

THE QUALITY OF LESSON PLANNING AND DELIVERY IN COLLABORATIVE TEAM MEETINGS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF FUTURE EFL TEACHERS

Aoda Kadhim Abid

Assist. Pro. In English Department

University of Al-Muthanna / College of Education for Human Sciences, Iraq

ABSTRACT

The goal of the current study was to determine how a suggested collaborative team meeting method (CTMS) affected the quality of lesson planning and delivery among potential EFL teachers. Participants in the study were the third-year English Department (n=18) at Thi-Qar University in Iraq's College of Education for Human Sciences. Two complete EFL fourth-year practicum groups made up the recruited participants. A pre-post-test one group design was employed in the investigation. A pre-post lesson planning quality evaluation checklist and a lesson delivery quality observation checklist were created and put into use to gather the study's data. The intervention training was a suggested method for team meetings that were collaborative (CTMS). The participants' lesson planning and delivery quality were procedurally pre-assessed before to the intervention. The CTMS was taught to the participants. Lesson design and delivery quality of intervention participants were pre-assessed before, during, and after the intervention. Results showed that the quality of class planning and delivery for aspiring EFL teachers has increased. Additionally, there was a tepidly favorable link between the caliber of lesson planning and lesson delivery among the potential EFL teachers. Finally, the collaborative team meeting approach (CTMS) proved successful in improving the caliber of lesson planning and lesson delivery among potential EFL teachers.

Keywords: *collaborative team meeting, potential EFL teachers, lesson delivery and preparation standards.*

INTRODUCTION

It can be difficult for new teachers and potential EFL teachers to practice teaching for the first time. Most aspiring EFL teachers are confused about how to teach since they lack experience. They may run into a number of pedagogical challenges in actual classroom teaching situations. The majority of these challenges could be attributed to a mismatch between their pre-service training and the demands of real-world teaching jobs. Lesson preparation and delivery are perhaps two of the most troublesome issues EFL

potential teachers face. An increasing proportion of EFL prospective teachers tend to give up teaching when the nagging challenges reach their pinnacle. Quality teachers are typically necessary for high-quality education. As a result, educators should possess advanced degrees and training. Poor teachers are unable to sustain high standards of instruction and learning. It is axiomatic that excellent instruction is necessary for effective learning. If the students desire to learn what the teacher wants to teach, then teaching is effective. Quality lesson planning is one of a set of pedagogical abilities required for effective

teaching. However, the observations made during practicum courses show that not all aspiring EFL teachers are capable of creating useful and applicable lesson plans. For many aspiring EFL teachers, mastering the art of successful class planning and delivery is a daunting task.

One crucial goal of teacher education programs around the world is the development of preservice teachers' professional competencies (Cochran-Smith & Villegas, 2016). Lesson planning and delivery are essential components of instructors' professional competence. The goal of teacher education programs is to help aspiring educators organize effective lessons. According to Flores (2016), teacher education programs give aspiring educators hands-on instruction in lesson planning. Lesson planning is a crucial challenge for new teachers, according to Konig et al. (2020). Lacking teaching experience, aspiring EFL teachers and new teachers turn to various ways for lesson planning. In actuality, the level of the EFL prospective teachers' pedagogical performance is determined by the lesson planning and delivery methods they employ. Effective lesson planning techniques enable future EFL teachers to create engaging lesson plans. A professional competency that aspiring and beginning teachers should be aware of and be able to execute is lesson preparation. In reality, a lot of aspiring EFL teachers lack the necessary cumulative teaching experience. Thus, creating an effective lesson plan using a roadmap is a difficult challenge for many aspiring EFL teachers and beginning teachers.

Due to the importance of lesson preparation and lesson delivery, aspiring EFL teachers must receive training in new, efficient ways for effectively organizing and delivering EFL classes. As such, practicum is designed to help aspiring EFL teachers translate their theoretical professional knowledge into actual classroom performance. According to Darling-Hammond (2014), teaching practicums work as a platform for bridging theory and practice. According to Akcan (2016), the value of practicum increases for aspiring EFL instructors when the pre-service courses place a strong emphasis on theory at the expense of experience. In the practicum, university supervisors and cooperating teachers from the host school identify and treat the weaknesses of aspiring EFL instructors.

