# Effectiveness Of Micro Teaching Learning On Teaching Basic Skills: Do The Facilities Matter?

**Hamzah Pagarra, Muhammad Irfan, Ahmad Syawaluddin**

**Abstract:** Micro teaching learning is expected to equipped prospective teachers to master several teaching skills, as in micro teaching learning these teachers will be trained to practice from each component or teaching skills. The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of micro teaching learning on the basic skills of teaching students. The method used is the method of public opinion survey research with the Simple Random Sampling technique. The results of the analysis it was obtained that micro teaching learning for students of the class of 2015 in PGSD Study Program FIP UNM was in the low category and based on the results of this study showed that Micro Teaching learning was not effective towards the basic skills of teaching the these students. Suggestions for teaching basic skills lecturers that learning in micro teaching laboratories need to be improved again, with the best possible use of existing facilities to facilitate students when practicing each teaching skill so as to improve the quality of implementing micro teaching learning.

**Index Terms:** Microteaching effectiveness, learning, basic teaching skills. .

## INTRODUCTION

Learning is a complex process, as learning is a way to integrate the components of learning in an integrated manner including learning objectives, teaching materials for students, methods, media and learning resources. evaluation, students, teachers and other learning environments (Azis, Haeruddin, & Azis, 2018). There are several basic assumptions underlying micro teaching, among others; first, in general teachers are not born but are formed first, the two successes of mastering complex things are largely determined by their success in mastering things that are simpler in nature, third by simplifying the training situation, so attention can be focused entirely on skill development certain components of teaching activities (Albin & Shihomeka, 2017; Bakir, 2014; Remesh, 2013; Shanu, 2016).The ability to teach a teacher is also required to have three professional abilities as follows: First, cognitive ability, means the teacher must master the material, methods, media, and be able to plan and develop learning activities. Second, affective ability, means the teacher has a noble character, maintained his behavior so that he will be able to be a model that can be imitated by his students. Third, psychomotor abilities, means that teachers are required to have knowledge and ability to implement the knowledge they have in everyday life (Bell, 2007).Therefore, a teacher must be able to carry out his duties professionally because professionals are the demands of position, job / profession. Being professional means being an expert in their field. Professional teachers are people who have special abilities and expertise in the field of teacher training so that they are able to carry out their duties and functions as teachers with maximum abilities.

In addition, the teacher must have the basic skills and skills needed for the smooth and effective teaching and learning process. The teacher's skills in teaching and learning include: opening and closing skills, explaining skills, asking skills, strengthening skills, discussion guiding skills small groups, skills in managing classes, variation skills, and teaching skills of individuals and small groups (Saud, 2009).One effort to prepare the ability of prospective teachers or to improve the ability of teachers in facing the complex task of learning, can be carried out a process of training or learning using a more simplified model or approach to learning with micro teaching learning (Albin & Shihomeka, 2017; Arsal, 2014).The concept of teacher competence has been found to be related to several variables such as student motivation, student achievement and teacher classroom management approaches. Therefore, teacher competence is the most important determinant of teacher behavior because efficacy beliefs influence teacher behavior depending on the level of trust held by the teacher (Bilen, 2015).Micro teaching learning is expected that prospective teachers are able to master several teaching skills, because in micro teaching learning prospective teachers will be trained to practice from each component or teaching skills. The exercise after training was programmed systematically and consistently. In order to grow a good behavior in the prospective teacher if he is standing in class / teaching. If the appearance / performance is not trained and accustomed then what is done in front of the class mimics the appearance of the class teacher or his own friend. So that continuous training is needed through micro teaching learning in the subject of basic teaching skills.

### Problem of Research

Micro teaching aims to provide opportunities for prospective teachers to practice practicing some teaching skills in front of their friends in a constructive atmosphere. So that he has integrated mental readiness, skills and performance capabilities for the provision of actual teaching practice in school (Ostrosky, Mouzourou, Danner, & Zaghlawan, 2013). Microteaching has been considered an effective method that offers the opportunity to plan and apply new teaching strategies to pre-service language teachers who can make connections between theory and practices (Koc & Ilyaa, 2016; Shanu, 2016). Despite of the mentioned empirical facts above, a question remains, do the micro teaching learning is influenced by the facilities?


