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Abstract: This study aims at promoting undergraduate student teachers’ teaching practicum that highlights the pedagogical and teaching performance within the designated speaking class. Four senior student teachers participated in five weeks’ teaching practicum through the purposive sampling selection. The method of this study used observation, questionnaire, and teaching practicum documents to facilitate the qualitative analysis in relevance with student teachers’ teaching files, running-methods course, and classroom observations. The core practices of probing pedagogical activities engaged student teachers in intrinsic discussions explicitly and implicitly. The substantial pedagogical matters and their sub-matters were experimentally derived from the relevant practicality into the common sense of instruction criteria on planning, implementation, and reflection stages. The discussion substance highlighted daily speaking performance in vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and content among freshmen and sophomores. This study recommends student teachers improve their theoretical and practical teaching methods by accommodating enumeration and sense-making classroom discussion.
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INTRODUCTION
During the epochal years of the Covid-19 pandemic spreads, the teaching and learning programs conditionally change from face-to-face learning to multiple online learning platforms. The instructions ascertain student teachers to adapt their new learning and teaching platforms which have never considered before. Recently, teachers’ agency notions are accustomed to portraying their participative attempts in teaching professional creation since English teachers are responsible for their multifaceted jobs sequentially (Ekşi et al., 2019) and equipped with the fundamental knowledge, skills, and behaviors for their profession (Aydin & Ok, 2019). As a matter of teachers’ professionalism, teaching practicum stands for the key determinant of student teachers’ education as supported by the fundamental theory, methodology, and best practice to serve student teachers with genuine and practical proficiency for teaching practices, applying curriculum contents and knowledge development (Kim, 2020), besides minimizing the abrupted closure from curriculum and teaching practicum methodology, and creating assessment steps for student teachers (Moyo, 2020).

Teaching practicum becomes an important attribution in the teacher training curriculum, although its implementation flexibility shows alteration. Some flexibilities and various feedback and evaluation durations empirically lead to changeability (Krammer et al., 2019) in years. The educational reform holds teachers to be more accountable for students’ learning cognitively and affectively (Radwan & Ghavifekr, 2021; Sumekto et al., 2021) since schools’ education system involves students, teachers, and learning circumstances’ interplay (Yungwei, 2016). Teaching practicum becomes one of practically core courses in the faculty of teaching training and education in Indonesian universities. Student teachers’ teaching agenda at the Institute of Teachers’ Education, so-called by Lembaga Pendidikan dan Tenaga Kependidikan (LPTK) in Indonesia, is designed to be a well-structured program to establish teachers’ professional and pedagogical opportunities within the relevant subject matters and its applicability in the real teaching professionalism at schools. The practicum intercalates with scheduled and congested weeks of teaching practicum at schools, where student teachers apply theories to practices with at least one experienced teacher’s supervision (Maaranen & Stenberg, 2017). This deals with the instruction-integrated learning that emphasizes a period of teaching services relevant...
in-service training agenda. They will be engaged in-class activities, starting from applying and integrating practical methodology and theoretical knowledge to working with the class registers, students’ books, and worksheets reviews, attending teachers’ meetings, and assisting with extra-mural activities (Sormunen, Juuti, & Lavonen, 2020), that become the key factors on student learning successes. Student teachers are highly motivated to fulfill affordable teaching practices for students’ best learning experience (Aglazor, 2017), where their teaching qualifications undertake both academic contribution and school-based experience practically (Maaranen & Stenberg, 2017).

Student teachers’ self-efficacy will support their capabilities of teaching practice, determining motivation, and achieving significant academic (de la Fuente et al., 2017) with written and oral feedback as part of an evaluation. Reviewing students’ progress and identifying shortcomings and suggestions for overcoming anxieties, and understanding non-verbal languages (Sumekto & Setyawati, 2020) will accordingly accentuate their teaching performance based on strategies and approaches. Student teachers’ attitudes and behaviors will also be supervised through the systematic guidelines (Sormunen et al., 2020), in terms of contextualizing classroom challenges in an intensive and fair climate to connect with all student teachers’ teaching necessities (Yu et al., 2018). For example, student teachers need to create a learning atmosphere that stimulates logical and critical thinking, question-asking, and efficient knowledge development through the learning processes and outputs, self-reflection, mutual communication, persuasion and decision-making, teamwork, and task distribution (Alles et al., 2019). Hence, their teaching professionalism theoretically and practically can be well-prepared (Tsibulsky & Muchnik-Rozanov, 2019).