Examining applicable literature reveals that there is just a small amount of empirical data on how teachers

organize their lessons (Jacobs et al., 2008). Empirical research on lesson planning as a skill for pre-service teachers and the development of such skill during teacher education is scarce (Cochran-Smith and Villegas 2016). Recently, Konig et al. (2020) confirmed that the dearth of research on lesson preparation is related to the idea that lesson planning is a difficult subject to study. Additionally, Konig et al. (2020) note that there is little empirical research on lesson planning as a preservice teacher ability. Ward (2006) adds that it's still not apparent how well a lesson is planned will affect how it is delivered. This uncertainty is reiterated by Praetorius et al. (2018), who point out that there is little correlation between teachers' lesson plans and their actual performance in class.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Lesson planning

Different conceptualizations are used to define a lesson plan. According to Lika (2017), a lesson plan is a collection of notes that aids teachers in formulating their objectives and delivery strategies. Lika's definition of a lesson plan focuses on its purpose, whereas Habibi's definition (2020) emphasizes its nature and notes that creating lesson plans is a crucial skill for EFL teachers. Stigler and Miller (2018) conclude that although expert instructors prepare their lessons in a process-driven manner, with an emphasis on the teacher expertise and the procedures involved in lesson planning. Teachers follow a step-by-step process. One specific ability that is mastered is lesson preparation.

similar to other teaching techniques. The primary purposes of an effective lesson plan are frequently explained by other scholars in the context of EFL. According to Harmer (2000), lesson preparation aids teachers in selecting choices regarding the lesson's objectives, activities, materials, timing, grouping, and other elements.

Similarly, Gutierrez (2015) asserts that lesson planning helps teachers make judgments regarding particular teaching strategies. Lesson planning, according to Pang (2016), encourages or helps teachers acquire communicative competence in a foreign language, both of which can be done during the preparation stage. According to Lika (2017), lesson planning aids teachers in taking into account a

variety of factors, including students' learning styles, prior knowledge, types of intelligence, interests, and other pertinent concerns. According to Kola (2019), good teaching and the implementation of curriculum policies are supported by effective lesson planning. According to Sahin-Taskin (2017), the connection between effective lesson preparation and teaching-learning quality sparked the interest of numerous scholars.

According to Naeem's study (2014), EFL student teachers encounter a number of challenges during practicum, including poor lesson planning, a lack of time for activities, supervisors who are resistant to creative teaching methods and frequently skip class observation, low voice, and students who act inappropriately, lack motivation, and have poor linguistic and pedagogical skills. According to Rusznyak and Walton (2011), reinforcing this ability requires a lot of practice and takes time. The significance of lesson planning in the context of EFL and ESL is highlighted by Gillies and Boyle (2010). Even while many teachers value lesson planning, there may be differences in how they approach it. According to Fernandez and Cannon's (2005) research on a cross-cultural study that enrolled 25 Japanese and 36 American instructors, the Japanese teachers perceived lesson planning as a more important task. American instructors concentrated more on trying to teach information well, while Japanese teachers concentrated more on the process of students' learning.

Regarding the components of lesson planning, Haynes (2010) affirms that the actions that should be completed prior to delivering a class include planning and preparation. According to Cicek (2013), a lesson plan should include the purpose, the time block, the technique, and the necessary teaching resources. It is important for new instructors to understand that they will typically need to plan far more thoroughly than more seasoned educators. According to Kang (2017), choosing and developing learning activities for students to participate in during class can be regarded as the basic aspects of lesson preparation.

According to Konig et al. (2020), defining the learning activities is the most crucial part of a lesson plan since the tasks chosen for a certain session should reflect its goals. Additionally, Habibi (2020) studied 20 papers on lesson planning in the context of EFL and came to the conclusion that the majority of

the articles under consideration concentrated on learning objectives, activity types, learning styles, intelligence, assessment activities, and teaching time. Because lesson planning is a talent, it should be completed flawlessly, quickly, and with ease. Although the length of a lesson plan does not always indicate its quality, according to Charalambous (2010), a brief overview cannot properly prepare teachers to "unfold tasks" during classroom instruction. Effective lesson planning encourages active involvement, which fosters learning (MacDonald and Phillips, 2005). The success of a teacher's daily work is largely determined by the lesson planning they do (Konig et al. 2017).

Stein et al. (2003) said unequivocally that lesson planning can reveal more about classroom instruction, supporting the association between lesson planning and teachers' instructional effectiveness. Evidence on the connection between lesson planning and teaching quality in terms of student achievement and instructional conduct is provided by Meyen and Greer (2009).

Dorovolomo, Phan, and Maebuta (2010) assert that there is a correlation between the effectiveness of instruction and the effectiveness of its delivery. On the contrary, Ward (2006) states that it is still unknown how well a lesson is planned will affect how it is delivered. According to Praetorius et al. (2018), there is little correlation between teachers' lesson planning and their actual performance in class.

