JEEF
Journal of English Education Forum
https://jeef.unram.ac.id/index.php/jeef/index

Perceived Benefits of Micro Teaching Course to Students' Teaching Apprenticeship (PLP)

Adena Rahmi[1], Santi Farmasari[2], Kurniawan Apgrianto[2]
[1,2,3] English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, University of Mataram, Indonesia

Received : July 18, 2025
Revised : September 28, 2025
Accepted : September 28, 2025
Published: September 29, 2025

Corresponding Author
Adena Rahmi
adenarahmi4@gmail.com

DOI: 10.29303/jeef.v5i3.890

© 2025 The Authors. This open access article is distributed under a (CC-BY License)

Abstract
This study analyses how student-teachers at the University of Mataram's English Education Program view the benefits of the microteaching course to get ready for their Teaching Apprenticeship (PLP). Applying a mixed-method strategy, data were collected from 30 student-teachers through a Likert-scale questionnaire and in-depth interview with six selected participants. Findings indicate that the majority of participants (76%–93%) perceived microteaching as highly beneficial for developing practical teaching skills, building confidence, designing student engagement strategies, and fostering reflective practice. Nevertheless, only 40%–57% felt adequately prepared to handle real-world classroom challenges such as managing disruptive student behavior, addressing distractions, coping with emotional stress, and delivering extended lessons—issues largely absent in the idealized microteaching setting. These results reveal a persistent gap between the structured safety of microteaching simulations and the unpredictable dynamics of authentic school environments. The study recommends enhancing microteaching by incorporating unpredictable classroom scenarios, integrating classroom management and emotional resilience modules, using role-plays that simulate authentic student behaviors, and facilitating post-PLP reflection seminars. While microteaching remains a valuable foundational component of teacher education, these improvements could better align it with the multifaceted demands of real classroom teaching.

Keywords
perceived benefits, microteaching, teaching apprenticeship (PLP), student-teacher

INTRODUCTION

Micro-teaching began in the early 1960s at Stanford University in California, United States of America, at the Stanford Teacher Education Program. In 1963, Dwight W. Allen and a colleague at Stanford University developed it for the first time (Ping, 2013). Microteaching has become a foundational component of pre-service teacher training programs globally. Designed as a scaled-down teaching simulation, microteaching provides student-teachers the opportunity to practice specific teaching skills in a safe and controlled environment (Koross, 2016). The objective is not only to enhance technical abilities but also to build pedagogical confidence, foster reflective practice, and introduce students to basic classroom dynamics before they transition into full teaching responsibilities during their teaching practicum (Reddy, 2019).

The nature of microteaching allows pre-service teachers to perform a lesson in front of their peers and lecturers, receive constructive feedback, and then re-teach the improved version of the lesson. This cyclical process is proven effective in skill acquisition and confidence building (Remesh, 2016). As such, microteaching has been embraced across teacher education institutions, especially in contexts where limited access to real classrooms is a challenge during the early stages of training.

In the Indonesian context, particularly at the University of Mataram, microteaching is a mandatory course taken prior to the *Program Lapangan Persekolahan* or in this case is known as *PLP*, also referred to as teaching apprenticeship (Kemenristek-Dikti, 2017). During *PLP*, student-teachers are assigned to partner schools to carry out actual classroom teaching under the guidance of a mentor teacher. This real teaching environment introduces complexities such as diverse student backgrounds, curriculum integration, classroom disruptions, time constraints, and school culture adaptation. These dynamics pose a challenge that microteaching does not always fully simulate (Junaidi, 2022).

Although the microteaching course aims to prepare student-teachers for *PLP*, questions persist about its actual effectiveness. Many student-teachers experience a sense of disconnection between their performance in microteaching and their ability to manage real-life classroom teaching. For instance, the safe and idealized setting of microteaching often fails to prepare them for unexpected student behaviors, administrative responsibilities, or emotional stress in actual school contexts. The perceived gap necessitates a critical exploration of how student-teachers assess the benefits and shortcomings of the microteaching experience (El-Asri, 2024).