Although student teachers’ obstacles also happen in day-to-day teaching practicum. In a few cases, student teachers are not confident with their teaching competence and have limited supervision from the assigned teachers during handling teaching practicum. Student teachers’ difficulties indicate slow learning participation, passive and non-cooperative, improper attitudes with various characteristics, less motivation, ineffective teaching guidance, irrational teaching hours, and over teaching materials designed and delivered (Barnes et al., 2018). They are used to being nervous and uncomfortable before teaching practicum since lacking self-confidence, showing difficult ways in engaging students with the existing school management (Lennon et al., 2018), and facing the absorbed students’ noise and silence for nothing (Wang et al., 2020). Although in the same condition, student teachers attempt at emphasizing the constructivist ideas from which students may create knowledge and learning experience (Jawarneh, 2017), following etiquette, honesty, peer-to-peer positive reinforcement, and guidance (Olivares & Castillo, 2018). This condition constructively aligns independent teaching practicum linking to the theories and practices, discussion with tensions, collaborations, and teaching reflections (Perry et al., 2020).

Some studies identified the significance of student teachers’ roles and experiences. Student teachers’ educational and scientific literacy had made significant changes and enhanced communication and interpersonal skills (Ahmad et al., 2019), they incorporated relationships into a constructive learning circumstance by inspiring students’ hearts and minds on the educational interactions and experiences (Pourhaji, 2020), as well as showing a positive attitude toward their reflective practices (Riyanti, 2020). Teaching practicum affected student-centered learning and improved the learning quality through the constructivist learning creation, which meant to be more flexible learning, engaged students in learning processes, and reinforced social interaction and collaboration (Anagün, 2018). This constructivist learning engaged students’ activity, dialogue, and joint-thinking about learning processes (Machumu et al., 2018). Next, the language tasks component stimulated student teachers and students’ intrinsic motivations, progressed communications, and strengthen students’ language skills (Babai et al., 2020). Student teachers’ strategies moved to their holistic and comprehensive outputs (Perry et al., 2020) relating to teaching practicum, which enlightened lesson plans, cognitive activation, and classroom management (Becker et al., 2019). Then, student teachers’ competencies refined their critical attempts to conceptualize the valuable instructional works (Reisman et al., 2019) with the relevant evaluation of constructive feedback, authenticity, role in students’ positions, discipline, and classroom management (Ekşi et al., 2019) towards available experience from micro-teaching sessions, and pedagogical method courses (Boz et al., 2019). They might predominantly manipulate reactive behavioral strategies, whereas they effectively engaged proactively cognitive and
behavioral strategies in harmonizing teaching practicum stimulation (Heikonen et al., 2017).

This study comprehends the existing problems and resumes the previous studies with two research questions (RQs) to highlight the promotion efforts on alternative English teaching practicum from student teachers’ experience, as follows: (1) How do student teachers derive their teaching practicum experience in both face-to-face and online teaching? (2) How do student teachers earn opportunities for their pedagogical skills and personal qualifications acquisition after completing the teaching practicum program?

METHOD
This study was designed with qualitative research and conducted for a five-week teaching practicum involving senior undergraduate level from the English education program at a private university, Klaten, Indonesia. Four participants (2 females and 2 males) were engaged in a teaching practicum program in the 2020 to 2021 academic year and they had no prior formal teaching experience so far. The teaching practicum involved relationships between knowledgeable subjects with pedagogical skills relevance, student teachers’ capacity and alliances with students, and student teachers’ tasks and responsibilities (Zhu, 2017; Agudo & Azzaro, 2018). This teaching practicum was undertaken at the English education program since student teachers did not have any permission to teach at the entire schools in the Klaten district due to the release of collective decisions from four Ministries of Republic of Indonesia regarding the guidance for managing the learning activities in the academic year of 2020-2021 in terms of the COVID-19.

The teaching practicum policy in the first semester of the 2020-2021 was undertaken for the internal purpose only without cooperating with the school partners since the number of COVID-19 strike was still high in Klaten District from the mid of 2020 to 2021. All lower and upper secondary schools’ policy decided to run the teaching and learning activities through online learning platforms, whilst scheduling student teachers’ online class with the lower and upper secondary students regularly were not possible. Hence, four participants were internally assigned to handle their teaching practicum activities with their freshmen and sophomores.

Under the teaching practicum syllabus, student teachers taught speaking classes within five parallel weeks. Two different classes freshmen and sophomores became their teaching sites. They prepared their lesson plans along with the teaching materials through the mixed-learning platforms–three meetings were practiced in face-to-face teaching, dated on 9, 16, and 18 October and other three online teachings with the Google meet platform, dated 19, 23, and 24 November 2021. Another additional meeting with the supervisor was scheduled to evaluate their teaching performance at the end. Teaching practicum was officially facilitated by teaching syllabus and participants’ lesson plans, teaching materials, and assessment tools, in which the teaching allotments were allocated sixty minutes for each session with the small classes, approximately twelve to seventeen freshmen and sophomores for each class. Face-to-face teaching practicum was approved with the health protocols due to the COVID-19 virus spreading in the town.