Collaborative Team Meeting Strategy

The metacognitive learning practices include collaborative team meetings. Students utilize learning strategies, which are specific acts, behaviors, procedures, or techniques, to improve their own learning (Murcia, 2001). Learning strategies are task-specific tactics or procedures that a person employs to absorb, store, retrieve, and utilize knowledge as well as to organize, control, or evaluate learning (Hadley, 2001). Two integrated theoretical conceptualizations are used as the foundation for the proposed collaborative team meeting approach, or CTMS. It makes use of social metacognitive techniques, on the one hand. Apparently, Noviyenty (2018), Planning, focused attention, selective attention, self-management, self-monitoring, problem detection, and self-evaluation are some of the mental activities utilized by learners in the self-management

of their learning. According to Marjan and Mozghan (2012), collaborative learning is a teaching and learning style in which a group of students works together to solve a problem, complete a task, or create a product. As they listen to many viewpoints and are required to defend their perspectives, students participate in social and emotional activities in a collaborative learning setting. Cooperative planning, according to Friend and Cook (2007), is a voluntary engagement between equals that involves reaching a common objective through a process of cooperative decision-making. Collaboration can also encourage the production of knowledge (Bruce, Flynn & Stagg-Peterson, 2011). According to Darling-Hammond (2010), there is evidence that instructors are more likely to effectively meet the needs of all children when they collaborate to address practice-related issues.

As a result, effectively created teacher collaborative learning can enhance students' learning activities, instructors' teaching methods, and teachers' own teaching practices (Vescio, Ross, and Adams, 2008). (Chichibu & Kihara, 2013). According to Dudley (2014), collaborative lesson planning is a process in which groups of teachers prepare, deliver instruction, observe, and evaluate student learning and teaching. Additionally, Nguyen (2017) draws the conclusion that during collaborative lesson planning, teachers engage in a reflective process and draw on existing knowledge to create lesson plans that are well-supported. Collaborative lesson planning has received attention in the pertinent literature due to its importance as a useful activity for lesson planning.

Context of the Problem

In the third academic years, EFL teaching practicum courses are given in the College of Education for Human Sciences at Thi-Qar University in Iraq. EFL potential instructors are required to create and present lesson plans during the practicum. The researcher noted that many EFL prospective teachers' lesson plans were rife with pedagogical and a few linguistic errors while serving as the general supervisor of the EFL practicum. The researcher looked at 15 lesson plans in an effort to find and categorize the typical errors made by EFL prospective teachers. The amendment found that failure to accurately state the lesson's learning objectives was the first and most common error. Secondly, stereotypes were used in a few chosen educational activities. Thirdly, evaluation activities

were not in line with the learning objectives and content. Poor lesson planning and a lack of pedagogical expertise among EFL student teachers may have a negative impact on their ability to instruct. Although lesson planning is a fundamental professional skill, EFL study did not consider lesson planning quality (Ruys, Van & Terman; 2012). The goal of the current study is to determine how using a team meeting strategy affects the caliber of lesson planning and lesson delivery among prospective EFL teachers.

Statement of the Problem

Lesson preparation and delivery by aspiring EFL teachers fall short of ideal standards (70%).

Study-Related Questions

The research made an effort to respond to the following queries:

1. How Effective Is the Collaborative Team Meeting Strategy for Developing the Planning of EFL Prospective Teachers?
2. How Effective Is the Collaborative Team Meeting Strategy for Developing High-Quality EFL Lesson Plans?
3. How closely related is the caliber of lesson planning to the caliber of lessons delivered by potential EFL teachers?

Aim of the Study

The purpose of the current study is to determine whether collaborative team meetings are an effective strategy for training aspiring EFL teachers in lesson planning and lesson delivery quality.

Significance of the Study

Multiple factors contribute to the current study's significance. A creative planning technique that deserves investigation is the collaborative team meeting strategy. More research is required on the professional competence of lesson planning. A pedagogical need is improving the caliber of lesson delivery by aspiring EFL teachers. Concentrating on teaching practicum could spur other scholars to carry

out more thorough research.

Hypotheses of the Study

The research aims to investigate the following theories:

1. There is a statistically significant difference in how well EFL prospective instructors prepare their lessons between the pre-LPQC and post-LPQC ratings, with the post-LPQC scores favoring lesson planning quality.
2. There is a statistically significant difference in how well EFL prospective teachers give lessons between the pre-LDQC and post-LPQC ratings, with the post-LPQC scores favoring lesson delivery quality.
3. There is a positive association between EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning and lesson delivery quality.

Definitions of Terms

In the current study, "lesson planning quality" refers to the precise instructional plan for teaching understanding that EFL prospective teachers developed in consideration of specific quantifiable pedagogical criteria. The term "collaborative team meeting strategy" in the current study refers to the cooperative and mutually supportive peer-learning process in which a group of EFL prospective teachers works together in accordance with a work protocol to develop and implement elevated lesson plans during their practical training.

