This paper presents a study about critical incidents in Action Research Teaching Journal (ARTJs) in Microteaching, which comprised of five sections: topic, planning, action, observation and reflection. ARTJs were made before and after conducting each mini teaching. Twelve ARTJs were collected from four student-teachers who had taken the Microteaching course. A descriptive data analysis was used to identify types of critical incidents found in ARTJs by using NVIVO software tool. All unanticipated events occurring during the lessons, also known as critical incidents that triggered insights about some aspect of teaching and learning, were observed to find out to what extend the events had led them to be reflective teachers in ELT. The analysis began with coding the sections of the teaching journals which reflected types of critical incidents, then classifying similar types of critical incidents into categories. The last step in the analysis was to interpret the categorized data. The analysis of the data shows that there were four prominent themes that emerged from this study: course delivery problems, students’ participation, language proficiency problems, and course preparation. The paper ends with some recommendations for improvements in Microteaching course.
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INTRODUCTION

Students of one English Department (ED) of a reputable private university in Salatiga, who are expecting to hold bachelor degrees of English education, have to pass several pre-requisite courses in teaching, beginning with Introduction of Language Education (InLang), Teaching English as Foreign Language (TEFL), Teaching Learning Strategies (TLS), Curriculum Material Development (CurMatDev), Language Assessment (LangAss), Microteaching, and ending with a Teaching Practicum. In this case, Microteaching is chosen to be the focus of this research since this course is the beginning of the real teaching before ED students serve as teachers in educational institutions. ED students have to do certain requirements such as doing three times twenty-minute teaching, creating and developing lesson plans, and making ARTJs for every mini lesson they make.

From what ED students have planned in topic and planning sections, there are events that come unexpectedly in action, called as critical incidents, which were then analyzed in the observation section. Many of the researches on critical incident based their study on Tripp (1993) and Cruickshank and Applegate (1981). For example, Mohammed (2016) analyzed the critical incident as a reflection for a teacher educator. He added that the analysis of critical incident is a pedagogical theory, which approaches enable “reflection on teaching situations so that teachers can develop their professional judgments and practices” (p. 25). Tripp, as the one who developed this theory, as well as other following studies identified critical incident theory as an effective means employed by teachers and teacher-trainers as a way to improve teaching through reflection on classroom events (Farrell, 2008; Thiel, 1999; Tripp, 1993). This theory is in coherence with an older but relevant notion saying that the identification and examination of these incidents have become part of ‘reflective practice’, a common component of many language teacher education programs, helping trainee teachers “to think about what happened, why it happened, and what else could have been done to reach their goals” (Cruickshank & Applegate, 1981, p. 553). Therefore, critical incidents utilize student-teachers for the development of their next teaching.

There are several previous studies that examined the categories emerging from the critical incident events in the classroom. Farrell’s (2008) research result from eighteen Singaporean trainee teachers at National Institute of Educations in Singapore has shown that there were a total of thirty six critical incidents categorized into nine “categories (language proficiency, class participation, behavior, gender, classroom space, lesson objectives, classroom activities, attention spans, additional class assistance)” (p. 4). Another researcher from University of Delhi, Khandelwal (2009), also has done research on critical incidents. The research was conducted in University of Delhi with sixty participants and resulted in 237 critical incidents which were sorted into six categories. Those “six categories were rapport with students, course preparation and delivery, encouragement, fairness, time spent with students outside of class, and control” (p. 299). In addition, Mohammed (2016) conducted a ‘self-reflection’ approach in which he examined how the critical incidents helped him to develop his professional judgments and practices and found out that there were mismatch between the educator’s expectations, research, and the reality which happened in the teaching environment. Therefore, by
experiencing critical incidents, the values of the teachers can be changed, extended, and elaborated (p. 25).

Those studies show that most researchers focused on what kind of critical incidents happened, how to cope with critical incident events, and how critical incidents affect the teacher and the teaching practices. This study, however, tried to analyze critical incidents from the student teachers’ ‘self-reflection’ efforts written in their ARTJs as a part of their Microteaching course’s assignment. Further, in the analysis, the aspect of critical incidents that the writer wants to emphasize is the types of critical incident found in ARTJs.