Data collection constituted observation, questionnaire, and teaching practicum documents, such as lesson plans, practicum reports and evaluation forms, and reflective journals that were integrally attached to the teaching practicum. Data analysis qualitatively used student teachers’ teaching artifacts, running-methods course questionnaires, and observations. These frameworks analyzed student teachers’ uptake in practices and classroom discussions with the freshmen and sophomores.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
When Covid-19 pandemic spreads over the world in March 2020, universities decided to pause their face-to-face learning system, then moved to online learning platforms for the rest of two years in 2022. Taking out the policy from my university, the classes had been designed with mixed-learning systems: face-to-face and online learning. Face-to-face learning classes were conducted with a very selected and careful learning interaction and followed a standard health protocol. Only small classes with less than fifth-teen students in a classroom were allowed to sit in. The policy had also commenced to senior student teachers who planned to attend the teaching practicum program. As assigned to be a teaching practicum supervisor, I spent more extra time arranging this duty with some necessities including coaching with four student teachers under my supervision, preparing online video communication technology, such as Google Classroom, Google meet, Zoom, and setting a safe classroom for face-to-face learning accommodation.
The asynchronous class was designed for creating discussions that encouraged students’ reflections on a daily topic, by responding to others’ works. Herein, the topics might be driven whilst interacting with the others applying both face-to-face and online learning. Coaching student teachers for either face-to-face or online teaching practicum needed time allotment and energy till all student teachers connected with the offline learning tools, such as lesson plans, teaching materials, LCD and laptop, and teaching journal. Meanwhile, the online learning schedule needed some audiovisual, video, and internet connection accordingly. Both face-to-face and online classes started with the reminder to all freshmen and sophomores about standard health protocols regarding the Covid-19 spreads during the classes, the introduction to the teaching syllabus, learning media, and online learning devices. Four student teachers had an opportunity to facilitate their teaching practicum with multiple functions of the devices, such as operating LCD with the laptop, distributing the PPT files, providing approval from Google meet and Zoom media, sharing screens from their laptops and materials link, and typing on a chat room. Either first face-to-face or online classes ran smoothly as expected, student teachers were successful to inform and engage students in their understanding, obedience, and frustration-away.

Student teachers’ face-to-face and online teaching practicum devices took a chance at learning reflection on what was effective and efficient, determined through the accessible evaluations. What student teachers decided on teaching methods seemed to be more hands-on towards students’ learning activities. These teaching methods gave experience in students’ participation, enumeration sessions, and classroom discussions. Students’ attractiveness and collaboration were shown in these learning activities, where they enthusiastically engaged in sessions both face-to-face and online learning (Figures 1 and 2). Further, these observable learning activities triggered students’ new learning adaptations, whilst their speaking skills seemed to impress accordingly.

![Figure 1. Small speaking classes engaging sophomores in vocabulary acquisition sessions](image)

Left-to-right sophomores’ small classroom discussions were handled by student teachers (Khuznul and Fauzi) in a face-to-face learning platform. This observable learning activities triggered their new learning adaptation during the Covid-19 pandemic as the alternative teaching practicum engagement. Taking pictures in the classroom were granted by both sophomores and participants.

As shown in Figure 2, student teachers handled an online group discussion regarding speaking class. The group presented about informing address to someone. The discussion used Google meet learning platform within sixty minutes, where students could get online with their portable computers and or smartphones around at any comfortable place, although sometimes the internet signals were not stable. The speaking activities relied on presenting a topic within twenty minutes, the assigned sophomores group presented in turn with other members. When the presentation ended, the session continued with questions and answers. Some questions were answerable and discussable well, whilst few attendees argued the presented slides of a street map, but the discussion still seemed to be conducive. For some moments in speaking class, some attendees kept silent without responding and participating during the session. The speaking class intentionally encouraged
students to be more active by sharing individual ideas about the school year’s agenda, strengthening ability to talk and argue, exploring and elaborating ideas with other classmates, and so forth.

Figure 2. Online freshmen’s speaking class

The figure above showed a student teacher, Azizah talked about ‘Informing Address to Someone’ who asked how to reach Oak Street. She conveyed her speaking class to the freshmen and assigned them in a coupled demonstration. Speaking’s Google meet-based session took more or less 60 minutes. Twelve freshmen joined this session and they had been grouped into six groups. Each group had an opportunity for four minutes to demonstrate their transactional communication. This session emphasized part of speeches and informative vocabulary that were directed to someone who needed information. Before ending this online mode, I collectively obtained an approval from the audience to take the screenshot.

