JAMBURA JOURNAL OF ENGLISH TEACHING AND LITERATURE
Vol. 7 No. 1, April 2026, pp. 15-26
doi:10.37905/jetl.v7i1.35756

Student Perceptions of the Three-Phase Learning Model in English Courses

Rifda Nur Hikmahwati Arif
Universitas Negeri Makassar
rifdanha@unm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to analyze student perceptions of the implementation of a three-phase learning model (trigger questions and discussion, lecturer explanation, and practice exercises) in English courses. This research contributes to the pedagogical discourse on active learning approaches by providing empirical evidence of how non-English major students perceive structured, phase-based instruction that combines discussion, direct explanation, and practice. The findings offer insights into which instructional elements resonate most with learners and which require refinement, thereby informing evidence-based improvements in English language teaching for teacher education programs. This study employed a survey method with a quantitative descriptive approach. The research sample consisted of 72 students from the Primary School Teacher Education Program, divided into three classes (A, B, and ICP). The research instrument was a questionnaire with 32 statement items using a 1-5 Likert scale. The instrument reliability was very high, with a Cronbach's alpha of 0.928. The results showed that student perceptions of the three-phase learning model were in the good category, with a mean score of 3.68. The aspects receiving the highest appreciation were the delivery of learning objectives at the beginning of the session (mean score of 4.25) and the relevance of examples to the exercises (mean score of 4.12). Meanwhile, the pace of material delivery (mean score of 3.25) and transitions between phases (mean score of 3.32) require improvement. ANOVA tests showed no significant difference in perceptions among classes ($p=0.260$), nor did t-tests based on gender ($p=0.533$).

Keywords: student perception, three-phase learning model, English, primary teacher education

Received:	Revised:	Accepted:
02-12-2025	05-01-2026	08-02-2026

INTRODUCTION

English proficiency is an essential skill for prospective elementary school teachers in the current era of globalization. As an international language widely used in academic communication, scientific publications, and access to global learning resources (Gettinger & Walter, 2012), English language proficiency has become an important asset for teachers to continuously improve their professionalism (Nel & Müller, 2010; Tai & Zhao, 2022). Students

in the Primary School Teacher Education Program are expected not only to be able to teach subjects in elementary schools but also to have the ability to access various international references to enrich their pedagogical insights. Therefore, English courses are a strategic part of the curriculum in preparing competent elementary school teachers who are capable of competing globally (Alshaikhi & Khasawneh, 2024; Gan et al., 2020).

English language teaching in higher education for non-language major students faces significant challenges, such as heterogeneity in students' initial abilities, limited face-to-face time, and low learning motivation. Heterogeneity in abilities refers to differences in the level of English proficiency among students, which makes designing learning materials difficult to effectively meet the needs of all students. Limited face-to-face time makes it difficult for lecturers to provide personal attention and conduct the repeated practice necessary for language skill improvement. In addition, the low learning motivation of non-language major students is often caused by a lack of connection between English materials and their field of study, so students feel that language learning is less relevant to their academic goals. Therefore, effective learning requires adaptive learning strategies, the use of technology for independent learning outside the classroom, and approaches that can increase student motivation by linking English with the context of their profession or interests (Mckinley & Rose, 2022; Rintaningrum, 2023; Tai & Zhao, 2022).

The three-phase learning model is one innovative approach that can be applied to address these problems. This model consists of three main stages: (1) the trigger questions and discussion phase, where students are invited to explore prior knowledge through stimulus questions that encourage group discussion; (2) the lecturer explanation phase, where the lecturer provides clarification, concept reinforcement, and systematic explanation based on previous discussions; and (3) the practice exercises phase, where students apply the understanding that has been built through structured exercises. This three-phase learning model adopts the principles of active learning and constructivism, which emphasize the active role of learners in constructing their own understanding (Alfalathi, 2018; Kasmawati et al., 2022; Manan, 2011; Nelyza et al., 2022; Zaman, 2020).

