In *Research on second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective on professional development* (pp. 168-185). 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*. Routledge.

Karamustafaoğlu, O., & Akdeniz, A. R. (2002). Fizik öğretmen adaylarının kazanımları beklenen davranışları uygulama okullarında yansıtabilme olanakları. *V. Ulusal Fen Bilimleri ve Matematik Eğitimi Kongresi, 1*, 456-769.

Katitia, D. M. O. (2015). Teacher Education Preparation Program for the 21st Century. Which Way Forward for Kenya? *Journal of Education and Practice, 6*(24), 57-63.

Kilic, A. (2010). Learner-Centered Micro Teaching in Teacher Education. *Online Submission, 3*(1), 77-100.

Klopper, C., & Drew, S. (2015). Teaching for learning and learning for teaching. In *Teaching for Learning and Learning for Teaching* (pp. 1-11). SensePublishers, Rotterdam.

- Kottkamp, R. B. (1990). Means for facilitating reflection. *Education and urban society*, 22(2), 182-203.
- Kubukcu, F. (2010). Congruence and dissonance between micro-teaching and macro-teaching. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2), 326-329.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1990). On the need for a theory of language teaching. *Georgetown University Round Table on Languages and Linguistics*, 261-270.
- Levine, T., Howard, E., & Moss, D. (Eds.). (2014). *Preparing classroom teachers to succeed with second language learners: Lessons from a faculty learning community*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Loughran, J. (2013). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching & learning about teaching*. Routledge.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2015). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. London: Lawrence.
- Mennim, P. (2012). Peer Teaching and Learner-Generated Materials: Introducing Students to New Roles¹. *Language Education in Asia*, 3(2), 230-242.
- Mennim, P. (2016). A discourse-based evaluation of a classroom peer teaching project. *Elt Journal*, ccw046, 37-49.

- Merc, A. (2015). Microteaching Experience in Distance English Language Teacher Training: A Case Study. *Journal of Educators Online*, 12(2), 1-34.
- Mule, L. (2006). Preservice teachers' inquiry in a professional development school context: Implications for the practicum. *Teaching and teacher education*, 22(2), 205-218.
- Oddens, D. A. M (2004). Trend in Dutch Vocational Education Teacher Training in Terms of Personal Quality. *In International Conference on VET Teacher Training. Vol.1: VET Teacher Training*, 347-354.
- Ogeyik, M. C. (2009). Attitudes of the student teachers in English language teaching programs towards microteaching technique. *English Language Teaching*, 2(3), 205-212.
- Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programs. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-278.
- Pennington, M. C. (1990). A professional development focus for the language teaching practicum. *Second language teacher education*, 132-151.
- Riazi, A. M., & Candlin, C. N. (2014). Mixed-methods research in language teaching and learning: Opportunities, issues and challenges. *Language Teaching*, 47(2), 135-173.

- Richards, J. C. (2008). Second language teacher education today. *RELC journal*, 39(2), 158-177.
- Richards, J. C., & Nunan, D. (Eds.). (1990). *Second language teacher education*. Cambridge University Press.
- Saban, A., & Çoklar, A. N. (2013). Pre-Service Teachers' Opinions about the Micro-Teaching Method in Teaching Practise Classes. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 12(2), 234-240.
- Saban, A., & Çoklar, A. N. (2013). Pre-Service Teachers' Opinions about the Micro-Teaching Method in Teaching Practise Classes. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 12(2), 234-240.
- Savas, P. (2012). Micro-teaching videos in EFL teacher education methodology courses: Tools to enhance English proficiency and teaching skills among trainees. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 55, 730-738.
- Seferoğlu, G. (2006). Teacher candidates' reflections 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.

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

Yin, K.R (2014), *Case Study Research Design and Methods*, 5th ed., Stage, London.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Permission Letter

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to inform you that Mr. Seyed Farshad Tork Nejad was a student in Bachelor's Program at Shiraz Azad University. He is currently a graduate student at the Eastern Mediterranean University (Northern Cyprus) and has decided to conduct his research study in the English Language Department of Shiraz Azad University. I am writing to inform you that he is allowed to collect the data required for his study in this department through questionnaires and interviews with students and instructors.