This online group discussion (Figure 2) encouraged student teachers’ experience to comprehend the discussion enrollments—how to understand every student’s learning approach and participation that might be different from each other, including establishing the nature of students’ engagement existence, and learning interest both individuals and collaborations through online observation. A stable internet connection supported a better communication in online teaching practicum. Hence, in preparing classes with designed lesson plans, student teachers established all necessities well-accommodated. Student teachers’ lesson plans and supporting document were submitted by e-mail and got any feedback electronically either. Meanwhile, another student teacher’s teaching practicum supervision established the teaching materials and audio-visual devices worked satisfactorily by facing all freshmen and sophomores’ live camera and voice tools on the screen. The real-time meeting was set up by Google meet which facilitated camera and voice for all participants who were involved in this online learning platform. Freshmen and sophomores were in awaiting room until they had permission to join in speaking classes. Once the permission was ‘clicked’ into Google meets’ learning room, student teachers started greeting and welcoming freshmen and sophomores to the online session. Then, student teachers asked them to mute the voices system since the learning session was about to begin. However, the chatroom function was still available to discuss with other classmates.

At the end of the speaking-teaching practicum, student teachers asked the participants for the preferable allotments of their speaking topics and learning approaches. Student teachers’ procedure questions unofficially set up freshmen and sophomores’ learning entry behavior whether they remembered and understood the lesson or vice-versa. Particularly, every online speaking’ class was automatically video-recorded and used for student teachers’ teaching reflection. The applicable reflection conveyed teaching practicum in speaking topics and references, apperception, students’ motivation, both face-to-face and online classroom management including communication, and students’ lecturing difficulties. Teaching reflection also identified students’ learning behavior and facial expression through face-to-face and Google meet’s camera responses. So, teaching practicum’s benefits and limitations upon the direct and video reflections established students’ empirical learning performances dealing with the assessment for speaking classes.

| Table 1. PSETs’ practicum upon pedagogical activities and intrinsic discussions |
|-------------------------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| Teaching Practicum Experience | Azizah      | Fauzi          | Khusnul     | Tomi           |
| A. Pedagogical activities     |             |                |             |                |
| 1. Working collaboratively with students’ ideas to explore and elaborate speaking (E) | Observable | Not observable | Observable | Partly observable |
| 2. Bridging spoken and written communication in the class (E) | Observable | Observable    | Observable | Partly observaible |
| 3. Moving from the basic thoughts and practices into applied learning activities (E) | Observable | Not observable | Observable | Not observable |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4. Producing relationships and communications with and among students effectively (E)</th>
<th>Observable</th>
<th>Observable</th>
<th>Observable</th>
<th>Observable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|   | 5. Working with gestures and other non-verbal languages (E)                        | Not 
observable | Partly 
observable | Not 
observable | Not 
observable |
|   | 6. Using new knowledge and developing learning activities (E)                       | Observable | Not 
observable | Observable | Observable |
|   | 7. Bringing cooperative/ collaborative learning circumstances (E)                   | Observable | Observable | Observable | Observable |

**B. Intrinsic discussions**

|   | 1. Pre-selecting ideas into discussion (I)                                         | Observable | Observable | Observable | Observable |
|   | 2. Conveying simple and acceptable spoken expressions during discussions (E)         | Observable | Observable | Observable | Observable |
|   | 3. Accommodating discussion ethics whilst collaboratively working with others (I)   | Observable | Observable | Observable | Observable |
|   | 4. Delivering spoken expressions effectively [e.g.: exploring, elaborating, confirming, disagreeing with, and asking for clarification] (E) | Partly 
observable | Not 
observable | Observable | Partly 
observable |
|   | 5. Discussing the goals explicitly, which involves students’ participation (E)       | Observable | Observable | Observable | Observable |
|   | 6. Engaging students’ ideas and accessible activities in speaking classes (E)        | Observable | Observable | Observable | Observable |
|   | 7. Involve students collaboratively in problem-solving (I)                           | Observable | Observable | Observable | Observable |

**Note.** I = Implicit and E = Explicit were remarkably abbreviated for both pedagogical activities and intrinsic discussion.

All student teachers focused on addressing rational speaking courses which flexibly comprehended students’ oral skills. In practicing it, they viewed students’ academic identities at glance before continuing the sessions. Somehow, Azizah, Fauzi, Khusnul, and Tomi generally conducted the discussion on how students were necessary to participate in either individual or group talks. For example, they determined the use of language ethics for acceptable vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and content when students conveyed ideas in a discussion. They distinguished themselves from each other in emphasizing pedagogical activities and intrinsic discussions. All student teachers were identifiable from the selected instruments of both parts A and B, in which they were not observable, partially observable, and observable during the modeling debrief (Table 1).

