*An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year*

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

AN ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH PRE-SERVICE TEACHERS' COMPETENCE IN SECOND SESSION OF PRE-SERVICE TEACHING PROGRAM 2016/2017 ACADEMIC YEAR

[1]**Salsa Belladinna Putri Utami, S.Pd.**
[2]**Dr. Hj. Nurhaeda Gailea, M.Hum.**
[3]**Ledy Nurlely, M.Pd.**

[1, 2, 3]University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa
[1]salsabella.utami@gmail.com
[2]ida_gailea@yahoo.co.id
[3]ledynurlely@untirta.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research was intended to see; 1.) How is the English pre-service teachers' competence in Pre-service Teaching Program?; 2.) What challenges do English pre-service teacher face during the Pre-service Teaching Program?; and 3.) How do English pre-service teachers solve the challenges? in Second Session of Pre-service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year in the University of Sultan Ageng Tiratayasa. Qualitative method and Case study design was used. After got the data from observation checklist and interview and analyzed by data condensation analysis the result said that most of the participants got under 50% from 60 points and only one participant got 70% from 60 points and most challenges they faced during the Pre-service Teaching Program (PTP) were in the category of professional competence and pedagogical competence. Another finding said that the presence of the supervisor in the school very helpful and almost covered all matters they faced during PTP.

Keywords: English; Pre-service Teacher; Pre-service Teaching Program; Teachers' competence

INTRODUCTION

Pre-service teaching program is a period of guided and supervised teaching in all teachers training education program. Pre-service teaching program is assumed to enable the pre-service teachers to make positive changes in their professional practice. Tedick in Bonavidi (2013: 1) says that:

The programs essentially prepare teachers to be committed to students' learning; to have knowledge sufficient to be used for effectively preparing, implementing and evaluating the teaching of their subject; teach and assess students' learning; systematically and critically reflect on their teaching experiences; and be ready to participate in communities of learning and schooling.

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

Different with the statements above, based on the researcher's experience it was fact that pre-service teaching program became a fear for some of the English pre-service teachers in the University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa. Most of them said that they did not believe toward their competence because of their limited experience to teach in a formal institution. According to this problem the researcher curious to know the pre-service teachers' competence based on the teachers law which said in Jalal et al. (2009: 20-21) that the Teacher Law describes in some detail four key competencies required of teacher; pedagogical competency, professional competency, personal competency and social competency. According to the explanation, the researcher posed the three research questions; 1.) How is the English pre-service teachers' competence in Pre-service Teaching Program?; 2.) What challenges do English pre-service teacher face during the Pre-service Teaching Program?; 3.) How do English pre-service teachers solve the challenges?, while the subject of this research was the English pre-service teachers who joined the second session of Pre-service Teaching Program in the University of Sultan Ageng Tirtaysa in 2016/2017 Academic Year.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK
Pre-service Teaching Program

Pre-service Teaching Program is a program in the University level specifically in educational course which is aimed to provide students or pre-service teacher practice their experience in teaching in a formal institution. This program is aimed to make sure the pre-service teachers apply the theory into practice.

Merger and Spooner-Lane in (2012:66) said that pre-service teacher education programmes aim to prepare graduates to become quality teachers equipped with pedagogical practices that will serve to meet the increasing demands associated with the teaching profession.

By the definition above it can be concluded that pre-service teaching program is a period of guided and supervised teaching in all teacher training education program for pre-service teacher to practice experience in teaching. Pre-service teaching program is aimed to enable the students who take a course in educational field to make positive changes in their professional practice. By pre-service teaching program, college students are forced to prepare all aspects needed as a good teacher. Because of that reason, this program is important to do in order to improve pre-service teachers' professional development.

