

## CHAPTER IV. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

### 41 Finding

This study aims at examining the significant difference between EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer students and real students in microteaching and exploring EFL student teachers' perception towards teaching peer students and real students in microteaching. This subchapter presents the findings of those two aims of the study.

#### 41.1 The Significant Difference of the EFL Student Teachers' Teaching Practice to Peer Students and Real Students in Microteaching

To find out the significant difference between EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer students and real students in microteaching, the data needed are the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students. Those data are then analyzed using descriptive statistics and paired samples t-test. Before those statistical examination, the data are examined for the normality to determine if the data fit the standard normal distribution.

To run the normality test for the data of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and that to real students, the Shapiro-Wilk statistic is used because the sample size is small, that is less than 50 (Ho, 2014). The hypotheses comprise of the null hypothesis and the alternative hypothesis. The null hypothesis is that the data is normally distributed and the alternative hypothesis is that the data is not normally distributed. These can be formulated as follows:

Ho: the data follow a normal distribution

Ha: the data do not follow a normal distribution

The result of the Shapiro-Wilk test for the data of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and that of the real students is presented in the table below.

Table 4.1. The Normality of Microteaching Score of the EFL Student Teachers' Teaching Practice to Peer

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Score	.115	29	.200 <sup>*</sup>	.955	29	.248

From the result, it is found out that the p-value is 0.248. It is higher than the significance value ( $\alpha$ ) 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis can not be rejected which means that the data come from a normal distribution. In other words, the data of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer are normally distributed.

The data from the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students is also calculated using Shapiro-Wilk test for determining its normal distribution. The result of the calculation is demonstrated in the following table.

Table 4.2. The Normality of the Microteaching Score of the EFL Student Teachers' Teaching Practice to Real Students

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
Score	.154	29	.076	.948	29	.158

The result indicates that the p-value is 0.158. Since the p value is greater than the significance value (0.05), the null hypothesis is not rejected. Therefore, it can be stated that the data of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students follow the normal distribution.

To infer, both the data of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students are normally distributed. This result serves as the basic assumption to run the pair samples t-test.

The data of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students are then calculated for their descriptive statistics. The descriptive statistics provide simple

summaries about the samples and the measures which form the basis for the quantitative analysis of the data. Like its name, the descriptive statistics simply describes the data.

The data of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer were calculated using descriptive statistics to find out the minimum and maximum scores, mean, and standard deviation. The result of the calculation is described in Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3. The Descriptive Statistics of the Microteaching Score of the EFL Student Teachers' Teaching Practice to Peer

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Score	29	70.00	83.80	77.4345	4.06591
Valid N (listwise)	29				

The table above shows the minimum score of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer was 70, whereas the highest score was 83.8. It also details the mean and standard deviation values for the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer. The average total weighted score was 77.43 with a standard deviation of 4.07.

The microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students were also calculated using descriptive statistics. The result of the descriptive statistics can be seen in the following Table 4.4.

Table 4.4. Descriptive Statistics of the Microteaching Score of the EFL Student Teachers' Teaching Practice to Real Students

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Score	29	71.80	86.80	80.5655	4.11845
Valid N (listwise)	29				

The minimum score of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students increases from that of peer, that is from 70 to 71.8. The same phenomenon

also occurs for the maximum score, in which the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer was 83.8, while to real students it was 86.8. The increase affects the average score too as the mean value from the scores of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students is 80.57 with a standard deviation of 4.12. This mean is higher than that of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer.

From the result of the descriptive statistics, it can be inferred that there is an increase in the mean value of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and the mean value of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students. Nevertheless, the descriptive statistics only describes the data alone and can not be used to make the conclusion that there is significant difference between the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and that to real students. To make such judgment, the inferential statistics is used as explained in the followings.

As the table of paired samples statistics of Table 4.5 shows, the mean value of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer is 77.43 while the mean value of the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students is 80.57. From those data, it can be stated that the EFL student teachers performed better when they did teaching practice in front of real students. When the difference between the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and that to real students was examined through paired t-test, it was found out that there was the statistically significant difference between their microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer and to real students. The result of the inferential statistics is shown in the following table of paired samples test.

Table 4.5. Paired Sample t-test of the Microteaching Score of the EFL Student Teachers' Teaching Practice to Peer and that to Real Students

	Paired Differences	t	df	Sig. (2-
--	--------------------	---	----	----------

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Peer - Real	-3.13103	3.32588	.61760	-4.39613	-1.86594	-5.070	28	.000

Based on the paired sample t-test in the above table, it is known that the p-value is 0.00. Since the p-value (0.00) is lower than 0.05 ( $0.00 < 0.05$ ), this means that the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer is significantly different from the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students. Thus, it can be stated that the appearance of peers and real students influence the teaching practice of the EFL student teachers in microteaching.

#### **4.12 The Perception of EFL Student Teachers towards Peer and Real Students in Microteaching**

This study also aims at exploring the EFL student teachers towards teaching peer and real students. The data were collected through closed-ended questionnaire adapted from Ogeyik (2009) and the result is presented in the following table.

