

## **WHAT MAKES FOR AN EFFECTIVE GRAMMAR PRESENTATION?: PEER, SELF- AND TEACHER TRAINER EVALUATION OF MICRO-TEACHING**

Ana **Dorđević**, University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philology,  
*ana.djordjevic@fil.bg.ac.rs*

Milica **Vitaz**, University of Belgrade – Faculty of Philology,  
*milica.vitaz@fil.bg.ac.rs*

Original scientific paper

DOI: 10.31902/fil.49.2024.13

UDC: 81'36:371.3

**Abstract:** In order to identify the elements of grammar teaching which most influence the perception of its effectiveness, we looked into the link between general evaluations of students' micro-teaching grammar presentations (an overall grade) and the assessments of their individual aspects, such as student-teacher personality, their non-verbal communication, the teaching method employed and the appropriateness of the materials and the activities used. The study involved 36 final year students of English language, literature and culture at a state university in Serbia who engaged in micro-teaching as part of their English language teaching methodology 2 coursework. After each classroom-based 5-minute grammar presentation, the same online questionnaire was completed by student teachers themselves (self-evaluation), their fellow students acting as language learners (anonymous peer evaluation) and two university ELT methodology teachers (397 evaluations in total), thus enabling us to investigate the potential differences in the perceptions of the grammar teaching depending on the source of evaluation (peer, self- or teacher trainer). A thematic analysis was conducted on the participants' responses to an open-ended question regarding the key element that made the grammar presentation successful. Correlational analysis revealed that the strongest association occurred between the perceived level of grammar presentation effectiveness and the positive student teacher characteristics, while the qualitative data analysis showed that the student teacher personality and their teaching style consistent with the constructivist theory of learning were almost equally cited as the main contributors to the positive perception of micro-teaching. Differences between the perceptions of different groups of evaluators were identified and accounted for in both types of research inquiry.

**Keywords:** grammar teaching, micro-teaching, teacher effectiveness, teacher personality, teaching method, peer evaluation, self-evaluation

## Introduction

Despite the general consensus on the profound impact of effective teaching on student achievement (Goe et al. 2; Teven 434; Toropova et al. 1), research on teacher effectiveness (see a historical overview in Campbell et al.) has been hampered by the lack of agreement on what constitutes good teaching (Kim et al. 2019: 166; Korthagen 78). In fact, because of the largely context-dependent nature of instructional practices, Korthagen has argued that it may even be “impossible or pedagogically undesirable to formulate a definitive description of ‘the good teacher’” (78). Indeed, many authors attest to the complexity of instructional contexts (Turner and Meyer; Šimić Šašić), which, if unfavourable, may put a strain on the performance of even the most competent and experienced teachers. This has led us to look into various aspects of effective grammar teaching in a simplified context of university-based micro-teaching sessions involving groups of 8-10 pre-service English language teachers in their final year of study, as it makes for a relatively safe environment in which students acting as learners tend to be “uniformly helpful and compliant, following the microteacher's instructions and earnestly offering responses” (Bell 33). By enabling us to focus on the aspects of teaching other than classroom management, such a set-up has also created a level playing field for evaluations of students' five-minute grammar presentations from the perspectives of student teachers themselves (self-evaluation), their peers acting as learners (peer evaluation) and two university ELT methodology teachers, one of whom has never taught them. Micro-teaching was part of the coursework for ELT Methodology 2, a course taught by the other teacher trainer, in which students had previously received both theoretical instruction and practical training in various elements of grammar teaching (e.g. elicitation techniques, concept checking, giving instructions, lesson planning).

The aim of the research was, therefore, twofold: (1) to investigate the potential correlations between the general assessments of student grammar presentations (an overall grade) and the evaluations of their individual elements such as teacher personality, teacher presence (body language and the use of voice), teaching style (e.g. student-centred, interactive, inductive approach) and the activities and materials used. This was done with a view to identifying those aspects which most contribute to the positive or negative perception of grammar teaching; (2) to look into the potential differences between the students' (peer evaluation), student teachers' (self-evaluation) and teacher trainers' perceptions of the grammar presentations. However, in order to better understand the complex interplay between the investigated elements

of micro-teaching and to further explain the differences in evaluations depending on their source, a thematic analysis of the participants' responses to an open-ended question about the key positive element of each grammar presentation was performed.

### **Micro-teaching**

Micro-teaching, as a way of training prospective teachers, has been a long-standing practice. The fact that it is still used by professionals proves that the advantages of micro-teaching greatly outnumber the disadvantages. According to Fortune et al. (389), one of its main benefits is exposing teacher trainees to different teaching situations without overwhelming them. This is significant since for most student teachers this is their first brush with actual teaching (Bodrič 930). Such activities are also beneficial as they create opportunities for close examination and detailed feedback. Since it breaks down complicated teaching procedures into small steps, micro-teaching is deemed to be an effective teaching tool for novice teachers (Shi 168; Dwight and Eve 181).

What is often challenged in employing micro-teaching is its authenticity (Bodrič 931; Shi 169). Experts wonder how far we can go with altering everyday classroom conditions before removing ourselves too far from what authentic teaching really looks like. Bell (24), for example, claims that those taking part in such training techniques view them more as a performance than an actual opportunity to teach. Nevertheless, in their quasi-experimental study Metcalf et al. found that it was the student teachers who engaged in micro-teaching and other university-based teacher training activities rather than the field experience trainees who improved their reflective ability and their teaching performance (e.g. increased interaction with learners, more adaptation to their level).

Despite some of the drawbacks of micro-teaching, a lot of research is being conducted to explore its efficiency and the results mostly outline the benefits of using micro-teaching in teacher training environments. Shi (168) investigated its effects on prospective English language teachers in China, where, similarly to our own research, student teachers were evaluating themselves, they received feedback from their peers and a mentor. However, while the majority of studies reviewed focus on either teacher trainees' comments of recorded micro-teaching sessions (Deneme) or the benefits of such sessions to prospective teachers (Bodrič; Fernández; Önal), to our knowledge there are none that explore the aspects of micro-teaching that are presented in this paper.