Regards,


Mohammad Javad Riasati
Department of English Language,
Shiraz Azad University, Shiraz, Iran
Email: mjriasati2002@yahoo.com

Mohammad J. Riasati (Ph.D)
Shiraz Azad University
English Language Department
Faculty Member

M. J. Riasati

28/02/2018

Appendix B: Approval Letter from ethics committee of EMU

 Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi "Uluslararası Kariyer İçin"	Eastern Mediterranean University "For Your International Career"	P.K. : 99628 Gazimağusa, KUZLEY KIBRIS / Famagusta, North Cyprus, via Mersin-10 TURKEY Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995 Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919 bayek@emu.edu.tr
---	--	---

Etik Kurulu / Ethics Committee

Reference No: ETK00-2018-0111
Subject: Application for Ethics.


27.03.2018

RE: Seyed Farshad Tork Nejad
Department of Foreign Language Education

To Whom It May Concern,

As part of the 2017-2018 Spring Semester, pertaining to Master Thesis questionnaires EMU's Scientific Research and Publication Ethics Committee has granted Mr. Seyed Farshad Tork Nejad, from the Foreign Language Education Department, to pursue with his survey entitled *Integrating Peer-teaching Element into Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education Courses*. This decision has been taken by the majority of votes. (Meeting number 2018/56-38)

Regards,



Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şükrü Tüzmen
Director of Ethics Committee

ŞT/sky.

www.emu.edu.tr

Appendix C: Student Questionnaire

Informed Consent Form for Students

Dear students,

I am a graduate student at Eastern Mediterranean University and I am collecting data through this questionnaire for my thesis research study entitled *Integrating Peer Teaching Element into Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education Courses*.

The present study aims to investigate into the attitudes of both students and instructors towards 'peer teaching' element, therefore this **questionnaire** aims to identify your attitudes as well as your needs, expectations and suggestions as regards the integration of peer teaching (micro-teaching) element into some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, practicum course, etc. In order to collect the data, you are kindly invited to respond to this questionnaire, and please be informed that you can withdraw from the study at any time. Your identity and individual responses are treated as confidential and will be used only for research purposes. For further information, do not hesitate to contact me or my thesis supervisor.

I would appreciate your cooperation.

Seyyed Farshad Tork Nejad

MA student

Department of Foreign Language Education
Education

Faculty of Education

Eastern Mediterranean University

E-mail: torknejad.farshad@gmail.com

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatos Erozan

MA thesis supervisor

Department of Foreign Language

Faculty of Education

Eastern Mediterranean University

E-mail: fatos.erozan@emu.edu.tr

✂-----

Consent Form

I am completely aware of the aim of the study in general and the purpose of this questionnaire; therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Name-Surname: -----

Signature & Date: -----

Student Questionnaire

I. Background information

1- Age: _____ (please specify)

2- Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male

3- Nationality: ☐ Iranian Other: _____ (please specify)

4- Native language: ☐ Persian ☐ English Other: _____ (please specify)

5- Class: ☐ Third year ☐ Forth year

II. The Questionnaire

In this questionnaire, the definitions of the two terms (*student teacher* and *microteaching* or *peer-teaching*) are as the following:

Student teacher is a student who is studying in a teacher education program to be a teacher. For example, you are a *student teacher*.

Microteaching or Peer-teaching is the teaching in which the student teacher plays the role of the teacher in the classroom and teaches his or her peers (classmates) English as if they are real students who are learning English.

Part A

Directions: Please indicate your **level of agreement** with the following statements about having a **microteaching** element in some of your departmental courses. Put a cross (X) as appropriate:

5- Strongly agree (SA)

4- Agree (A)

3- Not sure (NS)

2- Disagree (D)

1- Strongly disagree (SD)

	Microteaching...	5 SA	4 A	3 NS	2 D	1 SD
1	increases student teachers' motivation.					
2	helps student teachers to become more interested in the course.					
3	develops creativity.					
4	increases autonomy.					
5	helps student teachers to be organized.					
6	develops planning skills.					
7	helps student teachers to prepare their own materials and activities.					
8	helps student teachers to learn how to manage the class.					
9	helps student teachers to develop the actual teaching skills they will need in future.					
10	helps student teachers to learn how to predict classroom problems.					
11	helps student teachers with their time management.					
12	develops student teachers' listening skills.					
13	develops student teachers' reading skills.					
14	develops student teachers' writing skills.					
15	develops student teachers' speaking skills.					
16	develops student teachers' vocabulary.					
17	develops student teachers' grammar.					
18	gives student teachers an opportunity to learn by observing their peers.					
19	helps student teachers to put theory into practice.					
20	enables student teachers to learn by doing.					
21	creates awareness of how to teach.					
22	improves student teachers' teaching skills.					