Teachers' Competence

Indonesia has national policy support for teacher education. Widiani et al. (2010:24) describe that:

The National Education System Law No. 14 of 2005 ± The law specifies provisions for teacher education reform. One crucial point worth mentioning is the epoch-making declaration of "Teachers as Professionals." This law also places emphasis on actions to improve the quality of education in Indonesian schools. In particular, it addresses measures considered necessary to empower and improve the quality of teachers. This teacher law mandated four groupings of essential competencies all teachers are required to demonstrate. These are: 1) pedagogical; 2) personal; 3) professional, and 4) social.

Based on those Law, at least the teacher should have four based competencies including pedagogical competency, personal competency, professional competency and social competency. Those major competencies will be explained as follow:

Pedagogical Competency

First competency should be owned by the teacher is pedagogical competency. Pedagogical competency related to teachers' ability to managing the class. As it was said by Hakim (2015:2) that pedagogical competence is the ability to manage the learning of learners includes an understanding of learners, instructional design and implementation, evaluation of learning outcomes, and the development of learners to actualize their potential.

Based on Widiani et al. (2010: 47-50) said that pedagogical competency require the teachers to have an ability to understand their students' learning styles and physical, social, cultural, emotional, moral, and intellectual characteristics. They should at least:

• Understand to students' backgrounds (e.g., family, social, and cultural).
• Understand to students' difficulties.
• Can efficiently design and execute lesson plans.
• Evaluating learning process and outcomes.
• Having the ability to facilitate the development of their students' potential.

Personal Competency

Personal competency is an ability related to personality. Hakim (2015:2) said that the teacher should be a role model for their students. Therefore and educator needs to have the capability with regard to the development personality.

At least a good teacher should be:

• Having a good personality (stable, consistent, mature, wise, and respectful).
• Serving as an exemplary members of the society (motivator and role model).
• Evaluation their own performance (knowing their strength and weaknesses, and accepting criticism).

Professional Competency

Different with those competencies above, this competency is the certain skill should owned by the teacher related to their subject matter. Hakim (2015:3) said that indicators used to measure the level of professional competence includes understanding of the teaching materials appropriate curriculum, understand the concepts and linkages with other sciences, as well as mastering the steps in the research and critical analysis to explore teaching materials.

Teachers should continually develop themselves. They should

• Understanding the content of their subject matter.
• Comprehensively grasp basic principles of language learning and teaching.
• Has fluent competence in speaking, writing, listening to, and reading English.
• Uses appropriate principles of classroom management.
• Using the appropriate methodologies and variety techniques.
• Understand the linguistic system of English phonology, grammar, and discourse.

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

Social Competency

Widiani et al. (2010:51) states that teachers should have the ability to effectively and emphatically communicate with their students' parents or guardians, colleagues, and other members of the society. They should:

- Know the principles of effective and clear communication.
- Effectively and clearly communicate with others.
- Participate in and organize various programs in school and in the community.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Qualitative method used in this research. Qualitative research is concerned with developing explanations of social phenomena. Therefore, it aims to help us to understand the social world in which we live and why things are the way they are.

This research used case study design as a part of qualitative design. Yin (2003:1) states that in general, case studies are the preferred strategy when "how" or "why" questions are being posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within some real-life context.

In the line with the explanation above, Cohen et al. (2007: 253) states that a case study is a specific instance that frequently designed to illustrate a more general principle. Therefore, since the focus of the discussion is about phenomenon of English pre-service teachers' competence in second session of Pre-service Teaching Program of course the case study design is appropriate to use.

Since the objective of qualitative research is to understand and give meaning to a social process, rather than quantify and generalize to a wider population. Therefore, purposive sampling was used by this present research. And the object was the four English pre-service teachers who joined the second session of Pre-service Teaching Program 2016/2017 academic year in the University of Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa.

In order to answer the three research questions there were several techniques used by the researcher. Those techniques were explained below:

Observation

The first research question is "How is English pre-service teachers' teaching competence in English Pre-service Teaching Program?" The data that needed to answer this question was about the competencies that owned by the English pre-service teachers. To gain the data the observation was organized.