### **Teacher personality**

Looking back on our formal learning experiences, we seem to regard the role of our teachers and their personality as more important than the teaching methods and the materials they used (Bailey et al. 15; Kneipp et al. 904; Suplicz; Vitaz). However, while personality assessment has been widely used in organizational settings for personnel selection (Göncz 85; Kim et al. 2018: 321), such a practice appears to be much more controversial in educational contexts (see Borko et al.).

Despite its long tradition and diversity both in educational psychology (Rockoff et al. 8; see Göncz for the research classification) and beyond (John et al. 148; Kell 2), it is only in recent decades that personality research has undergone, what some authors call, a paradigm shift (see John et al.) with the general acceptance of the Big Five trait taxonomy as the dominant personality framework (Decker and Rimm-Kaufman 47; Kim, Verena and Klassen 164). Emerging from factor analyses of trait adjectives (see Goldberg; Saucier and Goldberg), the Big Five model comprises the following five dimensions commonly referred to as: extraversion (energetic, talkative, outgoing), agreeableness (kind, warm, helpful), conscientiousness (organised, efficient, thorough), emotional stability (calm, relaxed, secure) and openness (creative, intelligent, curious).

Using predominantly this, as well as other personality taxonomies (e.g. Rushton et al.; Thornton et al.), research studies investigating teacher effectiveness as a function of teacher personality have yielded somewhat inconsistent results – from those reporting no significant relationship between the constructs (Corcoran and O’Flaherty; Rockoff et al.; see Kell) to those establishing a clear link between teaching performance and at least some, although often different, aspects of teacher personality. For example, while in their meta-analysis of 25 studies focusing on the relationship between teacher Big Five personality domains and teacher effectiveness and burnout, Kim et al. (2019) found that all of the personality dimensions except for agreeableness were positively associated with teacher effectiveness (with extraversion and conscientiousness being especially important for student evaluations), in a study involving 63 university instructors (Kneipp et al.), agreeableness was found to be the only personality characteristic significantly correlated with student ratings of instructional quality. In another study by Kim et al. (2018) involving Australian secondary school students and their English and mathematics teachers, teacher personality predicted the subjective measures of teacher effectiveness, with conscientiousness being most important for teacher academic support, agreeableness for teacher personal support

and teacher stability for student performance self-efficacy, but it did not predict academic achievement as a more objective measure of teacher effectiveness.

Instead of using students' evaluation of teachers, some researchers focused on pre-service teachers and compared their personality types to those found in the general population (Ripski et al.; Thornton et al.). The results of the study conducted by Ripski et al. indicate that pre-service teachers are less neurotic, more extraverted, more open to experience, more agreeable and more conscientious than their peers, which is consistent with the findings reported by Genc et al. who investigated Serbian university students' expectations of what a good teacher should be like.

### **Effective grammar teaching**

Although most teachers and students dislike it, languages cannot function without grammar, so it has to be taught in some way (Tomović 100). Consequently, there has always been a debate about the most effective way of teaching grammar. The perception of grammar instruction within the different ELT methods and approaches has been subject to change (see Schenck 165-167 for an overview), but the latest trends stress the importance of contextualized grammar teaching, its integration into the more communicatively-oriented syllabus and the promotion of student noticing of the target structures by using various techniques such as input flooding, input enhancement, consciousness-raising tasks, the garden path strategy etc. with a view to encouraging learners to work out the rules themselves (Ellis 48; Larsen-Freeman 257; Mart 124).

Apart from being taught in context, grammar can be taught overtly and covertly, i.e. by explaining the rules to students, or by hiding grammar from them, so that they are doing an activity without being aware that they are learning a particular structure or rule (Tomović 101-102). Overt grammar teaching can be deductive or rule-driven and inductive or discovery learning, both of which have their advantages and disadvantages. Deductive teaching saves time and appears to be the preferred method among some language learners in Serbia (see Nešić and Hamidović 201; cf. Đorđević 331). However, the main drawback of such an approach is that students are not active participants in the learning process, which is incompatible with the main tenets of the constructivist theories of learning which show that active construction of knowledge, problem-based learning, the use of higher-order thinking skills and cooperative learning lead to deeper levels of understanding, produce better learning outcomes, promote student engagement and

keep them more focused on the task at hand (Džinkić and Milutinović 143; Loyens and Gijbels 352; Šimić Šašić 237).

Among other conclusions that Schenck (184) reaches, there is one relevant to our research parameters: explicit grammar instruction may be more effective with students at a lower level of language proficiency, whereas at higher levels, learners seem to acquire grammatical structures more efficiently when asked to use self-discovery. Since the vast majority of students in our study opted for target structures typically taught at higher levels of language proficiency, it was expected of the research participants to have considered exposing their students to more inductive and covert ways of teaching grammar. Furthermore, as most of them claimed to have experienced the traditional, transmission-based, teacher-fronted language teaching as learners at school (see Nešić and Hamidović 201), micro-teaching was seen as an opportunity for them to step out of their comfort zone and experiment with the more progressive teaching methods.

Finally, while there is research to be found exploring self- and/or peer evaluation in teacher education (Bedir; Ozogul; Zaier), we were unable to locate any studies connected to this type of practice in the context of pre-service teachers micro-teaching grammar.

### **Research methodology**

This study was conducted during the autumn term of 2020/21 school year with fourth year students of English language, literature and culture at the Faculty of Philology, Belgrade University. The final sample size used in the analysis comprises of 36 students<sup>1</sup>, all in their early twenties, and two full-time university teachers at the abovementioned institution, one of whom was teaching the ELT Methodology 2 course the participants were attending at the time (i.e. they knew and had been previously taught by the teacher) and the other one was unknown to them, and vice-versa. The students had been asked to prepare and teach a grammar point of their choice to their peers who were pretending to be language learners, all within a five-minute time frame. The student participants took turns at being teachers within their group of 8 to 10 fellow students, while teacher trainers observed them and after each micro-teaching session everyone was asked to fill in a survey evaluating the grammar presentation they were a part of. Each time three types of evaluation (self-evaluation, anonymous peer evaluation and

---

<sup>1</sup> The number was reached after excluding the sessions in which student teachers were evaluated only by one teacher trainer, as a result of the other university teacher testing positive for COVID-19.

independent teacher trainer evaluation) were conducted using private mobile phones to complete the same online questionnaire designed in Google Forms (see Appendix).