Since critical incident analysis is proven to be an empowering and supportive process for teachers and teaching practices (Mohammed, 2016, p.29), the writer urges the importance of this research conducted among student teachers who, in the future, want to become successful educators. Furthermore, from the critical incident events occur in the classroom, teachers’ value can change, be extended, and elaborated during the day-to-day-practice.

Based on the discussion above, this paper aimed to answer the research question below:

What were kinds of critical incidents identified in the ARTJs in Microteaching course?

It is expected that this research can contribute to the future of classroom teaching, especially in Indonesia, in which the teachers can be more aware of critical incidents, know how to cope with them and utilize them as a self-reflection effort, and finally understand why their existence is important, so that the incidents can finally help them improve their quality as teachers. In addition, it is also expected that this research will add to the literature on the importance of critical incident analysis, not only for teachers but also for teacher education institutions, so that they can equip themselves with better skills to perform self-reflection efforts on critical incident events. By so doing, teachers and student-teachers can use the skills to develop their teaching practices.

What is Critical Incident?

There is a keyword, a critical incident, which needs to be clearly defined. Mohammed (2016) said that critical incident was initially developed by Tripp (1993). According to Tripp (as cited in Farrel, 2013, p. 84), critical incident is an interpretation of the significance of an unplanned event that is faced by teachers in which the events of it can be either positive or negative. This statement is in coherence with Thiel, who defined the terms as “teaching high” and “teaching low” (as cited in Farrell, 2013, p. 85). Farrell (2013) defined the term of teaching high as a spontaneous and unanticipated intervention or change in the lesson plan that has a positive effect on the lesson. On the other hand, teaching low is defined as a specific classroom incident that is immediately problematic and perplexing so that the teachers have to struggle to cope with the incidents.

Critical incident is used as a means for the teachers to perform self-reflection effort (Mohammed, 2016). Although there were only few researchers who had conducted research in this field, critical incident can obviously give some benefits for teachers and student-teachers. Kwan and Simpson (2010) stated that critical incidents might become a clear guideline for a student-teacher to engage in a reflective
practice. “Critical incidents are not at all dramatic or obvious and they can often be straightforward accounts of very common events that occur in routine professional practice” (Tripp, 1994, as cited in Kwan and Simpson, 2010, p. 423). Such an incident could be of very short duration and yet still be highly significant to the teachers. The incident can happen a few minutes or a segment of the lesson. It can also occur in a whole lesson or even a sequence of lessons.

Kwan and Simpson (2010) also noted that critical incidents are “characterized by an element of unplanned occurrence which can be problematic for the teacher, calling for an on-the-spot adjustment (reflection-in-action) of the planned course of the lesson” (p. 423). All of them are critical incidents that represent a point at which the lesson may take quite different directions depending on the student-teacher’s strategy to respond to them. As a result, the critical incident forms valuable data for reflection.

Furthermore, Farrell’s (2008) previous study found that there were nine themes of critical incidents, namely “language proficiency, class participation, behavior, gender, classroom space, lesson objectives, classroom activities, attention spans, additional class assistance” (p. 8). Khandelwal (2009) added into the literature “six more themes or categories of critical incidents, namely, rapport with students, course preparation and delivery, encouragement, fairness, time spent with students outside of class, and control” (p. 299).

From the above explanation, critical incidents can be summarized as the unplanned events happening in the classroom that require the teachers to alter the lesson plans in order to cope with the incidents and make the learning practices work. It can end up either positively or negatively. Since teaching high only has positive implication and there might be no confusion to deal with, it is not the focus of this study. Hence, in this paper the word “critical incident” might only represent “teaching low”, which is explained as unplanned events which need a strategy to deal with. Therefore, this paper would focus on the themes or kinds of critical incidents found on student-teachers’ ARTJs which then the researcher could give some suggestions for improvement based on the findings.

Why Action Research Teaching Journal?

Elisabeth and Sonora defined Action research (AR) as “research carried out in the classroom by the teacher of the course, mainly with the purpose of solving a problem or improving the teaching/learning process” (as cited in Burns, 2010, p. 4). In relation to this study, each student teacher was asked to document every teaching practice that they conducted in the form of ARTJs, which then were used by the researcher as data to be further analyzed. This practice was chosen based on the following notions. First, Richards and Farrell (2005) defined “a teaching journal as a notebook in which a teacher writes regularly about teaching experiences and other events” (p. 8). Khandelwal (2009) added into the literature “six more themes or categories of critical incidents, namely, rapport with students, course preparation and delivery, encouragement, fairness, time spent with students outside of class, and control” (p. 299).