- *Hamzah Pagarra, Universitas Negeri Makassar Email: hamzah.pagarra@unm.ac.id*
- *Muhammad Irfan, Universitas Negeri Makassar Email: m.irfan@unm.ac.id*
- *Ahmad Syawaluddin, Universitas Negeri Makassar Email: unmsyawal@unm.ac.id*

**Research Focus**

This research focuses on 1) knowing the effectiveness of the micro teaching practices are influenced by the facilities, and, 2) knowing whether the facilities in micro teaching practices are enhancing the practices or not.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

General Background

The type of research conducted is quantitative research. Quantitative research is a study whose analysis generally uses statistical analysis. The method used is the method of public opinion survey research, which is a survey that aims to find out public opinion about particular focus.

Sample / Participants / Group

The research location at Campus IV FIP UNM PGSD Study Program with a population of 126 students from the Class of 2015. The sampling technique used in this study is Simple Random Sampling, because sampling is done randomly regardless of the strata that exist in the population. So from the total number of students of the 2015 Makassar PGSD Study Program, which amounted to 126 people, 30% were taken as a sample of 35 people. All of the respondents were assigned by pseudonym name in order to maintain research ethics and anonymity.

Instrument and Procedures

The data collection technique used in this study is questionnaire. Using a questionnaire to find out the answers from the sample regarding facilities, micro teaching learning and basic skills in teaching students.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique used in this study, namely quantitative descriptive statistical analysis techniques and inferential statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics are used to analyze data by describing or describing data that has been collected while inferential analysis is used to measure the effectiveness of micro teaching learning on basic skills in teaching students, using the t-test formula.

## RESEARCH RESULTS

a.Micro Teaching Learning

Based on the following table, descriptive statistics are carried out with the following calculations:

- Range / range (R), which is the largest value (Xt) minus the smallest value (Xr)

R = Xt - Xr

= 49 - 35

= 14

- Many interval classes (k)

k = 1 + (3.3) log 35 = 1 + 5.09 = 6.09

- Determines the interval of the class with the formula:

P = R / K

= 14 / 6.09

= 2.29

**Table 1. Microteaching Learning Questionnaire Results**

| Respondents | Σ Total |
|---|---|
| Nevi Karisma Said | 38 |
| A. Etika | 46 |
| Novi Ariyanti S | 42 |
| Sulfadly | 40 |
| Irwana | 44 |
| Nathasya A. Putri | 49 |
| Ina Fitrayani Jamal | 40 |
| Hajrawati | 44 |
| Rini Wahyuni | 44 |
| Adrianto Talagande | 40 |
| Musfira | 39 |
| A. Wiwi Rahmaniar | 36 |
| Nurul Sakinah Fitrah | 39 |
| Muh. Asri Hidayat | 39 |
| Ummi Kalsum | 42 |
| Asmaniar | 35 |
| Umrah Rahayu | 35 |
| Yuyun Indriani | 42 |
| Sudirman | 39 |
| Sulfika | 44 |
| Sri Wahyuni | 45 |
| Indriani | 46 |
| Riska Asmasari | 41 |
| Ahmad Gabriel Gibran | 37 |
| Ulyawati | 42 |
| Wahyu Kamal | 40 |
| Gebriela Sandang | 41 |
| Azizah | 41 |
| Erita Novianti | 42 |
| Eka Saputri Idrus | 35 |
| Rezky Adriani | 38 |
| Risnalasari | 44 |
| Andi Anah Suhaenah | 42 |
| Nurul Hikmah Husain | 37 |
| Pangeran Akbar Fatahillah | 41 |
| **Total** | **1429** |

**Data processed, 2018**

**Table 2. Percentage of Microteaching Learning**

| Interval | Frequency (*fi*) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| **35 - 37** | 6 | 17,14 % |
| **38 - 40** | 10 | 28,57 % |
| **41 - 43** | 10 | 28,57 % |
| **44 - 46** | 8 | 22,86 % |
| **47 - 49** | 1 | 2,86 % |
| **Total** | 35 | 100 % |

**Data processed, 2018**

**Table 3. Micro Teaching Learning Categorization**

| Interval | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| **35 - 37** | Very Low | 6 | 17,14 % |
| **38 - 40** | Low | 10 | 28,57 % |
| **41 - 43** | Moderate | 10 | 28,57 % |
| **44 - 46** | Good | 8 | 22,86 % |
| **47 - 49** | Excellent | 1 | 2,86 % |
| **Total** | | 35 | 100 % |

**Data processed, 2018**

Interval = (range of values) / (amount of classes)
= (49-35) / 6
= 14/6
= 2, 33 (rounded to