The success of implementing a learning model is not only determined by good instructional design but also by learners' perceptions and acceptance of the model (Mudrikah et al., 2023). Student perceptions of the learning process are an important factor affecting their motivation, engagement, and ultimately their learning outcomes (Rafsanjani, 2016; Riady & Ekawati, 2016; Salsabila, 2020). Students who have positive perceptions of learning models tend to be more motivated to participate actively and achieve optimal learning outcomes (Sanjaya et al., 2018; Woromboni et al., 2022). Therefore, evaluation of student perceptions becomes an important component in the cycle of continuous improvement of a learning program (Alya et al., 2024; Herdi et al., 2021).

Despite numerous studies on active learning approaches in language education, there remains a gap in understanding how specific instructional phases—particularly the sequential integration of discussion, explanation, and practice—are perceived by non-English major students in teacher education contexts. While previous research has examined student perceptions of individual active learning strategies (Mudrikah et al., 2023; Sanjaya et al., 2018), few studies have systematically analyzed how prospective teachers perceive the flow and effectiveness of multi-phase instructional models in English courses. This gap is particularly significant given that teacher education students will eventually design and implement their own classroom instruction, making their metacognitive awareness of effective teaching sequences especially valuable. Furthermore, existing perception studies often lack granular

Vol. 7 No. 1, April 2026, pp. 15-26
doi:10.37905/jetl.v7i1.35756

analysis of which specific aspects of instruction require improvement versus which should be maintained as best practices.

Based on this background, this study aims to analyze the perceptions of Primary School Teacher Education students regarding the implementation of the three-phase learning model in English courses. Specifically, this study examines: (1) the level of student perceptions of each aspect in the three-phase learning model; (2) aspects that receive high appreciation and aspects that need to be improved; and (3) whether there are differences in perceptions based on class and gender. The results of this study are expected to contribute theoretically to the development of English learning models in higher education, as well as practical contributions in the form of recommendations for improvement for lecturers teaching the course (Nasrulloh et al., 2024).

METHOD

This study used a survey method with a quantitative descriptive approach (Darmawan et al., 2021; Istanti et al., 2024). The survey method was chosen because it is suitable for collecting data on perceptions, attitudes, or opinions from a number of respondents in a relatively short time. The quantitative descriptive approach was used to describe the phenomenon of student perceptions systematically and objectively based on numerical data collected through standardized instruments (Mulyono & Suryana, 2021; Pandiangan & Albina, 2025; Samaray, 2025).

The research population consisted of all students in the Department of Science Education who took English courses in the odd semester of the 2025 academic year. The study employed census sampling, including all 72 students from the 2025 cohort enrolled in English courses during this semester. Rather than selecting a subset, all students across three intact classes—Class A (n = 24), Class B (n = 27), and the International Class Program (ICP; n = 21)—participated in the study.

This census sampling approach was appropriate given the relatively small population size and the study's focus on evaluating the implementation of a specific instructional model within a clearly defined educational context (Etikan et al., 2016). All participants had comparable exposure to the three-phase learning model across multiple class sessions during the semester, ensuring that their perceptions were grounded in similar instructional experiences in both regular and ICP classes. However, the findings are bounded to this particular institutional and program context and should be generalized cautiously to other settings. The sample comprised 10 male (13.9%) and 62 female (86.1%) students, reflecting the typical gender distribution in elementary teacher education programs.

The research instrument was a questionnaire developed to measure student perceptions of the three-phase learning model. The questionnaire consisted of 32 statement items covering various aspects of learning, including: delivery of learning objectives, clarity of learning flow, effectiveness of discussion, quality of lecturer explanation, suitability of practice exercises, time management, classroom atmosphere, and overall satisfaction with learning. Each statement item was measured using a 5-point Likert scale with categories: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. Prior to data collection, the instrument underwent expert validation by two faculty members from the Department of Science Education with expertise in educational evaluation. Content validity was assessed to ensure that all items adequately represented the dimensions of the three-phase learning model. The instrument was then pilot tested with 15 students from a different cohort who had similar exposure to the learning model. Based on the pilot results, three items were revised for clarity. Students in the main study had no prior exposure to this specific instrument.