Even though several studies have been conducted on the impact of microteaching on students' teaching skills, none have looked into the perceived benefits of micro-teaching courses to students' teaching apprenticeship (*PLP*) at the University of Mataram, English Education Program, period 2022-2024. Apart from that, this research aims to find out more deeply about student-teacher perceptions of the benefits of micro-teaching classes to their *PLP* as adequate preparation for the real teaching task, as well as the aspects of *PLP* that have not been properly covered in the micro-teaching.

This study focuses on the perceptions of student-teachers at the English Language Education Program, University of Mataram, regarding the benefits of the microteaching course in preparing for theis *PLP*. The research examines both the cognitive (skills and strategies) and

affective (confidence and emotional readiness) aspects of their experiences.

The scope limited to student-teachers who have competed both the microteaching course and *PLP* program, data collected through a Likert scale questionnaire and semi-structured interviews, and the perceptions rather than direct performance outcomes in *PLP*. This study does not evaluate students' teaching competency through classroom observations or supervisor assesments. It is also limited by the subjective nature of self-reported data, which may be influenced by personal bias or memory.

Perceived Benefits

The concept of *perceived benefits* refers to student-teachers' subjective evaluation of the usefulness and impact of their training experiences on future professional practice. According to Rahmi (2025), examining *perceived benefits* helps institutions align pedagogical interventions with student expectations and realities in the field. Perceived benefits are concerned with how students interpret and evaluate these advantages in light of their specific experiences and expectations. They contend that students can clarify how they teach and modify their methods in response to feedback and self-evaluation by participating in organized reflection both during and after microteaching sessions. In order to promote professional development and instructional efficiency, this reflective approach is essential. Perceptions toward the benefits of microteaching for student-teachers in the PLP program in this study are individual perceptions that come from their experience in learning how to teach, especially focused on what they have done in microteaching and *PLP*. As in microteaching sessions and *PLP* practice, learning to teach is a step that might be considered essential to the teaching process.

Micro Teaching

Microteaching is a 15- to 25-minute learning activity involving 5 to 10 peer students, designed to simulate real teaching scenarios in a scaled-down setting. Typically, it includes stages such as planning, delivering a mini-lesson, receiving feedback, and revising performance. The course carries two credit hours and is a compulsory subject for pre-service teachers before entering the Teaching Apprenticeship (PLP) program recommended by the local government.

This structured cycle enables student-teachers to enhance their pedagogical skills and self-reflect on their teaching behavior in a safe, low-risk environment (Remesh, 2016; Reddy, 2019; Azmi, 2019). According to Putri et al. (2024), microteaching provides opportunities for practicing instructional techniques, classroom language, and student engagement strategies. Feedback and reflective practices during microteaching have been shown to significantly improve future classroom performance. Pangaribuan et al. (2023) emphasize that through peer and lecturer feedback, student-teachers gain valuable insights into their teaching strengths and weaknesses, which contributes to better teaching competence before they enter real classroom environments.

Teaching Apprenticeship (PLP)

PLP is a stage in the process of preparing professional teachers at the Bachelor of Education level, in which students are given assignments to implement learning outcomes by observing the learning process in schools/educational institutions, receiving training in developing learning tools, and guiding teaching and learning, all of which are accompanied by reflective actions. During *PLP*, student-teachers are assigned to partner schools where they teach actual students under the guidance of a *guru pamong* (mentor teacher) and a supervising lecturer. The apprenticeship is designed to integrate real-world experience with academic preparation, thus supporting the development of professional identity (Nurfarhati et al., 2019; Pangaribuan et al., 2023).