	Microteaching...	5	4	3	2	1
		SA	A	NS	D	SD
23	makes student teachers aware of the qualities of a good teacher.					
24	prepares student teachers for their teaching career.					
25	helps student teachers to use various teaching approaches/methods/techniques appropriately.					
26	helps student teachers to learn how to use teaching materials.					
27	helps student teachers to realize how to use body language effectively.					
28	helps student teachers to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching.					
29	helps student teachers to learn how to evaluate learners.					
30	helps student teachers to learn how to use praise and encouragement.					
31	helps student teachers to learn how to give appropriate feedback.					
32	helps student teachers to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses.					
33	helps student teachers how to use technology in teaching.					
34	is fun.					
35	is easy to do.					
36	is beneficial.					
37	causes anxiety.					
38	is waste of time.					
39	is carried out in an artificial environment.					
40	offers very limited teaching experiences.					
41	attracts peers' attention.					
42	makes student teachers embarrassed when teaching their peers.					
43	makes student teachers feel bored.					

Part B

Directions: Please indicate the **level of desirability** for each of the following items to indicate your **needs** and **expectations** regarding the **microteaching** element in some of your departmental courses by placing a cross (X) as appropriate.

5- Very desirable (VD)

4- Desirable (D)

3- Neutral (N)

2- Undesirable (UD)

1- Very undesirable (VUD)

	Items	5 VD	4 D	3 N	2 UD	1 VUD
1	Doing microteaching in methodology courses					
2	Doing microteaching in literature courses					
3	Doing microteaching in education courses					
4	Doing microteaching in linguistics courses					
5	Doing microteaching in translation courses					
6	Doing microteaching in practicum courses					
7	Being asked to prepare lesson plans before each microteaching					
8	Getting feedback from the course instructor before each microteaching session					
9	Getting feedback from the course instructor after each microteaching session					
10	Doing microteaching to teach listening skills					
11	Doing microteaching to teach reading skills					

	Items	5 VD	4 D	3 N	2 UD	1 VUD
12	Doing microteaching to teach writing skills					
13	Doing microteaching to teach speaking skills					
14	Doing microteaching to teach vocabulary					
15	Doing microteaching to teach grammar					
16	Being asked to apply different teaching strategies in microteaching lessons					
17	Giving and receiving feedback on others' (peers') microteachings					
18	Being asked to prepare our own teaching materials in microteaching sessions					
19	Doing microteaching to reteach the same lesson to improve my performance					
20	Using PowerPoint presentations in the microteaching sessions					
21	Using technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials in microteaching sessions					

III. Open-ended Questions

- Should there be a microteaching (peer teaching) element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, literature courses, etc.? Why or why not?
- Into which courses in the curriculum do you think the microteaching component should be integrated? Please list these courses.

3. What are your **needs** and **expectations** regarding microteaching element in these courses? In other words, what do you need/expect to have about microteaching sessions? Please explain.
4. What might be some **benefits** of integrating microteaching element into these courses?
5. What might be some **problems** or **difficulties** you may face while preparing for or doing micro-teachings in these courses?
6. **How** do you think the microteaching element should be like in these courses?

Appendix D: Instructor Questionnaire

Informed Consent Form for Instructors

Dear instructors,

I am a graduate student at Eastern Mediterranean University and I am collecting data through this questionnaire for my thesis research study entitled *Integrating Peer Teaching Element into Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education Courses*. The present study aims to investigate into the attitudes of both students and instructors towards 'peer teaching' element, therefore this **questionnaire** aims to identify your attitudes as well as your students' needs, expectations and suggestions as regards the integration of microteaching (peer-teaching) element into some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, practicum course, etc. In order to collect the data, you are kindly invited to respond to this questionnaire, and please be informed that you can withdraw from the study at any time. Your identity and individual responses are treated as confidential and will be used only for research purposes. For further information, do not hesitate to contact me or my thesis supervisor.

I would appreciate your cooperation.

Seyed Farshad Tork Nejad
MA student
Department of Foreign Language Education
Education
Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean University
E-mail: torknejad.farshad@gmail.com

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatos Erozan
MA thesis supervisor
Department of Foreign Language
Education
Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean University
E-mail: fatos.erozan@emu.edu.tr

✂-----

Consent Form

I am completely aware of the aim of the study in general and the purpose of this questionnaire; therefore, I agree to participate in this study.