Vol. 7 No. 1, April 2026, pp. 15-26
doi:10.37905/jetl.v7i1.35756

Instrument reliability testing using Cronbach's Alpha resulted in an alpha coefficient = 0.928, which is in the very high (excellent) category, indicating that the instrument has very good internal consistency. Data were collected through the distribution of online questionnaires using Google Forms at the middle of the semester after students completed the series of learning with the three-phase model. Questionnaire filling was done voluntarily and anonymously to ensure objectivity of responses. The questionnaire filling time was 10-15 minutes and respondents could fill it in at any time during a specified one-week period.

Data analysis was performed using descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics included calculations of mean, standard deviation, minimum value, maximum value, and frequency distribution. Mean score interpretation used the following categories: 4.51-5.00 = Very Good; 3.51-4.50 = Good; 2.51-3.50 = Fair; 1.51-2.50 = Poor; 1.00-1.50 = Very Poor. Prerequisite analysis tests included normality tests using the Shapiro-Wilk Test. Inferential statistics used were One-Way ANOVA to compare perceptions among classes and Independent Sample t-Test to compare perceptions based on gender. The significance level used was alpha = 0.05. All data analysis was performed using Python with pandas, numpy, and scipy libraries (Agustian et al., 2025; Pannadhitthana Candra, 2025).

FINDINGS

Respondent characteristics

This study involved 72 students as respondents with characteristics presented in Table 1. The majority of respondents were female (86.1%), which is a common characteristic of Primary School Teacher Education students. The distribution of respondents was relatively equal in the three classes with Class B having a slightly higher proportion (37.5%).

TABLE 1. Respondent Characteristics

Characteristic	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Class	A	24	33.3%
	B	27	37.5%
	ICP	21	29.2%
Gender	Male	10	13.9%
	Female	62	86.1%
Total		72	100%

Prerequisite analysis test

Before conducting inferential analysis, a data normality test was performed using the Shapiro-Wilk Test. The test results showed a W value of 0.972 with $p = 0.105$ ($p > 0.05$), indicating that the data were normally distributed. The skewness value of 0.454 and kurtosis of -0.340 also support the normality assumption as they are within the range of -1 to +1. Thus, the use of parametric statistics (ANOVA and t-test) could be performed.

Overall student perceptions

The analysis results showed that the average score of student perceptions of the three-phase learning model was 3.68 (SD = 0.40), which is in the Good category. The distribution of student responses is presented in Table 2, which shows that the majority of students (59.2%) gave positive responses by choosing Agree or Strongly Agree to the statement items in the questionnaire.

Vol. 7 No. 1, April 2026, pp. 15-26
doi:10.37905/jetl.v7i1.35756

TABLE 2. Distribution of Student Responses

Response Category	Frequency	Percentage
1 Strongly Disagree	12	0.5%
2 Disagree	73	3.2%
3 Neutral	852	37.1%
4 Agree	1,069	46.5%
5 Strongly Agree	293	12.7%
Total	2,299	100%

Aspects with highest and lowest scores

Per-item analysis identified aspects that received the highest appreciation and aspects that require improvement. The five aspects with the highest scores were: (1) delivery of learning objectives at the beginning of the meeting (M=4.25; SD=0.66); (2) relevance of examples to practice exercises (M=4.12; SD=0.63); (3) concise and structured lecturer explanation (M=4.06; SD=0.67); (4) trigger questions that activate thinking (M=3.99; SD=0.64); and (5) emphasis on signal words by the lecturer (M=3.96; SD=0.72). Meanwhile, the five aspects with the lowest scores were: (1) appropriateness of the pace of material delivery (M=3.25; SD=0.85); (2) smoothness of transitions between learning phases (M=3.32; SD=0.53); (3) appropriateness of the pace in completing exercises (M=3.33; SD=0.86); (4) ability to recognize signals and common errors (M=3.36; SD=0.70); and (5) courage to ask questions when not understanding (M=3.38; SD=0.91).