The data were collected and analysed using the following tools:

- The data preparation (data cleaning and validation) was done in the open-source application OpenRefine.
- Testing whether there are statistically significant differences in the scores between the matched pairs of treatment participants (Friedman Test) and a non-parametric correlation analysis were done in IBM SPSS Statistics 22.
- A thematic analysis of the participants' responses to an open-ended question was done in the qualitative data analysis software – Nvivo 12. After initial coding, a number of themes were identified (e.g. motivating and encouraging students) and grouped into broader categories (e.g. teacher personality, content delivery/teaching methodology).

### Research results and discussion

#### The importance of different aspects of grammar (micro-)teaching

In order to determine the strength of correlations between general assessments of student teachers' micro-teaching (see Q3 in the Appendix) and evaluations of their individual aspects (teacher personality, body language, student involvement, grammar rule elicitation, teaching materials and activities; see Q4–Q13 in the Appendix), a Spearman's rank-order correlation was run.

Table 1. The output of non-parametric correlation analysis

		Q3. Overall grade	Q4. Positive teacher character.	Q7. Body language	Q8. Involving students	Q9. Eliciting grammar rules	Q1. Materials	Q13. Activities
Spearman's rho	Q3.Overall Grade	Correlation Coeff. = .7000	.840**	.734**	.676**	.605**	.687**	.703**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
		N	397	397	397	397	267	357
			97	7	7	7	2	7
Q4. Positive teacher	Correlation Coeff.	.840**	1.000	.830**	.677**	.602**	.650**	.672**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	397	397	397	397	397	267	357

characteristics	N	397	397	397	397	267	357
-----------------	---	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As a result, a strong positive correlation was found between the general evaluation of the grammar presentations (Q3 overall grade, see Table 1) and the degree of perception of positive teacher characteristics ( $r_s(395) = .840, p = .000$ ), as well as between the degree of perception of positive teacher characteristics (Q4) and the degree to which their adequate physical presence in the role of the teacher (Q7) was observed ( $r_s(395) = .830, p = .000$ ). In other words, the grammar presentations of student teachers who were perceived as exhibiting positive teacher personality traits during their micro-teaching (e.g. enthusiastic, confident, kind, patient) were commonly highly evaluated, while the positive perception of teacher personality was also typically coupled with the perceived appropriate use of body language, facial expressions and voice in the classroom (Q7), which attests to their powerful influence in ELT (Hismanoglu and Hismanoglu; Liu; Salah; a strong positive correlation with the overall grade ( $r_s(395) = .734, p = .000$ ).

As for the link between the general assessment of grammar presentations (Q3) and the perception of the level of student involvement (i.e. interactive teaching; Q8), a moderate positive correlation was observed ( $r_s(395) = .676, p = .000$ ). This means that, generally speaking, the more students were included in the presentation of target structures, the higher evaluation it received. A somewhat weaker association, however, may be explained by the fact that the focus was on the quantity and not necessarily the quality of student–student teacher interaction (see Q8 in the Appendix), so that despite the perceived high degree of interactivity in the classroom, some important aspects of pedagogical communication may have been missing, such as understanding, openness, active listening, the presence of emotions and empathy (Zukorlić and Osmanlić 173). Namely, student teachers had been previously instructed about the benefits of constructivist teaching (see Džinkić and Milutinović 143; Loyens and Gijbels 352; Tomčić and Andevski 54; Šimić Šašić 237), which entails interactive communication with and between students and it was observed that, although many strived for increased student engagement in their micro-teaching, in some cases the interaction was somewhat strained, with student teachers posing questions mechanically without much emotion and warmth and without showing genuine interest in or properly acknowledging and reacting to students' answers. This may partly be explained by the somewhat artificial set-up of the micro-teaching

assignment in which all the participants are pretending to be either a teacher or students (see Bell 24; Bodrič 931; Shi 169). Therefore, a moderate positive correlation between the perception of positive teacher characteristics (Q4) and the degree to which students were perceived to be included in the presentation of grammar (Q8) ( $r_s(395) = .677, p = .000$ ) may be seen as a confirmation of such an observation.

When it comes to the teaching method employed, a moderate positive correlation was also observed between the overall assessment of the grammar presentation (Q3) and the perceived level of eliciting grammar rules from the students (Q9) ( $r_s(395) = .605, p = .000$ ), which points to a generally positive evaluation of the inductive approach in grammar instruction. However, the fact that the association between the overall grade and the perceived degree to which student teachers elicited target structures was the weakest of all the investigated aspects of micro-teaching, may be accounted for by some students' preference for the deductive grammar teaching, often based on their positive learner experience or in line with their personal learning style (see Nešić and Hamidović 201), or some instances of poorly applied guided discovery techniques, in which students had been trained, such as posing inadequate 'lead-in' questions, no concept checking, providing insufficient information or inappropriate examples for student analysis.

Finally, a moderate to strong positive correlation was found between the general evaluation of micro-teaching and the perceived level of adequacy of the teaching materials used ( $r_s(260) = .687, p = .000$ ) and the activities employed ( $r_s(355) = .703, p = .000$ ), which suggests that appropriate, well-chosen and carefully thought-through materials and activities are highly significant in the teaching and learning of a foreign language. Nevertheless, the results also point to a complex interplay between these and other factors involved in teaching (e.g. content delivery, teacher personality, teacher–student rapport), while a closer inspection of the results reveals cases of successful grammar presentations in which no materials or activities were used, and vice versa. Edge and Garton (55), therefore, rightfully notice that "as long as a teacher is using a certain set of materials, even if their appropriateness seems questionable, it is important to use them with enthusiasm."