The researcher used observation checklist during the observation which was adapted from (Brown, 2001, p. 432)*Figure 23.1. Teacher observation form; observing other teachers.* There were 15 points separated from 4 categories printed in the observation checklist which was related to the four based competencies explained by the Teacher Law, included pedagogical competency, personal competency, professional competency and social competency.

Non – participant observation employed. In this approach, the researcher was not act as a member of the subject. The researcher only watched the subjects of the study and lived as an observer without taking an active part during the observation.

Interview

To triangulate the data from the observation and answered both the second and the third research questions, the researcher organized unstructured interview in order to answer the second and the third research questions already posed in this research. The unstructured interview is the less formal type in which although sets of questions may be used, the interviewer freely modifies the sequence of questions, changes the wording and sometimes explains them or adds to them during the interaction. to After having the data from the observation and already coding the result, the researcher will organize the interview to all participants to make sure the data got from observation was valid.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
Finding and Discussion of Observation

Observation had been done for a month since 19 April until 19 May 2017. The purpose of this observation was to find out the pre-service teachers' competence in teaching and learning activities at the Pre-service Teaching Program (PPLK), which related to the first research question that said "How is the English pre-service teachers' competence in Pre-service Teaching Program?"

The observation was served in the form of observation checklist that divided into four basic category; pedagogical competence, professional competence, personal competence and social competence. During the observation the researcher recorded the teaching and learning activity into a written text to support the research.

As the object of the research, there were four English pre-service teachers available as the object of the research. They were Nofal Pratama (Participant 1/ P1), Dendy Rifaldi Maulana (Participant 2/ P2), Maulana Jahid Syah (Participant 3/ P3) and Edwin Cahya Pratama (Participant 4/ P4).

From the observation the researcher found that most of the participants got low score in the result of observation checklist, which represented that the participants' competence were not good enough. Most of them were lack of professional competence, for example in pronunciation, mastering the material and etc. The next competence was Pedagogical competence. The participants were hard to designing and executing a good lesson plan. From the observation also, the researcher found some problems happened to the participants during teaching and learning process. Most of the problem they encountered were class room management and mastering the material. The participants were hard to conduct an orderly class.

Participant 1 (P1)

Generally P1's competency was not really good. He got the lowest score in the result of observation checklist. His best score on observation checklist only reached 27 points from 60 which only reached 45% from 100%. In the category of pedagogical competency his problem appeared in the design and execute a good lesson plans and evaluation of learning process. From the observation, the researcher found that his supervisor was not really satisfied with his lesson plans. During the learning process in almost all his performance, he was not put the

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

evaluation process (reviewing material) to make sure students' understanding toward his explanation about the material during the teaching and learning process. But he was really good at understanding students' background, it was proved by his way to communicate with the students. Sometimes he used students' mother tongue as his tool to communicate with the students.

In the category of personal competency, he was actually had a good personality, wise, consistent and mature but he rarely gave the appreciation toward his students even if only applause. From the observation also the researcher found that the P1 was continuously to evaluate his performance with the supervisor.

In the category of Professional Competency P1 got the problem in almost all point including mastering the material, knowing the principles of teaching and learning also related to his competence in grammar, speaking, writing, reading and listening English. It proved by his performance when teaching that he was not put the suitable material with the level of the students for example in listening material. On the other hand related to his Social Competency P1 was good enough. He made a good communication with another college and senior teacher over there but not really good with his supervisor.

Participant 2 (P2)

Generally the P2's competency almost got the same as the P1's competency. On the result of observation checklist, his best score only reached 29 points from 60, which mean 48,3% from 100%. In pedagogical competency, P2 got the problem in evaluation learning process. P2 never put a reviewing material at the end of teaching and learning activity. On the other hand, he did not really get problem in designing lesson plan. His supervisor did not really put it into a big problem.

In personal competency, actually P2's he was mature enough, stable, wise and good at serving as a role model. He always did an evaluation toward his performance with asking to his supervisor or to other colleges.