Introduction to School Field I (*PLP I*), commonly referred to as a week of school observation, is the first phase of the Introduction to School Fields for the Bachelor of Education Program. It occurs during the seventh semester. Following *PLP I*, the stage will move on to Introduction to School Field II (*PLP II*) the following week. During this part, student-teachers will work under the direction of their supervising teacher for a week before continuing on their own for the remainder of the school day. *PLP* lasts for 45 days. Asa stated otherwise, the practicum's structure comprises the following: observation of the school, student-teachers' teaching evaluation, guided instruction, individual instruction, and *PLP* report submission. There was no set minimum or maximum number of lessons that the student-teachers were required to teach, but there was an expectation that all of them would follow the same schedule and plan for the stages. The student-teachers had limited influence on negotiations; the supervising teacher made most of the decisions.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used a mixed-methods research methodology, which is particularly beneficial when investigating complex subjects like microteaching. According to Sugiyono as cited in Putri et al. (2024), mixed methods is a combination of two methods between quantitative and qualitative, in single research. By combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies, this methodology provides a more in-depth understanding of how student-teachers perceive the benefits of microteaching during their *PLP*.

Ethics rules for this study guarantee that participants are fully aware of the research and its purpose. It is completely optional, and participants are free to leave at any moment without facing consequences. Personal data were anonymised to preserve privacy and will be kept private. In order to confirm that participants' rights and privacy are protected during the study, all information gathered were safely preserved and used exclusively for the research project.

The study's population consists of 194 students who have completed microteaching courses and *PLP* and are currently working on their thesis. These students are ideal for exploring the impact of microteaching on their success in teaching apprenticeships, as they possess both theoretical knowledge and practical teaching experience. To ensure that every member of the population has an equal chance of being chosen, simple random selection was used for the quantitative phase. Cohen et al. (2018) states that for the majority of basic

statistical analyses, a sample size of 30–50 individuals can be adequate for populations of approximately 100–200. He argues that most quantitative studies, particularly those with well-defined, clear aims, are usually conducted with a minimal sample size of 30 participants. Therefore, 30 students were chosen randomly to participate in this research. In contrast, six individuals were chosen through purposive sampling for the qualitative phase. This is in line with research by Guest et al. (2020), which indicates that smaller sample sizes (between 5-10 participants) can be sufficient for achieving data saturation, where no new themes emerge from additional interviews. Since the study's objective was to obtain in-depth, context-specific observations, 6 participants were chosen. They selected based on their background or field of experience concerning the study topic to ensure the collection of rich data.

Quantitative data were collected using a Likert-scale questionnaire consisting of 30 items grouped into five domains: skill acquisition, confidence building, student engagement, adaptability, and self-reflection. The questionnaire was adapted from previously validated instruments and modified to suit the local context. The questionnaires were shared through Google Form. Dillman (2014) claim that online surveys can save expenses related to conventional survey methods while also greatly increasing response rates. They stress how crucial it is to ask quick and simple questions to improve participant understanding and engagement, which is essential for gathering accurate data.

Qualitative data were obtained through semi-structured interviews with six participants. The interview guide contained open-ended questions exploring participants' perceptions of the benefits and limitations of the microteaching course in preparing them for PLP. Follow-up questions were used to probe deeper into specific experiences or opinions expressed by the participants. This method is in line with Nurfarhati et al. (2019), who emphasize the flexibility and depth of insight afforded by semi-structured interviews in education research. According to Silverman as cited in (Farmasari, 2020) the term "interview society" has emerged due to the increasing prevalence of using interviews as a means of gathering information.

The data collection was conducted over the course of one academic semester. Questionnaires were distributed after the participants completed their PLP. Interviews were conducted face-to-face in a quiet location on campus, and each lasted approximately 30–45 minutes. All interviews were recorded with permission and transcribed verbatim for analysis.

Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics to identify the distribution of responses across the five domains. Percentages and frequency counts were used to determine how many participants agreed or disagreed with each item.

Qualitative data were analyzed using the Miles and Huberman model of thematic analysis, which involves three main steps:

1. Data reduction: selecting, focusing, simplifying, and transforming raw data.
2. Data display: organizing and assembling information to draw conclusions.
3. Conclusion drawing and verification: interpreting the meaning of data and confirming findings through triangulation.

To ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the qualitative data, the study employed triangulation**,** member checking, and peer debriefing. Member checking was done by allowing participants to review the transcribed interviews to confirm the accuracy of their statements. In addition, peer debriefing was conducted with two fellow researchers to validate the coding process and interpretation of data.