Based on the results of the analysis of questionnaire data from 72 student respondents, the following are the five aspects of learning that received the highest appreciation from students:

TABLE 3. Five Aspects of Learning with the Highest Scores

No	Learning Aspects	Mean	Std. Dev	Category
1	Delivering learning objectives at the beginning of the meeting	4.25	0.66	Very good
2	Relevance of examples to practice questions	4.12	0.63	Good
3	The lecturer's explanation is concise and structured	4.06	0.67	Good
4	The trigger question is able to activate thinking	3.99	0.64	Good
5	Emphasis on word signals by lecturers	3.96	0.72	Good
	Average	4.08	0.66	Good

Description: Mean = average value (scale 1-5); SD = Standard Deviation; Category: 4.51-5.00 = Very Good; 3.51-4.50 = Good; 2.51-3.50 = Sufficient

Based on Table 3 , it can be seen that the aspect of conveying learning objectives at the beginning of the meeting obtained the highest score with a mean value of 4.25 and is included in the Very Good category. This finding indicates that students highly appreciate the clarity of the learning direction conveyed by the lecturer at the beginning of the meeting. When students know what will be learned and the targets to be achieved, they can be more focused and have clear expectations of the learning process. The relatively small SD value of 0.66 indicates that student responses tend to be homogeneous or uniform in giving a positive assessment of this aspect.

Vol. 7 No. 1, April 2026, pp. 15-26
doi:10.37905/jetl.v7i1.35756

TABLE 4. Five Learning Aspects with the Lowest Scores

No	Learning Aspects	Mean	Std. Dev	Category
1	Suitability of the speed of material delivery	3.25	0.85	Enough
2	Smooth transition between learning phases	3.32	0.53	Enough
3	Appropriate speed in working on questions	3.33	0.86	Enough
4	Ability to recognize common signals and errors	3.36	0.70	Enough
5	The courage to ask when you don't understand	3.38	0.91	Enough
	Average	3.33	0.77	Enough

Description: Mean = average value (scale 1-5); SD = Standard Deviation; Category: 4.51-5.00 = Very Good; 3.51-4.50 = Good; 2.51-3.50 = Sufficient

Based on Table 4, the aspect of appropriateness of material delivery speed obtained the lowest score with a mean value of 3.25 (category Adequate). This finding indicates that some students felt the tempo of material delivery by the lecturer was too fast, making it difficult for them to follow and understand the material optimally. The relatively high SD value of 0.85 indicates a significant variation in answers among students, which can be interpreted as some students felt the speed was appropriate while others felt it was too fast. The heterogeneity of students' initial English abilities is likely a factor causing these differences in perception.

Comparison of perceptions among groups

The results of the One-Way ANOVA test to compare perceptions among classes are presented in Table 5. The average perception score for Class A was 3.67 (SD=0.33), Class B was 3.60 (SD=0.36), and ICP Class was 3.79 (SD=0.49). The F-statistic value of 1.372 with $p = 0.260$ ($p > 0.05$) indicates that there was no significant difference in student perceptions among the three classes.

TABLE 5. Anova Test Results for Perceptions among Classes

Class	N	Mean	Std. Dev	F	Sig.
A	24	3.67	0.33		
B	27	3.60	0.36	1.372	0.260
ICP	21	3.79	0.49		

Furthermore, the results of the Independent Sample t-Test to compare perceptions based on gender showed that the average score of male students (M=3.75; SD=0.45) was slightly higher than that of female students (M=3.67; SD=0.39). However, the t-statistic value of 0.627 with $p = 0.533$ ($p > 0.05$) indicates that the difference is not statistically significant.

DISCUSSION

The research findings indicate that students' perceptions of the three-phase learning model are in the Good category. These results suggest that the structured approach—integrating discussion, explanation, and practice—effectively balances student engagement with guided learning. This positive reception demonstrates that when instructional phases are clearly demarcated and purposefully sequenced, students can recognize and appreciate the pedagogical intent behind each stage. The model's success lies in its transparency: students understand why they are asked to discuss before receiving explanations, and why practice follows rather than

precedes conceptual clarity. This metacognitive awareness is particularly valuable for prospective teachers, as it allows them to experience effective teaching sequences as learners before replicating these strategies in their own future classrooms.