In the professional competency, the researcher found that almost all aspect in this category he got low score, especially related to his competence in speaking writing, reading, listening and reading English. He also got problem in understanding the linguistic system of English grammar. On the contrary, he was good to twine a good communication to the colleges and senior teacher over there.

Participant 3 (P3)

Different with both P1 and P2 above, this participant got higher score than them. It can be seen from the result that the P3's score reach until 35 from 60 which only 58,3 % from 100%.

In pedagogical competency, P3 got the problem in evaluating learning process, that he did not use a reviewing material at the end of the process of teaching and learning activity. On the other hand, he was really good at designing a lesson plan, even the execution did not apply all process he was created at the lesson plan.

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

In personal competency, he had a good personality, he was stable and mature but he could not take a wise action to control his uncontrolled students. In appearance, he was good enough as a role model and he was a good motivator not only for his students but also for his colleges. On the contrary, he did not like to evaluate his performance. It proved from his way to escape all the things researcher asked his feeling toward his performance at that time.

In professional competency, P3 got the problem in managing the class. There will always some students that could not focus to his explanation, and made a disturbance during the learning process. From the observation the researcher also found that P3's competency in speaking, writing and listening also reading was not really good, or it can be said only at the average level. For example, he ever did a mistake in writing the word 'written'. He wrote 'writen' instead of 'written'.

In social competency, P3 twined a good communication not only with his colleges, but also with his supervisor, senior teacher and others school administrators.

Participant 4 (P4)

From the observation, the researcher found that from all of the participants, P4 got the highest score in observation checklist. It can be seen from the result that the P4's score reach until 42 from 60, which only 70% from 100%.

In pedagogical competency, he got the problem in evaluating learning process. Same as the other participant he did not put a reviewing material at the end of teaching and learning activity, which was important to make sure students' comprehension toward his explanation. On the contrary, P4 was really good at understanding students' difficulties which was proved by his way to communicate with the students during the teaching and learning process.

In personal competency, he almost good at these three points, he was consistent, wise and mature, but sometime he was not stable to confront uncontrolled student. He also continuously checked and asked to his college and his supervisor about his performance at that time and he wise enough to accept all the suggestion.

In the professional competency, the researcher found that P4 got lack in his competence in speaking. Sometimes his pronunciation was wrong, for example the way to pronounce the word "written" he said /'wraiten/ instead of /'ritn/, /wrait/ instead of /r^it/. Another problem came from his way to use a good methodology in teaching and learning process. He was fixated to lecturing method and only book as the media and did not use another appropriate media or method. On the contrary he was good at managing the class and make sure the student focus toward his explanation.

In the social competency, he got a problem with his college in this program. His communication was not really good to some colleges, but good enough to supervisor and senior teacher over there. It can be seen from the ways he treat them during the program running.

Finding of Interview

In order to triangulate the data, the researcher organized the interview to make sure the data collected by the researcher was valid. The interview was held on Thursday 18 May 2017

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

to the three participants and 29 May 2017 to another participant. The interview was organized in order to seek participants' response toward the problems happened to them and the solution they had been done during the process of Pre-service Teaching Program.

From the interview the researcher found that the most of problem happened to the participants were in the professional competency and social competency included the classroom management and the communication to their social community, for example to the supervisors and colleges. The next problem that also encountered by them was in the mastering the material and producing and executing a good lesson plan.

Participant 1 (P1)

Problem and Solution during Pre-service Teaching Program

From the interview the researcher found that, almost all the problem he got was in designing a good lesson plan. He said that, there will always some mistakes that he did in writing lesson plan especially in grammar. The participant also admitted that he was not good at making a test or evaluation test. Sometimes he did not put a suitable level of question to the students, which made the students confused and could not answer the question. The solution he did to arrange a good lesson plan and a good evaluation test was asking and discussing it with his supervisor continuously.

Another problem he felt during program was in his personal competency that he said he was nervous to stand in front of the class. This problem made the participant forgot to the material he would explain to his students.