Name-Surname: -----

Signature & Date: -----

Instructors Questionnaire

I. Background information

- 1- Age: _____ (please specify)
- 2- Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male
- 3- Nationality: ☐ Iranian Other: _____ (please specify)
- 4- Native language: ☐ Persian ☐ English Other: _____ (please specify)
- 5- Level of education: ☐ BA ☐ MA ☐ PhD
- 6- Years of teaching experience: _____ (please specify)

II. The Questionnaire

Part A

Directions: Please indicate your **level of agreement** with the following statements about having a **microteaching** element in some departmental courses. Put a cross (X) as appropriate:

- 5- Strongly agree (SA)**
- 4- Agree (A)**
- 3- Not sure (NS)**
- 2- Disagree (D)**
- 1- Strongly disagree (SD)**

	Microteaching...	5 SA	4 A	3 NS	2 D	1 SD
1	increases student teachers' motivation.					
2	helps student teachers to become more interested in the course.					
3	develops creativity.					
4	increases autonomy.					
5	helps student teachers to be organized.					
6	develops planning skills.					
7	helps student teachers to prepare their own materials and activities.					
8	helps student teachers to learn how to manage the class.					
9	helps student teachers to develop the actual teaching skills they will need in future.					
10	helps student teachers to learn how to predict classroom problems.					
11	helps student teachers with their time management.					
12	develops student teachers' listening skills.					
13	develops student teachers' reading skills.					
14	develops student teachers' writing skills.					
15	develops student teachers' speaking skills.					
16	develops student teachers' vocabulary.					
17	develops student teachers' grammar.					
18	gives student teachers an opportunity to learn by observing their peers.					
19	helps student teachers to put theory into practice.					
20	enables student teachers to learn by doing.					
21	creates awareness of how to teach.					

	Microteaching...	5 SA	4 A	3 NS	2 D	1 SD
22	improves student teachers' teaching skills.					
23	makes student teachers aware of the qualities of a good teacher.					
24	prepares student teachers for their teaching career.					
25	helps student teachers to use various teaching approaches/methods/techniques appropriately.					
26	helps student teachers to learn how to use teaching materials.					
27	helps student teachers to realize how to use body language effectively.					
28	helps student teachers to learn how to establish eye contact while teaching.					
29	helps student teachers to learn how to evaluate learners.					
30	helps student teachers to learn how to use praise and encouragement.					
31	helps student teachers to learn how to give appropriate feedback.					
32	helps student teachers to discover their teaching strengths and weaknesses.					
33	helps student teachers how to use technology in teaching.					
34	is fun.					
35	is easy to do.					
36	is beneficial.					
37	causes anxiety.					
38	is waste of time.					
39	is carried out in an artificial environment.					
40	offers very limited teaching experiences.					
41	attracts peers' attention.					
42	makes student teachers embarrassed when teaching their peers.					
43	makes student teachers feel bored.					

Part B

Directions: Please indicate the **level of desirability** for each of the following items to indicate your students' **needs** and **expectations** regarding the **microteaching** element in some of the departmental courses by placing a cross (X) as appropriate.

5- Very desirable (VD)

4- Desirable (D)

3- Neutral (N)

2- Undesirable (UD)

1- Very undesirable (VUD)

	Items:	5 VD	4 D	3 N	2 UD	1 VUD
1	Having microteaching element in methodology courses					
2	Having microteaching element in literature courses					
3	Having microteaching element in education courses					
4	Having microteaching element in linguistics courses					
5	Having microteaching element in translation courses					
6	Having microteaching element in practicum courses					
7	Asking the students to prepare lesson plans before each microteaching					
8	Giving feedback to the students before each microteaching session					
9	Giving feedback to the students after each microteaching session					
10	Doing microteaching to teach listening skills					
11	Doing microteaching to teach reading skills					
12	Doing microteaching to teach writing skills					

13	Doing microteaching to teach speaking skills					
14	Doing microteaching to teach vocabulary					
15	Doing microteaching to teach grammar					
16	Asking the students to apply different teaching strategies in microteaching lessons					
17	Asking the students to give and receive feedback on others' (peers') microteachings					
18	Asking the students to prepare their own teaching materials in microteaching sessions					
19	Asking the students to do microteaching to reteach the same lesson to improve their performance					
20	Using PowerPoint presentations in the microteaching sessions					
21	Using technology-integrated (i.e. digital) materials in microteaching sessions					

III. Open-ended Questions

1. Should there be a microteaching (peer-teaching) element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, literature courses, etc.? Why or why not?
2. Into which courses in the curriculum do you think the microteaching component should be integrated?
3. What are your students' **needs** and **expectations** regarding microteaching element in these courses? Please explain.
4. What might be some **benefits** of integrating microteaching element into these courses?