### **Peer, self- and teacher trainer evaluation**

Another aim of the research was to determine whether the perceptions of micro-teaching sessions differ through a comparison of student teachers' self-assessment, anonymous peer evaluation by their fellow students acting as English language learners and independent

evaluations by two university ELT methodology teachers (teacher trainers), one of whom (teacher trainer 2) has never taught them.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

	N	Percentiles		
		25 <sup>th</sup>	50 <sup>th</sup> (Median)	75 <sup>th</sup>
Teacher_trainer1	36	6.00	7.00	8.00
Teacher_trainer2	36	4.25	7.00	8.00
Teacher	36	6.00	7.00	8.00
Student	36	8.00	8.00	9.00

Given the fact that all the participating students were evaluated as student teachers on one occasion, while in other cases they were students evaluating their peers, it was decided to use a Friedman Test, which is usually run to determine if three or more measurements from the same group of subjects are significantly different from one another on a chosen variable of interest.

Table 3. Friedman Test statistics

N	36
Chi-Square	36.399
Df	3
Asymp. Sig.	.000

Consequently, a statistically significant difference was found in an overall grade students gave to their peers acting as teachers in the course of their anonymous evaluation of micro-teaching in relation to those that student teachers gave to their own presentations (self-evaluation), as well as in relation to the grades student teachers were awarded by their university teachers,  $\chi^2(3) = 36.399$ ,  $p = 0.000$  (see Table 3). However, at this stage, we knew that there were differences somewhere between the related groups, but we did not know exactly where the differences had actually occurred, which is why separate Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were run on the different combinations of related groups (peer evaluation vs. self-evaluation; students' grades vs. teacher trainers' grades; self-evaluation vs. teacher trainers' grades). A post hoc analysis with a Wilcoxon signed-rank test was conducted with a Bonferroni correction applied, resulting in a significance level set at  $p < 0.0125$  (significance level of  $0.05/4$ ), which yielded the following results (see Table 4):

Table 4. Wilcoxon signed-rank test statistics

	S Teacher - Student	T_trainer1 - Student	T_trainer2 - Student	T_trainer1 - S Teacher	T_trainer2 - S Teacher	T_trainer2 - T_trainer1
Z	-4.514 <sup>b</sup>	-4.589 <sup>b</sup>	-4.306 <sup>b</sup>	-.555 <sup>b</sup>	-1.312 <sup>b</sup>	-1.329 <sup>b</sup>
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.579	.189	.184

a Based on positive ranks.

Median (IQR) overall grades provided by fellow students, student teachers, teacher trainer 1 and teacher trainer 2 were 8 (8 to 9), 7 (6 to 8), 7 (6 to 8), and 7 (4.25 to 8), respectively (see Table 2). There was a statistically significant difference between student teachers' and students' evaluations ( $Z = -4.514$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ; see Table 4), as well as between students' grades and those given by the two university teachers ( $Z = -4.589$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ;  $Z = -4.306$ ,  $p = 0.000$ ). In other words, students in the role of language learners made a more favourable judgement of grammar presentations than did the student teachers. This is in line with the authors' observation that students generally tend to be both self-critical and kind to their peers in the course of their micro-teaching sessions involving reflection. Namely, these are typically viewed as stressful, high-stakes events by students, the more so as they are formally assessed and involve university teacher and peer feedback, so that camaraderie and the sheer awareness of the difficulty of being publicly evaluated and subjected to critique (see Bell 38) often lead students to soften their comments, stress only the positive aspects of the observed grammar presentations and generally act in a more gentle and sympathetic manner towards their fellow students. Therefore, despite the anonymous nature of the micro-teaching peer evaluation in the course of this study, students' identities as friends and classmates may certainly have influenced their subjective assessment.

On the other hand, self-evaluation as the only element of the online survey in which the participants were identifiable, has provided a more rigorous and possibly a more realistic assessment of student teachers' performance. A more negative self-evaluation may be explained as a "protection against potential disappointment resulting from confrontation with more negative students' perceptions" (Wubbels and Breckelmans 20). In our research, teacher trainers' access to student teachers' self-reports and other-reports may have caused a similar reaction, although we certainly hope that student teachers were genuinely aware of both the strengths and weaknesses of their performance during simulated teaching, which has resulted in no

significant differences between their self-evaluation grades and the teacher trainers' grades for their grammar presentations ( $Z = -0.555$ ,  $p = 0.579$ ;  $Z = -1.312$ ,  $p = 0.189$ ).

Finally, it is also important to stress that no significant differences were observed between the independent evaluations of the two university teachers themselves ( $Z = -1.329$ ,  $p = 0.184$ ). This points to a shared system of teaching beliefs and a clear set of assessment standards applied, although it is interesting to note that the teacher trainer 1 who was familiar with the students was slightly more generous in her evaluations compared to the teacher trainer 2 as a possibly more objective observer and assessor (see Table 5).