In the line with the observation that he got low score in professional competency, especially in speaking competency he also admitted that he was a slow explainer. He said the time was not enough to explain all material in a meeting because his speaking was not fluent. Same as the result of observation, during the interview he admitted that he was not wise to some uncontrolled students, so his class sometimes crowded and the students did not focus to his explanation.

Participant 2 (P2)
Problem and Solution During Pre-service Teaching Program

From the interview, the researcher found that he got problem in mastering the material, he did not prepared well to all aspect he would like to explain to the students. He did not check all the vocabularies in detail. So, when the students asked some vocabularies he could not answer the question. The solution he did was asking the supervisor and check the material in detail.

Participant 2 also said that he got the problem in the way to response the students. He could not response all the students, then sometimes may be it makes the student disappointed. He said that he could not make the cooling down situation during the teaching and learning process, so the learning process seems to be bored. There was no solution he did, because it was related to the personality.

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

Participant 3 (P3)

Problem and Solution During Pre-service Teaching Program

In the line with the observation that he got low score in professional competency, especially in speaking competency he also admitted that his pronunciation was not good. He said the time was not enough to explain all material in a meeting because his speaking was not fluent. Same as the result of observation, during the interview he admitted that he was not wise to some uncontrolled students, so his class sometimes crowded and the students did not focus to his explanation.

Participant 4 (P4)

Problem and Solution During Pre-service Teaching Program

From the interview, the researcher found that the participant 4 got the problem in the social competency. He had a problem to twine a good communication with his college during the Pre-service Teaching Program. he said that some of them sometimes changes his mood into bad mood and this situation affected to the participant in the way of his teaching and learning process. The solution he did, that he was instantly speaking to them and discuss it until the problem solved.

Another problem he felt during the program was connecting between the syllabus and certain skill he would like to bring to the class. He said, sometimes he confused to search the material that suitable with the certain skill based on the syllabus. The solution he did a discussion with his supervisor or sometimes with his friend.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

Based on this research the researcher concluded that most of the pre-service teacher competence in second session of Pre-service Teaching Program had a low competence, it can be seen from the result of observation that the highest score from participant 1 only reach until 27 points, which mean only 45% from 60. It represented that the P1's competence was not good or unsatisfactory. The highest score from participant 2 only reach until 29 points, which mean only 48,3% from 60. It represented that the P2's competence was not good or unsatisfactory. The highest score from participant 3 only reach until 35, which mean only 58,3% from 60. It represented that the P3's competence was quiet good or average. The highest score from participant 4 reach until 42, which mean 70% from 60. It represented that P4's competence was good or above average. From those points above the researcher concluded that from 4 participants that became the object of the research, only one participant (P4) who had a good competence in teaching and learning process.

Related to the problem that pre-service teachers found during the program, based on the data that researcher got it can be concluded that most of the problems they found were around their self, i.e.: arranging a good lesson plan, executing a good teaching and learning process based on lesson plan and mastering the material that would be given to the students.

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

Nevertheless those problems above had been solved by them with the biggest effect from supervisor. The pre-service teachers were discussing those problems above with their supervisors continuously. They also admitted that the role of supervisor was important in order to guide the participant to develop their professionalism in teaching performance.

Suggestion

Considering the result of the research, the researcher proposed several suggestions as follow:

1. For the program maker, the researcher suggested that the program maker should make sure the student who will join the Pre-service Teaching Program was good enough at understanding the basic principle of teaching and learning, so they will take care of their responsibility while become a pre-service teacher.

2. For the next Colleges or students who will join the Pre-service Teaching Program, the researcher suggested that the colleges should prepare all the things needed, including material readiness and also mental readiness.

REFERENCES

Adnyani, D. P.2015. *Professional Development for Pre-service Teacher A Case Study of Professional Development Program for Pre-service Teacher in State University in Central Indonesia.* Stockholm.

Akurugu, B. M.2010. *The Attitudes and Perception of students about The study of English grammar: the case of selected Senior High School students in Northern region.*

Annum, D. G. (2016, August 29). Research Instrument for Data Collection. *KNUST Gh* 1(1), 1-3.