Azizah, Fauzi, Khusnul, and Tomi provided a model and handled a discussion with the key facilitation on the process- and output-oriented. The discussion was dynamic involved burning substantiation from the selected speaking topic, re-expressing students’ ideas when sharing in the discussion, confirming students whether they still wanted to address more about the school year activities (Figure 2) or arguing with other classmates’ ideas, and finally exploring and elaborating students’ comments and opinions about school’s academic calendar annually. Student teachers helped freshmen and sophomores contextually through vocabulary enactment assistances and exampled students’ ideas and work accordingly. Students’ interactive collaborations provided a drift of fresh ideas with each student turning to talk and argue gently. By mixing the adaptable facilities in teaching practicum supports, student teachers transparently derived the capacity of delivering ideas in front of their students’ discussions progress, such as frequently drawing vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and content. Student teachers explicitly presented their ideas that represented the results of teaching practicum experience and intrinsic discussions. However, they differentiated on how to initiate discussion, engage students in active roles, explore the topic with contextual issues, elaborate ideas among others, stimulate problem-solving, and close the discussion (Table 1) through observations. They were considered to work with the intended construction of accessible speaking skills in vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and content for all freshmen and sophomores. The following explicative comments from student teachers when reflecting on their teaching practicum experience were due to:
“I have to understand more about the knowledge of learning materials and classroom management so that my classes are not boring and monotonous. I think it is very important. The teaching practicum program needed to make students (teacher candidates) know how to maintain or manage the class. But it is very unfortunate during this pandemic, teaching practicum programs do not deal directly with students at schools.” (Azizah)

Azizah’s role attempted in providing the importance of students’ initial ideas validation before preparing the discussion with students. She rigidly emphasized appropriate approaches from which students were willing to be responsible accordingly for the discussion enrolment relating to ideas sharing, questions and inquiries acknowledgment, and agreement and disagreement notifications. Preparing for this learning circumstance, Azizah realized to comprehend her knowledge of learning materials and classroom management in terms of boring and monotonous anticipation. Unfortunately, she failed to use new knowledge and develop learning activities in her teaching practicum experience (Table 1).

“It deals with good learning processes because I need to improve my teaching qualifications. Teaching practicum program is an important stage for prospective teachers who are currently still students. This program provides an opportunity for comprehending the real world of teacher training before they get into it.” (Fauzi)

Fauzi’s speaking classes explicitly addressed the instruction messages from the beginning, including the discussion sessions. He started his classes by displaying lesson plan slides through the LCD projector. Fauzi’s files also explained the group’s discussion session. When Fauzi demonstrated his teaching ability, some teaching practicum matters were still unobservable. Those matters complied with students’ collaborative works—exploring and elaborating speaking, stepping from fundamental thoughts and practices into applied learning activities, and using new knowledge and developed learning activities. Nevertheless, Fauzi was willing to facilitate students’ necessities with the intrinsic discussions to concentrate on their ideas, although she still needed to fix her well-organized discussion. Overall, Fauzi was aware of his good learning processes that improved his teaching qualifications.

“I have to improve my (low) voice, (poor) pronunciation, and articulation. In my opinion, the teaching practicum program is an essential way for us to practice teaching and managing the classroom well. It is also important to add teaching experience before my graduation.” (Khusnul)

Khusnul’s speaking classes explicitly addressed the instruction messages from the beginning, including the discussion sessions. She started her classes by displaying lesson plan slides through the LCD projector. Khusnul’s files also explained the group’s discussion session. She started with a clear greeting and apperception in handling her speaking classes. Students got her points and were ready to interact in speaking class. The session seemed to be conducive since everybody paid attention and replied to Khusnul’s apperception. However, when Khusnul demonstrated her teaching ability, she naturally left some matters in her teaching practicum. This relied on using new knowledge and developing learning activities in a teaching practicum experience, but Khusnul’s intrinsic discussions were well-observable (Table 1). Those matters contextually complied with students’ collaborative works—exploring and elaborating speaking, stepping from fundamental thoughts and practices into applied learning activities, and using new knowledge and developed learning activities. Nevertheless, Khusnul was willing to facilitate students’ necessities with the intrinsic discussions to concentrate on their ideas, although she still needed to fix her well-organized discussion. Overall, Khusnul was aware of her good teaching practicum which improved her teaching qualifications.

“I need to improve my speaking skills and manage the classroom during teaching practicum. By doing a teaching practicum I can get ideas of how to teach properly, besides improving my teaching technique. So, I can be more confident.” (Tomi)

Tomi’s classes attempted to understand freshmen’s language backgrounds. Tomi culturally modeled his speaking classes on how to keep in touch with his students by using multilingual–English, Indonesian, and Javanese. Tomi realized this model of teaching would bring students to enjoyable speaking activities and
stimulate their participation. For example, Tomi translated some vocabularies into equivalent meanings in three languages, such as drink (English) – minum (Indonesian) – ngombe (Javanese), step (English) – langkah (Indonesian), napak (Javanese), and go (English), pergi (Indonesian), lunga (Javanese), etc. Tomi also realized the use of these mixed vocabularies was to neutralize his nerves when he was mobile around his students. By doing this way, Tomi thought that he might take a bit chance to do self-reflection whilst teaching. Hence, he situationally improved his speaking fluency and managed students. On the other hand, Tomi was explicitly aware of identifying the pre-requisites for conducting discussion, including students’ ideas latent. He promoted teaching media for student’s speaking fluency, although conditionally ignoring grammar rules. Tomi consistently portrayed his enumeration when he confirmed, ‘Well class, we are focusing on using, exploring and elaborating individual ideas and capacity of performing speaking ability, but we can start from what we gain at the first time although with our limitations’. Further, what was observable from Tomi’s teaching practicum concerned with his moving from the basic thoughts and practices into applied learning activities and using new knowledge and developing learning activities in the teaching practicum experience (Table 1).