METHOD

Participants

18 third-year students from the English language department of the College of Education for Human Sciences at Thi-Qar University in Iraq participated in the study. Three groups of men and one group of women made comprised the four groups of participants. The female group included 6 future EFL teachers, compared to 4 in each of the male groups. A lesson plan quality assessment checklist (LPQC) and a teaching performance observation checklist were used to pre-evaluate all of the participants' lesson plans and watch their teaching

performance, respectively, prior to the intervention (LDOC). In terms of lesson plan quality and teaching performance, the two groups scored equally on pre-evaluations of both the lesson plans and the teaching performance.

Experimentation

A pre-post one-group design was adopted in the investigation. As a result, the lesson plan quality checklist and the lesson delivery observation checklist were used to pre-evaluate the participants' lesson plans and lesson delivery, respectively, before to the intervention (LDOC). The participants in the intervention received training on how to create excellent lesson plans through collaborative team meetings. Six sessions of instruction were held during the practicum period. Except for the third session, each session concentrated on two of the primary subjects from the quality lesson plan. Defining learning objectives and wrap-up activities were the focus of the first session. The second session focused on learning and teaching methods. The third session focused on educational tasks. Presentation, practice, and production were the main topics of the fourth session. The fifth session provided examples of several ILOs Assessment methodologies.

Study Instruments

Lesson Plan Quality Checklist

A pre-post one-group design was adopted in the investigation. As a result, the lesson plan quality checklist and the lesson delivery observation checklist were used to pre-evaluate the participants' lesson plans and lesson delivery, respectively, before to the intervention (LDOC). The participants in the intervention received training on how to create excellent lesson plans through collaborative team meetings. Six sessions of instruction were held during the practicum period. Except for the third session, each session concentrated on two of the primary subjects from the quality lesson plan. Defining learning objectives and wrap-up activities were the focus of the first session. The second session focused on learning and teaching methods. The third session focused on educational tasks. Presentation, practice, and production were the main topics of the fourth session. The fifth session provided examples of several ILOs Assessment methodologies.

A group of TEFL specialists determined the LPQC's content validity. The final version of the checklist, which had the LPQC updated in light of the experts' comments, was found to be legitimate in terms of its objective and scope. The test-retest technique was performed to determine the dependability of the LPQC. Three TEFL university lecturers were given the LPQC to evaluate six lesson plans. The same raters were asked to reevaluate the same 6 lesson ideas after ten days. Calculated was the correlation between the two evaluations. The checklist's reliability coefficient was ($r = .73$). This result indicates that the test showed a respectable level of reliability.

Two days before to the start of the intervention, the LPQC was implemented and pre-administered to evaluate the participants' 36 lesson plans. The LPQC was post-administered to evaluate 36 lesson plans, two lesson plans for each participant, following the 6-week intervention. Ratings were compared and given statistical treatment. The lesson plans of the participants were evaluated and graded on a scale of 5 values. One point (the lowest rate) to five points (the greatest rate) were assigned to each item or indicator (highest rate).

Lesson Delivery Observation Checklist (LDOC)

The lesson delivery observation checklist (LDOC) was created to assess prospective EFL teachers' performance during and after lessons. The LDOC was created to accomplish two goals.

Using teaching performance quality, participants' equality and homogeneity can be assessed. Second, the impact of the collaborative team meeting strategy (CTMS) on improving the quality of EFL prospective teachers' teaching performance/lesson delivery was determined by post-evaluating EFL prospective teachers' teaching performance/quality of lesson delivery after the intervention using the LDOC. The LDOC's material was created using knowledge gleaned from the body of literature on teacher performance evaluation. The checklist includes 11 indications, including goals, warm-up activities, teaching methodologies, and learning activities. Homework, presentations, rehearsals, productions, ILO evaluations, wrap-ups, and learning activities A group of TEFL specialists determined the LDOC's content validity. The necessary adjustments were

made in response to the experts' comments, such as replacing the warm-up activity domain with anchor activities to be more inclusive. Regarding its purpose and content, the final edition of LDOC was found to be reliable. The test-retest technique was applied in order to determine the LDOC's reliability. During teaching practicum sessions, the researcher and two additional trained observers utilized the LDOC to assess how well seven potential EFL teachers delivered their lessons.

Calculated was the correlation between the three observers' projected rating ratings. The observation checklist's reliability coefficient was ($r = .79$). The LDOC was pre-administered to assess participant teaching performance ($n=18$) and was implemented two days prior to the start of the intervention. The LDOC was post-run to assess the lesson delivery of the participants who received training in collaborative team meeting technique after the intervention, which lasted for 6 weeks (CTMS). Ratings were compared and given statistical treatment. On a scale of 5 values, the participants' teaching performance was evaluated and scored. Each item or indicator received a score between 1 and 5 points, with 1 being the lowest value (highest value).