The relevance of examples to practice questions ranked second with a mean score of 4.12 (Good category). This indicates that students felt the examples provided by the lecturer were directly related to the practice questions they were required to complete. The congruence between examples and questions helped students transfer conceptual understanding to practical application. Students had no difficulty connecting the material explained to the tasks they were required to complete.

The lecturer's concise and structured explanations achieved a mean score of 4.06 (Good). This finding indicates that students positively assess the lecturer's concise and systematic presentation of the material. Structured explanations make it easier for students to follow and understand the learning material step by step. The trigger questions designed to activate students' thinking received a mean score of 3.99 (Good category). This score indicates that the questions presented at the beginning of the discussion phase successfully stimulated students' cognitive activity, serving as a bridge to explore prior knowledge and encouraging students to think critically before receiving explanations from the lecturer. The lecturer's emphasis on signal words achieved a mean score of 3.96 (Good category). This indicates that students found the emphasis on key words (signal words) helpful for understanding English sentence structure. The ability to recognize signal words is a crucial skill in language learning, helping students identify grammatical patterns and structures.

Overall, these aspects represent the main strengths of the three-phase learning model: clarity of objectives, relevance of material, well-structured explanations, activation of thinking through discussion, and emphasis on key concepts. These aspects need to be maintained and become best practices in future learning implementations.

The smoothness of transitions between learning phases achieved a mean of 3.32 (Sufficient category) with the lowest SD of 0.53. The low SD value indicates that almost all students shared the same perception that the transition from the discussion phase to the explanation phase, and from the explanation phase to the practice phase, was not smooth. Unsmooth transitions can cause students to lose focus and have difficulty adapting to the different learning activities in each phase. The appropriateness of the speed of completing the questions had a mean of 3.33 (Sufficient category) with the highest SD of 0.86. This indicates that students felt the time allotted to complete the practice questions was insufficient. A high SD value indicates significant differences in ability among students, where students with higher abilities may feel the time is sufficient, while students with lower abilities need more time. The ability to recognize signals and common errors obtained a mean of 3.36 (category: Adequate). This finding indicates that although the lecturer has emphasized word signals (as seen in Table 3), students still find it difficult to apply this knowledge to recognize patterns and common errors independently. There is a gap between students' conceptual understanding and application skills.

The aspect of courage to ask questions when not understanding received a mean of 3.38 (categorized as Adequate) with the highest SD of 0.91. The very high SD value indicates a polarization of student perceptions, where some students feel confident in asking questions while others feel uncomfortable or embarrassed to do so. Psychological factors such as fear of being wrong, embarrassment in front of friends, or lack of confidence in English skills are likely the causes of low courage to ask questions.

These five aspects represent areas requiring improvement in the implementation of the three-phase learning model. In general, the main issues were time management (too fast a

Vol. 7 No. 1, April 2026, pp. 15-26
doi:10.37905/jetl.v7i1.35756

pace), smooth transitions, and student psychology (their courage to ask questions). These aspects require special attention for future learning improvements.

The aspect that received the highest appreciation was the presentation of learning objectives at the beginning of the session (M=4.25). This finding is consistent with the principles of effective instructional design, where clarity of learning objectives helps students understand the direction and expectations of learning (Johan et al., 2023; Solihudin & Chamalah, 2025). When students know what they will learn and achieve, they can be more focused and motivated in participating in the learning process (Nasrullah & Amin, 2021). Furthermore, the relevance of examples to practice questions (M=4.12) was also highly appreciated, indicating that students value the connection between theoretical concepts and practical applications.

On the other hand, the speed of material delivery and transitions between phases were areas requiring improvement. These findings indicate that some students felt the learning pace was too fast and the transition between phases was not optimal (Putri, 2024). This is understandable considering the heterogeneity of initial abilities of Science Education students in English. Students with lower initial abilities may require more time to process information and adapt to each learning phase (Kholifah & Hakiki, 2024; Putri, 2024). The practical implication of these findings is the need for lecturers to pay more attention to learning pacing and provide sufficient breaks between phases to ensure student readiness.