Figure 3. Student teachers’ schematic updates in speaking class enumeration and discussion
Dotted lines [ ] indicated minimal contribution to no participation. Double braces told proportion of mobility for configuration, discussion facilitation, defining ideas, and closing categories. Meanwhile, double bracket [ ] showed trends, but precise proportions.

This study discusses on the PSETS’ teaching practicum contributed a matter of developmental programs in English teacher education professionalism. They showed the tender steadfastness in teaching matters that built their prospective career through the teaching roles passion. Student teachers’ reflective teaching fundamentally constructed the teaching practicum issues which led to their experience, accommodated theories and practices, and addressed the real-life learning conditions (Ekşi et al., 2019). It postulated an improved comprehension from which student teachers became more thoughtful in teaching practicum and be more critical in learning and growing in a matter of English teaching practicum (Chen & Russell, 2019). The findings experientially constituted with the teaching practicum determinants, such as teaching readability and individual toughness among student teachers, teaching syllabus, lesson plans, designed freshmen and sophomores to be students, teaching materials and media, internet connections, and supervisors who consequently covered their roles of mentoring, guiding, and observing student teachers what to do for their teaching practicum necessities.

On the other hand, some obstacles relied on a lack of student teachers’ confidence when being mobile around the class and getting online with the camera at Google meet. Others connected with the belatedness of student teachers’ face-to-face and online class attendances which made students lack enthusiasm in joining the classes, student teachers’ unwell-prepared lesson plans, and time management which resulted in them being discouraged, inadequate, and less confidence in teaching. Student teachers also originally had an experience of instructional shock, which led them to pedagogical and psychological weaknesses. Conversely, the occurrences of limited internet connections and student teachers’ lack of necessary electronic devices were still dominating in online language learning. Nevertheless, their insufficient digital literacies, limitedly structured-contents against online resource redundancies, engagement and encouragement deficiencies, and cognitive and non-cognitive contributions were linked to pedagogical barriers (Feri et al., 2020).

What had happened in students’ multiple behaviors in both face-to-face and online classrooms remained to be student teachers’ responsibility (Gregory et al., 2018) since teacher education programs constituted the major determinant of student teachers’ development upon the effective teaching practices (Kloser et al., 2019).

Facing these facts, the teaching practicum agenda might negatively influence student teachers’ perception of the teaching profession in general. Deng et al. (2018) connected student teachers’ obstacles with the tension dilemma of classroom authority and sense of teaching care that fell into the ethical predicament category. This predicament happened when student teachers navigated their classes and anticipations into their competitiveness. On the other hand, student teachers personally befriended the freshmen and sophomores by providing a sense of empathy and care. However, in the meantime of the teaching practicum, student teachers needed to maximize opportunities for their self-confidence and self-efficacy to acquire necessary coping strategies (Yuan et al., 2019). Student teachers’ multiple perspectives influenced their cognitive, affective, cultural, and organizational matters in future and real classrooms (Kloser et al., 2019). These matters could be implementable through comprehending students’ diversity in the classroom, which potentially exposed the various learning condition since teaching practicum matched with students’ learning necessities when a sense of respectfulness, tolerance, awareness, and students–students or students–teachers communications were well-manageable (Sumekto et al., 2020).

Moreover, student teachers transformed contents-knowledge and highlighted more about the teaching context, lesson plan, teaching materials, and students within various criteria of teaching and learning processes. Hence, the practicum experience triggered student teachers remain to more confident (Arslan & Ilin, 2018). Besides being aware of the practical experience, student teachers were also concerned with the learning environment management that was related to the specific context, school structure, and community enlightenment system, as well as having relationships with students, teachers and supporting staff, and comprehending the contextual study within students’ preferences and necessities (Albakri et al., 2017). Supporting student teachers in the classroom with computer-added language learning (CALL) or simulation
became an efficient teaching decision to increase students’ learning capacity and significance. It experientially changed students’ cognitive and affective improvement toward the constructive processes (Wood et al., 2018). Therefore, setting up the applicable teaching models using the CALL might improve student teachers’ teaching practicum development, as long as the sustainable interactions established the theoretical and practical matters, intensive contacts, and collaborations that were effectively implementable (Kim, 2020). So far, online learning needed electronic digitalis to connected with the internet (Gonzalez & Louis, 2018), which widely accommodated student teachers’ online language learning inevitably (Plaisance, 2018). Online language learning reasonably appointed multiple learning alignments in fully virtual learning, hybrid or mixed-learning systems, and web-facilitated learning system. Hence, the EFL’s online language learning might take place within the COVID-19 pandemic proportionally since both students and student teachers did not meet each other in a face-to-face context (Wu et al., 2019).