The Suggested Collaborative Team Meeting Strategy (CTMS)

The justification for the suggested approach was based on the idea that in order to increase the quality of their lesson plans, aspiring EFL teachers needed more creative training in collaborative planning. The major objective of the suggested collaborative team meeting approach CTMS is to create lesson plans for aspiring EFL teachers, which will enhance their teaching abilities. By the end of the CTMS, EFL prospective teachers who successfully completed the training will be able to state quality learning objectives, prepare fun and interesting warm-up activities, choose effective teaching techniques, choose effective learning strategies, design learning tasks, operate production activities, operate presentation activities, and suggest and implement learners' ILOs assessment.

The CTMS's content was divided into 6 sessions/topics that each focused on two objectives, with the exception of the third session, with each session lasting 45 minutes.

These are the sessions' divisions: Speaking of sessions, the first one covered stating learning

objectives and wrap-up activities, the second covered teaching strategies and techniques, the third covered learning tasks and activities, the fourth covered presentation, practice, and production (PPP), the fifth covered various ILOs assessment techniques, and the sixth covered fundamentals of wrap-up and homework. The CTMS learning outcomes were evaluated using formative and summative evaluation techniques. The preceding topic had to be appraised before the current session could begin, per the weekly evaluation.

Principles Underlying the CTMS

1. Interdependence in a good way.
2. Complementary interaction
3. Individual and group accountability.
4. A culture of social trust.
5. Periodic evaluation of the group.

The Procedures of the CTMS:

1. The meeting team members begin by determining the topic of the session's goal.
2. The group discusses the chosen subject.
3. The group considers its actual recent experiences.
4. The team considers and documents its strong and weak elements.
5. The team views typical inputs like YouTube videos.
6. The group collaborates to summarize the inputs from the video.
7. Each participant is required to give a sample of the intended ILOs.
8. The group collaborates to create a rough draft of the chosen topic.
9. The group collaborates to assess the model.
10. The group collaborates to improve the targeted model.

Table. 1. Lesson planning rate percentages

Elements	Max. Score	Pre Assessment				Post Assessment			
		Score	Max M.	Obtained M.	%	Score	Max M.	Obtained M.	%
Objectives	360	155	20	8.6	43	263	20	16.4	73
Warm-up	90	38	5	2.1	42.2	60	5	3.7	66.6
Teaching Techniques	90	32	5	1.7	35.5	70	5	4.4	77.7
Learning Strategies	90	40	5	2.2	44.4	67	5	4.1	74.4
Learning Tasks	360	165	20	9.2	45.8	260	20	16.2	72.2
Presentation	180	97	10	5.4	53.8	131	10	8.1	72.7
Practice	180	114	10	6.3	63.3	126	10	7.9	70
Production	180	103	10	5.7	57.2	127	10	7.9	70.5
ILOs Assessment	90	32	5	1.8	35.5	73	5	4.4	81.1
Wrap-up	90	39	5	2.2	43.3	64	5	3.9	71.1
Homework	90	38	5	2.1	42.2	63	5	3.9	70
Total	1800	853	100	47.4	47.4	1304	100	72.4	72.4

Table.2 Black effect size of CTTS on developing lesson planning quality

Σ Test Score	Pre-Mean	Post-Mean	MGR	Significance
1800	47.4	72.4	1.9	Accepted: above 1.2

$$\text{Black Modified Gain Ratio MGR} = \frac{72.4-47.4}{1800-47.4} + \frac{72.4-47.4}{1800} = 1.9$$

$MGR = (72.4-47.4)/(1800-47.4) + (72.4-47.4)/1800 = 1.9$ for the black modified gain ratio.

Since Black's adjusted gain ratio was (1.9), which is higher than the acceptability level, the suggested CTTS' effective size on improving EFL perspective instructors' lesson planning quality was acceptable, as shown in Table 2. (1.2). The first hypothesis was therefore accepted as stated: There is a statistically significant difference in the ratings of EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning quality on the pre-LPQC and post-LPQC, favoring lesson planning quality on the post-LPQC ratings. This outcome may be understood in the context of a number of theories. A strong theoretical foundation served as the foundation for the suggested collaborative team meeting tactics, which in turn, makes it more efficient. The participants' understanding of the strategy was aided by the orientation session because their roles were clearly defined. The CTTS's material might be enough for

the needs of aspiring EFL teachers. The training materials were fascinating since they included YouTube videos that showed sample lesson plans. Each team member has a certain responsibility and a goal for the team. The participants were encouraged to converse freely while working as a team by the welcoming and stress-free environment. In general, this result is consistent with Mow's (2010) findings that collaborative learning improves students' performance.