The absence of significant differences in perceptions between classes or by gender is a positive finding. This indicates that the three-phase learning model is equally accepted by various student groups with different characteristics. This consistency of perceptions indicates that the implementation of the learning model was relatively uniform across the three classes and was not biased toward a particular gender. This finding also strengthens the external validity of the study results, as the effectiveness of the learning model does not depend on the demographic characteristics of the students (Astalini et al., 2021; Tanti et al., 2022).

The instrument's very high reliability (alpha=0.928) ensures that the collected data has good internal consistency and is reliable for decision-making. A reliability coefficient above 0.90 is considered excellent according to George and Mallery's (2003) criteria, indicating that the questionnaire items consistently measure the same construct. The skewed positive response distribution (59.2% chose Agree or Strongly Agree) with very few negative responses (3.7% chose Disagree or Strongly Disagree) further strengthens the conclusion that the three-phase learning model is well-received by students (Mudrikah et al., 2023; Woromboni et al., 2022).

CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and discussion, it can be concluded that: (1) the perceptions of Primary School Teacher Education students regarding the three-phase learning model in English courses are in the Good category with an average score of 3.68; (2) the aspects that received the highest appreciation were the delivery of learning objectives at the beginning of the meeting and the relevance of examples to practice exercises, while the pace of material delivery and transitions between phases need improvement; (3) there were no significant differences in student perceptions among classes or based on gender, indicating that the learning model can be accepted equally by all students.

This study advances English pedagogy for non-language majors by demonstrating that structured, phase-based instruction can effectively balance constructivist principles with the need for direct explanation in language learning contexts. The three-phase model—integrating discussion, explanation, and practice—provides a replicable framework that addresses

common challenges in teaching English to teacher education students: heterogeneous proficiency levels, limited contact hours, and low intrinsic motivation. By identifying which instructional elements resonate most strongly with learners (clear objectives, relevant examples, structured explanations) and which require refinement (pacing, transitions, psychological safety for questioning), this research offers evidence-based guidance for curriculum designers and instructors seeking to optimize English language instruction in teacher preparation programs. Importantly, the model's equal effectiveness across different class types and genders suggests its applicability to diverse student populations within teacher education contexts.

Recommendations for improving learning include: (1) maintaining the practice of delivering clear learning objectives at the beginning of meetings; (2) adjusting the tempo of material delivery by providing sufficient pauses for information processing; (3) smoothing transitions between phases by providing brief summaries before moving to the next phase; and (4) creating a more conducive classroom atmosphere so that students are more courageous to ask questions. Future research is suggested to examine the effectiveness of the three-phase learning model on student learning outcomes using an experimental design.

REFERENCES

Agustian, A., Suryana, A., Lisdiana, K., & Nursalman, M. (2025). Analisis Statistik Uji Normalitas dan Homogenitas Data Nilai Mata Pelajaran dengan Menggunakan Python. *AL-IBANAH*, *10*(1), 51–56. https://doi.org/10.54801/b2726673

Alfalathi, S. (2018). Penggunaan Model Pembelajaran Active Learning untuk Meningkatkan Prestasi Belajar. *Oborpenmas*, *1*(1). https://doi.org/10.32832/oborpenmas.v1i1.1477

Alshaikhi, T., & Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2024). Enhancing Teacher Competence in Differentiated Instruction for English Language Learners with Disabilities: A Professional Development Intervention. *World Journal of English Language*, *15*(1), 101. https://doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v15n1p101

Alya, KSL, Luthfi, MJ, & Achadi, W. (2024). Student Perceptions of Quizizz as a Media for Evaluating Learning Materials in Research Methodology Courses. *JIIP - Scientific Journal of Educational Sciences* , *7* (3), 2309–2314. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v7i3.3632

Astalini, A., Darmaji, D., Kurniawan, D. A., & Simamora, N. N. (2021). Mathematical physics e-module: A study of students' perception based on gender. *Momentum: Physics Education Journal, 5*(2), 209–226. https://doi.org/10.21067/mpej.v5i2.5602