Table 5. Ranks table

	Mean Rank
Teacher_trainer1	2.17
Teacher_trainer2	2.14
Teacher	2.17
Student	3.53

#### **Thematic analysis: Positive aspects of grammar presentations**

In the course of online evaluation of micro-teaching, respondents were asked to choose the key element that made a grammar presentation successful (see Q14 in the Appendix). In order to identify the underlying themes among their answers, the responses were grouped into different categories to describe the same concept, such as Teacher personality (blue boxes in Table 6), Content delivery/teaching methodology (beige boxes), Body language/use of voice (orange boxes) and Classroom management (green boxes). Given the complexity of instructional contexts (Turner and Meyer; Šimić Šašić) and especially the fact that it is almost impossible to separate what teacher is (i.e. teacher personality) from what they do in the classroom (e.g. content delivery, classroom management), the division was only tentative with some inevitable overlapping between the categories (see Šimić Šašić 234). The main focus and the result of the analysis, however, were the main themes extracted and presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Themes related to perceptions of key elements that made the presentations successful

Theme subgroups/categories	Students		Student teachers		Teacher trainers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Use of materials; visual aids (ppt); whiteboard	2 7	5 ,4	2	3 ,3	1 7	1 2,4
Interesting; engaging	5 6	1 1,2	5	8 ,3	4	2 ,9
Involving activities	1 1	2 ,2	6	1 0,0	1	0 ,7
Eliciting; discovery learning; personalisation; involving students	1 03	2 0,7	1 1	1 8,3	2 6	1 9,0
Level-appropriate	2	0 ,4	0	0 ,0	1	0 ,7
Well-organized	1 3	2 ,6	1	1 ,7	3	2 ,2
Motivating and encouraging students	3	0 ,6	1	1 ,7	9	6 ,6
Good classroom management	1	0 ,2	0	0 ,0	2	1 ,5
Checking comprehension	1	0 ,2	1	1 ,7	3	2 ,2
Enthusiastic; motivated	2 4	4 ,8	5	8 ,3	5	3 ,6
Body language	0	0 ,0	0	0 ,0	2	1 ,5
Relaxed; patient; kind; pleasant; nice; polite; smiling; helpful; funny	4 3	8 ,6	2	3 ,3	2 1	1 5,3
Confidence	1 9	3 ,8	0	0 ,0	0	0 ,0
Authority	5	1 ,0	0	0 ,0	4	2 ,9
Dynamic; efficient	2 8	5 ,6	1	1 ,7	3	2 ,2
Rapport; positive atmosphere	1 0	2 ,0	2	3 ,3	9	6 ,6
Interaction with students	2 7	5 ,4	6	1 0,0	1	0 ,7

Clear and concise; comprehensive	6 8	1 3,7	5	8 ,3	1 5	1 0,9
Appropriate voice	2	0 ,4	0	0 ,0	6	4 ,4
Appropriate pace; good time management	2	0 ,4	2	3 ,3	1	0 ,7
Creativity	4	0 ,8	0	0 ,0	0	0 ,0
Simplicity	4	0 ,8	2	3 ,3	0	0 ,0
None	4 5	9 ,0	8	1 3,3	4	2 ,9
Total	<b>4 98</b>	<b>1 00,0</b>	<b>6 0</b>	<b>1 00,0</b>	<b>1 37</b>	<b>1 00,0</b>

The one with the highest representation (20.7%, 18.3% and 19%) (students, student teachers and teacher trainers, respectively) is the interactive, student-centred grammar teaching, including the extracted subthemes such as elicitation, discovery learning, personalisation and student involvement, commonly associated with the constructivist approaches to learning. In other words, it appears that the micro-teaching sessions have provided the students acting both as language learners and teachers with a firsthand experience of the benefits of being actively engaged (or actively engaging students) in the process of knowledge construction, thus confirming the teacher trainers' impression based on more than a decade of classroom and micro-teaching observation and evaluation, that such grammar presentations are far more successful and better-received than those where students are only passive recipients of the content delivered (see Džinkić and Milutinović 143; Loyens and Gijbels 352; Šimić Šašić 237). Furthermore, although 'interaction with the students' as another important theme identified (see Table 6), may be related to a number of pedagogical functions including teaching, classroom management, establishing rapport and supporting learner autonomy (see Tomčić and Andevski 50), it may be argued that because of the brevity of simulated teaching it was predominately seen as pertaining to instruction itself (e.g. rule elicitation, comprehension checks), thus adding to the positive perception of interactive teaching.

The comments related to the student-teachers' positive personality characteristics were almost equally highly represented among the students' and teacher trainers' responses as the previous theme (18.2% and 21.8%, respectively), of which 'enthusiastic/motivated' and

'confident', typically associated with extraversion (see Goldberg; Saucier & Goldberg), were most commonly cited among students acting as learners (4.8% and 3.8%, respectively; see Kim et al., 2019). The university teachers focused more on the student teachers' agreeableness (kind, pleasant, nice, polite, smiling, helpful) and emotional stability (relaxed) or both (patient), citing them as the key positive components of their grammar presentations (15.3% compared to 8.6% in peer evaluation). The finding that teacher trainers attach more importance to teacher–student interpersonal relations (e.g. teacher agreeableness), while students value far more the element of fun in teaching (e.g. teacher extraversion) is further supported by the prevalence of the responses associated with 'motivating and encouraging the students' and 'rapport; positive atmosphere' among the two university teachers (6.6% for both themes compared to 0.6% and 2% in peer evaluation, respectively), while those in the 'interesting, engaging' theme subgroup account for 11.2% and 8.3% of the students' and student teachers' answers, respectively and only 2.9% of the teacher trainers' responses (see Table 6).

Another aspect of grammar presentations that all groups perceived as a major contributor to their effectiveness is that they are clear, concise and comprehensive (13.7%, 8.3% and 10.9% for students, student teachers and teacher trainers, respectively). On the other hand, the idiosyncrasy of student teachers' self-evaluations lies, understandably, in a far lower rate of responses signifying positive personality traits (11.6% compared to 18.2% for students and 21.8% for teacher trainers) and a much higher proportion of 'none' responses (13.3% compared to only 2.9% for teacher trainers). This suggests that they may have been either too self-critical or simply uneasy about praising their own personal characteristics (except for their enthusiasm and motivation; 8.3%), which is why they focused more on the quality of the interaction they established with their peers and of the activities used (10% each). Interestingly, the teacher trainers, on the other hand, only mentioned the activities once in total, whilst placing more stress on the materials student teachers used, some of which featured input flooding and input enhancement with a view to promoting student noticing (see Larsen-Freeman 257).