From the above explanation, critical incidents can be summarized as the unplanned events happening in the classroom that require the teachers to alter the lesson plans in order to cope with the incidents and make the learning practices work. It can
Specifically, Zacharias (2011) stated that ARTJs are aimed at reflecting the student-teaching experience when conducting a mini lesson using English as an International Language (EIL) orientation to teach. That is the reason why ARTJs were used as the primary data of this research. Meanwhile, Burns (2010) illustrated AR as “a reflective research cycle of planning, acting, observing and reflecting” (p. 1). This cycle was adopted for Microteaching course in the English Department, where this research was conducted. Meanwhile, ARTJs serve as a part of the reflecting phase in this cycle as Zacharias (2011, p.1) stated that AR journals are aimed at reflecting the student-teaching experience when conducting a mini lesson using EIL orientation to teaching. AR journal was expected to be written by the students focusing on how they accommodated EIL approaches, the difficulties they encountered, as well as the critical incidents they found (Zacharias, 2011, p.1). From those explanations, the researcher believes that the analysis of ARTJs employed in this study is a valid method to answer the research question.

What is Microteaching?

According to Hanna (2003) Microteaching can be defined as “a training context in which a teacher’s situation has been reduced in scope or simplified in some systematic ways” (p. 23). Furthermore, “microteaching is an excellent way to build up skill and confidence, to experience a range of lecturing style and to learn and practice the giving constructive feedback” and is seen as a chance “to adopt new teaching and learning strategies, and through assuming the students’ role, to get an insight into students’ need and expectation” (Gavrilović, et al., (n.d., para. 2).

Furthermore, microteaching is also “defined as a scaled-down, simulated teaching encounter designed for the training of both pre-service or in service-teachers” (“Micro-Teaching: A scale”, para. 3). It also helps teacher improve “both contents and methods of teaching and developed teaching skill such as questioning, the use of examples and simple artifacts to make lessons more interesting, effective reinforcement techniques, and introducing and closing lessons effectively” (“Micro-Teaching: A scale”, para. 3).

In this research, all participants enrolled in the Microteaching class. In the Microteaching class, they were obliged to create lesson plans, conduct teaching practices, observe the teaching and learning practices through recorded videos of their own teaching practices, as well as reflecting to their own teaching practices in a form of teaching journals called ARTJs. From their ARTJs, all the critical incidents which occurred in the student-teachers’ classrooms were analyzed to answer the research question.

The Study

The study took place in an English Department of a reputable private university in Salatiga, Central Java, Indonesia, where English was the medium of instruction in the faculty. In doing the research, there were four participants from third-year students of English Department who were enrolled in Microteaching course. The researcher used pseudonyms for those four participants, namely DYA, SA, NTI, and RUM. As parts of the Microteaching class, every student was asked to write three ARTJs before and after doing each mini teaching. From four participants, twelve ARTJs were collected as the primary data for the research.
A descriptive data analysis was used to identify the kinds of critical incidents found in the ARTJs by using NVIVO software tool. The researcher wanted to find out kinds of critical incidents that occurred during the student-teachers’ mini teachings by performing a descriptive analysis. The descriptive analysis was performed by taking into account the two previous studies from Farrell (2008) on his nine categories of critical incidents and Khandelwal (2009) on his six categories of critical incidents. From the collection of the data, it was documented that the total of thirty nine critical incidents were found from the twelve ARTJs. The thirty nine critical incidents events fell into only four categories or themes. The summary of the findings is outlined in Table 1.

These incidents were categorized based where possible on how each student-teacher presented the incidents in their journals. Four kinds of critical incidents were found, namely course delivery problems, students’ participation, language proficiency problems, and course preparation problems. Those categories of critical incidents were all classified as teaching low as they caused confusions or problems for the teachers when they occurred in the classrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Numbers of Incidents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Delivery Problems</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ Participations</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Proficiency Problems</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Preparation Problems</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Incidents (Student-teachers=4)</td>
<td>(38)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS

The following section presents the analysis of the findings under the themes identified in the journals.