Bonavidi, R.2013. *Pre-service Teacher Education for English as an Additional Language in Indonesia: Work Integrated Learning Perspectives* . Adelaide: School of Education Division of Education, Arts and Social Sciences University of South Australia .

Brown, H. D.2001. *Teaching by Principles An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy* (2 ed.). New York: Longman, Inc.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. 2007. *Research Methods in Education.* New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Curtis, E. M.2012. *The heart of quality teaching A values-based pedagogy for pre-service teacher education.* Queensland: Queensland University of Technology.

Fox, N., Hunn, A., & Mathers, N.2009. *Sampling and Sample Size Calculation.* Nottingham: The NIHR RDS for East Midlands / Yorkshire & the Humber.

Hakim, A. 2015. Contribution of Competence Teacher (Pedagogical, Personality, Professional Competence and Social) On the Performance of Learning. *The International Journal Of Engineering And Sciences (IJES), 4*(2), 1-12.

Jalal, F., Samani, M., Chang, M. C., Stevenson, R., Ragatz, A. B., & Negara, S. D. 2009. *Teacher Certification in Indonesia: A Strategy for Teacher Quality Improvement.* Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Republik Indonesia.

Mergler, A. G., & Spooner-Lane, R. 2012. What Pre-service Teachers need to know to be Effective at Values-based Education. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 37*(8), 66.

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947

Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. 2014. *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook.* Los Amgeles: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Moreno-Murcia, J. A., Torregrosa, Y. S., & Pedreno, N. B. 2015. Questionnaire evaluating teaching competencies in the universitu environment. Evaluation of teaching competencies in the university. *New Approaches in Educational Research, 4*(1), 54-61.

Oatte, M. M. 2011. Examinig Preservice Teacher Knowledge and Competencies in Establishing Family-School Partnerships. *The School Community Journal*, 2.

Paaso, A., & Korento, K. 2010. *The Competent Teacher 2010-2020 The competencies of teaching staff in upper secondary vocational education and training.* Tampere: Finnish National Board of Education.

Rallis, S. F., & Rossman, G. B.2009. Ethics and Trustworthiness. In J. H. Croker, *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics* (p. 264). London: Palagrave Macmillan.

Scario, A., & Liddicoat, A. J.2009. *Teaching and Learning Language.* Adailaide: Curriculum Coorporation.

Sharbain, I. H., & Tan, K.-E.2012. Pre-service Teachers' Level of Competence and Their Attitudes towards the Teaching profession. *Asian journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 1*(3), 14-22.

So, H.-J.2009. Learning about Problem Based Learning; Student Teachers Integrating /technology, Pedagogy and Content Knowledge. *Australian journal of Education Technology, 25*(1), 101-116.

Toker, S.2014. *An Assessment of Pre-service Teacher Education program in Relation to Technology Training for Future Practice: A Case of primary School Teacher Edsucation Programme, Burdur.* Ankara: Middle Eeast Technical University.

White, P. T., & Stephenson, A. E.2000. Supervised teaching practice; a system for teacher supportand quality assurance. *Medical Tacher, 22*(6), 604-606.

Widiani, Maria; Baedhoni; Hartono.2010. *Teaching Competency Standards in Southeast Asian Countries.* Philippine: SIREP SEAMO INNOTECH REGIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAM.

Xiong, X. B., & Lim, C. P.2015. Rethinking the Impacts of Teacher Education Program on Building the ICT in Education Competencies of Pre-service Teachers: A Case of Teacher Education in Maindland China. *Journal of Applied Research in Education, 19*, 25-35.

Yin, R. K.2003. *Case Study Research Design and Methods Third Edition.* United States of America: Sage Publication.

An Analysis of English Pre-Service Teachers' Competence in Second Session
of Pre-Service Teaching Program 2016/2017 Academic Year

e-ISSN 2597-4955
p-ISSN 2597-4947