### **Conclusion**

Although the results of the first part of the study indicate that it is the positive teacher traits that are almost invariably associated with good grammar instruction, while the link with other investigated components of micro-teaching, despite the positive correlations

observed, is not as straightforward, it is important to acknowledge the limitation of the quantitative part of the study which focused on the quantity rather than the quality of student teacher–student interaction and grammar rule elicitation, which might have weakened the association with the general appraisal of micro-teaching. The qualitative data was therefore needed to further clarify the importance attached to different aspects of grammar instruction from the perspectives of students, student teachers and teacher trainers as a function of their perception of grammar presentation quality, so that the thematic analysis of their responses to what makes grammar presentation effective revealed that both teacher personality and the constructivist grammar teaching techniques (elicitation, active student engagement, guided discovery) were the most and, more or less, equally valued by both the students and teacher trainers, thus supporting the view that teachers are not only born but made as well.

Although well aware that the results cannot be generalised to real classroom settings, the importance of the research and its findings lies in the evidence found for the positive effects of the student-centred, interactive approach to grammar teaching and the opportunity the students were given to feel them directly by being put in the shoes of language learners. On a more personal level, the study has also confirmed the authors' observations about the nature of successful grammar presentation and the reliability of the micro-teaching assessment practices (no significant differences between the teacher trainers' independent evaluations, as well as between our appraisal and the student teachers' self-evaluation) and provided us with an insight into both the similarities (e.g. presentation clarity, conciseness and comprehensiveness) and the differences between the students' and our perceptions of what makes for an effective grammar presentation (teacher extroversion vs. agreeableness and emotional stability; interesting presentations vs. student teacher–student interpersonal relations, respectively). In future work, investigating the extent to which micro-teaching evaluations are predictive of student teachers' effective grammar instruction in real classrooms might prove important.

**Works cited:**

- Bailey, Kathleen M., et al. "The Language Learner's Autobiography: Examining the 'Apprenticeship of Observation'." *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching*. Ed. Donald A. Freeman and Jack C. Richards. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996. 11–29. Print.

- Bedir, Hasan. "Developing a Framework for the Integration of 21st Century Learning and Innovation Skills into Pre-Service ELT Teachers' Practicum." *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching (IOJET)* 6.4 (2019): 828-43. <http://iojet.org/index.php/IOJET/article/view/722>
- Bell, Nancy D. "Microteaching: What Is It That Is Going on Here?" *Linguistics and Education* 18 (2007): 24-40. DOI: 10.1016/J.LINGED.2007.04.002
- Bodrič, Radmila. „Efikasnost mikronastave u razvijanju praktičnih aspekata nastavničke kompetencije studenata anglistike.“ *Philologia Mediana* 8 (2021): 927-48. <https://doi.org/10.46630/phm.13.2021.56>
- Borko, Hilda, Dan Liston, and Jennifer A. Whitcomb. "Apples and Fishes: The Debate over Dispositions in Teacher Education." *Journal of Teacher Education* 58.5 (2007): 359-64. DOI: 10.1177/0022487107309977
- Campbell, R., et al. "Differential Teacher Effectiveness: Towards a Model for Research and Teacher Appraisal." *Oxford Review of Education* 29.3 (2003): 347-62. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3595446>
- Corcoran, Roisin P., and Joanne O'Flaherty. "Factors that Predict Pre-Service Teachers' Teaching Performance." *Journal of Education for Teaching* 44.2 (2018): 175-93. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1172364>
- Decker, Lauren E., and Sara E. Rimm-Kaufman. "Personality Characteristics and Teacher Beliefs among Pre-Service Teachers." *Teacher Education Quarterly* 35.2 (2008): 45-64. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ817310.pdf>
- Deneme, Selma. "Teacher Trainees' Opinions Regarding Video-Recorded Microteaching Sessions." *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology* 19.2 (2020): 24-33. <http://www.tojet.net/volumes/v19i2.pdf>
- Đorđević, Ana (né Vlaisavljević). „Gramatika u nastavi L2 – teorijski pristupi i stavovi budućih nastavnika u Srbiji i Velikoj Britaniji.“ *Filološka istraživanja danas: jezik i obrazovanje*. Ed. Julijana Vučo i Olivera Durbaba. Beograd: Filološki fakultet, 2013. 315-36. Print.
- Dwight, Allen, and Arthur Eve. "Microteaching." *Theory into Practice* 7.5 (1968): 181-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405846809542153>
- Džinkić, Olja i Jovana Milutinović. „Ideje konstruktivizma u savremenoj školskoj praksi.“ *Zbornik Odseka za pedagogiju* 27 (2018): 129-49. <https://zop.ff.uns.ac.rs/index.php/zop/article/view/27>
- Edge, Julian, and Garton Sue. *From Experience to Knowledge in ELT*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Print.
- Ellis, Rod. "Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective." *TESOL Quarterly* 28.2 (2006): 83-107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
- Fernández, Maria Lorelei. "Investigating How and What Prospective Teachers Learn through Microteaching Lesson Study." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26 (2010): 351-62. Print.
- Fortune, Jimmie C., James M. Cooper, and Allen W. Dwight. "The Stanford Summer Micro-Teaching Clinic." *Journal of Teacher Education*. 18.4 (1965): 389-93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002248716701800402>
- Genc, Lajoš, Jasmina Pekić i Ana Genc. „Struktura ličnosti dobrog nastavnika iz perspective studenata prema modelu Velikih pet.“ *Psihologija* 47.1 (2014): 49-63. DOI: 10.2298/PSI1401049G