Table 4.6. The Result of Closed-Ended Questionnaire

Item	Mean of Peer MT	SD of Peer MT	Mean of Real Student MT	SD of Real Student MT
1	3.76	.88	4.44	.65
2	3.96	.79	4.36	.64
3	3.92	.76	4.16	.69
4	3.72	.84	4.08	.81
5	4.16	.55	4.44	.58
6	4.36	.64	4.60	.58
7	4.60	.50	5.88	5.67
8	3.36	.95	4.20	.87
9	3.56	.92	4.12	.88
10	3.52	.92	3.76	.93
11	2.76	.88	4.04	3.11

12	3.00	.96	3.68	.98
13	3.56	.87	3.56	.87
14	3.36	1.08	3.96	.93
15	3.80	.82	4.04	.98
16	3.84	.55	3.92	.70
17	3.76	.59	3.92	.81
18	4.08	.49	4.04	.68
19	3.88	.60	4.12	.60
20	3.88	.44	4.04	.61
21	3.64	.81	3.60	.76
22	3.60	.76	3.40	.76
23	3.80	.41	3.72	.54
24	3.64	.76	3.68	.56
25	3.88	.67	3.84	.62
26	3.68	.56	3.68	.56
27	4.08	.70	4.12	.60
28	4.08	.57	4.04	.61

---

#### 4.1 Discussion

This subchapter presents the discussion of the findings. The discussion is made based on not only the data findings, but also the underlying theoretical framework of this study.

##### **4.1.1 The Significant Difference of the EFL Student Teachers' Teaching Practice to Peer Students and Real Students in Microteaching**

Based on the finding, it is found out that there is significant difference of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice in microteaching to peer students and real students. This indicates that the peers and real students influence the EFL student teachers in their teaching practice in microteaching.

Microteaching provides EFL student teachers with teaching experience in which they can practise their teaching in front of the small group of their peers in a shortened length of time. The number of peers usually ranges from ten to fifteen, while the length of time is around twenty to thirty minutes. The role of peers as students in microteaching bring both advantage and disadvantage for EFL student teacher who does teaching practice. The advantage

includes giving student teachers the classroom like situation in which they can practise their teaching. nevertheless, this kind of classroom like situation might not be natural. The peers who pretend to be students might sometimes end up with joking or teasing their peer practising teaching. This will cause the teaching practice not run smoothly and so the EFL student teachers might not get the maximum result.

The appearance of real students in microteaching can be an alternative solution that solve the problem. Real students are secondary school students who participate as students in microteaching. They can act naturally as students during teaching practice in student teachers' classroom. Unlike the student teachers' peers, real students do not need to pretend as students since they are the real students. Therefore, they can give natural classroom like situation that will benefit EFL student teachers with maximum learning to teach.

The EFL student teachers at the English Education Department of Universitas Muria Kudus get a chance to practise microteaching in front of their peers and real students. By this, it is expected that they will have various experiences of teaching. This study aims to find out if the EFL student teachers' teaching practice in microteaching in front of their peers differ significantly from that in front of real students.

The result shows that the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to peer is significantly different from the microteaching score of the EFL student teachers' teaching practice to real students as the p-value (0.00) is lower than 0.05 ( $0.00 < 0.05$ ). It can be inferred that the appearance of peers and real students influence the teaching practice of the EFL student teachers in microteaching. The EFL student teachers know that the students they are teaching are different. This results in different way of teaching that might include different technique, method, classroom management, assessment, and so forth. The awareness that peers and real students are different makes the EFL student teachers to see and conduct microteaching differently. This is because peers and real students have different characteristics. Even though they play the same role as students in microteaching class during the EFL student teachers having their teaching practice, they create different classroom like situation for the EFL student teachers. The peers tend to act unnaturally that cause the unnatural classroom like situation, whereas the real students act naturally that result in more natural classroom like situation due to their nature role as secondary school students.

#### **4.2.2 The Perception of EFL Student Teachers towards Peer and Real Students in Microteaching**

Based on the finding, the EFL student teachers perceive that real students microteaching prepare them for real teaching better than peer microteaching. It can be seen from the mean of the questionnaire item number 1 in which the real student microteaching resulted in 4.44, whereas peer microteaching 3.76. This shows that the EFL student teachers view teaching real students and teaching their peers differently that made them prepare more for teaching real students. Questionnaire items number 4 and 5 indicate that the EFL student teachers prepare their lesson plan as well as teaching material for real students better than for peer students. It can be because they feel more challenged and enthusiastic with real students as shown in questionnaire item number 8 and 9. The means of real students microteaching is higher than those of peer microteaching.