This methodological framework was designed to provide a comprehensive view of the research problem and to ensure that the results reflect both collective trends and individual perspectives of student-teachers involved in the microteaching and PLP programs.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The findings are categorized into five major benefit domains as proposed by Reddy (2019), along with additional insights into challenges encountered during PLP that were not addressed by the microteaching experience. The findings of this study were categorized into five major themes derived from questionnaire data and interview transcripts: (1) flexible skill practice, (2) confidence growth, (3) student interaction, (4) reflective improvement, and (5) adaptive teaching. Each of these themes emerged consistently from the perspectives of the respondents.

Flexible skill practice

Most student-teachers (93%) indicated that microteaching allowed them to apply lesson plans practically and refine essential instructional skills. They reported opportunities to explore classroom language, teaching media, and methods of evaluation. Interview results revealed that students found microteaching useful for rehearsing specific techniques such as opening and closing a lesson, giving instructions, and using questioning strategies effectively. This finding is in line with the theory that microteaching encourages active application of pedagogical theory (Pangaribuan et al., 2023).

These findings also align with Azmi (2019), who highlight how structured simulations improve teaching performance. Microteaching enabled student-teachers to rehearse core pedagogical skills, such as lesson planning, questioning, and instructional clarity. It provided a non-threatening environment to rehearse lesson segments and revise their approach based on observation and feedback.

Table 1 Flexible Skill Practice

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	% (SA+A)
Microteaching course helped me to understand more about teaching practically.	10	18	1	0	1	93%
I always make a lesson plan before teaching.	8	17	3	1	1	84%
I discover how to organized my classes to keep them solid and clear.	5	18	7	0	0	77%

Interview Insight:

"I practiced giving instructions, asking questions, and using different media. When I finally taught real students,

it felt familiar because I had done similar things in microteaching." – Participant 3

This flexibility promotes iterative learning and encourages exploration of various teaching techniques.

Confidence Growth

76% of student-teachers reported a significant increase in teaching confidence, primarily as a result of guided teaching practice and consistent peer feedback. These results align with previous studies highlighting the confidence-boosting function of microteaching (Remesh, 2013; Reddy, 2019; Pangaribuan et al., 2023)

Table 1 Confidence Growth

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	% (SA+A)
After finishing the microteaching course, I feel more capable of teaching in front of the students especially when *PLP*.	7	16	6	1	0	76%
I am able to communicate my thoughts to students in a clear and efficient manner.	7	11	9	3	0	60%

Interview Insight:

"At first, I was nervous to stand in front of the class. But after presenting multiple times and being supported by friends and lecturers, I felt more confident when entering PLP." – Participant 5

Microteaching functions as a desensitization phase, helping student-teachers manage performance anxiety before engaging with real students.

Active Students Interaction

90% percent of participants agreed they could prevent student boredom through varied strategies. Microteaching taught strategies for student engagement, including the use of multimedia, reinforcement, and group collaboration. These findings align with Rahayuningsih (2016), who highlight microteaching's role in promoting communicative classroom environments.

Table 2 Active Student Interaction

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	% (SA+A)
I use various type of learning strategies so that the students do not get bored during the class.	14	13	3	0	0	90%
I gained knowledge on how to include group exercises that encourage cooperation among pupils.	8	16	4	2	0	80%

Interview Insight:

"During PLP, I used the same methods we tried in microteaching, like group discussion and using pictures. It helped me keep the class alive." – Participant 6

Though peers in microteaching do not replicate actual students, the structure encouraged teachers to anticipate student responses and prepare accordingly.

Helpful Self-Reflection and Feedback

80% of students acknowledged that feedback from lecturers and peers helped them create personal teaching goals and refine their methods. These insights match Saban & Ahmet's (2018) findings that feedback enhances reflective practice and long-term improvement.