- Goe, Laura, Courtney Bell, and Olivia Little. *Approaches to Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness: A Research Synthesis*. Washington DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2008. <https://gtlcenter.org/sites/default/files/docs/EvaluatingTeachEffectiveness.pdf>
- Goldberg, Lewis R. "An Alternative 'Description of Personality': The Big-Five Factor Structure." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 59.6 (1990): 1216-229. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216>
- Göncz, Lajos. "Teacher Personality: A Review of Psychological Research and Guidelines for a More Comprehensive Theory in Educational Psychology". *Open Review of Educational Research* 4.1 (2017): 75-95. DOI: 10.1080/23265507.2017.1339572
- Hismanoglu, Murat and Sibel Hismanoglu. (2008). "The Use of Body Language in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching." *Journal of Social Sciences* 19 (2008): 165-78. <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/151879>
- John, Oliver P., Laura P. Naumann, and Christopher J. Soto. "Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Conceptual Issues." *Handbook of Personality*. Ed. Oliver P. John, Richard W. Robins, and Lawrence A. Pervin. New York: Guilford Press, 2008. 114-58. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/289963274>
- Kell, Harrison J. "Do Teachers' Personality Traits Predict Their Performance? A Comprehensive Review of the Empirical Literature from 1990 to 2018." *Educational Testing Service Research Report Series, no. RR – 19-04*. Princeton, NJ: ETS, 2019. DOI:10.1002/ets2.12241
- Kim, Lisa, Ilan Dar-Nimrod, and Carolyn MacCann. "Teacher Personality and Teacher Effectiveness in Secondary School: Personality Predicts Teacher Support and Student Self-Efficacy but Not Academic Achievement." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 110.3 (2018): 309-23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000217>
- Kim, Lisa, Jörg Verena, and Robert M. Klassen. "A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Teacher Personality on Teacher Effectiveness and Burnout." *Educational Psychology Review* 31 (2019): 163–95. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-018-9458-2>
- Kneipp, Lee B., et al. "The Impact of Instructor's Personality Characteristics on Quality of Instruction." *College Student Journal* 44.4 (2010): 901-905. <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA248733623&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=01463934&p=AONE&sw=w&userGroupName=anon%7E6640a6c3>
- Korthagen, Fred A. J. "In Search of the Essence of a Good Teacher: Towards a More Holistic Approach in Teacher Education." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 20 (2004): 77–97. DOI:10.1016/j.tate.2003.10.002
- Larsen-Freeman, D. "Teaching Grammar." *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Ed. Marianne Celce-Murcia. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle, 2001. 251-66. Print.

- Liu, Mingxia. "The Research on Body Language's Role in English Teaching." *International Journal of English, Literature and Social Science (IJEL S)* 4.4 (2019): 962-66. <https://dx.doi.org/10.22161/ijels.443>
- Loyens, Sofie M. M., and David Gijbels. "Understanding the Effects of Constructivist Learning Environments: Introducing a Multi-Directional Approach." *Instructional Science* 36.5-6 (2008): 351-57. DOI 10.1007/s11251-008-9059-4
- Mart, Çağrı Tuğrul. "Teaching Grammar in Context: Why and How?" *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 3.1 (2013): 124-29. <https://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol03/01/18.pdf>
- Metcalf, Kim K., M. A. Ronen Hammer, and Pamela A. Kahlich. "Alternatives to Field-Based Experiences: The Comparative Effects of On-Campus Laboratories." *Teaching & Teacher Education* 12.3 (1996): 271-83. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X\(95\)00037-K](https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(95)00037-K)
- Nešić, Ivana, and Kimeta Hrnjak Hamidović. "Teaching English Grammar: Efficiency of Inductive and Deductive Approaches – Students' Perceptions." *Zbornik radova Filozofskog fakulteta u Prištini* 45.3 (2015): 189-205. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293481795\\_Teaching\\_English\\_grammar\\_Efficiency\\_of\\_inductive\\_and\\_deductive\\_approaches\\_students'\\_perceptions](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293481795_Teaching_English_grammar_Efficiency_of_inductive_and_deductive_approaches_students'_perceptions)
- Önal, Ahmet. "An Exploratory Study on Pre-Service Teachers' Reflective Reports of Their Videorecorded Microteaching." *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies* 15.3 (2019): 806-30. <https://www.jlls.org/index.php/jlls/article/view/1248>
- Ozogul, Gamze, et al. "Teacher, Self and Peer Evaluation of Lesson Plans Written by Preservice Teachers". *Educational Technology Research and Development* 56.2 (2008): 181-201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-006-9012-7>
- Ripski, Michael B., Jennifer LoCasale-Crouch, and Lauren Decker. "Pre-Service Teachers: Dispositional Traits, Emotional States, and Quality of Teacher-Student Interactions." *Teacher Education Quarterly* 38.2 (2011): 77-96. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ926861.pdf>
- Rockoff, Jonah E., et al. "Can You Recognize an Effective Teacher when You Recruit One?" *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series, Working Paper* 14485. Cambridge, MA: NBER, 2011. <http://www.nber.org/papers/w14485>
- Rushton, Stephen, Jackson Morgan, and Michael Richard. "Teacher's Myers-Briggs Personality Profiles: Identifying Effective Teacher Personality Traits." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 23 (2007): 432-41. DOI: 10.1016/j.tate.2006.12.011
- Salah, Ali Mohammad. "The Use of Non-verbal Communication in the Classroom." *1st International Conference on Foreign Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics, Sarajevo.* (2011): 1096-99. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/153447323.pdf>