Darmawan, R., Yuda, AK, & Nugroho, S. (2021). Learning Motivation for Badminton Games in Public Junior High Schools in West Telukjambe District. *Journal of Sports, Fitness, and Rehabilitation (JOKER)* , *1* (1), 33–40. https://doi.org/10.35706/joker.v1i1.4464

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5(1), 1-4. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Gan, Z., Liu, F., & Yang, C. C. R. (2020). Student-teachers' self-efficacy for instructing self-regulated learning in the classroom. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, *46*(1), 120–123. https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2019.1708632

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4th ed.). Allyn & Bacon.

Gettinger, M., & Walter, M. J. (2012). Classroom Strategies to Increase Academic Engaged Time (pp. 653–673). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-2018-7_31

Herdi, H., Abbas, M., & Kasriyati, D. (2021). Analysis of Student Abilities in the Microteaching Management System with the Planning, Implementation, Evaluation, Control, and Improvement (PPEPP) Cycle. *Education* , *9* (1), 11–21. https://doi.org/10.36232/pendidikan.v9i1.608

Istanti, N., Cahyarani, PA, Rafifah, S., Prasetywati, AF, & Sulistiyono, S. (2024). Analysis of the Usefulness of the Internet as a Learning Resource for Students in Physics Subjects in Class XI IPA of SMAN 1 Lubuklinggau. *ANTHOR: Education and Learning Journal* , *3* (6), 8–20. https://doi.org/10.31004/anthor.v3i6.365

Johan, S., Mulyanto, NC, & Sarwoto, JA (2023). Effective Learning Training for College Students. *Randang Tana - Journal of Community Service* , *6* (2), 148–156. https://doi.org/10.36928/jrt.v6i2.1118

Kasmawati, K., Suriyati, S., Ningsih, D., & Nurhayati, R. (2022). Application of Active Learning Methods to Improve Student Learning Activities in Islamic Religious Education Subjects. *Al-Qalam Journal: Journal of Islamic Studies & Education* , *14* (1), 14–22. https://doi.org/10.47435/al-qalam.v14i1.801

Kholifah, SP, & Hakiki, MAN (2024). Perspectives on Students' English Learning: Awareness and Development. *Karimah Tauhid* , *3* (1), 957–964. https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i1.11008

Manan, AL (2011). Application of the Active Learning Model to Improve Student Motivation and Academic Achievement in the Sociology of the Family Course. *AGASTYA: Journal of History and Learning* , *1* (2). https://doi.org/10.25273/ajsp.v1i2.712

Mckinley, J., & Rose, H. (2022). English language teaching and English-medium instruction. *Journal of English-Medium Instruction*, *1*(1), 85–104. https://doi.org/10.1075/jemi.21026.mck

Mudrikah, A., Faudzan, NF, & Rahman, SA (2023). Improving Students' Mathematical Communication Skills and Students' Responses to Learning Through the Think Pair Share Cooperative Learning Model. *Jurnal Cendekia: Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika* , *7* (1), 442–454. https://doi.org/10.31004/cendekia.v7i1.1705

Mulyono, M., & Suryana, ME (2021). Study of Several Methods for Calculating Definite Integrals Numerically. *Proceedings of the National Science and Technology Conference* , *1* (1). https://doi.org/10.36499/psnst.v1i1.4932

Nasrullah, R., & Amin, S. (2021). Students' Speaking Strategies When Experiencing Difficulties in Speaking Activities. *Journal of Social and Humanitarian Management Sciences (JIMSH)* , *2* (1), 43–48. https://doi.org/10.51454/jimsh.v2i1.27

Nasrulloh, N., Widiyanto, Y., Pramono, B., & Deza Ikbal, M. (2024). Contribution of Information Technology to Improving English Language Training. *ADI Interdisciplinary Digital Business Journal* , *5* (1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.34306/abdi.v5i1.1063