Course Delivery Problems

The first critical incident found in the study was course delivery problems. Course preparation and delivery play a crucial dimension in teaching (Khandelwal, 2009). It refers to the presentation style that the teacher performs in front of the classroom as well as the manner in which information is delivered in the classroom setting (Khandelwal, 2009). When this is not done properly, it causes course delivery problems. In other words, course delivery problems was some actions done by a student-teacher or teacher in a course that caused the teaching and learning activity less working or less successful. There were three participants reported an incident related to their course delivery problems. Also, there were eighteen incidents which occurred in this category. From eighteen incidents, the general comments showed that most of them had problems in delivering the materials in their mini lesson because of their teaching techniques especially in terms of clarity of explanation. In addition, some of the data showed that lack of time caused student-teachers to have problems in delivering their mini lessons successfully.

For DYA, she experienced a course delivery problem in her second mini teaching:

the way I interact with the students was less interactive since I have just realized that I included the students only in the activities that I made for them: watching the videos and doing the game. (DYA, ARTJ2)

What had happened to DYA was generally faced by most inexperienced teachers for some reasons, for example the lack of teaching experience and the improper use of teaching technique. DYA’s problem was actually related to classroom interaction between the student-teacher and the students that led DYA to have course delivery problem.

In contrast to DYA’s problem, SA faced a different problem in giving the instruction:

I made many mistakes in giving the instruction such as I forgot to inform the students that the sentences in the box couldn’t be found when listening to the 1st video. (SA, ARTJ2)

Actually, it was her own teaching technique which caused problem during her mini lesson. She forgot to perform the thing she had planned in her lesson plan when she delivered the material in front of the students. This incident was also categorized as a course delivery problem. Similar to what DYA experienced, SA might have struggled as a new EFL teacher.

Lastly, what NTI experienced in her 3rd mini lesson was different from DYA and SA did:

In fact, there was no chance to make the students perform that part because I ran out of time. I felt little bit disappointed with myself. I couldn’t manage the classroom time management wisely since I conducted two activities. (NTI, ARTJ3)

It was clear that NTI had problems in delivering her mini lesson since she ran out of time. Compared to DYA and SA who dealt with problems of classroom interaction and clarity of instruction, NTI experienced a time management problem.
As what Charles (1983) stated, teachers know from experience that a lesson does not often take the direction it was planned to take as it might however include or exclude aspects that neither the teacher nor the students have anticipated. In other words, these three student-teachers can face the same course delivery problems in the future because of lack of clarity in explaining the material, lack of classroom interaction, and time management problem. Yet, as what Charles (1983) said, they will also learn from their experiences that those kinds of incidents are normal things in the classrooms as long as they know how to handle them.

Thus, critical incidents which occurred in these three journals made them do “self-observation” (Thiel, 1999) through the video of their own mini lessons, which was then written in their ARTJSs. Furthermore, these three student-teachers’ problems in teaching occurred when they wanted to make their students understand and “have the best possible learning opportunities and outcomes” (Bell & Gilbert, 1996, p. 1). However, it did not go well since they experienced problems namely course delivery problems in their mini lessons.

Students’ Participation

Another critical incident in student teachers’ action research teaching journal was students’ participation which appeared eleven times. In terms of teaching, students’ participation played a very important aspect. As teachers prepared all the material before they taught in the classroom, teachers had to consider the condition of their students. For example, in deciding what kind of activities teachers wanted to give to the students, they had to think about whether the students would be able to do the activities or not.

Even though teachers came to classroom well-prepared with materials and activities that the teacher thought it was suitable for the students, sometimes it just did not go well. This condition caused lack of students’ participation. Farrel (2008) defined “lack of students’ participation as the reluctance of the students to participate in the classroom activities” (p. 6). Observing action research teaching journals of the participants of this research, there were eleven events of lacking students’ participation which occurred as critical incidents. Among those eleven, the case of students who seemed not to be interested with neither the lesson nor the activity occurred mostly.