- Saucier, Gerard, and Lewis R. Goldberg. "Evidence for the Big Five in Analyses of Familiar English Personality Adjectives" *European Journal of Personality* 10 (1996): 61-77. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.59.6.1216>
- Schenck, Andrew. "Learning to Improve Grammar Instruction through Comprehensive Analysis of Past Research." *IRAL* 55.2 (2017): 165-95. [https://www.academia.edu/33434750/Learning\\_to\\_improve\\_grammar\\_instruction\\_through\\_comprehensive\\_analysis\\_of\\_past\\_research](https://www.academia.edu/33434750/Learning_to_improve_grammar_instruction_through_comprehensive_analysis_of_past_research)
- Shi, Jing. "A Critical Analysis of the Assessment for Micro-teaching Program for English Language Teachers in the Secondary Education in Mainland China." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies* 10.2 (2020): 168-75. DOI: 10.17507/tpls.1002.04
- Šimić Šašić, Slavica. „Interakcija nastavnik-učenik: Teorije i mjerenje." *Psihološki teme* 20.2 (2011): 233-260. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267826737\\_Interakcija\\_nastavnik-ucenik\\_Teorije\\_i\\_mjerenje](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/267826737_Interakcija_nastavnik-ucenik_Teorije_i_mjerenje)
- Suplicz, Sandor. "What Makes a Teacher Bad? – Trait and Learnt Factors of Teachers' Competencies." *Acta Polytechnica Hungarica* 6.3 (2009): 125-138. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/45087255>
- Teven, Jason. "Teacher Caring and Classroom Behavior: Relationships with Student Affect and Perceptions of Teacher Competence and Trustworthiness." *Communication Quarterly* 55.4 (2007): 433-50. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463370701658077>
- Thornton, Bill, Gary Peltier, and Gus Hill. "Do Future Teachers Choose Wisely: A Study of Pre-Service Teachers' Personality Preference Profiles." *College Student Journal* 39.3 (2005): 489-496. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ725584>
- Tomčić, Lana i Milica Andevski. „Interakcijsko-komunikacijski proces u nastavi i školsko postignuće učenika." *Zbornik Odseka za pedagogiju* 29 (2020): 49-70. <https://zop.ff.uns.ac.rs/index.php/zop/article/view/41>
- Tomović, Nenad. *Applied Linguistics and English Language Teaching*. Beograd: FOKUS – Forum za interkulturalnu komunikaciju, 2019. Print.
- Toropova, Anna, Stefan Johansson, and Eva Myrberg "The Role of Teacher Characteristics for Student Achievement in Mathematics and Student Perceptions of Instructional Quality." *Education Inquiry* (2019): 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20004508.2019.1591844>
- Turner, Julianne, and Debra K. Meyer. "Studying and Understanding the Instructional Contexts of Classrooms: Using our Past to Forge our Future." *Educational Psychologist* 35.2 (2000): 69–85. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/233080827>
- Vitaz, Milica (né Prvulović). "The Magic of Being a Good Teacher." *Магиз ИИНО: новое в исследовании языка и методике его преподавания* 2.5-8 (2015): 202-8. Print.
- Wubbels, Theo, and Mieke Breckelmans. "Two Decades of Research on Teacher–Student Relationships in Class." *International Journal of Educational Research* 43 (2005): 6–24. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2006.03.003
- Zaier, Amani, et al. "The Use of Video Annotation Tools and Informal Online Discussions to Explore Preservice Teachers' Self- and Peer-Evaluation of

Academic Feedback." *Journal of Education* 201.1 (2021): 19-27.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057420903269>

Zukorlić, Mirsada S. i Iljaz A. Osmanlić. „Nivoi interaktivne povezanosti učenika I nastavnika u nastavi." *Inovacije u nastavi* 30.2 (2017): 172-81. DOI: 10.5937/inovacije1702172Z

### ŠTA PREZENTACIJU GRAMATIKE ČINI USPEŠNOM?: SAMOEVALUACIJA, VRŠNJAČKA I EVALUACIJA MIKRONASTAVE OD STRANE UNIVERZITETSKIH NASTAVNIKA

Kako bismo se približili odgovoru na pitanje da li se nastavnici rađaju ili stvaraju, analizirali smo odnos između opštih ocena mikronastave gramatičkih jedinica na univerzitetskom nivou i procene individualnih aspekata pomenutih simulacija, kao što su ličnost nastavnika, njihova neverbalna komunikacija, nastavna metoda (transmisioni ili interaktivni model nastave, induktivna ili deduktivna metoda) i korišćenje odgovarajućih nastavnih materijala i aktivnosti. U istraživanju je učestvovalo 36 studenata engleskog jezika, književnosti i kulture na završnoj godini studija. Posle svake petominutne prezentacije gramatičke jedinice identičan elektronski upitnik popunjavali su studenti-nastavnici (samoevaluacija), studenti-učenici (anonimna vršnjačka evaluacija) i dva univerzitetska nastavnika metodike nastave engleskog jezika (ukupno 397 popunjenih upitnika). Na taj način omogućeno je ispitivanje razlika u percepciji uspešnosti mikronastave zavisno od evaluatora (kolega, samih studenata-nastavnika ili univerzitetskih nastavnika). Urađena je tematska analiza odgovora učesnika istraživanja na pitanje otvorenog tipa o ključnom elementu koji je predstavljanje gramatičke jedinice učinio uspešnim. Korelacijska analiza je pokazala da je najjača veza između opšte ocene prezentacije i stepena percepcije pozitivnih karakteristika ličnosti studenta-nastavnika, dok je kvalitativna analiza podataka otkrila da su ličnost studenta-nastavnika i primenjena nastavna metoda koja je u skladu sa teorijom konstruktivizma u učenju (interaktivna, na učenika usmerena nastava, upotreba induktivne metode) skoro u istoj meri navođene kao glavni faktori u pozitivnom doživljaju prezentovane gramatičke jedinice. Razlike u percepcijama mikronastave od strane tri grupe ocenjivača su takođe identifikovane i analizirane kako u kvantitativnom tako i u kvalitativnom delu istraživanja.

**Ključne reči:** nastava gramatike, mikronastava, uspešnost nastavnika, ličnost nastavnika, nastavna metoda, vršnjačka evaluacija, samoevaluacija

**APPENDIX**

Micro-teaching survey

\* Required

1. The name of the student teacher observed \*

---

2. What was your role in the grammar presentation? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

- A student  
 A teacher  
 Teacher trainer 1  
 Teacher trainer 2

3. To what extent was the grammar presentation successful? (an overall grade) \*

*Mark only one oval.*

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

4. To what extent did the student teacher demonstrate positive teacher characteristics (e.g. enthusiastic, dynamic, authoritative, confident, kind, patient, efficient)? \*

*Mark only one oval.*

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

5. Write down one or two most prominent positive characteristics of the student teacher (either from the list above or other).\*
- from the list above or other).

---