## a. Basic Teaching Skills for Students

**Table 4. Results of Student Teaching Basic Skill Questionnaire**

| Respondents | Σ Total |
|---|---|
| **Nevi Karisma Said** | 106 |
| **A. Etika** | 94 |
| **Novi Ariyanti S** | 86 |
| **Sulfadly** | 93 |
| **Irwana** | 97 |
| **Nathasya A. Putri** | 92 |
| **Ina Fitrayani Jamal** | 90 |
| **Hajrawati** | 93 |
| **Rini Wahyuni** | 92 |
| **Adrianto Talagande** | 90 |
| **Musfira** | 86 |
| **A. Wiwi Rahmaniar** | 75 |
| **Nurul Sakinah Fitrah** | 87 |
| **Muh. Asri Hidayat** | 87 |
| **Ummi Kalsum** | 91 |
| **Asmaniar** | 84 |
| **Umrah Rahayu** | 86 |
| **Yuyun Indriani** | 99 |
| **Sudirman** | 82 |
| **Sulfika** | 100 |
| **Sri Wahyuni** | 101 |
| **Indriani** | 93 |
| **Riska Asmasari** | 88 |
| **Ahmad Gabriel Gibran** | 78 |
| **Ulyawati** | 110 |
| **Wahyu Kamal** | 89 |
| **Gebriela Sandang** | 92 |
| **Azizah** | 88 |
| **Erita Novianti** | 92 |
| **Eka Saputri Idrus** | 85 |
| **Rezky Adriani** | 100 |
| **Risnalasari** | 93 |
| **Andi Anah Suhaenah** | 83 |
| **Nurul Hikmah Husain** | 91 |
| **Pangeran Akbar Fatahillah** | 100 |
| **Total** | **3193** |

**Data processed, 2018**

Based on the table above, descriptive statistics are carried out with the following calculations:

- Range / range (R), which is the largest value (Xt) minus the smallest value (Xr)

R = Xt - Xr
= 110 - 75
= 35

- The number of interval classes (k)

k = 1 + (3.3) log 35 = 1 + 5.09 = 6.09

- Determines the interval of the class with the formula:

P = R / K
= 35 / 6.09
= 5.74

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the lowest score of micro teaching learning seen from the results of the questionnaire is 35 and the highest score is 49 with a total score of 1429. While the standard deviation is 3.273 The results of descriptive statistical calculations about micro teaching learning students of PGSD Study Program class of 2015 Faculty of Education University Negeri Makassar with an average value of 40.83. Based on the table above, it was found that students in the very low category were 6 people (17.14%), students in the low category were 10 people (28.57%), students who were in the moderate category were 10 people ( 28.57%), students in the good category were 8 people (22.86%) and students in the excellent category were 1 person (2.86%).

**Table 5. Percentage of Basic Teaching Skills for Students**

| Interval | Frequency (*fi*) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| **75 - 80** | 2 | 5,71 % |
| **81 - 86** | 7 | 20 % |
| **87 - 92** | 13 | 37,14 % |
| **93 - 98** | 6 | 17,14 % |
| **99 - 104** | 5 | 14,29 % |
| **105 - 110** | 2 | 5,71 % |
| **Total** | **35** | **100** |

**Data processed, 2018**

Interval = (range of values) / (the amount of the classes)
= (110-75) / 6
= 35/6
= 5, 83 (rounded to 6)

**Table 6. Basic Teaching Skills Categorization**

| Interval | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| **35 - 37** | Very Low | 2 | 5,71 % |
| **38 - 40** | Low | 9 | 25,71 % |
| **41 - 43** | Moderate | 15 | 42,86 % |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **44 - 46** | Good | 3 | 8,57 % |
| **47 - 49** | Excellent | 6 | 17,14 % |
| **Total** | | 35 | 100% |

**Data processed, 2018**

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the lowest score of student teaching skills seen from the results of the questionnaire is 75 and the highest score is 110 with a total score of 3193. While the standard deviation is 7.182. The results of the descriptive statistical calculations about the Basic Teaching Skills of the class of 2015 in the Faculty of Education, Makassar State University with an average value of 91.23. Based on the table above, it was found that students in the very low category were 2 people (5.71%), students who were in the low category were 9 people (25.71%), students who were in the moderate category were 15 people (42.86%), students who are in the good category as many as 3 people (8.57%) and students who are in the excellent category as many as 6 people (17.14%).

c. The following section will answer the third problem statement, so the analysis used is inferential statistical analysis using the t test.