Deeply involved in both face-to-face and online learning, student-teachers’ competencies would reflect their learning deviant behaviors, pedagogical content knowledge, and their capability of using assessment variances. Improving classroom practice competencies upon observations and reflection was strongly recommended during the teaching practicum to promote experiential learning (Thaba-Nkadimene, 2017). Teaching practicum effectiveness at the same time still managed student teachers’ additional focus on placement selection, time allotment, and evaluations (Pratiwi, 2020) of engaging cooperative, reflective, and critical functions in classes. Student teachers’ teaching flexibilities had better be promoted by acknowledging the various teaching methodologies. Their classroom management emphasis should attract students’ learning attention to gain knowledge proficiency consistently (Masoumpanah et al., 2016). To accommodate today’s teaching practicum, Gürsoy, Korkmaz, and Damar (2017) offered four tips to the implementable teaching issues, as follows: (1) re-designed teaching materials and pre-training were implementable in the classroom implementation, hence students, student teachers, and supervisors might provide better opportunities for non-directive and non-prescriptive feedback; (2) student teachers’ reflective teaching practicum needed to be integrated with the reflection-in- and -on-action; (3) the use of video recordings in teaching practicum would be beneficial for student teachers’ teaching reflection on synchronous and asynchronous communication mode; and (4) student teachers’ teaching duration could be appropriately and flexibly extended to earn teaching experiences and develop self-confidence, skills, real-life teaching experiences, and sense of awareness about teachers’ profession in the future. Therefore, student teachers’ experience might encourage the insightful balancing theory flexibilities that promoted the current curriculum and practiced assessments and students’ diversity (Yung, 2020) since teaching practicum aims at proportionally affirming a knowledge orientation, such as preparing teaching material and specifying pedagogical knowledge (Portman & Rass, 2019).

Classroom-based teaching practicum slowly developed and it inadequately appeared as the substantial pedagogical changes. So, this study embedded ethics of change and reflective practices conditionally. Student teachers empirically experienced with any chances upon the firsthand how the classroom-based teaching practicum might be developed. In addition, critical self-reflection transforms the theoretical knowledge—from coursework to practical knowledge. This critical self-reflection served to shape teachers’ identities (Setyono, 2022). It should be sustainably applicable to student teachers referring to teaching practicum context and in-service English teachers following their professional development continuity in some English subjects. Fostering student teachers’ reflection redrew based on the contextual practicum. Student teachers and students might co-regulate studying teaching attitudes utilized in the following analysis. Co-planning entailed verbalization and behaviors in thinking and activating students’ previous learning and knowledge, such as asking about the designated lessons, tasks analyses, goals setting for previous and existing learning, learning strategies dealing with the enlightened challenges faced in the lessons, which collaborated with other classmates and student teachers. The co-regulated strategy comprised verbalization and behaviors in monitoring the learning situation, controlling students’ cognitive and behavioral actions, and implementing disciplinary learning strategies to support others’ learning collaboratively. Co-reflection consisted of verbalization and behaviors in reflecting student teachers’ learning condition,
such as reviewing the learning topic, evaluating the learning objectives and feedback on the tasks or quizzes, and comparing learning occurrences to students’ experience and knowledge.

On the other hand, student teachers’ non-verbal modes, such as gestures, lips-setting, and facial expressions (Sumekto et al., 2021; Sumekto & Setyawati, 2020), closer position to students when listening to and asking for students’ responses and questions, eyes contact with students would be student teachers’ priority throughout the lessons. Progressive activities involved students’ co-regulated activities would indicate their enthusiasm levels through face-to-face and online learning (Saariaho et al., 2019). In the experiential speaking classes, students also conveyed their learning interests by promptly responding to what student teachers asked about the topics. The questions stimulated students’ new vocabularies used in expressing the transactional conversation, broadened students’ comprehension regarding the school’s academic calendar of school years and informing address to someone, and paid details attention to the standard command of English and part of speech, and worked collaboratively among group members as well.