Table 2 shows the overall percentages of aspiring EFL teachers across all pre- and post-lesson delivery quality checklist elements (LDQC). The collective percentages of aspiring EFL teachers on the pre and post lesson delivery quality checklist (LPQC) fluctuate, with the post percentages favoring the pre (LDQC). The significance of this discrepancy, however, will be discussed in the following table 3.

Table 2. Lesson delivery rate percentages

Elements	Max. Score	Pre Assessment				Post Assessment			
		Score	Max M.	Obtained M.	%	Score	Max M.	Obtained M.	%
Objectives	180	51	10	3.3	28.3%	263	10	7.6	75.6%
Warm-up	180	36	10	2.2	20%	60	10	2.2	72%
Teaching Techniques	180	89	10	5.3	49.0%	70	10	5.8	58.3%
Learning Strategies	180	74	10	4.3	41.1%	67	10	6.9	69.4%
Learning Tasks	180	89	10	5.2	49.4%	260	10	7.1	71.1%
Presentation	180	79	10	4.6	43.9%	131	10	6.3	62.8%
Practice	180	70	10	4.1	38.9%	126	10	6.4	64.4%
Production	180	72	10	4.3	40%	127	10	7.4	74%
ILOs Assessment	90	38	5	2.2	42.2%	73	5	3.7	74.4%
Wrap-up	180	65	10	3.9	36.1%	64	10	7.4	73.9%
Homework	90	42	5	2.4	46.6%	63	5	3.7	74.4%
Total	1800	705	100	39.1	39.1%	1304	100	69.6	69.6%

Table 3 Statistically significant difference between pre and post LDQC (t-test)

Administration	N	m	P	t
Pre	18	39.1	0.05198	0.5754*
Post	18	69.6		

The p-value is 0.05198 and the t value is 0.5754 in Table 3, indicating that the CTTS was effective for improving the caliber of EFL prospective instructors' lesson delivery

Their pre-LDQC and post-LPQC performance favored the post-LPQC. The second hypothesis, that there are statistically significant variations between the ratings of the quality of the EFL prospective teachers' lesson delivery on the pre-LDQC and post LPQC favoring their performance on the post LPQC, was therefore accepted as stated. This outcome is

partially attributable to the CTTS's benefits because its content may address the demands of aspiring EFL teachers. The films and the researcher's presence, who served as the instructor, made the training materials entertaining.

Working as a team encouraged the participants to engage in free-wheeling conversation while taking advantage of the relaxed and pleasant atmosphere. This finding generally supports Burton's (2015) claim that good collaboration practices improve instructors' pedagogical skills.

Table 4. Lesson plan and lesson delivery quality correlation

Spearman's Rank Correlation	r	Sig.
Lesson Plan Quality	.54	Moderate Positive Correlation
Lesson Delivery Quality		

According to Table 4, there is a connection coefficient of $r = .54$ on the Spearman's Correlation Rank between the participants' mean scores for the quality of the lesson preparation ($m=72.4$) on the post LPOC and their mean scores for the quality of the lesson delivery ($m=69.6$) on the post LDOC. The lesson plan and lesson delivery quality of potential EFL teachers are therefore marginally positively correlated. This finding lends support to the third theory, which is modified slightly as follows: The quality of the lessons delivered and the lesson planning of aspiring EFL teachers are moderately positively correlated.

This conclusion that there is a modestly favorable association between the quality of the lessons delivered and the EFL prospective teachers' lesson planning is consistent with Stein et al(2003) 's assertion that lesson planning can reveal more about classroom instruction. Evidence for the correlation between lesson planning and teaching effectiveness in terms of student accomplishment and instructional conduct is provided by Meyen and Greer (2009). Clearly asserting that there is a positive association between the caliber of lesson design and the caliber of delivery, Dorovolomo, Phan, and Maebuta (2016) report that $r = .42$.

On the contrary, Ward (2006) states that it is still unknown how well a lesson is planned will affect

how it is delivered. This uncertainty is reiterated by Praetorius et al. (2018), who note that there is little correlation between teachers' lesson plans and their actual performance in class. Given the contentious situation, this study offers only mildly encouraging proof of the link between the caliber of lesson design and delivery by aspiring EFL teachers. This study does not, however, imply that aspiring EFL teachers will inevitably go from lesson planning to lesson delivery.

On the other side, it is feasible for educators who utilized mediocre lesson ideas but were able to carry them out successfully. It is possible that there were additional factors that influenced this outcome that were outside the purview of the current investigation. They must be given the tools they need to implement lessons in actual classrooms as well as plan lessons (Tsangaridou, 2008).