5. What might be some **problems** or **difficulties** your students may face while preparing for or doing micro-teachings in these courses?

6. **How** do you think the microteaching element should be like in these courses?

Appendix E: Student Interview

Informed Consent Form for Students

Dear students,

I am a graduate student at Eastern Mediterranean University and I am collecting data through this interview for my thesis research study entitled *Integrating Peer Teaching Element into Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education Courses*. The present study aims to investigate into the attitudes of both students and instructors towards 'peer teaching' element, therefore this **interview** aims to identify your attitudes as well as your needs, expectations and suggestions as regards the integration of microteaching (peer-teaching) element into some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, practicum course, etc. In order to collect the data, you are kindly invited to participate in this interview, and please be informed that you can withdraw from the study at any time. The interview will be audio-recorded and your identity and individual responses will be treated as confidential and will be used only for research purposes. For further information, do not hesitate to contact me or my thesis supervisor.

I would appreciate your cooperation.

Seyyed Farshad Tork Nejad
MA student
Department of Foreign Language Education
Education
Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean University
University
E-mail: torknejad.farshad@gmail.com

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatos Erozan
MA thesis supervisor
Department of Foreign Language
Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean
E-mail: fatos.erozan@emu.edu.tr

✂-----

Consent form

I am completely aware of the aim of the study in general and the purpose of this interview; I agree to participate in this interview which will be audio-recorded by the researcher.

Name-Surname: -----

Signature & Date: -----

Student Interview Questions

1. How do you feel about the integration of microteaching element into your departmental courses?
2. Should there be a microteaching element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, literature courses, etc.? Why or why not?
3. In which courses in the curriculum do you think the microteaching element should be integrated?
4. How do you think microteaching sessions can **help** you? What are your **expectations**?
5. Do you think you will have enough opportunities to **do** microteaching in your departmental courses? How many microteachings do you **want/need** to do in each course? Please explain.
6. What might be some **advantages** of microteaching element in these courses?
7. What might be some **problems** you may encounter during the microteaching sessions?
8. What are your **needs** regarding microteaching element in these courses? How should they be like? What do you suggest?

Appendix F: Instructor Interview

Informed Consent Form for Instructors

Dear instructors,

I am a graduate student at Eastern Mediterranean University and I am collecting data through this interview for my thesis research study entitled *Integrating Peer Teaching Element into Pre-Service English Language Teacher Education Courses*.

The present study aims to investigate into the attitudes of both students and instructors towards 'peer teaching' element, therefore this **interview** aims to identify your attitudes as well as your students' needs, expectations and suggestions as regards the integration of peer teaching (micro-teaching) element into some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, practicum course, etc. In order to collect the data, you are kindly invited to participate in this interview and please be informed that you can withdraw from the study at any time. The interview will be audio-recorded and your identity and individual responses will be treated as confidential and will be used only for research purposes. For further information, do not hesitate to contact me or my thesis supervisor.

I would appreciate your cooperation.

Seyyed Farshad Tork Nejad
MA student
Department of Foreign Language Education
Education
Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean University
E-mail: torknejad.farshad@gmail.com

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fatos Erozan
MA thesis supervisor
Department of Foreign Language
Education
Faculty of Education
Eastern Mediterranean University
E-mail: fatos.erozan@emu.edu.tr

✂-----

Consent form

I am completely aware of the aim of the study in general and the purpose of this interview; I agree to participate in this interview which will be audio-recorded by the researcher.

Name-Surname: -----

Signature & Date: -----

Instructors Interview Questions

1. How do you feel about the integration of microteaching element into some of the departmental courses?
2. Should there be a microteaching element in some of the departmental courses such as methodology courses, literature courses, etc.? Why or why not?
3. In which courses in the curriculum do you think the microteaching element should be integrated?
4. How do you think microteaching sessions can **help** your students? What are their **expectations**?
5. Do you think your students will have enough opportunities to **do** microteaching in their courses? How many microteachings do they **want/need** to do in each course? Please explain.
6. What might be some **advantages** of microteaching element in these courses?
7. What might be some **problems** your students may encounter during the microteaching sessions?
8. What are your students' **needs** regarding microteaching element in these courses? How should they be like? What do you suggest?