The participants felt that the activities or the topics of the lessons that they had already prepared would interest the students, but they were mistaken. Of course there were many aspects which made the students seem not to be interested in the course. As it was stated by Fu, Yang, and Xuesong (2012) there were “many factors related to the student’s participation in the classroom such as the classroom’s situation, students’ motivation, student’s interest, hunger, etc” (p.155-156). However, the unpredictable situation in the classroom affected everything the teachers had prepared before.

One of the participants, DYA stated in her action research teaching journal of her second mini teaching about her critical incident caused by lack of student’s participation:

However, I noticed that three students (RA, BE, and FE) were pausing to sing out the song since they didn’t remember the name of Jamu which made the continuity of the game seemed less fun. (DYA, ARTJ3)
She thought that asking the students to sing a song together would be fun and interesting. Even though it was just a simple song but because the students did not notice the lyric of the song seriously, they were unable to sing the song fluently. DYA tried to continue singing cheerfully to encourage her students to sing but she did not really succeed.

Another example of students’ participation which occurred as critical incident came from NTI’s action research teaching journal of her second mini teaching. She mentioned the following statement:

I expected to get the student’s enthusiasm more when they performed storytelling activity; however, it didn’t work like what I hoped before. (NTI, ARTJ2)

Classroom would be boring if the activity prepared by the teacher did not interest the students as students expected that the teacher knew what their needs were. However, the teacher also hoped that he/she could cooperate with the students to build a fun learning activity in the classroom. When these two expectations did not match, students’ participation problems emerged, as what had happened to NTI. She already planned a story telling activity and hoped that her students would do the way she wanted, like a story telling which used gestures, intonation, expression, and certain facial expressions to make it more interesting. In the classroom, she found out that her students just read their stories without noticing what she already instructed.

RUM, another student-teacher also experienced a students’ participation problem in her second mini teaching. It was shown in her second action research journal related to the following statement:

What didn’t go well during my second mini teaching is when I asked my students to pretend to be foreigner tourists, but they didn’t make it well. (RUM, ARTJ2)

Her focus at that time was the different way of speaking English. The activity that she already prepared was asking her students to perform a conversation using different dialects in speaking English. What happened was her students just spoke using their own dialect and didn’t show varieties of English dialects. She did not know whether it was because her demand was too difficult for the students to do or because her students felt reluctant to imitate others’ way of speaking English.

Those examples showed how students’ participation could sometimes emerge in the classroom. As illustrated in the examples, the teachers were demanded to take immediate actions to solve the problems, including altering the lesson plans or doing other necessary actions. DYA’s example showed that she did an effort to solve the problem as she tried to sing cheerfully to improve students’ participation. However, it was not stated in RUM’s ARTJ on what she finally did to address the problem.

Language Proficiency Problem

The third focus of the study was critical incidents in mini teaching caused by language problem proficiency. Farrell (2008) defined “language proficiency problem as a condition when teacher did not have good English language skills” (p. 5). He also conducted a study at National Institute of Education in Singapore and the result showed that “language proficiency problem in EFL classroom was in the top chart causing the occurrence of critical incidents” (p.4). While in this study, the frequency of critical incidents caused by
language problem proficiency was not too high. From 38 critical incidents, only 4 critical incidents caused by language proficiency problem were found.

After analyzing all language proficiency problems, it was outlined that the underlying key of language proficiency problem was about the teachers’ struggle in using English as a medium of explanation. It was also highlighted that there were four causal factors which contributed to teacher’s difficulty in explaining the materials. These were grammar, pronunciation, diction, and proportion between English and Indonesian.

An example was NTI in her 3rd ARTJs who perceived that grammar was the things which made her struggle to give some explanations to answer students’ questions:

I feel that there are some grammar mistakes that can be easily detected when I responded to the student’s answer. (NTI, ARTJ 3).