Nel, N., & Müller, H. (2010). The impact of teachers' limited English proficiency on English second language learners in South African schools. *South African Journal of Education*, *30*(4), 635–650. https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v30n4a393

Nelyza, F., Ruslaini, R., & Novika, T. (2022). Implementation of Active Learning in Science Learning to Improve Students' Learning Independence. *Jurnal Tunas Bangsa* , *9* (2), 64–77. https://doi.org/10.46244/tunasbangsa.v9i2.1850

Pandiangan, D., & Albina, M. (2025). Models and Stages of Quantitative Research: Theoretical and Practical Approaches in Educational Studies. *IHSAN Journal: Journal of Islamic Education* , *3* (3), 724–730. https://doi.org/10.61104/ihsan.v3i3.1494

Pannadhitthana Candra, A. (2025). Data Analysis Using Python: Introducing Pandas and NumPy. *Journal of Information System and Education Development* , *3* (1), 11–16. https://doi.org/10.62386/jised.v3i1.118

Putri, HWF (2024). First Semester Students' Difficulties in Learning English. *Karimah Tauhid* , *3* (8), 9350–9357. https://doi.org/10.30997/karimahtauhid.v3i8.14531

Rafsanjani, MA (2016). The Influence of Perceived Parental Involvement on Students' Economics Learning Outcomes. *Journal of Accounting and Business Education* , *2* (1). https://doi.org/10.26675/jabe.v2i1.6046

Riady, A., & Ekawati, S. (2016). The Influence of Student Perceptions of Multimedia Learning on Activities and Motivation, Which Have Implications for Student Learning Outcomes. *Pedagogy* , *1* (1). https://doi.org/10.30605/pedagogy.v1i1.399

Rintaningrum, R. (2023). Technology integration in English language teaching and learning: Benefits and challenges. *Cogent Education*, *10*(1). https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2022.2164690

Salsabila, A. (2020). Student Perceptions of the Muhadatsah Learning Process at IAIN Lhokseumawe. *ITQAN: Journal of Educational Sciences* , *11* (2), 15–33. https://doi.org/10.47766/itqan.v11i2.1005

Samaray, S. (2025). Statistical Analysis of Biggs Learning Patterns and Numerical Method Learning Outcomes of Informatics Students. *Al-Irsyad Journal of Mathematics Education* , *4* (2), 77–84. https://doi.org/10.58917/ijme.v4i2.171

Sanjaya, IMB, Susani, YP, & Lestari, R. (2018). Student Perceptions of the Clinical Learning Environment of the Faculty of Medicine, University of Mataram and Influencing Factors. *Unram Medical Journal* , *7* (4), 1. https://doi.org/10.29303/jku.v7i4.308

Solihudin, M., & Chamalah, E. (2025). Optimizing Instructional Design to Improve the Effectiveness of Indonesian Language Learning in Elementary Schools. *Epistemic: Scientific Journal of Education* , *4* (3), 522–537. https://doi.org/10.70287/epistemic.v4i3.503

Tai, K. W. H., & Zhao, Y. V. (2022). Success factors for English as a second language university students' attainment in academic English language proficiency: exploring the roles of secondary school medium-of-instruction, motivation and language learning strategies. *Applied Linguistics Review* , *15* (2), 611–641. https://doi.org/10.1515/applirev-2022-0049

Tanti, T., Astalini, A., Darmaji, D., Kurniawan, D. A., & Fitriani, R. (2022). Student perception review from gender: Electronic moduls of Mathematical Physics. *JPI (Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia),* *11*(1), 85–95. https://doi.org/10.23887/jpiundiksha.v11i1.35107

Woromboni, S., Ambarsarie, R., & Lestari, N. (2022). The Relationship Between Student Perceptions of the Learning Environment and Academic Achievement at the Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Bengkulu. *Raflesia Medical Journal* , *8* (1), 37–47. https://doi.org/10.33369/juke.v8i1.30113

Zaman, B. (2020). Implementation of Active Learning in Islamic Religious Education Learning. *As-Salam Journal* , *4* (1), 13–27. https://doi.org/10.37249/as-salam.v4i1.148