Table 3 Helpful Self-Reflection and Feedback

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	% (SA+A)
I always evaluate my own teaching strategies after class.	11	13	5	1	0	70%
Based on feedback from microteaching classes, I learnt how to create personal teaching objectives.	9	15	4	2	0	80%

Interview Insight:

"Feedback from peers and lecturers during microteaching was very helpful, I could see my mistakes and work on them to improve my teaching techniques." – Participant 2

Self-evaluation combined with external input strengthened teaching awareness and promoted continuous professional development.

Develop Adaptive Teaching

While 77% of participants reported adjusting their methods to suit learning objectives, only 57% felt fully able to adapt to students' diverse comprehension levels. This indicates a gap that can be addressed by improving simulation variety in microteaching, as suggested by Junaidi (2022).

Table 5 Developing Adaptive Teaching

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	% (SA+A)
I am able to adapt properly to different student comprehension levels.	3	14	12	1	0	57%
I adjust the learning strategy based on the learning objectives to be achieved by the students.	8	15	5	2	0	77%

Interview Insight:

"Microteaching taught me to plan lessons, but in real teaching, I had to change the plan when students didn't understand. That part was hard." – Participant 4

This reveals a partial gap in preparation: Microteaching fosters pre-planned adaptability but not the spontaneous, in-the-moment flexibility required in actual classrooms.

Despite Microteaching's benefits, participants consistently reported areas where it failed to prepare them for PLP. Challenges not addressed by microteaching include behavioral unpredictability, emotional strain, and classroom management. Only 40% of participants felt prepared to manage extended lessons and classroom discipline. These findings align with Barahmeh (2016), who noted similar struggles during practicum.

Coping with Real-World Classroom Challenges

Only 40% of student-teachers believed that microteaching adequately trained them for classroom management. In a simulated environment, peer audiences

rarely replicate disruptive behavior realistically. Thus, student-teachers entered PLP with limited experience in dealing with distractions, disobedience, or student conflicts. The peer-based format of Microteaching did not accurately replicate student behavior. Simulated classes with peers lack realism, limiting training for discipline issues (Barahmeh, 2016).

Table 6 Coping with Real-World Classroom Challenges

Statement	SA	A	N	D	SD	% (SA+A)
I was emotionally prepared to face real classroom situations after taking microteaching course.	6	13	6	5	0	63%
I was ready to manage unexpected student behavior during PLP.	4	10	10	5	1	47%
I was confident handling distractions and classroom management during PLP	5	12	7	5	1	57%
Microteaching course prepared me for teaching long, consecutive lessons in a real classroom schedule.	3	9	12	5	1	40%

Interview Insight:

> *"In Microteaching, everyone behaved because we were friends. In PLP, I faced noisy classes, late students, and those who didn't pay attention. It was very different."* – Participant 1

This suggests a need for simulated behavioral scenarios in Microteaching practice.

CONCLUSION

The findings showed that student-teachers generally perceived microteaching as highly beneficial. It helped them improve their lesson planning, communication strategies, questioning techniques, classroom management, and use of teaching media. The course also contributed significantly to building their teaching confidence. In addition, microteaching encouraged student-teachers to reflect on their performance through peer and lecturer feedback. These benefits align with existing theories and previous studies that emphasize microteaching's role in developing core teaching skills and supporting professional growth.

However, the study also revealed that microteaching had certain limitations. Many students-teachers felt that the course did not fully prepare them for emotional and behavioral challenges of real classrooms. They experienced difficulties in managing unexpected student behavior, dealing with classroom distractions, and teaching extended periods. While microteaching provided a strong foundation in instructional skills, it did not simulate the pressure and complexity of actual teaching conditions. These findings highlight the gap between simulated practice and real classroom experiences.

The findings of this study underscore several important pedagogical and institutional implications. While student-teachers reported significant benefits from microteaching in developing teaching skills, boosting confidence, engaging learners, and improving adaptability, they also identified notable gaps in their preparedness for classroom management and emotional endurance in real teaching contexts. To enhance the relevance and authenticity of microteaching, a number of recommendations are proposed: incorporating unpredictable classroom scenarios, integrating dedicated modules on classroom management and emotional resilience, utilizing role-plays that simulate authentic student behaviors, providing post-PLP reflection seminars, enhancing the quality of mentorship and feedback, and blending virtual classroom simulations into the training process. Collectively, these strategies aim to create a more dynamic, responsive, and comprehensive microteaching experience that more closely mirrors the complexity and demands of actual classroom teaching.