**Table 7. Guiding Table on the Effectiveness of Micro Teaching learning on Basic Teaching Skills of Students.**

| No | X | Y | X2 | Y2 | XY |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1** | 38 | 106 | 1444 | 11236 | 4028 |
| **2** | 46 | 94 | 2116 | 8836 | 4324 |
| **3** | 42 | 86 | 1764 | 7396 | 3612 |
| **4** | 40 | 93 | 1600 | 8649 | 3720 |
| **5** | 44 | 97 | 1936 | 9409 | 4268 |
| **6** | 49 | 92 | 2401 | 8464 | 4508 |
| **7** | 40 | 90 | 1600 | 8100 | 3600 |
| **8** | 44 | 93 | 1936 | 8649 | 4092 |
| **9** | 44 | 92 | 1936 | 8464 | 4048 |
| **10** | 40 | 90 | 1600 | 8100 | 3600 |
| **11** | 39 | 86 | 1521 | 7396 | 3354 |
| **12** | 36 | 75 | 1296 | 5625 | 2700 |
| **13** | 39 | 87 | 1521 | 7569 | 3393 |
| **14** | 39 | 87 | 1521 | 7569 | 3393 |
| **15** | 42 | 91 | 1764 | 8281 | 3822 |
| **16** | 35 | 84 | 1225 | 7056 | 2940 |
| **17** | 35 | 86 | 1225 | 7396 | 3010 |
| **18** | 42 | 99 | 1764 | 9801 | 4158 |
| **19** | 39 | 82 | 1521 | 6724 | 3198 |
| **20** | 44 | 100 | 1936 | 10000 | 4400 |
| **21** | 45 | 101 | 2025 | 10201 | 4545 |
| **22** | 46 | 93 | 2116 | 8649 | 4278 |
| **23** | 41 | 88 | 1681 | 7744 | 3608 |
| **24** | 37 | 78 | 1369 | 6084 | 2886 |
| **25** | 42 | 110 | 1764 | 12100 | 4620 |
| **26** | 40 | 89 | 1600 | 7921 | 3560 |
| **27** | 41 | 92 | 1681 | 8464 | 3772 |
| **28** | 41 | 88 | 1681 | 7744 | 3608 |
| **29** | 42 | 92 | 1764 | 8464 | 3864 |
| **30** | 35 | 85 | 1225 | 7225 | 2975 |
| **31** | 38 | 100 | 1444 | 10000 | 3800 |
| **32** | 44 | 93 | 1936 | 8649 | 4092 |
| **33** | 42 | 83 | 1764 | 6889 | 3486 |
| **34** | 37 | 91 | 1369 | 8281 | 3367 |
| **35** | 41 | 100 | 1681 | 10000 | 4100 |
| **Total** | 1429 | 3193 | 58727 | 130729 | 130729 |

It can be seen from the table that to find out whether the two x and y variables are correlated, then it is tested using the t test formula to obtain the following results:

$$t = \frac{40,83-91,23}{\sqrt{\frac{3,278^2}{35}+\frac{7,182^2}{35}}}$$

$$t = \frac{-50.4}{\sqrt{\frac{10,71}{35}+\frac{51,58}{35}}}$$

$$t = \frac{-50,4}{\sqrt{1,78}}$$

$$t = \frac{-50,4}{1,3}$$

$t$ = -37,778

After being tested with the formula above, the results obtained were -37,778 which proved that micro teaching learning with basic skills in teaching students was not influential.To test the significance by comparing t-count = -37.7778 with t table = 1.67 from the results above, the t-count is smaller than t table. It can be seen that for n = 35, the level of error table (5%) dk = n1 + n2-2 = 70- 2 = 68, so that t table = 1.67 based on the analysis obtained, it is known that t-count is less than t-table or -37,778 ≤ 1.67, H0 is accepted and Ha is rejected, thus micro teaching learning is not effective for the basic skills of teaching the students.

## DISCUSSION

**Micro Teaching Learning for PGSD Study Program Students.**

From the results of research conducted on students of the 2015 PGSD Study Program, the Faculty of Education,

Makassar Random University, which was selected randomly after testing statistical analysis, was obtained from the results of a questionnaire analysis filled by 35 students who completed the questionnaire. each of the 6 people in the very low category obtained a percentage of 17.14%, then in the low category as many as 10 people with a percentage of 28.57%, students who were in the moderate category as many as 10 people with a percentage of 28.57%, students who were in the good category as many as 8 people with a percentage of 22.86% and students who are in the excellent category as many as 1 person as much as 2.86%.Based on the results of micro teaching learning analysis, it was found that micro teaching learning for students of the PGSD Study Program class of 2015 Faculty of Education Makassar State University is in the low category, this is reflected in the results obtained, there are 10 people with a percentage of 28.57%, and scores the average is 40.83 with a standard deviation of 3.273. This is in line with I'anson, Rodrigues, & Wilson's work (2003) and Tahir's (2018).