Similar to NTI, RUM remarked that it was hard to use correct grammatical rules. She added that not only grammar but also pronunciation which hampered her in giving explanation as presented in her statements as follow:

Another thing is I’m not sure about my pronunciation, whether I spoke clearly enough or not, whether I used appropriate language or not. When I watched the video I thought I did not speak clearly, I don’t know whether it is because the video recorder or whether I did not speak clearly. I also wonder if my students recognized and thought I was mispronouncing words or I was using incorrect English. (RUM, ARTJ1)

Besides, Rum also paid attention on her pace when explaining the material. Despite realizing that she was too fast in giving explanation, she still did the same thing and made her really frustrated in delivering the material. She explained:

I tried not to speak too fast, but, unfortunately, one of my friends said that I spoke too fast. (RUM, ARTJ2)

Interestingly, DYA noted down that she found it difficult to decide the proportion between English and Indonesian when she was explaining the material. She struggled very hard to explain the material in a good proportion of English and Indonesian:

... let’s talk about certain things that puzzled me after I saw the video. It was, firstly, the proportion of Bahasa Indonesia and English that was 90%:10%. (DYA, ARTJ3).

Since the study was conducted in “EFL context where English is not commonly used in the society” (Lin, 2012, p. 2-3), it was shocking that language proficiency problem was included as one of the things that could trigger critical incident in mini teaching (Farrell, 2008, p. 4).

From the findings, there were 4 language proficiency problems which occurred in this study, caused by lack understanding of grammar, pronunciation problems, diction problems, and proportion between English and Indonesian used while explaining.

Course Preparation Problems

The last theme found in this study was Course Preparation Problems. It has been stated earlier that course preparation and delivery play a crucial dimension in teaching (Khandelwal, 2009). Again, Khandelwal (2009) said that “the course preparation
and delivery centers on presentation style and the manner in which information is delivered in the classroom setting so, critical incidents were almost evenly distributed” (p. 302). If the previous section mainly discussed about the delivery of the material, this section focuses mainly in the preparation of the material. All of the participants reported to have critical incidents related to their course preparation. In total, there were five incidents which occurred in this category.

CONCLUSION

Critical reflections can be accomplished by encouraging teachers to describe and examine critical incidents that occur during teaching practice in the Action Research Teaching Journal. Reflecting critically on teaching is a process of recognizing and analyzing assumptions that underlie teachers’ thoughts and actions (Brookfield, 1990). This study examined kinds of critical incidents identified in the ARTJTs for Microteaching course. There were thirty eight critical incidents categorized into four themes: course delivery problems (18), students’ participation (11), course preparation problem (4), and proficiency problem (5). Compared to Farrel’s (2005) research result which found the most critical incidents were in language proficiency problem, the finding of this research reported the highest occurrence of critical incidents was course delivery problems. It mostly occurred because of time limitation since each mini lesson only lasted for only twenty minutes.

Therefore, as teachers who faced critical incidents, teachers’ development will be gained through “individual, one-to-one, group-based or institutional” activities (Richards and Farrell, 2005, p.14). It is a process interconnected with the past and the present. In other words, after teachers experienced critical incidents, they should share to the others so that other teachers can learn from them. This will finally develop the teachers professionally as they see and analyze what they have done in the teaching. Also, when teachers have found their problems related to critical incidents, “knowledge base of teaching constantly changes” (Richards and Farrell (2005, p. 1). In brief, critical incidents found in teachers’ ELT will form teachers’ development if they are solved and then discussed with other teachers.
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### Appendix

Kinds of Critical Incidents with NVIVO Software Tool:

1. **Course Delivery Problems (18)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of student-teacher</th>
<th>Taken from</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sasa</strong></td>
<td>Document 'ARjournal2 Annisa Liliyana', 1 passages, 167 characters.</td>
<td>I made many mistakes in giving the instruction such as I forgot to inform the students that the sentences in the box couldn’t be found when listening to the 1st video.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document 'ARjournal3 annisa liliyana', 2 passages, 429 characters.</td>
<td>I think I didn’t have a chance to emphasize EILs’ side in my lesson. Actually I have planned to give elaboration about ideNtity relates to the culture such as explained the student diversity of ideNtity can leads to different accent while speaking, different intonation and also different perception or thought, however some important aspects such as my fluency while speaking; my explanation about the lesson seemed unorganized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dya</strong></td>
<td>Document 'ARJournal1 ArdiyaniWiDya', 1 passages, 217 characters.</td>
<td>Second, my teaching materials were real but I did not put pictures or the things or ideas that I was going to teach. Also, in designing the lesson plan I carelessly let the learning objective in less appropriate way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Passage</td>
<td>Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ARJournal1ArdiyaniWiDya', 4 passages, 478 characters.</td>
<td>I did not explain the aim of the game and correlated it to EIL. In fact, I designed this game to give a clear understanding toward students that by using quantifier expression through the game.</td>
<td>These incidents were categorized based where possible on how each student-teacher presented the incidents in their journals. Four kinds of critical incidents were found, namely course delivery problems, students' participation, language proficiency problems, and course preparation problems. Those categories of critical incidents were all classified as teaching low as they caused confusions or problems for the teachers when they occurred in the classrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ARJournal2ardiyaniwiDya', 2 passages, 864 characters.</td>
<td>I forgot to list the things first by using quantifier before they started the game.</td>
<td>Firstly, the way I delivered the instruction to the students when they were going to do the game. I knew that some of them were confused about the game since some of them didn’t do my instruction well. For example, Kanthi’s group, the representative was Febrika so what Kanthi and Dhenok did were giving Febrika hints by comparing the picture on Febrika’s back to the one in the whiteboard. In fact, what Kanthi and Dhenok did was pointing at the intended picture to Febrika so Febrika didn’t give the hints by them. I have tried to give them the instruction again by telling them not to point the picture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 'ARjournal1 AnnisaLiliyana', 1 passages, 680 characters.</td>
<td>I supposed to teach 20 minutes but I cut it in to 18 minutes. The reason is in the reading section I just gave my student 2 minutes, in fact I have planned 3 minutes in reading section. It is because when I asked the students “are you finish?”, they answer &quot;yes&quot;. Yes, they finished earlier that it was supposed to be since they have read the material from the previous teacher. I should think twice. In my mini-teaching I have to pretend that the student didn’t know the material at all. Besides, when giving the review of material I just spent a minute to explain what I have taught today. However it is noted down in my lesson plan that the review of material is 2 minutes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 'ARjournal2 Annisa Liliyana', 2 passages, 465 characters.</td>
<td>....my 1st mini teaching I finished teaching the material faster that I have already planned, in contra in my 2nd mini teaching I ran out of time and I didn’t get an opportunity to give a review of whole class. But Henny had to stop me while I asked the student to sing with their own accents. I’m really sad I couldn’t give my last word to close my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 'ARjournal3 annisaliliyana', 1 passages, 222 characters.</td>
<td>I felt anxious if I run out of time while teaching. My anxiousness made me want to end the class quickly. I set a goal that was finish the class on time since my previous teaching always has a problem with time allocation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Actually one more thing that I want to discuss in the last minute of my teaching is the meaning of the lyric.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 'ARjournal3Kanthirusana', 1 passages, 180 characters.</td>
<td>I spent too much time in discussing the material from touchstone, so I running of time during the discussing of the main activity. Luckily when my teaching time is up, all is done.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document 'ARjournal3Kanthirusana 2', 1 passages, 228 characters.</td>
<td>In fact, there was no chance to make the students perform that part because I ran out of time. I felt little bit disappointed with myself. I couldn’t manage the classroom time management wisely since I conducted two activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I want my students practicing some English expressions I gave to them by talking to me as foreigner, and then I wanted to try to speak using different accent of English. Because of the limitation of the time, I canceled that idea.

I planned that I would finished my third mini teaching in fifteen minutes, but in fact, it became twenty minutes. I almost ran out of time.

Right after viewing my video-recording of my mini-lesson I feel that my mini-teaching was so boring. Although the student enjoyed the activities, I could feel the students are fun. When I watch it carefully, I know the reason is because I am as a teacher never gave my student smile. Oh my god, I am very surprised why I never smile. If my teacher were me, I would skip her class. Moreover, I use many yes no question. It made the student speak up, but I think the interaction wasn’t really natural.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Document 'ARjournal3 annisa liliyana', 1 passages, 477 characters. | At the first time I think that the student will be easier writing a commentary text based on their names but I was shocked when two of my students asked me to write a commentary text based on their friend’s name. When I asked them why, the answer was because it would be easier to do. Because I want to emphasize the values of their own identity and other’s identity, at last I said “it is better to make a commentary text based on your names, so anyone won’t get offended”.

Dya | Document 'ARjournal2ardiyaniwiDya', 2 passages, 369 characters. | Firstly, the realization of my doubt about the students' reluctance to drink Brotowali (stated in my planning) occurred at the time I was putting each Jamu to their glasses.