REFERENCES

Azmi, S. (2019). *Perceived benefits of microteaching on classroom practices: A case study at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya* [Unpublished undergraduate thesis]. UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

Barahmeh, A. (2016). An investigation of EFL student teachers' classroom performance anxiety during their practicum. *European Journal of Educational Research, 5*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.5.1.1

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge.

Dillman, D. A. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method.* Wiley.

El-Asri, S. (2024). Bridging the gap between EFL pre-service teacher training expectations and in-practice realities: Challenges, impacts and solutions. *International Conference on Languages and Communication (ICLC2024).* https://www.researchgate.net/publication/383534716

Farmasari, S. (2020). *Exploring teacher agency through English language school-based assessment: A case study in an Indonesian primary school* [Professional Doctorate thesis, Queensland University of Technology]. QUT ePrints. https://eprints.qut.edu.au/205615/

Guest, G., Namey, E. E., & Chen, M. (2020). A simple method to assess and report thematic saturation in qualitative research. *PLOS ONE, 15*(5), e0232076. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0232076 https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/l-e/article/view/4629 https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3724377/ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330889488_Teaching_How_to_Teach_Microteaching_A_Way_to_Build_up_Teaching_Skills

Junaidi, A. (2022). *Indonesian pre-service teachers' appropriation of the scientific approach* [Doctoral dissertation, Monash University]. https://doi.org/10.26180/21663791.v1

Kemenristek-Dikti (2017). *Peraturan Menteri Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi Nomor 55 Tahun 2017 Tentang Standar Pendidikan Guru*.

Koross, R. (2016). Micro teaching An efficient technique for learning effective teaching skills: Pre-service teachers' perspective. *IRA International Journal of Education and Multidisciplinary Studies*, *4*(2), 289. https://doi.org/10.21013/irajems.v4.n2.p7

Nurfarhati, N., Nawawi, N., & Waluyo, U. (2019). Teacher's Perception of Curriculum 2013 and its implication to

the teaching of English. *Proceedings of the 3rd Asian Education Symposium (AES 2018)*, 486-490. https://doi.org/10.2991/aes-18.2019.109

Pangaribuan, Y. E. M., Sipayung, K. T., Manurung, L. W., & Situmorang, A. (2023). Student's perception of micro teaching course to their teaching internship at the English Department of HKBP Nommensen University. *Journal on Education*, *6*(1), 2561–2575. https://doi.org/10.31004/joe.v6i1.3287

Ping, W. (2013). Micro-teaching: A Powerful Tool to Embedding the English Teacher Certification Testing in the Development of English Teaching Methodologies. *International Journal of English Language and Literature Studies. Vol. 2 No. 3*, 163-175. https://archive.aessweb.com/index.php/5019/article/view/695/1145

Putri, N. D., Amin, M., Putera, L. J., & Susanti, N. W. M. (2024). The effectiveness of online and offline learning: A comparative study at English Education Department, University of Mataram. *Journal of English Education Forum (JEEF), 4*(3), 142–147. https://doi.org/10.29303/jeef.v4i3.648

Rahayuningsih, D. (2016). Student teachers' challenges in developing teaching materials during teaching practicum in vocational school. *Journal of English and Education, 4*(2), 24–34.

Rahmi, A., Farmasari, S., & Apgrianto, K. (2025) *Perceived benefits of microteaching course to students' teaching apprenticeship (PLP)* (Unpublished undergraduate thesis). University of Mataram.

Reddy, C. (2019, May 22). *Micro teaching: Principle, procedures, benefits, and limitations*.

Remesh, A. (2016). Microteaching, an efficient technique for learning effective teaching. *Journal of Research in Medical Sciences, 21*(2), 158–163.

Saban, A., & Ahmet, N. (2018). Student-teacher perceptions of microteaching: Feedback for future practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(4), 489–503. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1015454.pdf