**Basic Teaching Skills of Students Makassar State University Makassar.**

From the results of research carried out on students of the 2015 PGSD Study Program, the Faculty of Education of the Makassar State University were randomly selected (Simple Random Sampling). each 2 people in the very low category with a percentage of 5.71%, then in the low category as many as 9 people with a percentage of 25.71%, students who are in the moderate category as many as 15 people with a percentage of 42.86%, students who are in good category as many as 3 people with a percentage of 8.57% and students who are in the excellent category as many as 6 people as much as 517.14%.Based on the results of the analysis of the basic skills of teaching students, it was found that the basic teaching skills of students of the 2015 PGSD Study Program were in the category of low, this was reflected in the results obtained, namely 13 people with a percentage of 37.14%, and the average score is 91.23 with a standard deviation of 7.182.

**Effectiveness of Micro Teaching learning on Basic Teaching Skills for students.**

Based on the results of this study indicate that it is not effective Micro Teaching learning on the basic skills of teaching students of the Makassar PGSD Study Program class of 2015, Faculty of Education, Makassar State University. Based on t test shows that the value of t = - 37,778 The results of statistical analysis using inferential statistics show that the value of t obtained from the results of calculations is smaller than the value of t obtained from the distribution table t (t table) with a significance level of 5%. So -37,778 ≤ 1.67 then H0 is accepted and Ha is rejected, it can be concluded that it is not effective micro teaching learning for the basic skills of teaching students of the 2015 PGSD Study Program Faculty of Education, Makassar State University. The ineffectiveness is due to the microteaching learning system itself (Gurbuz, 2015; Musa, Haeruddin, & Haeruddin, 2018; Zhang & Cheng, 2011).

In terms of implementation, there are obstacles, including the limited problem of micro laboratory space, the time used because all this time using holidays, namely Saturday, the availability of sufficient funds, and the existence of weaknesses in the real microteaching system that must be overcome. However, if the goal is to improve quality, then these obstacles will certainly be overcome (Azis, Haeruddin, & Azis, 2018; Haeruddin & Natsir, 2016; Kuswandono, 2014; McCullagh & Doherty, 2018; Pinasti, 2008).For some people, micro teaching is called false teaching because of class size, lesson time; subject matter is all reduced so that it has an idea of the practice of the pre-service teacher rather than the subject itself (Bagatur, 2015; Golightly, 2010). In the learning process in Microteaching courses, it is very important for everyone in the class to participate in the assessment. So that the lecturer has an important role in facilitating students so that all stages can go according to plan (Yang, 2016). However, if from the beginning the lecturer was able to explain the method of work and the procedure of this assessment to all students, then for the next process, the lecturer could just observe (Bell, 2007; McCullagh & Doherty, 2018; Punia, Miglani, & Singh, 2016; Shanu, 2016).

## CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Based on the results of the research and discussion, the following conclusions can be drawn that micro teaching learning and teaching basic skills of the students of the Makassar Campus PGSD FIP Study Program are in the low category. Based on the t-test shows that the t-count ≤ t table then H0 is accepted and Ha is rejected It can be concluded that it is not effective micro teaching learning on the basic skills of teaching students in the PGSD Study Program class of 2015 Makassar Campus, Faculty of Education, Makassar State University.Based on the conclusions stated, the following suggestions are proposed: For basic teaching skills lecturers that learning in micro teaching laboratories needs to be improved again, using the best available facilities to make it easier for students to practice each teaching skill so that can improve quality in implementing micro teaching learning. Students or prospective teachers are expected to truly master, and understand various teaching skills and be serious in practicing teaching skills. For researchers, as a reference for improving the basic teaching skills of students in learning in a micro teaching laboratory, especially the PGSD Makassar Study Program. Future research may benefit from a qualitative study which would explore the deeper insight from the respondents on the micro teaching effectiveness.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank the Directorate of Higher Education, Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, the Republic of Indonesia for their financial support of this research. We appreciate the Research Institution of Universitas Negeri Makassar (UNM), and to anonymous reviewers for excellent comments and suggestions for this paper.