CONCLUSION

The goal of the current study was to determine how a suggested collaborative team meeting method affected the quality of lesson planning and delivery among potential EFL teachers. There were two complete third-year practicum EFL groups among the selected participants ($n=18$). Both a lesson delivery quality observation checklist and a pre-post lesson planning quality checklist were created and put into use. The intervention training was a suggested method for team meetings that were collaborative

(CTMS). The participants' lesson planning and delivery quality were procedurally pre-assessed before to the intervention. The CTMS was taught to the participants. Lesson design and delivery quality of intervention participants were pre-assessed before, during, and after the intervention.

The study's findings showed that lesson planning for potential EFL teachers was enhanced by employing the CTTS. The CTTS also enhanced the quality of the lessons delivered by aspiring EFL teachers. These findings are corroborated by Mow (2010) and Burton (2015), who claim that effective collaborative practices improve teachers' pedagogical skills and that collaborative learning has a favorable impact on students' performance. Another study revealed that the caliber of lesson planning and delivery amongst aspiring EFL teachers showed a moderately positive link. Moreover, The results of the current study showed a fairly positive link between the effectiveness of lesson planning and delivery by aspiring EFL teachers. Ward (2006) and Praetorius et al. (2018) disagreed with this finding, arguing that there is little correlation between teachers' lesson planning and students' lesson planning. Dorovolomo, Phan, and Maebuta (2016), on the other hand, support this finding by stating that there is a positive link ($r = .42$) between the quality of lesson planning and the quality of delivery.

This finding does not, however, imply that aspiring EFL teachers will automatically move from lesson planning to lesson delivery. On the other side, it is feasible for educators who utilized mediocre lesson ideas but were able to carry them out successfully. Such results were probably influenced by additional factors that were outside the purview of the current investigation. They must be given the tools they need to implement lessons in actual classrooms as well as plan lessons (Tsangaridou, 2008).

Finally, more study is needed to examine additional factors that might favorably influence the effectiveness of lesson planning and teaching performance of EFL prospective instructors. The impact of combining cooperative lesson preparation and co-teaching has to be further studied.

The operational definitions of the major terms and variables, which are partially constrained to the study area, are the only definitions that fall within the

purview of the current investigation. Since the study sample was quite small, it was not able to generalize the results. Due to the fact that the researcher served as their practicum supervisor, the participants gave it their all. In this study, the gender disparity was ignored. The participants were carrying out their practica in private schools, which had more modern academic facilities than government-run public institutions.

REFERENCES

1. Akcan, S. (2016). Novice non-native English teachers' reflections on their teacher education programmes and their first years of teaching. *PROFILE Issues in Teachers' Professional Development*, 18(1), 55-70.
2. Bruce, C., D., Flynn, T., & Stagg-Peterson, S. (2011). Examining what we mean by collaboration in collaborative action research: A cross-case analysis. *Educational Action Research*, 19(4), 433- 452.
3. Charalambous, C. (2010). Mathematical knowledge for teaching and task unfolding: An exploratory study. *Elementary School Journal*, 110, 247–278.
4. Chichibu, T., & Kihara, T. (2013). How Japanese schools build a professional learning community by lesson study. *Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*, 2(1), 12-25.
5. Cicek, V. (2013) Effective Use of Lesson Plans to Enhance Education. *International Journal of Economy, Management and Social Sciences*, 2(6): 334-341
6. Cochran-Smith, M., & Villegas, A. (2016). Research on teacher preparation: Charting the landscape of a sprawling field. In D. H. Gitomer & C. A. Bells (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (5th ed., pp. 439–547). AERA.
7. Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. London: Teachers College Press.
8. Darling-Hammond, L. (2014). Strengthening clinical preparation: The holy grail of teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education: Issues of Leadership, Policy, and Organizations*, 89(4), 547-561.
9. Dorovolomo, J., Phan, H. & Maebuta, J. (2016). Quality lesson planning and quality delivery: do they relate? *The International Journal of Learning*, 17 (3). pp. 447-456.
10. Dudley, P. (2014). *Lesson Study Handbook*. Cambridge: UK
11. Flores, M. A. 2016. "Teacher Education Curriculum." In *International Handbook of Teacher Education*, edited by J. Loughran and M. L. Hamilton, 187–230. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer. Friend, M. & Cook, L. (2010). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (6th Ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.
12. Gillies, R. and Boyle, M. (2010). Teachers' reflections on cooperative learning: Issues of
13. implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 933–940.
14. Gutierrez, C. (2015). Beliefs, attitudes, and reflections of EFL pre-service teachers when exploring critical literacy theories to prepare and implement critical lesson plans. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal*, 17(2), 179-192.
15. Habibi, K., (2020). Effectiveness of Lesson Planning in Teaching EFL. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR.)* 9(6). DOI: 10.21275/SR20612151857
16. Hadley, A. (2001). *Teaching Language in Context*. United States: Heinle and Heinle Thomson. Harmer, M. & Russell, D. (2000). *How can I plan more effective lesson?* Massachusetts. United States of America.
17. Haynes A. (2010). *The Complete Guide to Lesson Planning and Preparation*. Continuum International Publishing Group.
18. Jacobs, C., Martin, S., & Otieno, T. (2008). A science lesson plan analysis instrument for formative and summative program evaluation of a teacher education program. *Science Education*, 92(6), 1096–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sce.20277>.
19. Kang, H. (2017). Preservice teachers' learning to plan intellectually challenging tasks. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 68(1), 55–68. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487116676313>
20. Kola, M. (2019). Pre-service teachers' action research: technology education lesson planning in a South African University, *Educational Action Research*, 29(1). 99-117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2019.1686043>
20. Konig, J. et al. (2020a) Pre–service teachers' generic and subject-specific lesson-planning skills: On learning adaptive teaching during initial teacher education, *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 43:2, 131-150, DOI: 10.1080/02619768.2019.1679115