Further, the obstacles influxes among student teachers during teaching practicum participation attributed to their teaching professionalism following the common structural and cultural teaching performance within implicit teaching necessities accordingly as being embedded in the pedagogical practicum agenda (Yuan & Lee, 2016). However, student teachers showed their self-reflections to indicate approaching steps that consisted of classroom management environment to be the evaluative teaching consideration (Kleinknecht & Gröschner, 2016). Empirically, student teachers commented on some instances of their problems that mostly appeared in teaching practicum sessions either face-to-face or online classes. Student teachers’ problems were revealed from the questionnaire fulfillment at the end of their teaching practicum session. To deepen student teachers’ comprehension regarding why and how teaching practicum could be ideally implementable and distinguish ways of thinking about micro- and macro-obstacles in teachers’ development and professionalism (Clarke & Mena, 2020). Four student teachers (Azizah, Fauzi, Khusnul, and Tomi) accordingly conveyed the technical and substantial problems in teaching materials in both offline and online classes in the following statements:

‘I usually prepare my teaching materials well in offline class, but I will truly forget when standing in front of the class before teaching my students. This may cause I am nervous. Meanwhile, my problems are due to the internet connection when facing online teaching and students’ focus is not attenable since they turned off the camera and microphone. I think they mostly may not participate in my class entirely.” (Azizah)

“My problems are lack of confidence when teaching students with face-to-face platform and I cannot manage students, whilst the internet signal is bad when I teach online.” (Fauzi)

“Based on my experience, I have not mastered the English materials yet, particularly in pronouncing and articulating words when designing them in freshmen and sophomores’ face-to-face classes. Nevertheless, my problems in online classes are concerned with the internet signal stability and how to manage students.” (Khusnul)

“When entering the classroom, I have problems with delivering my teaching materials since I am used to being nervous in managing the classroom. On the other hand, the weak signal and unclear audio sounds from the computer influence my online teaching quality.” (Tomi)

Realizing student teachers’ technical and substantial problems in teaching practicum, the feedbacks balance (Prilop, Weber, & Kleinknecht, 2019) were provided through a micro-genetic analysis of mutual interactions between student teachers and supervisor in terms of teaching practicum issues (Yoon & Kim, 2019) to lessen the obstacles in vocabulary, grammar, fluency, and content in speaking classes that supported pedagogical necessities and common abilities, student teachers’ capacities, and student teachers and students’ roles in bridging relationships, and student teachers’ authentic responsibilities (Deng et al., 2018) as well as examining innovative pedagogies (Kidd & Murray, 2020). The informal discussion was also engaged regarding the readability of teaching materials mastery and self-confidence and -toughness, managing the classroom, and sharpening pronunciation and articulation in face-to-face teaching. Further, this oriented dilemma was widespread among four student teachers since teaching practicum encompassed multifaceted tasks, such as designing teaching syllabus and mastery, proving
self-confidence, using online teaching media effectively, managing the classroom, and engaging collaboration and communication. Nevertheless, when student teachers found few students with high performance in speaking classes, which concerned with more positive responses by displaying their camera and microphone on and sharing ideas, student teachers might adopt a creative instructional approach. These facts constituted observations and were strengthened with the informal discussion just three days after their teaching practicum ended. Drilled practices in teaching speaking intensively would encourage teaching readabilities. Following the drilled practices, Zhu et al. (2020) supported that practicing teaching practicum effectively would encourage student teachers’ daily instructional increase towards students’ multiple learning inquiries.

This study also considered some weaknesses in accordance with teaching methods applicability that did not effectively claim any causalities during student teachers’ teaching practicum involvement. These facts relatively provided insightful chances and obstacles for student teachers’ comprehension of developing core instructional and pedagogical practices. The obtainable data confirming the analyses with contextually medium to low comprehension and sense-making discussions. All student teachers, namely: Azizah, Fauzi, Khusnul, and Tomi still incompletely underlined the underpinning of principal fields of teaching methods applicability and was affected other relevant speaking topics to address enumeration and classroom discussion. Other weaknesses accordingly engaged in a small-scale design in which the findings were not generalizable. In particular, teaching practicum was merely reinforced to freshmen and sophomores regarding the accessibility of applicable curriculum, both accommodating face-to-face and online teaching within a five-week.

CONCLUSION
This study derives how student teachers accommodate their teaching practicum experience in both face-to-face and online teaching. English teaching experience remained to be student teachers’ core practices of probing pedagogical activities and engaging in intrinsic discussions in the eligible sessions explicitly and implicitly. Showing the discernment to freshmen and sophomores who deserve to be the students, student teachers become aware of their teaching methodology, from which the substantial pedagogical matters and their sub-matters are experientially addressed from the relevant practicality into the common sense of instruction criteria. These pedagogical matters are empirically observed during the early stages of their teaching practicalities. They address the goals for discussions by explicitly specifying, and viewing students to be semi-prepared speaking materials in their discussions. They accentuate the substance of discussions in bridging students’ speaking participation gaps which highlight daily speaking performance, such as vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency, and content among freshmen and sophomores. They eligibly show similar outputs but use different teaching styles emphasizing how the closing teaching objectives accommodate any constructive discussion among freshmen and sophomores. However, this study suggests that substantial and authentic insights into practices and pedagogies in teaching practicum are accordingly obtainable. This study also recommends individual student teachers for improving their theoretical and practical methods of teaching by facilitating the enumeration and sense-making classroom discussion confidently.
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