Dealing with lesson presentation, the EFL student teachers claim that they can do microteaching more naturally with real students. This can be seen from the mean of real students microteaching in questionnaire item number 10 which is bigger than the mean of peer microteaching. In addition, the EFL student teachers think that they can comprehend teaching methods in a better way when they taught real students as the questionnaire item number 3 shows the mean of real student microteaching is higher than that of peer student. However, in terms of doing apperception and mastering teaching skills and material, the EFL student teachers do not find them quite different when they taught their peers or real students. This phenomenn is also found out when the EFL student teachers performed classroomlanguage. They see it quite similar either in peer microteaching or real students microteaching as shown in questionnaire item number 25. It is when they need to relate the material with relevant knowledge and reality as well as when they deliver the material indicated in questionnaire items number 19 and 20, they perceive that real students microteaching enabled them to do it better than peer microteaching.

The EFL student teachers seem to have difficulty in encouraging real students to ask or give comments. They can do better with peer students as questionnaire item number 23 shows that the mean of peer microteaching is higher than that of real student microteaching. Nevertheless, the EFL student teachers responded the question and comments of real students better than peer students indicated in the result of the means of questionnaire item number 24. They also state that they can reinforce real students better than their peers. Regarding setting

an interesting teaching circumstances, the EFL student teachers find it the same for both their peers and real students. This can be seen from the same mean of questionnaire item number 26, that is 3.68.

In managing the classroom, the EFL student teachers perceive that they can manage the class with peers students better than with real students. Furthermore, they can allocate time with peer students better as well. The questionnaire items number 22 and 23 display that the means of peer microteaching are bigger than those of real student microteaching. The same phenomenon is found in concluding and reflecting the material with students. The EFL student teachers note that they can do it better with their peers than with real students.

In general, the EFL student teachers perceive real student microteaching is more difficult and cause more anxiety compared with peer microteaching as shown in the mean results of questionnaire items number 11 and 12. Besides, real student microteaching is more money consuming and time limited than peer microteaching. However, in term of causing criticism from their peers, the EFL student teachers do not find difference between peer microteaching and real student microteaching.

Despite the difficulty the EFL student teachers face with real students, they admit that teaching real students is more interesting and knowledgeable than teaching their peers indicated in questionnaire item number 2. They also acknowledge that real student microteaching gives them more benefits compared to peer microteaching. One of the benefits is that they can learn from observing their friend's teaching practice as shown in questionnaire item number 7, in which the mean of real student microteaching is 5.88, while peer microteaching is 4.60.

The findings of the study reveal that the EFL student teachers work better with peer and real students in different areas. In planning and preparation, they view real students enable them to prepare the lesson plan and material better than their peers. This might be caused by their anxiety when teaching real students that they are not familiar with before. When teaching their peers, the EFL student teachers are familiar enough and so, it did not cause much anxiety for them. Besides, dealing with real students for the first time made the EFL student teachers feel challenged and enthusiastic which resulted in their preparing the lesson more seriously.

In conducting the lesson, the EFL student teachers find out that they can conduct the teaching practice more naturally with real students than with their peers. This must be obvious since real students provide them with classroom-like situation where the students act naturally as students. Therefore, the EFL student teachers think that they can comprehend the teaching methods and deliver the material better when having teaching practice with real students. Nonetheless, in perceiving doing apperception, mastering teaching skills and performing classroom language, the EFL student teachers have similar perception for both peers and real students.

The EFL student teachers encountered difficulty when they had to encourage real students to ask and give comment. It is easier to do it with their peers than with real students as they use the same level of language when communicating with their peers. With real students, they must delve into the real students' world that not all EFL student teachers are capable of doing so. As a result, they found it more difficult in making real students to ask and give comment during the teaching practice. This phenomenon is quite different from responding questions and comments as well as in reinforcing. The EFL student teachers can perform better in those areas with real students compared with their peers. However, in setting interesting teaching circumstances, the EFL student teachers seem to make the same efforts when teaching both their peers and real students.

Regarding classroom management, the finding shows that the EFL student teachers can work better with their peers than with real students. They were able to manage the time better when having teaching practice with their peers. One of the reasons might be due to the nature of their peers that already know the material well so that as students, they can come up with better time management. Real students might face difficulty with the teaching material and that might take more time for them which finally result in worse time management from student teachers' point of view. In concluding and reflecting material, the EFL student teachers also acknowledge that they can do better with their peers. The distinct level of education might be the cause of it in which the peers will be able to make conclusion and reflection better and faster than real students.

The data also indicates that the EFL student teachers perceive real student microteaching is more money consuming. This is due to that they had to spend some more money given for

real students as the transport fee. Actually, there is no such rule to give real students the transport fee, but the EFL student teachers were willing to do it by themselves. In addition, they see real student microteaching is more limited in time. It is understandable and parallel with the finding of time management in which the EFL student teachers had more difficulty with real students in managing the time. The natural acts of real students cause the EFL student teachers unable to predict what responds those real students give. Meanwhile, the acts of the peers can be easily predicted as they just pretend to be students. However, in general the EFL student teachers agree that working with real students is more interesting for them compared to working with their peers. They get more benefits from the natural acts of real students when they taught them during the teaching practice.