21. Konig, J. et al. (2020b). General pedagogical knowledge, pedagogical adaptivity in written lesson plans, and instructional practice among preservice teachers, *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 52(6), pp. 800-822, DOI: [10.1080/00220272.2020.1752804](https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2020.1752804)
22. Konig, J., Bremerich-Vos, C. Buchholtz, S. Lammerding, S. Strauß, I. Fladung,
23. and C. Schleiffer. (2017) "Modelling and Validating the Learning Opportunities of Preservice Language Teachers: On the Key Components of the Curriculum for Teacher Education." *European Journal of Teacher Education* 40 (3): 394–412. doi:10.1080/02619768.2017.1315398.
24. Lika, (2017). Pedagogy EFL/ESL teaching: importance of teaching lesson planning in second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(1), 246-263. doi:10.1002/tesq.283
25. MacDonald, J. & Phillips, R.A.D. (2005). Developing teaching briefs and plan teaching sessions. *Education for Primary Care*, 16, 496-498.
26. Marjan, L., & Mozghan, L. (2012). Collaborative learning: what is it? *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* (3)1 491 – 495. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.092.
27. Meyen, E. and Greer, D. (2009). The role of instructional planning in math instruction for students with learning disabilities. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 41(5), 1–12.
28. Mishra, R. (2009). *Lesson Planning*. APH Publishing Corporation. New Delhi. India.
29. Mow I. (2010). Effectiveness of Collaborative Learning in Teaching Information Systems. In: Elleithy K., Sobh T., Iskander M., Kapila V., Karim M., Mahmood A. (eds) *Technological Developments in Networking, Education and Automation*. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-9151-2_15.
30. Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. United States: Heinle and Heinle Thomson.
31. Naeem, M. (2014). English preservice teaching: Problems and suggested solutions. Available at <https://scholar.google.co.th/scholar?>
32. Nguyen, H. (2017). *Models of mentoring in language teacher education*. Switzerland: Springer. Pang, M. (2016). Companion guides for lesson planning: a planning template and the lesson plan pro forma, *ELT Journal*, 70, 4.
33. Praetorius, A., Klieme, E., Herbert, B., & Pinger, P. (2018). Generic dimensions of teaching quality: The German framework of three basic dimensions. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 50(3), 407–426. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-018-0918-4>
34. Ruzsnyak, L., and E. Walton. 2011. "Lesson Planning Guidelines for Student Teachers: A Scaffold for the Development of Pedagogical Content Knowledge." *Education as Change* 15 (2): 271– 285. doi:10.1080/16823206.2011.619141.
35. Sahin-Taskin, C. (2017). Exploring Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions of Lesson Planning in Primary Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*.(8)12.
36. Stein, B., Jaycox, L., Kataoka, S., Wong, M., Tu, W., Willott, M. (2003). A mental health intervention for school children exposed to violence. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 290, 603– 611.
37. Stigler, J., & Miller, K. (2018). Expertise and expert performance in teaching. In A. Ericsson, R. R. Hoffman, A. Kozbelt, & A. M. Williams (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (2nd ed., Ch. 24, pp. 431–452). Cambridge University Press.
38. Tsangaridou, N. (2008). Trainee primary teachers' beliefs and practices about physical
39. education during student teaching. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 13(2), 131-152. Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher education*, 24(1), 80-91.
40. Ward, P. (2006). What we teach is as important as how we teach it. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*. 77(8), 23-25.