## REFERENCES

[1] Albin, S., & Shihomeka, S. P. (2017). Learning from Students' Experiences of Microteaching for Numeracy Education and Learning Support: A Case Study at University of Namibia, Southern Campus. American Scientific Research Journal for Engineering, Technology, and Sciences (ASRJETS), 36(1), 306-318.

[2] Arsal, Z. (2014). Microteaching and pre-service teachers' sense of self-efficacy in teaching. European Journal of Teacher Education, 37(4), 453-464.

[3] Azis, M., Haeruddin, M., & Azis, F. (2018). Entrepreneurship

education and career intention: The perks of being a woman student. Journal of Entrepreneurship Education, 21(1), 1-10.
[4] Bagatur, S. (2015). Dismayed or enchanted: ELT students' perceptions towards microteaching. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences , 199, 770 - 776.
[5] Bakır, S. (2014). The effect of microteaching on the teaching skills of preservice science teachers. Journal of Baltic Science Education, 13(6), 789-801.
[6] Bell, N. D. (2007). Microteaching: What is it that is going on here?. Linguistics and Education, 18(1), 24-40.
[7] Bilen, K. (2015). Effect of micro teaching technique on teacher candidates' beliefs regarding mathematics teaching. Procedia - Social and behavioral sciences , 174, 609 - 616.
[8] Golightly, A. (2010). Microteaching to assist geography teacher-trainees in facilitating learner-centered instruction. Journal of Geography, 109(6), 233-242.
[9] Gurbuz, F. (2015). Physics education: Effect of micro-teaching method supported by educational technologies on pre-service science teachers' misconceptions on basic astronomy subjects. Journal of Education and Training Studies, 4(2), 27-41.
[10] Haeruddin, M., & Natsir, U. D. (2016). The cat's in the cradle: 5 personality types' influence on work-family conflict of nurses. Economics & Sociology, 9(3), 99-110.
[11] I'anson, J., Rodrigues, S., & Wilson, G. (2003). Mirrors, reflections and refractions: The contribution of microteaching to reflective practice. European Journal of Teacher Education, 26(2), 189-199.
[12] Koc, B., & Ilyaa, A. (2016). Exploring Pre-service Language Teachers' Perceptions and Actual Practices of Giving Feedback in Micro-teaching. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences , 232, 421 – 429.
[13] Kuswandono, P. (2014). University mentors' views on reflective practice in microteaching: building trust and genuine feedback. Reflective Practice, 15(6), 701-717.
[14] McCullagh, J. F., & Doherty, A. (2018). Digital makeover: what do pre-service teachers learn from microteaching primary science and how does an online video analysis tool enhance learning?. Teacher Education Advancement Network Journal, 10(2), 15-28.
[15] Musa, M. I., Haeruddin, M. I. W., & Haeruddin, M. (2018). Customers' repurchase decision in the culinary industry: Do the Big-Five personality types matter?. Journal of Business and Retail Management Research, 13(1), 131-137.
[16] Ostrosky, M. M., Mouzourou, C., Danner, N., & Zaghlawan, H. Y. (2013). Improving teacher practices using microteaching: Planful video recording and constructive feedback. Young Exceptional Children, 16(1), 16-29.
[17] Pinasti, V. I. S. (2008) Efektifitas Real Microteaching Pada Program Ppl I (Microteaching) Di Program Studi Pendidikan Sosiologi Fise Uny. Dimensia, 2(2).
[18] Punia, V., Miglani, P., & Singh, S. P. (2016). Perception of pupil-teachers' regarding micro-teaching sessions. World Scientific News, (26), 61-69.
[19] Remesh, A. (2013). Microteaching, an efficient technique for learning effective teaching. Journal of research in medical sciences: the official journal of Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, 18(2), 158.
[20] Saud, U. S. (2009). Pengembangan Profesi Guru. Bandung: CV.Alvabeta.
[21] Shanu, Y. M. (2016). Impact of microteaching video feedback on student-teachers' performance in the actual teaching practice classroom. International Journal of Instructional Technology and Distance Learning, 13(11), 45-52.
[22] Tahir, T. (2018). The Impact of Edmodo Assisted Education on Project Evaluation Achievement Scores and Determination of Opinions for use in Education. TEM Journal, 7(3), 651-657.
[23] Yang, L. (2016, December). The Problems of and Solutions to Micro-teaching for English Pedagogical Students. In 2016 3rd International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Inter-cultural Communication (ICELAIC 2016). Atlantis Press.
[24] Zhang, S., & Cheng, Q. (2011). Learning to teach through a practicum-based microteaching model. Action in Teacher Education, 33(4), 343-358.