However, I noticed that three students (Rani, Benny and Febrika) were pausing to sing out the song since they didn't remember the name of Jamu which made the continuity of the game seemed less fun.

Nti | Document 'ARjournal3Kanthirusana', 2 passages, 164 characters. | the students felt difficult

I expected to get the student's enthusiasm more when they perform storytelling activity; however it seems didn't work like I hope before.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document 'ARjournal 3Kanthirusana 2', 1 passages, 779 characters.</th>
<th>After I watched the video-recording of my last mini teaching, I was surprised that I am the one who dominated in the class instead of my students from the very beginning. First, when I shared the various kind of tea from around the world, I tried to interact with the students by asking them some question to grab their attention. In fact, after I watched the video, I answered my questions by myself. Because the students just mumbled and spoke with very slow voice. Second, when I discussed the answer of my first activity, they seemed not interested to follow me. The students just answered such as “hmm, hmmm, what, oohh, oohh, ehh” Since their responses weren’t enthusiastic enough, I couldn’t control my emotion to answer the questions by myself again and again.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document 'ARjournal 3Kanthirusana 2', 1 passages, 175 characters.</td>
<td>Here I should explain the material of the procedure text to the students in order to make the students understand about it, but it seemed that I have explained it to myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>'ARJournal2ArRumWiDya', 1 passages, 139 characters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>'ARJournal2ArRumWiDya', 1 passages, 139 characters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
<td>'ARJournal3ARumWiDya', 1 passages, 408 characters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Language Proficiency Problems (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of student-teacher</th>
<th>Taken from</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nti</td>
<td>Document 'ARjournal 3 Kanthirusana', 1 passages, 112 characters.</td>
<td>I feel that there are some grammars mistakes that can be easily detect when I responded to the student's answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dya</td>
<td>Document 'ARjournal2ardiyaniwiDya', 1 passages, 205 characters.</td>
<td>Finished talking about surprised things in the mini lesson, let's talked about certain things that puzzled me after I saw the video was firstly the proportion of Bahasa Indonesia and English were 90%:10%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>Document 'ARJournal2ArRumWiDya', 1 passages, 97 characters.</td>
<td>Another thing is I’m not sure about my pronunciation, whether I spoke clearly enough or not, whether I used appropriate language or not. When I watched the video I thought I did not speak clearly, I don’t know whether it is because the video recorder or whether I did not speak clearly. I also wonder did my students recognize and think I was mispronouncing words or I was using incorrect English (grammatical mistake like Singaporeans do)?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I tried not to speak too fast, but, unfortunately, one of my friend said that I speak too fast.
4. Course Preparation Problems (5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of student-teacher</th>
<th>Taken from</th>
<th>sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nti</td>
<td>Document 'ARjournal3Kanthirusana', 1 passages, 46 characters.</td>
<td>...the copy tasks is not enough for all students...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sasa</td>
<td>Document 'ARjournal1AnnisaLiliyana', 1 passages, 49 characters.</td>
<td>I couldn’t work well with my slide show, my paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nti</td>
<td>Document 'ARjournal3Kanthirusana', 1 passages, 98 characters.</td>
<td>...this is the second time I got technical problem using the remote of the LCD and finding the video...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rum</td>
<td>Document 'ARJournal3ARumWiDya', 2 passages, 1076 characters.</td>
<td>Well, I don’t think today is my lucky day. This is the worst mini teaching I have ever done, seriously. I have prepared the material and activity very neatly. But when it came the time for me to teach it in the classroom, everything is just messed up just because of the technical problem. I brought my own speaker and I didn’t want to borrow it from the administration office like what we usually do because I think the quality of my speaker id better than the one in the administration office, at least, it works very well in my computer. However, it didn’t work in my friend’s computer (let’s call this as first computer).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I’ve just realized that my recording data is in the first computer. Oh gosh! Then I had to look for my phone USB cable in my bag, because the recording data was there. After I found it, I tried to play it, but it didn’t work. I couldn’t operate the media player in the second computer because I’m not used to it. I had tried it in the first computer and it worked. Then one of the students (the owner of that second computer) offered to help me. Right